

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, APRIL 2, 1903

NO. 14



We admit that religious people may interest themselves in public welfare. We have no objection to churches, or Odd Fellows, or any other body or corporation promoting the public welfare. We welcome their co-operation. But we do object to any body of men saying to us that there is some valid ground for legislation which is not based upon considerations of public welfare, but which is dictated solely by the religious views of a certain portion of the community, even if that portion be ninety-nine hundredths of the whole.

—John S. Ewart, K. C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Oct. 26, 1902.

This claim [that Sunday legislation is not based on religious grounds] is contradicted by the facts of all the centuries. Every Sunday law sprang from religious sentiment. . . . There is no meaning in the statutes prohibiting "worldly labor," and permitting "works of necessity and mercy," except from the religious standpoint. Every prohibition which appears in Sunday legislation is based upon the idea that it is wrong to do on Sunday the things prohibited. . . . To say that the present Sunday laws do not deal with the day as a religious institution, is to deny every fact in the history of such legislation. The claim is a shallow subterfuge.

—Dr. A. H. Lewis in "A Critical History of Sunday Legislation."

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.

5 or more copies to one address, one year..... **per copy.**
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

Orders for our "Power of Love and Love of Power" number of THE SENTINEL have just about reached the 45,000 mark. We would be glad to see it touch 50,000. Let our friends work a little longer and this can be done.

Many of our subscribers after reading the March 12th SENTINEL are sending in for additional copies. The following letter, just received, is illustrative of this point:

"After reading the 'Power of Love and Love of Power' number of THE SENTINEL, and recognizing the importance of the paper, I decided to sell single copies. Enclosed find \$2.50 for which send me 200 copies of that number."

Several have written that they purchased a supply of the March 12th SENTINEL with the idea of giving them away, but that instead they sold them. The reports are that they were easy to sell. We would be glad to correspond with those who will take up this line of work.

A number of Religious Liberty Conventions are being held at different points in the State of Iowa. We have just learned that one recently held in Des Moines was largely attended, and much interest was manifested in this question. An effort to further the circulation of THE SENTINEL was made, with the result that a score, lacking one, of subscriptions was secured. We are waiting with interest to see reports of the other conventions held.

MORE than ever do I appreciate THE SENTINEL since it has become a weekly visitor to my house.

J. M. ELLIS.

VIOLIN

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

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1903

NO. 14

The Massachusetts Hearing

The Religious Character of Sunday Legislation and the Religious Purpose of Its Supporters Plainly Exhibited Through the Instrumentality of a Non-Religious Bill

EARLY in February a bill entitled "An Act to Provide for a Civil Sabbath" was introduced in the lower house of the Massachusetts legislature at the request of Mr. Geo. B. Wheeler, of South Lancaster, who, as the representative especially of the Seventh-day Adventists, is opposing the Sunday-enforcement propaganda in New England. This bill, which was known as "House No. 689," provided that the term "Lord's day" should be stricken from the State Sunday law, and that the words, "the first day of the week," should be substituted in its stead; that the Sunday or "Lord's day" law should be so amended as to prohibit on the first day of the week "only such labor and amusements as are an actual disturbance to public and private worship"; that all employers should give their employees a release from labor either upon the first or one other day of each week; and that all portions of the present Sunday law inconsistent with these provisions should be thereby repealed.

This bill was submitted to the legislature not with the expectation that it would be passed, but for the purpose of exhibiting the fact that the "Lord's day" statute is not a "civil sabbath" law, and of causing the champions of Sunday legis-

lation to show plainly their hand and exhibit the fact that it is a *religious* Sabbath and not merely a civil rest day in the interest of which they are using and demanding the power of the State. In writing us regarding the matter Mr. Wheeler said:

My purpose in having this bill introduced was to draw a clear, distinct line between a civil and a religious sabbath, by providing for all that could be justly claimed from the standpoint of a civil sabbath and eliminating all religious features. Thus, in opposing the bill, the Sunday-law advocates are obliged to take their stand squarely upon their only legitimate and true ground—the religious ground—and to admit that their contention for a "civil sabbath" is only a blind for their real object.

And the bill did not fail of its purpose in this respect. Although it was endorsed by a number of prominent citizens, including several prominent Baptist clergymen, editors, and educators, all of whom declared that the measure secured everything that the State had a right to require, it met with the instant condemnation and opposition of the Sunday-law advocates, who, according to the expectation, exhibited very plainly just what it is they are interested in. The organ of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective

(Enforcement) League delivered itself thus:

This bill needs no comment, as its first provision is so utterly adverse to our present laws that it will defeat the bill in the minds of perhaps every legislator. It seems hardly possible that even a Seventh-day Adventist, as its author, Rev. George B. Wheeler, is one of the lights of that communion, can honestly desire to detach the name of our "Lord" from the *Christian Sabbath*, and to open it [the "Christian Sabbath"] to all forms of toil and sport and games. The dog-in-the-manger spirit, which says, "If I cannot have my sacred day, you shall not have yours," is pitiable.

This quotation certainly needs no comment in order to show whether it is a civil or religious institution that those whom it represents are interested in having the State maintain. We should like to comment on it, however, but that must be done elsewhere.

In thorough accord with this quotation was the opposition to the bill at the hearing which took place before a committee of the legislature at the State House in Boston on March 4. The preceding is by way of introduction to a report of this hearing, or rather to a presentation of some of the utterances made at it. Inasmuch as a great deal that was said on this occasion is not only of interest in connection with this particular hearing, but is of importance in connection with the Sunday-law question however and wherever it may be presented, we have deemed it best to present quite a full report of what was said. The speakers whose utterances we present in favor of the bill are Seventh-day Adventist ministers. Only one speech is given entire, that of Mr. Fifield. The others are greatly condensed, and as they are reproduced from hastily taken notes, are not absolutely verbatim, but what is given is substantially as it was uttered.

Mr. Wheeler, the author of the bill, said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: It has been stated very often by those who are advocating Sunday legislation—members of the Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League and others—that all they desired of the civil authorities was the maintenance and enforcement of a "civil sabbath." This bill is in harmony with that declaration; the "Lord's day" law which they uphold is not. Every specification of a civil rest day, every possible requirement of humanity with respect to a weekly rest day, is provided for in this bill. Anything in the present Sunday law that goes beyond the provisions of this bill is simply and purely religious legislation. Now the question arises, and the principle involved is right here, Is it right for one portion of the religious community, no matter how great a portion it may be, to use the power of the State to compel every one, without any regard for the wishes or beliefs of those who differ from them, to conform to their interpretation of the Word of God respecting the Sabbath or Lord's day, or at least to conform to their custom and practise in a matter of religion? Is not such a thing an utter denial of the rights of conscience? It is because it rests upon this evil principle that we are opposed to the Sunday law as it now stands.

Notice the inconsistencies of the "Lord's day" statute. In it the General Court of Massachusetts decides that the first day of the week is a sacred, holy day by command of God, and assumes to reenact and put in force this law of God. This is exactly what the enactment of the law amounts to. Then, after deciding that the first day of the week is the Lord's day or the Sabbath day, and is not to be profaned by secular labor, it gives permission to certain parties to break this law of God in various ways, as for instance in the operation of street and steam railways, the publishing of newspapers, etc., etc. Thus the General Court not only assumes to declare and enforce God's law, but it also assumes to release whom it chooses from the obligation to obey that law, permitting them to do secular labor on the day which it has already in effect declared that God requires to be kept holy and sacred. The State thus assumes to grant to some the privilege to sin, for if it is a violation of God's law to work on Sunday that is exactly what the State does when it allows some to work on that day while prohibiting others. Now I would ask, did God ever give to the General Court of Massachusetts the right to reenact and enforce His

laws, or the right to grant to some the privilege of disobeying them, even in cases of "necessity and charity." The question is, who is the authority in this matter of Sabbath or Lord's day observance, the General Court of Massachusetts or the Lord?

Now this bill before you provides for the protection from disturbance of all worshipping assemblies, whether in public or in private, and provides that all employers shall release their employees from labor one day each week. This is all that any one has the right to demand.

Ques. Do you object to the printing of newspapers on Sunday morning?

Ans. No, sir. I believe it is the right of the state to require civility or respect for the rights of others at all times, but beyond that it has no right to go on any day.

Ques. If there was a horse race going on near a church on Sunday, and the noise disturbed the worshipers, the law would have to be enforced to protect the worshipers, would it not?

Ans. Yes, if the *tumult and shouting* was an actual disturbance.

Ques. A manufacturer gives his employees one day in the week. They might observe different days, might they not?

Ans. They might, but without a doubt in practise the day of rest would be Sunday in nearly all cases.

Ques. Suppose they wanted to observe Saturday as the Sabbath, and the employer Monday. The manufacturer would have the say, would he not?

Ans. He would have the say for himself, and the employees would have the say for themselves.

Ques. I understand that this bill will practically allow liberty to have theatres, baseball games, horse races, etc., on Sunday?

Ans. So far as the state is concerned these things are just as objectionable on Monday as on Sunday. If they are inconsistent with public peace and order on Sunday, so are they on Monday, and if they should be prohibited on one day they should be prohibited on all days.

Religious Character of Law Shown by Exemption Clause

Mr. K. C. Russell, of Melrose, said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I am in favor of this bill because it is in harmony with this provision of the Bill of Rights of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

"And no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiments, provided he doth not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship."

Now it is evident that the present legislation requiring Sunday observance is contrary to this provision in the Bill of Rights. The measure before you seeks to alter this legislation so that it will be in harmony with the Bill of Rights. The present Sunday law does not allow the individual to choose for himself in the matter of Sabbath observance, but decides for him, requiring him to observe as the Lord's day a day which the legislature has selected for him and declared to be the Lord's day. Thus the individual is deprived of his God-given right to exercise his own choice and to follow the dictates of his own conscience in the matter. The present Sunday law also deprives the citizen of the right of deciding *how* he shall observe the "Lord's day." In it the State not only undertakes to select for him the *season* when he shall worship God by Sabbath observance, but it also in a large measure determines the *manner* of that observance, saying that the citizen shall not do this and shall not do that during this season of "holy time" that has been selected for him by the State. All this is in flagrant violation of the provision of the Bill of Rights that I have just read.

It may be said that those who observe the seventh day of the week are secured in the benefits guaranteed in the Bill of Rights by the exemption clause in the Sunday law. Allow me to call your attention briefly to this exemption clause. It reads thus:

"Whoever conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular labor and business on that day, shall not be liable to the penalties of this chapter for performing secular business, travel, or labor on the Lord's day, if he disturbs no other person."

Can any one fail to see that this exemption clause is just as thoroughly a religious measure as is the Sunday law itself? Notice, that the seventh day observer must *conscientiously* observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, and must do nothing on the "Lord's day" that "disturbs" the observers of that day, or else he is not exempt from the requirement of the statute to observe the "Lord's day." It will be seen at once that this law presumes to enter the domain of conscience. How can

the State determine whether or not a man *conscientiously believes* in and observes a day as the Sabbath? Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the principle of this exemption clause, of this Lord's day law, is the principle which led to the establishment of the Inquisition and to the persecution to the death of millions of the best people of the earth. The Inquisition was the logical result of the attempt to rule the consciences of men; it was necessary in order to wring from them the secrets of their hearts; in order to find out just what they *conscientiously* believed. I appeal to you, gentlemen of this committee, how can we undertake to require and compel men to conscientiously believe in and observe a day as the Sabbath without adopting the principle of the Inquisition and starting on the road which leads to the rack, the thumb-screw, and the stake? I am not straining the point, for the principle of all this is in this "Lord's day" statute and its exemption.

This exemption clause also provides that those exempted must actually refrain from *secular* labor and business on the seventh day. That is, they must do none other things than those that are religious and sacred on that day. It needs nothing more than this to show that this exemption clause is a religious measure, and only religious. But how can it be otherwise? It is a part of a thoroughly religious law.

Another point. This exemption clause is class legislation, for it permits the class which observes the seventh day of the week religiously to work on Sunday, while prohibiting all others from doing so. It relieves one class from requirements which it imposes upon all not belonging to that class. The man who does not conscientiously and religiously observe the seventh day is treated as a criminal if he does what others are permitted by the law to do.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am opposed to the existing Sunday law of Massachusetts, and am in favor of the bill before you, which provides for all that the State has the right to require with regard to a weekly rest day.

Fallacy of "Civil" Arguments for Sunday Legislation

Mr. G. E. Fifield, of Lynn, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee: I am to speak to you on the fallacy

of the "civil" arguments for Sunday legislation. Nothing could better show the fallacy and hypocrisy of these arguments in a general way than to simply call your attention to certain well known facts in this House. For years there have been almost constantly before this House various Sunday bills having for their manifest object the securing of a better observance of the first day of the week as the "Lord's Day," or "Christian Sabbath." I have myself had the privilege of speaking against perhaps a dozen of these bills. Those who have appeared in favor of these bills have almost invariably declared that they were not asking for religious legislation, as they knew that such legislation was against the genius of our American institutions. They only wanted, so they said, a Sunday law for civil reasons. But the end sought was religious. They seem to think that they can make a religious law civil by simply calling it so. A delegation of clergymen once called upon Abraham Lincoln with reference to some measures which they called "civil," but which he knew to be religious. Mr. Lincoln tried to check their flow of eloquence by saying, "Gentlemen, it is not often a man is honored with a delegation direct from the Almighty." Still they proceeded with their "civil" arguments till Mr. Lincoln brought them up short by asking, "Gentlemen, if you call a calf's tail a leg, how many legs has that calf?" The clergymen answered, "Five." Mr. Lincoln said, "No." "Why, yes," they said. "If you call his tail a leg, he has five legs, hasn't he?" Again the President answered, "No!" In wonder the clergymen asked, "Why?" "Because," said Lincoln, "*calling his tail a leg does not make it a leg.*" So, gentlemen, calling these laws "civil" does not make them civil, for they are religious.

If there is anything these people do not want it is a civil Sunday. If they do want a civil Sunday why do they oppose this bill, which is the only truly civil Sunday bill ever introduced here, so far as I know? This bill provides for every physical need of a weekly rest. The bill does not satisfy them simply because it is civil. Europe has a civil Sunday. In continental Europe, aside from the fact that those who wish to, go to church on that day, Sunday is much like the yearly holidays. But the Sunday-law workers here are constantly asking for "civil" laws to prevent "our American Sabbath" from "degenerating into the Continental Sunday." In other words, they are asking for what they

call "civil" laws to prevent "our" religious Sabbath from becoming a civil Sabbath. The fallacy and hypocrisy of this is apparent. Several years ago clergymen and church people in California were about to introduce a Sunday law bill into the legislature. The puzzling question was what to name the bill. Some honest ones said, "Call it a Sabbath observance bill." Others said: "No, no; the people will not vote for it if you call it by that name; call it a civil Sunday bill." This did not suit all. It seems as difficult to name a Sunday law as it is to name the first baby that comes into a family. They finally decided to call this California Sunday bill "A Sanitary Regulation." But do you know, gentlemen, those clergymen had such wonderful insight into sanitary science, so far beyond all the doctors of their day, that they discovered that it was unsanitary to sell milk on the street on Sunday morning after 10 o'clock, in other words, after time for the people to be going to church.

In Arkansas several years ago there was a Sunday law under which some thirty Seventh-day Adventists were persecuted by fines and imprisonment. These were as truly cases of persecution by religious bigotry as ever were seen in the Dark Ages. To illustrate: A seventh-day observer, after having kept sacred the seventh-day Sabbath according to the commandment, was on Sunday working in his field a mile and a half from a public road, digging potatoes, I think. A Methodist neighbor, who had not observed the day before, had, on his sacred day, been off to buy a cow, and was leading it home. He stopped and tied it to the fence and went over into the field and transacted some business with this Seventh-day Adventist, then went away and had him arrested and fined for working on Sunday. This is but a fair sample of those persecutions. By the earnest and eloquent efforts of Senator Crockett this law was repealed. A few years later, from a county where Seventh-day Adventists were rapidly progressing and adding to their numbers, a petition was sent to the legislature that this same law be restored to the statute books. Senator Tilman made a speech in favor of this from which I quote:

"Mr. President: I assume that Christianity is the true religion, and that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. The Christian Sabbath is an institution of Almighty God, and should be respected as such, and if assailed the civil law should be invoked to protect it. This bill provides for the general ob-

servance of the first day of the week as a day of rest from secular employments other than those of necessity, comfort, or charity. *It is in the nature of a civil regulation only.* It is not of the character of state protection of the church. It does not seek to violate the principle that the affairs of the church and the state should be kept separate. *It interferes in no way with the full and free exercise of religious freedom...* I have a local interest in this measure. In my county we have a religious sect known as Seventh-day Adventists, a very devout and respectable people, but they labor on our Sabbath, and greatly annoy the Christian people of that section. In Springdale, where most of these people live, there exists a very great demand for the passage of this bill... The Seventh-day Adventists are generally good citizens... The senator from Independence suggests that if this bill should pass it would drive this people from the State. That would be no serious loss. There would be fewer Sabbath breakers to deal with. After having left Arkansas, they might very truly exclaim:

"True patriots are we,
For be it understood,
We left our country
For our country's good."

Nothing could better show the fallacy and hypocrisy of these "civil" Sunday laws than this. It was asserted that the bill was purely civil, and yet it was admitted that it would drive "good citizens" and "devout people" from the State solely because of their religious belief and practise. I remember that on one occasion a bill had been introduced into this legislature prohibiting all forms of amusements on Sunday. The clergymen, as usual, spoke in favor of it, but declared that all they wanted was "civil legislation." An agnostic arose and made a ringing speech, declaring that the church wanted a hard-and-fast religious monopoly of the day. Then one of Boston's "reverend divines" was stirred to righteous indignation, and declared that it was monstrous that any man in this enlightened age should make such a charge against the Christian church. He reasserted that all they wanted was civil legislation, but before he concluded, he said: "I maintain that the church cannot compete with the theater and the golf game, and ought not to be expected to do so." This was admitting all that the agnostic had said, and all that the clergyman had denied. We believe that when the church gets into that condition where it cannot compete with the world, it ought not to ask the world to help it, but it ought rather to seek God for new power from on high.

The founders of the American government knew well that it was an innovation on all

the precedents of the past. On the obverse of the great seal of the United States is this motto in Latin, "A new order of things." By this motto the United States pledged itself to the establishment of a new order of things in the practical application of the principles of liberty. This new order of things consisted of two principles, both of which came from the teachings of Jesus Christ and the conflict of Christianity with paganism in the early centuries. These two principles are: first, civil equality before the law, and, second, religious independence before the law. It was to these principles that Daniel Webster referred in his eulogy on Washington, delivered eighty-one years ago, when he said: "The experiment is entirely new... If we fail, who shall venture the repetition?... If this great western sun be stricken out of the firmament, at what other flame will the lamp of liberty hereafter be lighted? What other orb shall emit a ray, even, to glimmer on the darkness of this world? Gentlemen, there is no danger of our overrating or overstating the part we are now acting in human affairs."

In all the past it had been thought there were created by God two orders of men, a ruling class and a ruled class. To the ruling class were given all the rights—the right to do as they pleased, and the right to compel others to do as they pleased. To the ruled class was given simply the right of submission to authority. Jesus overthrew this doctrine of the divine right of kings by teaching that every man is a king, that every human law is to be tried by the revelation of the divine law in every human soul, and that all men are brothers, and One is our master, even Christ. If all men are brothers, the ruler is the brother of the ruled. He is there not to give rights, for rights are all God-given; not to take them away, for they are inherent and inalienable. He is there simply as our chosen servant to protect us in the enjoyment of our own inherent rights. Thomas Jefferson stated this principle grandly thus: "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprized of the rightful limits of their power; that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us." The immortal Declaration of Independence stated it thus: "We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." In this new order

of things to which the United States is pledged by its great seal, laws are not arbitrary; they cannot create a crime by simply calling a certain action criminal. If the act is a crime at all, it is so because it is an infringement of the inherent rights of man.

Let us try some of our laws by this principle of civil Americanism. If it is thought expedient, the state has a right to set certain days apart as legal holidays. That is simply saying by law that such days shall not be included in a year's work, when a man hires by the year, unless he especially contracts that they shall be. They do not deny the right of the man to work for himself on those days if he so chooses, nor do they deny his right to contract to work for another on those days. If they did they would be an infringement of natural rights, and so the laws themselves would be criminal. The state has a right, if it is thought expedient, to say that ten, or eight, hours shall constitute a day's work. That is not denying the right of a man to work as many more hours as he chooses, if he sees fit to do so. But a law denying a man's right to work more than eight or ten hours, if he chose to do so, would itself be criminal.

So, too, if it is thought expedient, a law may declare that six days shall constitute a week's work, as this bill practically does. But if the law goes farther and prohibits a man from working on a certain day, regardless of his choice in the matter, that law infringes his inherent right to do as he pleases so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of another.

Thus our compulsory Sunday rest laws are all a direct violation of the principle of civil Americanism, a sacred principle which came from the teachings of Christ himself. John Hampden said that if the king could tax him twenty shillings without his consent through representation, he could, at his own sweet will, confiscate all his estate. So, rather than pay the twenty shillings, he suffered fines and imprisonment. And because he and others acted thus nobly, we have the principle established to-day of no taxation without representation. Is it not time for some more John Hampdens? If the state can confiscate one-seventh of my time, and tell me just how I may and may not use that time, the whole blood-bought principle of civil, inherent rights is gone. It is then but a mere matter of expediency whether or not the state shall confiscate two-sevenths of my time, three-sevenths, or even the whole seven-sevenths of my time, and so make me a slave.

Laws that have the natural rights of man on

their side, are both just and strong. Even the criminal consents to their justice. The thief and the murderer know that they ought to be restrained. But the laws that invade the rights of man by petty distinctions that have no basis in natural rights, such as Sunday laws which permit the sale of tobacco and cigars, but forbid the sale of soda water, etc., are unjust and weak. They are often thoughtlessly broken. But, having broken them, the young man is haled before the courts and disgraced by fines or imprisonment, and so often discouraged and started on the road to real crime. Such laws are themselves criminal. In conclusion I wish to speak briefly of the five so-called civil arguments for Sunday legislation.

1. It is argued that the Sabbath law is written in the physical nature of man; that the observance of one day in seven as a day of rest is a physical necessity, and that, therefore, the state has a right, for civil reasons, to enforce this rest. This is an assumption that can never be proven. Some men work so little on week days that it could not injure their physical health to work some on Sunday. But, admitting this assumption, is the state the guardian of the physical health of the individual citizen, and that regardless of his own volition? It is a fact that it is necessary to take a bath once a week in order to be healthy. Shall the state enforce the taking of this bath, providing its public bath-house, and requiring that every citizen shall bathe there each week? Hygienic food is essential to health. Shall the state provide a menu for all its citizens and enforce it upon them? Many eat too much for their health. Shall the state restrict their diet by law? The government that enters upon this road will find no place to stop short of complete paternalism. The state may make laws against harmful adulterations and certain regulations necessary to the public health, but liberty demands that the individual shall determine his own actions so long as he does not injure another, even though he may choose to do that which will injure himself.

2. Those who observe the first day of the week say that they have a civil right to have the day quiet, and that this right should be protected by civil law. The reply is that any public meeting, religious or otherwise, on Sunday or on any other day, should be protected from needless disturbance, and there are laws for this purpose. If they are not adequate they should be made so. Laws to prevent needless noise on a crowded city street every day

in the week would be civil laws. But it is clear that is not simple noise that disturbs the Sunday observer. Nothing in all the week makes more noise than the Sunday morning church bells. This does not disturb because it is thought to be a very pious noise. But just when all the air is filled with the clamor and clanging of the near-by church bells, let the Sunday observer barely hear the report of a gun in a far distant woods, and immediately he is greatly disturbed. The evident reason why is that the report of the gun is thought to be a very impious, a very wicked noise. My friend here, Mr. Gibson, from Everett, was engaged not long since in the not very noisy occupation of painting his barn on Sunday, and this so disturbed a neighbor that he had him arrested and fined. It could not have been the noise that caused this disturbance. It is the shock to the religious prejudice, a purely mental disturbance, and a disturbance because of religious belief. While they call it "civil legislation," these Sunday-law people really want the state to protect their religious belief and prejudice from shock. This is what the zealot and persecutor has wanted in all ages.

3. We are told by the Sunday-law advocates that a man has a right to rest one day in seven, and that the civil law should protect that right. If this is all that is wanted, they should support this bill, for it provides for the protection of that right. But the right to rest is no greater than the right to work, and one right must not be protected by denying another equally sacred. Compulsory Sunday rest laws on the pretense of protecting an inherent right, absolutely deny and nullify another inherent right. One is reminded of the Sunday bill introduced into the national legislature by Mr. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, a man not so religiously popular now, although then almost canonized by the religio-political workers. The title of this bill was, "A bill to prevent people from being forced to work on Sunday." The bill was in reality a bill to force people not to work on Sunday. In pretending to protect a right it took away a right. The Constitution of the United States guarantees that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States." No man is compelled to work on Sunday in this country. Mr. Crafts, the very chief of the Sunday-law champions, declares that he never knew a man who lost a job by con-

scientifically refusing to work on Sunday who did not get a better job in the place of the one lost.

4. It is argued that the man who observes Sunday as the Sabbath has a civil right to be protected from the competition of other men in the same business who might not choose to rest on that day. In other words, the state is asked to compel one man to rest on Sunday that another man's religious convictions may not cost him anything. And this is called "civil legislation"! Where did Christ ever commission the state to take the cross out of Christianity? And who does not know that if the state takes the cross out of Christianity it will take the divine, uplifting power out also? It would be better if there were more cross in the popular Christianity of the day; there would be fewer unconverted people in the church, and the church would have more power. Such laws, while professing to be civil, are worse than religious; they are anti-religious, as indeed are all religious laws—opposed to the interests of all true religion. The same argument, if admitted at all, would justify the largest Christian denomination in asking that all business be prohibited on all its holidays, more than two hundred in number each year.

5. It is asserted that the "American Sabbath" is so intimately connected with the stability and welfare of the state that the state, for its own preservation, must enforce its observance. One is reminded of the free trade orator, who, following a speaker who had exalted to the heavens the wonderful virtues of a high protective tariff, said that it was evident that the Lord made a great mistake when he created the world, for, instead of spending six days upon the work, he should simply have made a protective tariff, and that would have done all the rest. So it is declared that the "American Sabbath" is the foundation and cause of everything worth having in this land, and that therefore it must be protected by the state. All true spontaneous religion is not only a blessing to the individual but also a blessing to the community and the land. If all men would freely and from the heart observe God's holy Sabbath, it would be a blessing to the nation, for it would bring peace and contentment into each life. But to compel men to keep the Sabbath against their will, instead of bringing content and rest of heart, brings discontent and unrest, and so is a curse to the state instead of a blessing. This same argument has been used in support of all the

religious legislation and persecution of the past. The spontaneous worship of one God as the All-Father would make us all brothers and sisters. This was God's design in the command, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." But the state in seeking to enforce this worship has ever created hypocrites for the church and traitors for the state. Once in Spain they reasoned that God could not bless the state while the Moors were permitted to live there. So they made a law that all should be either baptized or banished. This law was ruthlessly enforced, causing misery to thousands. Multitudes were banished, and about thirty thousand were baptized and then called Moriscoes. Then the tardy question arose in the minds of the legislators, "Were these people, who have been baptized under compulsion, really baptized? Are they really Christians?" They decided that the state must be protected at all hazards, and as there was only one way to make sure of this, they killed them all, saying that if they were Christians Christ would take care of them and reward them. This is the same old argument of all the persecuting ages of the past. Rome to-day declares that she never persecuted; she only turned men whom she called heretics over to the "civil law" to be dealt with as they deserved. Judge Welch of the Supreme Bench of Ohio has well said: "When Christianity asks aid from the civil power it denies itself."

Gentlemen, I submit to you that these so-called "civil" Sunday laws are really compulsory religious laws and relics of a persecuting past. I thank you for your kind attention.

Ques. Do you maintain that the state cannot pass a law restricting the rights of a man?

Ans. I maintain that the state exists not to pass laws which infringe the natural rights of men, but to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights.

Ques. How about the liquor traffic?

Ans. The state has no right to prevent me by law from drinking liquor because it is not good for me personally to drink liquor. It has a right, though, to restrain men in a business which produces murderers, lunatics, and paupers.

Ques. How are we going to decide what are a man's natural rights?

Ans. All men know intuitively what their natural rights are, and so all men really agree on this point. The difficulty is that some men are not satisfied with simply their own

rights; they want also to invade the rights of other men, and it is from this that the law should restrain them.

Mr. W. T. Gibson, of Everett, and Mr. M. D. Mattson, another Adventist minister, also spoke in favor of the bill. Announcing that he was "not a clergyman, but a laboring man," Mr. Gibson recounted to the committee some of the experiences he has been compelled to suffer at different times during the last eight or ten years through the instrumentality of the Sunday law. With these experiences readers of *THE SENTINEL* are somewhat familiar. In conclusion Mr. Gibson very properly declared that a law which enabled men on no better ground than that of "a mind disturbance" to prosecute and persecute others against whom they were prejudiced and spiteful because of difference of religious belief and practise, should be wiped from the statute books.

Citing a recent case in North Carolina, in which "two Christian men were fined and on refusing to pay their fines, were imprisoned," Mr. Mattson emphasized a point that has been almost entirely ignored heretofore in considering the evils of Sunday legislation. He declared that Sunday laws not only operate to deprive citizens of their rights, and to bring a

species of religious persecution upon upright and devout men, but that in many instances they oblige judges and other civil officials either to disregard their sense of right and justice or else to resign their official positions. The justice in the case in North Carolina declared at the trial that he though the Sunday law was unconstitutional and unjust, but that he was obliged to enforce it, adding that he hoped the cases would be appealed and his sentence reversed. Refusing to pay their fines, the men had to be taken to jail, and this placed the sheriff and the jailor in the predicament in which the justice had been. The first man deputized to take the men to jail refused absolutely to do so. The jailor, when the men were committed to him, refused to, or at least did not, imprison them as required by the sentence, but practically gave them their liberty during the time of their sentence, allowing them to stay at his house instead of at the jail. Mr. Mattson thought that proper regard for civil officials, to say nothing of those who are prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned under the law, required that they should be relieved from the necessity of enforcing such a measure as the Sunday law.

The Opposition

Representatives of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League and of other religious bodies were present in opposition to the bill. It is unnecessary to quote extensively from their remarks, as a few brief quotations will make perfectly obvious the character of their opposition to the bill. If there were any points of consequence in their arguments they are presented in the following utterances, which, of course, as is the case with some of those already presented, are reproduced from notes taken in haste and are not absolutely

verbatim, but are practically so. Rev. Mr. Kneeland, secretary of the organization just named, said:

This measure is opposed by the Sabbath-keeping, good citizenship people throughout New England, both Catholic and Protestant, and practically by all the churches, except those of the body which favors this bill. I have no grievance against these people, but believe they are grievously mistaken. We, with some twenty thousand others, are all against the passage of this bill, for it would be tending to extremes.

It seems to me that this measure is a dog-in-the-manger act. These people have been allowed an exemption clause, so that they can

have their day, and yet they desire to change the law regarding Sunday. These people are all right in their hearts, but the trouble is in their mental condition.

Rev. Mr. Bottsford, also representing the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League, said:

This bill is a radical reflection upon the customs and traditions of the past. I believe the majority must rule. Seventh-day Adventists are a very small but respectable body. I have regard for their views, but of course I must hold up my own. The people of this community believe in holding to the first day of the week, and they comprise some 2,500 churches, as compared with twenty or thirty churches of those who are against it. The majority must rule.

A Mr. Crumstead (we do not know whether or not he was a minister, but suppose he was) said:

If the law is religious, please point it out. I cannot find it. The only terms that make it religious are the exceptions. We now have a uniform law with reference to the day of rest, and this bill would go against all that and abolish it. Labor comes up and asks for shorter hours; but the operation of this bill will be to give less time for home or for culture. Health and home must be sacrificed on the altar of religious dogma and persecution. [What is meant here, we do not know.—EDITOR.] While those who are in favor of this bill are less than one-third of one per cent. of the people of the State, yet they want to ignore the ninety-nine and two-thirds per cent. who keep the Lord's day. The earlier apostles called Sunday the seventh day of the week, not the first day, as I could prove if I had time. This bill is injurious to health, and is a scheme to make converts.

Mr. White, representing the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Lowell, said:

The affairs of the State should be managed systematically. How are we going to do that and have one employer observe Monday and another Saturday is a mystery to me. This bill ignores Christ in its first section. Can you conceive of any reason why they want the law changed? I have thought that perhaps it was too religious for them, but since I came here perhaps I would not think that. This bill is not patriotic. We all admire

Plymouth Rock, and would defend it and the principles and traditions for which it stands. This bill is too great an alteration of our laws. It is a great opening to foreigners.

It will mix the State's affairs up beyond question to have this bill pass the legislature. One might hold to one day and another might hold to another day. Do not allow the Sabbath held to by a majority of the citizens of the United States to be changed or influenced by these people who constitute only one-third of one per cent. of the people of this Commonwealth.

The poor Adventists, whose "trouble," Mr. Kneeland assures us, "is in their mental condition," can certainly console themselves with the reflection that they are not the only people thus afflicted. It is difficult to believe that in this age and in this country, in one of the most enlightened of American commonwealths, there can be found persons of seeming intelligence who will stand up among other persons of intelligence and deliberately argue upon the assumption that a matter of religious belief and practise is an affair of the state, and will declare in so many words that in case of division regarding the matter the majority must rule and the minority must yield, and this for no other reason than that the majority is the majority and the minority is the minority; and who can see nothing but "a dog-in-the-manger spirit" and "a scheme to make converts" in the effort of a minority to free themselves from the oppressive dictation of the majority and to secure for all equality before the law. But evidently there are such representatives of the Dark Ages among us—people who think the last word has been said with regard to a question of religious legislation when once it has been ascertained that it is in the interests of the religion of the majority, and who cannot comprehend that there can be any possible objection to legislation favoring, supporting, and enforcing a religious observance in which a majority of the people believe, except

that which is inspired by sectarian envy, and rivalry for the same sort of favor and support.

The pretension that the Seventh-day Adventists in opposing Sunday legislation and enforcement are working to gain for the seventh day the legislative support that is now given to the first day, is eminently worthy of those who make it and the cause in behalf of which it is made. The people who make it seem to be utterly unable to comprehend that there can be such a thing as separation of religion and the state in this matter. The only alternative that they can think of for the enforcement of Sunday is the enforcement of some other day. They cannot comprehend, and it is not strange, that anybody can desire and can work hard to secure the complete abolition of all such enforcement; to secure simple freedom of choice and action in the matter.

The Adventists, like all other people, usually have some cause or motive for doing whatever they do. They, of course, do not take action with regard to matters in which they feel no concern. There is of course reason for the fact that they are to-day and have been for many years most stanch and active advocates and upholders of the principle of separation of church and state and of inalienable human rights with reference to this matter of Sunday legislation and enforcement. And that reason is not far to seek. It is found in the fact that they more than others have been made to feel the oppression of Sunday enforcement, and have thereby been aroused to a keen sense of its iniquity. They are hardly to blame for this; and if this casts discredit upon their constant appeal to the principle of separation of church and state and to the fundamental rights of human nature in opposition to Sunday legislation and enforcement, then all the struggles of the past against oppression and

all the victories of human freedom are discredited.

In all the years that they have been fighting Sunday legislation and enforcement the Seventh-day Adventists have never once given the slightest reason for the insinuation that they are working for state support of "their day," or that they have any other desire than to have put into practise the universal principles of right and justice to which they have constantly appealed. It will be time enough to call a halt upon the Adventists when they begin to show some signs of emulating the example of the Sunday agitators, and we assure these last-named gentlemen that THE SENTINEL will gladly join them in opposition to the enforcement of the seventh day. But in the meantime THE SENTINEL and the Adventists will not be diverted from the issue that is now before them. It is not the Adventists, but the Sunday champions who are *now* demanding the enforcement of a religious rest day, and they are the people to whom attention should now be given, and all honor to the Adventists and all others who are persistently meeting their demand with the opposition it so much deserves.

We have wandered somewhat from the matter under consideration, but this digression seemed necessary in view of the sort of construction that the Sunday opponents of this bill in Massachusetts have attempted to put upon the fact that the bill was supported chiefly by Seventh-day Adventists. Next week we shall present something very good bearing on this point and on others that were presented in opposition to the bill, by one who was present at the hearing, but who was not granted time for his remarks. As was of course to be expected, the hearing was the only outcome of the bill in the legislature. It was not reported favorably, and of course will die. But as we said at the beginning, it did

not fail of the chief purpose of its preparation and submission to the legislature. It has demonstrated that at least among

the active supporters of the Sunday law a *civil* rest day law is just exactly what is *not* wanted in Massachusetts.

The Outlook having said that "the object of Sunday legislation is ended when rest is secured for all classes," the *New York Christian Advocate* promptly declares, "This is very defective." Most certainly it is very defective from the standpoint of the Sunday-enforcement champion. And therefore the contention of the champions of Sunday enforcement that Sunday legislation is merely in the interests of a civil rest day is very defective. "Merely to put an end to business and guarantee rest," frankly says the *Advocate*, "as we have often shown, is not the sole end of Sunday legislation." No, we should say it is not. The sole end of Sunday legislation, from the standpoint of the class represented in this matter by the *Advocate*, and it represents the class which upholds such legislation, is the maintenance of a religious institution and the enforcement of a religious observance.

"When these Sunday-closing movements are inaugurated there is always the plea that there is no religious sentiment behind them; the ostensible considerations are the welfare of the employee, the needs of the physical system, common custom, the good of the state, etc. But when the ministers speak they invariably uncover the real animus of the agitation. Their pleas and arguments demonstrate that the *religious* phase is an inseparable part of the Sunday question, and that there can be no agitation for Sunday closing without the religious aspect coming in. And how can it be otherwise?—Sunday as a rest day, as an institution different from other days of the week, is *religious*; and there is no escape from that fact."

A newspaper in approving Sunday legislation says: "It has been decided time and again that it is within the province of a State to prohibit the prosecution of employments which are not necessary to the comfort and well-being of the people a large, especially when these tend to disturb the quietude of the Sabbath day." Exactly! The whole story is told in this last clause. And how does it happen that such a matter as "the quietude of the Sabbath day" comes within the province of an American State or any other civil power?

"Is it not unjust to meet to others that measure which we would not they should meet to us? Is not the Sabbath day profaned when we prohibit others from doing that on *our* Sabbath which we do, and claim the right to do, on *theirs*? Is not any day too good to be profaned by such an act of sheer injustice? And is not religion itself profaned when such injustice takes its name?"

We are obliged to omit from this issue the very interesting and important contribution that we had to appear under the heading, "The Supremacy of the Papacy." It will appear next week.

If it is immoral to labor on the first day of the week, then any exemption clause permitting seventh-day observers or any others to labor on that day is an immoral measure.

Sunday legislation can change its base easier than it can change its character. It undergoes no change when it is shifted from a religious to a "civil" basis.

"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:

Moreoco 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

## DON'T 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 3 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

We will send you by mail sufficient for  
**8 WASHINGS FOR 25c**

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

A TWENTY-FIVE CENT EDITION  
OF  
POWER FOR WITNESSING

---

---

Heretofore the 75 cent edition of this remarkable volume on the work of the Holy Spirit has been the only one obtainable; but a new edition in paper covers is now ready, the price of which is 25 cents, postpaid.

We believe the mere announcement of this fact will induce hundreds to secure a sufficient number of copies to supply their Sabbath-school classes and friends who are interested in the subject. It is so filled with incidents resulting from the operation of the Spirit on hearts that it will be eagerly read by all.

---

---

AN ILLUSTRATED DESCRIPTION WILL BE SENT ON APPLICATION.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

11 West 20th St.,           Oakland,           18 West 5th St.,  
New York City.           Cal.           Kansas City, Mo.