

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, MAY 28, 1903

NO. 22



The Constitution [of the United States] regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian.

. . . *The Christian religion made its way into the world in opposition to all human governments. Banishment, tortures and death were inflicted to stop its progress. But many of its professors, as soon as clothed with political power, lost the meek spirit which their creed inculcated, and began to inflict on other religions, and on dissenting sects of their own religion, persecutions more aggravated than those which their own apostles had endured.*

—From United States House of Representatives' Committee Report on "Sunday Mails" (1830), written by Col. Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky.

The long, unremitting tragedy of Christendom's brutalities against the Jewish people, lasting in some parts of Europe until now, constitutes one of the blackest pages of the world's history. There is not a form of torture, by fire, or cross, or knife, or dungeon, or starvation, which has not been inflicted in Christian [so-called] countries upon Jews because some of their ancestors were officially responsible for the death of Jesus; not a humiliation, not an indignity which has not been heaped upon them in the name of Him whose last words were, "Father, forgive them."

—From recent sermon by Dr. Geo. A. Thayer (Unitarian) in Cincinnati.

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

A Study of Principles

In Alonzo T. Jones' book entitled

"THE TWO REPUBLICS"

is a comparative study of the underlying principles of the two greatest Republics—Rome and the United States.

"The principle of Rome in all its phases is that religion and government are inseparable. The principle of the government of the United States is that religion is essentially distinct and wholly separate from civil government, and entirely exempt from its cognizance.

"As it was Christianity that first and always antagonized this governmental principle of Rome, and established the governmental principle of the United States of America, the fundamental idea, the one thread-thought of the whole book, is to develop the principles of Christianity with reference to civil government, and to portray the mischievous results of the least departure from those principles."

Rome occupies one extreme and the United States the other. Which is right? The question interests every reader of THE SENTINEL, for in its solution and the correct application of the principles lies the salvation of individual as well as nation.

"Two Republics" contains 895 octavo pages and is substantially bound in cloth. Price, postpaid, \$1.75.

Complete catalog of publications mailed on request. Address

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
11 WEST 20th STREET, NEW YORK CITY.**

WANTED

Ladies and gentlemen to represent us in every city, town, and county. Good chance to make an easy living. Write for particulars. We can interest you.

Address,

*Alfred Mallett,
Nyack, N. Y.*

"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.**

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XV||I

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1903

No. 22

The object of Sunday legislation is to enforce a *religious* observance, and that is what is done when such laws are enforced.

❖

Sunday laws are relics of the union of church and state, and are altogether out of place in these times and especially in this country. Such laws should never have been allowed upon the statute books of any American State.

❖

There is no more reason why the law should "recognize" and enforce Sunday observance than there is that it should "recognize" and enforce "Good Friday" observance. If one of these observances should have legal "protection" so should the other.

❖

It does not follow that because "the best interests of society and the commonwealth are most truly conserved" when the Sabbath is observed that Sabbath observance should be enforced. Religion ceases to be a blessing and becomes instead a curse to society and the state when it is enforced.

❖

A law which prohibits the following of "any pursuit" or "ordinary calling" on Sunday would interfere seriously with church services if it were literally enforced. Preaching and choir singing are

pursuits and ordinary callings with most of those who engage in them on Sunday, and are very seldom "works of necessity and charity."

❖

Throughout the English-speaking world to-day there is one point upon which the dominant religious forces are agreed and united—that of the maintenance of Sunday observance by law. In Australia as well as in America the clergy cling with great tenacity to this chief of the few remaining vestiges of church-and-state union. And not only do they cling to it, but, as shown by the article elsewhere on "Religious Liberty and the Australian Constitution," they are ready always to fight anything which seems to threaten this anachronism, and to improve every opportunity for more firmly entrenching it. Next week we will give a short report of a sermon recently preached in a Fifth Avenue church in New York in which were proclaimed ideas identical with those presented in the extract from Rev. T. Holme's sermon in Sidney.

❖

As we have remarked before, religion is inseparable from the matter of Sunday closing. A Minnesota newspaper in describing how the new Sunday law is regarded locally states that while most of the merchants and the people generally are well pleased with it there is considerable dissatisfaction in the community

over the prohibition of the sale of meats. On this point the paper remarks:

There are a great many people who feel that the law should not have been made to apply to meat markets. Men in the community who are known to be uniformly strict in their *observance of the Sabbath day* deem it no *irreverent* act to go to the meat market on Sunday morning for fresh meat.

This is of course equivalent to saying that what is in keeping with the "observance of the Sabbath day" and is therefore "no irreverent act" should not be prohibited by the law. And of course that is equivalent to saying that the "*observance of the Sabbath day*" and the prevention of "*irreverent*" acts is or should be the object of the Sunday-closing law.



Three weeks ago we presented some statements made by "Rev. Father Murphy" in a sermon at the "Church of St. Paul the Apostle" in this city on March 8. In the same connection he made the declaration that "the fundamental idea of the family and the home" was "an idea which she [the Roman Catholic Church] gave to Europe, and Europe to the civilized world." This is a good specimen of the baseless pretensions that "the Church" is making to-day, and which many people seem very willing to swallow. If the Catholic Church has any ideas about the family and the home that are worth anything, she gets them from the sources whence the rest of the world has obtained them. There were families and homes before the Catholic Church existed, and as good and true ones as have ever or will ever be produced under her influence. The fundamental idea of the family and the home was known and lived out thousands of years before there was any such organization as the Catholic Church, and the civilized world would have retained and have been as fully in possession of that idea as it is to-day had

the Catholic Church never existed. As long as the inhabitants of the civilized world have before them such teachings as are found in the Hebrew Scriptures and are not dead to the higher instincts and feelings of human nature, they will not need to go for the fundamental idea of the family and the home to an organization which has cursed the earth and degraded the idea of the family and the home with the idea of monasticism and celibacy, and which has had among its "infallible" heads and "spiritual" guides such men as were Boniface VI, John XII, Clement VI, John XXIII and others like them.



There are indications that another "holy" day or religious holiday is on the way toward joining the "legal" Sunday as a state supported and protected institution. We refer to "Good Friday." New York and Chicago public schools are now closed officially on this day; in fact the schools in New York are closed all during "Holy Week," because, as the by-law of the board of education says, it is "the week in which the day commonly known as Good Friday occurs." The Chicago schools were ordered closed this year by a committee of the school board in spite of the remonstrance of a Jewish school trustee, who pointed out that the action "was contrary to the fundamental principles of the nation, which separate church and state, and was also in violation of a rule recently passed by the school board, which declared that 'in the theory of the separation of church and state the board of education has no right to take official recognition of any religious holidays.'" In emphasizing his protest this Jewish trustee declared that Jewish holidays were never recognized and observed by the schools. The chairman of the committee replied that "there was a difference between the observance of Good Friday and Jewish holidays in this country, since *the*

United States is a Christian nation," and that "nearly all denominations now recognize Good Friday." This is enlightening as to the principle upon which "Good Friday" receives official recognition. But more significant than the closing of schools are these facts: A bill was introduced in the New York legislature during the session that has just closed which provided for the establishment of "Good Friday" as a legal holiday. The following ordinance "as to the official or quasi-official observance of the religious fast of Good Friday," to quote the *Sun*, was adopted by the board of aldermen of New York on March 24 and approved by the mayor on March 30:

Resolved, That the heads of the several departments of the government of the city of New York be and they are hereby requested to close their respective offices on Good Friday, April 10, 1903, and all other offices not by law required to be kept open for the transaction of public business to be closed on said day.

And the *Sun* declared that, "except as prevented by State or federal statutes prohibiting the closing of public offices, banks, or courts," the day was "observed in New York by the general suspension of official business." "The solemnity of the fast rested upon the whole town, and profoundly influenced the voluntary or involuntary conduct of the great mass of the citizens." While it is all right for officials as individuals to observe "Good Friday," or any other religious "fast" and "holy" day they may choose, so long as such observance does not interfere with the performance of their official duties, it is all wrong for them to make such observance a subject of official and legislative action. This latter is a clear and positive violation of the principle of separation of church and state. Of course "Good Friday" and the religious Sunday rest upon the same authority—the authority of the Roman Catholic Church—and

of course if one of them is a proper subject for official and legal recognition and establishment, so is the other. Both have equal claims in that respect; but proper regard for the principle of separation of church and state requires that such claims of both be utterly ignored.



The *American Israelite* of May 14 had this note at the head of its editorial page:

The massacre of Jews in Russia by a Christian mob, led by Christian priests, has so far not been deemed of sufficient importance to call for any notice from a single Christian religious paper that has come to the notice of the *Israelite*, an instance of bigoted callousness that seems hardly human.

If this failure to notice the Kishineff massacre is due to failure to abhor the atrocious and inhuman deeds and diabolical spirit of those who perpetrated it and are responsible for it, and to prejudice and bigotry against the race and religion whose representatives were its victims, then the strong words of the *Israelite* are more than justified. Although it has made no note of the matter, THE SENTINEL is probably not one of the papers whose failure to do so has been noticed by the *Israelite*. Its limited space and the circumstances of its publication do not permit THE SENTINEL to notice by any means all the matters that it would like to notice, at least not with promptness, and it does not attempt to do so. This Kishineff massacre is one of several matters that have come up in the last few weeks that we have desired to notice but which have as yet received no mention. We expected to notice it, however, when the facts of the matter became established with some certainty. The facts in brief as they now appear are these: Early on Sunday, April 19, there broke out in the city of Kishineff, in Bessarabia, a Russian province on the border of Rumania, an outbreak against the Jews, who constitute about one-third of the over 100,000 inhabitants of the

city. For two or three days riot, pillage and murder, with horrible mutilations, cruelties and indignities, without regard for age or sex, prevailed. Considerable portions of the Jewish quarters, including many synagogues, were wrecked, pillaged, and burned, and nearly one hundred Jews were killed and more than that number terribly maimed. The immediate cause of the outbreak was the circulation among the people of that product of ignorance, superstition and intolerance, the "ritual murder" charge against the Jews, which in this case, in the minds of the ignorant populace, was confirmed by circumstances. The outbreak was expected by the authorities, but they did nothing to quell it until the third day, and then the Jews were forbidden to defend themselves. And not only this, but if a document that has obtained credence is authentic, weeks before the massacre the governor of the province was directed by the Russian Minister of the Interior, Plehve, to confine himself to "admonitions" in preventing and suppressing the expected outbreak and not to have recourse to arms at all. If this is true a large share of the responsibility for the atrocities rests directly upon the Russian government itself. Of course it is impossible to condemn sufficiently this atrocious outbreak, and the spirit which inspired it. Of course those who participated in it were not Christians, though undoubtedly most of them professed to be. As we said last year with reference to the persecution of the Jews in Rumania, "to persecute is to repudiate Christianity; he who in the name of Christianity persecutes Jews is a thousand times less a Christian than is an honest-hearted, justice-loving Jew." Christianity is a religion of love and good will toward men—all men, of whatever race or religion—and they who persecute in its name are its worst enemies. In this terrible calam-

ity which intolerance has brought upon their fellow-religionists in southwestern Russia, the Jews of the world, we are sure, have the heartfelt sympathy of every true Christian in the world.



"Can Sunday Law Be Enforced Under Present Conditions?" was the subject of a debate at an "open-house" meeting at the Y. M. C. A. in Marion, Ohio, on April 20. According to the *Marion Star* of the 19th "not all the questions discussed since the inception of the present open-house programs have been of such general import," and "men prominent in the civic affairs of Marion" were to "be present to take part in the discussion." When the above subject is disposed of this one should be considered: "Should Sunday Laws Be Enforced Under Any Conditions?"



"A strong protest" against the "running of Sunday excursions out of Cleveland" was presented at a meeting of the Central Passenger Association in Chicago on May 13.

It came from the Cleveland Sunday Union, and was based upon the contention that Sunday excursions are demoralizing. The reply of the association was that Sunday excursions gave poor people a chance to have a day's outing which could be afforded them in no other way, and that so long as the public appreciated and demanded the excursions they would be run.



"The law requiring saloons to remain closed on Sundays was observed" in Vancouver, Wash., on March 22 "for the first time in a number of years." This was due to the action of the prosecuting attorney of the county.



Sunday barbering is no more of a crime than is Monday barbering, and no legislation can change the fact.

Religious Liberty and the Australian Constitution

By W. A. Colcord

I

IN forming a constitution for the Commonwealth of Australia two measures were considered touching the matter of religion: one looking toward an establishment of religion, the other toward keeping religion and the state entirely separate. A brief history of these, and the controversies which grew out of them, will be of interest to the readers of THE SENTINEL.

In the original draft of the constitution, made in 1891, there was a clause reading:

A State shall not make any law prohibiting the free exercise of any religion.

At the time of the Federal conventions held in Adelaide, March, 1897, and in Melbourne, February, 1898, for the final drafting of the constitution, many petitions from various churches were sent in, praying that in the preamble to the constitution there should be—

A recognition of Almighty God as having sovereignty over nations, and as supreme Source of all righteous and equitable government.

At the same time a counter petition was circulated, and signed by 38,000 persons, as follows:

We, the undersigned, adult residents of —, believing that religion and the state should be kept entirely separate, that religious legislation is subversive of good government, contrary to the principles of sound religion, and can result only in religious persecution, hereby humbly but most earnestly petition your honorable body not to insert any religious clause or measure in the constitution for the Australian Commonwealth which might be taken as a basis for such legislation, but that a declaration be made in the constitution stating that neither the Federal government nor any State parliament shall make any law respect-

ing religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The reasons why this petition was gotten up and circulated are given in the petition itself. Its object was to influence the Federal delegates, if possible, to form a government on the Christian principle of civil government, leaving to Caesar the control of civil things and to God the things which are God's.

The only reason given in the first-mentioned petitions for their existence and circulation was that those who signed them were "earnestly convinced" that there should be in the Federal constitution such a recognition of God as the petitions called for. What their real object was, however, may be learned from statements made by some of their friends and promoters. Thus the *Adelaide Church News*, for March 26, 1897, said:

We, the members of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, desire that in the preamble of the bill which frames the Federal Constitution some words may be inserted setting forth *our national creed*.

Their real object, therefore, was to establish a "national creed," and so lay the foundation for religious legislation and the enforcement of religious observances by law, as will appear from quotations given a little farther on. Some even in the convention saw this. When the matter came up for discussion, and a religious declaration was proposed for insertion in the preamble, Mr. Barton, the leader of the convention and the present premier of Australia, said, "I have all along thought that it is, to a certain extent, a danger to insert words of this kind in the preamble;" and pointed out

that it "might be construed as a peg on which to hang such further decision or such further enactment." Mr. Higgins, another of the delegates, said:

There is a danger in these words, if we are to look at the precedent of the United States. I find, on looking up a number of decisions in the United States, that it has been held again and again that, because of certain expressions, words or phrases used in the constitution, inferential powers are conferred upon Congress that go beyond any dream we have at present.

The convention, however, evidently did its best to please all parties concerned. In the forenoon of March 2, 1898, upon a motion introduced by Mr. P. M. Glynn, of South Australia, it agreed to amend the preamble so as to read:

Whereas the people of [the colonies adopting the constitution], *humbly relying upon the blessing of Almighty God*, have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland," etc.

In the afternoon of the same day the convention, by a majority of nine votes (25 to 16), also adopted the following clause, introduced by Mr. H. B. Higgins, of Victoria, in lieu of the one quoted at the beginning of this article, which had been stricken out:

The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth.

This is a strong and noble guarantee of religious freedom under the Federal government. In most positive and explicit terms it prohibits anything like a union of church and state under the Commonwealth, or the enactment of religious legislation, or the enforcement of any religious observance. It is a veritable charter of liberty so far as the jurisdiction of the Australian Commonwealth is concerned, and should have been hailed with delight by every professed follower of Christ in the Commonwealth, for it is

in perfect accord with the principle which he laid down—to render to Cæsar only that which belongs to Cæsar, and to God the things which belong to God.

But those who were so anxious that a religious declaration should be made in the constitution did not take kindly to this clause. It cut off the very thing which they wished to secure—legislation in matters of religion. This is apparent from remarks made both inside and outside of the convention.

Thus, on a former occasion, when Mr. Higgins introduced practically the same measure, only including the States as well as the Commonwealth, Mr. O'Connor objected to it on the ground that "observance" might include Sunday observance." Dr. Cockburn also objected to it, because, he said, "it would prevent a State from making laws against Sunday trading." Referring to it, Mr. Isaacs asked, "Would that prevent the Commonwealth from insisting upon Sunday being kept as a day of rest?" to which Mr. Barton replied that Mr. O'Connor had pointed out that "it might prevent the passing of a law for Sunday observance." Stating why he favored the clause in its later form, with the prohibition to the States left out, Mr. (now Sir) Wm. Lyne said: "It is not a wise thing, where you have a number of States to deal with, to allow the Commonwealth authority to decide how Sunday should be observed." Mr. Fraser, another delegate, opposed the measure entirely, because, he said:

If we give the right to an infinitesimal minority to come here and indulge in extraordinary practises, under the pretense that this is a new religion, we may have all the theatres and all the music-halls in Australia open on Sundays.

The remarks from without were no less conspicuous in indicating where the real objection to the clause lay. After the work on the constitution had been

completed by the Federal delegates, "Rev." T. Holme delivered a sermon in All Soul's Church, Leichhardt, Sydney, in which he said:

If they had simply left the preamble as it is, and added no 115th* clause, one might have hoped better things; but this 115th clause stamps the whole affair as irreligious, and positively dangerous in its present form. The Commonwealth must have a religion as a Commonwealth, or it will not last. The Commonwealth must have power to set apart days of humiliation and thanksgiving, as well as showing proper reverence for the Lord's day and Christian worship. The Commonwealth must deal with education, and in dealing with education it must recognise religion, for education

without religion is a proved failure. The Commonwealth must deal with the observance of Sunday, because the established law of the land deals with it, and so it must recognize religion. The Commonwealth, as a Commonwealth, through its rulers, must make a definite profession of the Christian religion.

On June 11, 1898, a deputation from the Minister's Union of Sydney, led, it appears, by Rev. H. Spear (Anglican), waited on the Premier of New South Wales and urged an amendment to this clause, leaving out the words, "for establishing any religion, or imposing any religious observance."

How the Jews Are Oppressed in Russia

IN connection with the terrible outbreak of intolerance at Kishineff, Russia, which has so recently held the attention of the world and aroused the just indignation of all right-minded persons, it is well to call to mind the injustice and oppression which Russian intolerance habitually and systematically inflicts upon the Jews—the persecution which is inflicted, not by spasmodic mobs, but by the regular administration of the laws. Speaking by request on the condition of the Jews in Russia at a mass-meeting in Pittsburg on March 18, Mr. S. H. Church said:

Russia's harsh treatment of the Jew manifests itself in two ways—first, in her suppression of his natural rights within her own territories, and, second, in the denial to him when he comes to her gates from other countries of that hospitality and right of domicile which she extends to other foreigners who are not Jews. Russia has among her own population between five millions and six millions of Jews, and because of the long centuries of oppression and ostracism which they have suffered a great many of them are perhaps not desirable subjects.

These multitudes are required by the laws of Russia to live within a limited area called the pale, or ghetto, herded sometimes like cat-

tle, under unsanitary conditions, which would send the pestilential spectre of death sweeping throughout the land did not the laws of Moses, to which they cling in their forlorn situation, protect them from such disease. Within the limits of this pale permanent settlements may be established by them only in towns and boroughs, but never in villages. They are not allowed to own real property or to engage in trade except under inhibitory restrictions. They are, with only a trifling exception, forbidden to enjoy the benefits of education in the colleges and universities. They cannot travel at will from one part of their common country to another. For themselves they have no country, no flag, no law, no court and no chief. They cannot enter the navy, and, while the Czar will use them for common soldiers as food for gunpowder, they can rise to no higher grade than corporal in the army. They are made by their environment the dregs of the empire, and are officially designated as the fifth or lowest class. They are without social aspiration, sunk to the lowest adversity, despised by their masters and contemned by themselves.

In order to prevent the augmentation of this wretched people by hordes of their kindred who are treated with perhaps even more severe repression in Austria and Roumania, Russia has erected barriers at her frontiers against the entrance of any foreign Jew. . . . Should our most distinguished Jewish American go to Russia and gain a temporary residence there he falls at once from the sovereign position which our laws give him, he loses the equal

* 116th of the Constitution as finally adopted.

station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle him, and he becomes a member of the despised fifth class, subject to the abhorrent restrictions of the "ghetto."

On the strength of facts furnished by Russian government publications, a correspondent of the New Orleans *Picayune* wrote a few months ago:

The "territorial ghetto" is a name applied to a district set aside for the habitation of such Jews as do not possess real estate elsewhere, or have no established commercial institutions. Places of this kind exist in various parts of the empire; the unfortunate dwellers therein have had some experience to instruct them as to the future, and their present condition is one of abject misery and want.

The poverty-stricken Russian Jew is, indeed, a pitiable creature. The law excludes him from agricultural pursuits. On account of their venerable faith they are denied employment on the government works. They cannot compete for the government contracts. The business of the artisan is closed to them. They are forbidden to work as goldsmiths, shoemakers, masons, tailors. They may not even be servants, or dig the ground even for the profit of a Russian master. . . . Under such restrictions it is hardly a matter of wonder that the Jews in the settlement districts—to apply the official name to the so-called "territorial ghettos"—find themselves unable to provide for their simplest needs. The settlement districts are simply gigantic cemeteries, where hope and ambition are first interred, and where death of the body speedily follows the death of the finest aspirations of the mind. . . . Since last November over 3,000 Jewish citizens, deported to the settlement district, have died of hunger and cold. The semi-official *Slovno*, after reporting on the death by frost and hunger of half a dozen or more families, says:

"It is impossible to speak of conditions of life in the settlement district; the prevailing order has only one tendency—that of insuring slow death. Locked up within the towns, the Jews dare not touch a blade of grass or a feather, they dare do nothing that would make life endurable or insure them a harvest of bread. Outside the cities agriculture languishes for want of hands, but the thousands of idle hands confined in the "ghettos" risk life and liberty when they attempt to work for a living in God's free nature. At the same time they are forbidden to even aspire to gov-

ernment or municipal jobs, high or low. Even the city knackeries, certainly the lowest of institutions, will not employ a person with a hooked nose, or one who cannot produce a baptismal certificate. Likewise is artisanship closed to these wards of the nation; they can neither engage in manufacturing nor in factory work. Commerce, finance, rum-selling, butcheries alone are open to them; but commerce is dead, finances are not for the homeless and fortuneless, and rum-selling and butcheries are businesses in which Jews can obtain but a meager patronage."

In a recent editorial the New York *Tribune* says:

The Jews were admitted into Russia by Peter the Great two centuries ago. Elizabeth expelled them in 1743, but Catharine II. readmitted them, and Alexander I. gave them full liberty in trade and industry. These latter privileges were withdrawn by Nicholas I., who excluded them from the greater part of the empire and crowded them into a few provinces. In annexing Poland Russia acquired a large Jewish population, multitudes of Jews having in the fourteenth century flocked into Poland to find asylum from German persecution; and many more were annexed to Bessarabia. So it comes about that Russia has a larger Jewish population than any other country in the world. It is also true that the Jews are treated with more harshness by the Russian government than by any other.

The "pale" within which Jews are permitted to live comprises Poland, West Russia, South Russia, excepting the Don Cossacks' country, a part of Little Russia, and the one Baltic province of Courland. From all the rest of the empire they are excluded by law, save that a few wealthy and influential Jews are tolerated there contrary to the law, and that, under a decree of Alexander II., three Jews are permitted to live in each town where there is a railway station. But it must not be supposed that in the sixteen provinces within the pale the Jews have anything like equal rights with Russians. In Courland Jewish residents are confined to descendants of families settled there before 1825. In the provinces of West, South and Little Russia Jews are compelled to live within the towns and are strictly forbidden to purchase, rent or occupy any agricultural land. They are practically excluded from the service of the state and from the learned professions, and are not permitted to take part in communal and municipal elections. . . . They are crowded into the

towns and cities of a part of the empire and are allowed to pursue only a certain limited class of callings. . . . If the Jews are an objectionable element of the population it is the Russian government itself that has made them

so by its repressive and unjustly discriminating policy toward them. They are what it has made them. To blame them for it is as unreasonable and unjust as the conduct of the Kishineff mob was wicked and barbarous.

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.

The city attorney of Mineola, Texas, "has published a card to the effect that he will prosecute all cases of violation of the Sunday law."

The Canisteo (N. Y.) *Chronicle* reports that "the Sunday-fishing law is going to be strictly enforced on Lake Keuka this summer."

A report comes from Mobile, Ala., that "the end of Sunday liquor selling is at hand" in that city. "Violators of the law will have to toe the mark and pay the penalty."

It was reported from Winside, Neb., recently that "the Sunday-closing ordinance has been drawn up and will probably be acted upon at the town board's next meeting."

Two saloon-keepers were fined \$25 and costs each at Tomah, Wis., on April 1 for "doing business on Sunday." On March 23 a saloon-keeper in Norwalk, Ohio, was fined \$50 and costs "for keeping his saloon open on Sunday."

At Morris, Minn., on May 10 "the police were called upon to put a stop to the violation of the Sabbath observance ordinance." They stopped a lineman from "putting up an electric-light wire between down-town business houses."

It was recently reported from Hutchinson, Minn., that "if the ministerial association can have its way there will be no ball playing on Sunday, and it is even doubtful if the small boy will be allowed to fish on that day. They say it attracts attention from their churches."

It is reported from Columbus, Ohio, that "the brewers have decided to aid the enforcement of the Sunday-closing laws in the smaller municipalities," and that "offers of support to this end have been communicated to over fifty mayors of the State by the organization." The secretary of the State Association of Brewers says the organization favors "a strict enforcement of the Sunday-closing law in the smaller municipalities of Ohio," holding that "there is a vast difference in the situation in these towns and that in the larger cities, like Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo."

On May 7 the barbers' union in La Crosse, Wis., again had Wm. Priebe, a non-union barber whose acquittal by a jury on April 30 on the same charge was reported last week, arrested on the charge of "keeping his shop open on Sunday." Although "the union lost the other case," "a union representative says Priebe is to be arrested every time he opens on Sunday, even if he persists in doing it for a lifetime." And thus "Priebe will be made to

suffer for his non-unionism." It is a point worth noting that Sunday-closing is rapidly becoming a test of unionism.

At Elizabeth, N. J., on May 11 "Prosecutor English reported to Supreme Court Judge Van Syckel" that on the previous day "several ball clubs had started to play before large crowds of spectators, and that a number of the players were arrested, taken before Police Justice Mahon and held in \$100 bail each."

The prosecutor said the grand jury was ready to come into court and report on the matter, but Judge Van Syckel said that was not necessary. The judge said the police should continue to arrest violators of the Sunday laws until it was determined which was the stronger, the law or the mob. The grand jury, he added, should continue to get all the evidence possible as to violations of the Sunday law, and if it found that the law was being violated should act in accordance with his previous instructions.

The substance of the instructions referred to was given here two weeks ago. The action of the police and the prosecutor was due to these instructions. Eight arrests were made by the police.

The Jacksonville (Fla.) *Times-Union* of May 18 reported that it had been determined by the retail clerks' association that "all retail stores in Jacksonville must be closed tight on Sunday, or cases will be made against the proprietors in the municipal court, and they will be fined." Early on the preceding day "committees were appointed and told to visit every store in the city and ascertain whether or not goods could be purchased." "About twenty-five members of the different labor unions assisted the clerks in this work." "Two stores were found open and goods purchased from them," and "unless these merchants consent to close every Sunday hereafter warrants for their arrest will be sworn out." "The large dealers are in sympathy with

the movement, but cannot afford to keep their places closed when others are open." So the work of the clerks is said to be "for the protection of merchants who desire to remain closed on the Sabbath." This is a sort of "protection" to which the law should lend no assistance whatever.

Mr. A. B. Bergfeldt, a barber in Tacoma, Wash., writes us that the following bill was introduced in the Washington legislature in January and referred to the committee on labor and labor statistics, and that it was passed by the legislature in March and is now in force as law:

An Act to prohibit carrying on the business of barbering on Sunday, and providing a penalty for the violation thereof:

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Washington:

Sec. 1. That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons or corporation to carry on the business of barbering on Sunday.

Sec. 2. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of ten dollars, or imprisonment in the county jail, for the first offense; and by a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars nor more than fifty dollars, or imprisonment in the county jail for not less than ten days nor more than twenty-five days, for the second and each subsequent offense.

Sunday barbering thus becomes a crime (an artificial crime) in Washington. Is there such a dearth of real crimes in Washington that the legislature can afford to enact a law making the pursuit of an honest and useful calling a misdemeanor?

A mass-meeting for "the creation of a sentiment demanding a more general observance of the Sabbath" was held in the Methodist church in Fairmont, Minn., on April 26. Several clergymen discussed "the question of Sabbath observance in all its aspects." Three of the topics were: "The relation of the Sabbath to (1) the

State, (2) the Individual, (3) and to Religion." One address was made in German. Resolutions were adopted in the name of the "citizens of Fairmont" commending and approving the Chicago & Northwestern Company for its restriction of freight traffic on Sunday, and the Chicago and St. Paul Company for "running no passenger trains on certain lines of its system on Sunday," and protesting "against any Sunday trafficking in our city, as subversive of respect for law and the best interests of our community," and "against Sunday baseball games in our community as doing violence to the quiet, peace and good order which the day demands." The preamble of the resolutions declared that "it is the testimony of all history that the best interests of society and the commonwealth are most truly conserved when the hours of the Sabbath are devoted to rest and relief from unnecessary labor."

The strict enforcement of the Sunday law at Pensacola, Fla., on May 3, was "due to the stand taken on the previous Sunday by the ministers in enforcing the law against ball playing." "Enthusiasts decided to continue the work commenced by the ministers." A mass-meeting was held and a committee of fifteen appointed "to make the rounds of the city with the sheriff and deputies to see that every store, fruit stand, meat market and such like places usually kept open on Sunday were closed." Sunday enforcement crusades nearly always originate with clergymen. A report from Pensacola under date of May 17 said:

To-day witnessed another closed town, the Sunday blue laws again being enforced, but not so strictly as was the case the two preceding Sundays. The sheriff has made it known that he does not propose to follow up his course of last Sunday and the one previous in making it his business to see that there were no violations of the law. He said to-day that parties desiring the enforcement of the blue

laws could file their complaints with the county solicitor. The sheriff himself will report any violations that he may see to-day, but will not make any arrests until the county solicitor files informations against the parties and the warrants are actually issued for the offenders.

Only one hackman ventured to follow his pursuit, and he was one who had made a test case of his arrest on the preceding Sunday and had not yet had his trial.



Having heard complaints that "certain stores and places of business are open during a greater portion of the forenoon on Sunday and that public traffic in the commodities kept for sale in such stores goes on upon the Sabbath day the same as other days," the mayor of Wadena, Minn., on May 5, issued a public notice in which he asked "all business men of the village who have been accustomed to keep open their places of business on Sunday to desist hereafter from so doing." He quoted the recently amended "Public Traffic" section of the State Sunday law and said, "it seems to be the opinion of a number of the citizens of Wadena that an especial responsibility devolves upon the person who happens from year to year to be president of the village council in the matter of the enforcement of the laws of the State similar to the one cited." He said that "those engaged in the saloon business" were complying with the Sunday law, and that "it does not seem right or fair when one class of business men is undertaking to obey the laws of the State relative to the conduct of their business that other business men should continually violate the law in the conduct of theirs." This is somewhat of a turning about of matters; usually the closing of stores is presented as a sufficient argument for the closing of saloons, but here the closing of saloons is an argument for the closing of stores

generally. But it all means Sunday enforcement.



In Philadelphia as elsewhere Sunday enforcement seems to be regarded as a necessary and important feature of the work of a "reform" administration. For several months past there has been unusual activity in making arrests for Sunday selling. On May 9 a special order was given to the police "to enforce the Sunday 'blue laws.'" Director of Public Safety Smyth is reported to have said: "It is the purpose of the administration to have the Sunday laws obeyed to the letter, and the police have been so instructed." When "asked to define the laws and what was meant by carrying them out to the letter," he said:

I mean every law that provides for the peace of Sunday. I need not recite them. The people should know what they are, and will be held to strict accountability if they violate any of them.

As a result of the order mentioned there were sixty-six Sunday-law cases in Magistrate South's court on May 13. Sixty-two of these cases were those of small dealers, and "thirty-five of these little fellows were forced to pay \$4 and costs each, a total of \$6.50, out of which the informer collected \$1. The proceeds of the day were \$189, the informers getting \$66 for their share of the plunder." Those not fined "were compelled to pay \$2.50 costs." The representative of the small dealers in "the battle to keep open on Sunday" stated that "he will continue the fight against the blue law." "The Pennsylvania Railroad surrendered, and not only paid the fine, but promised to close up the cigar stand at the Broad Street Station on Sundays hereafter. The Union News Company requested a continuance in the case of its agent at the Reading Terminal, and assured the magistrate that the fines would be paid and the offense not re-

peated." A report for May 18 says "the Sunday-closing edict was not so rigidly enforced as it was a week ago."



The following bill was introduced in the Minnesota legislature by Representative Handlan in February. It was not approved by the judiciary committee of the upper house, and was voted down by the senate on April 18. But two days later, in "the closing hours of the session," it "was resurrected and passed with only two dissenting votes," and was at once approved by the governor.

An Act to amend section two hundred and twenty-nine (229) of chapter one (1) of title ten (10) of the General Laws of the State of Minnesota.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Sec. 1. Section two hundred and twenty-nine (229) of the Penal Code of the State of Minnesota is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

PUBLIC TRAFFIC—All manner of public selling or offering for sale of any property on Sunday is prohibited, except that meals may be sold to be eaten on the premises where sold or served elsewhere by caterers; and prepared tobacco, in places other than where spirituous or malt liquors or wines are kept or offered for sale, and fruits, confectionery, newspapers, drugs, medicines and surgical appliances may be sold in a quiet and orderly manner; provided, however, that nothing in this section shall be construed to allow or permit the public sale or exposing for sale of uncooked meats, fresh or salt, or groceries, dry goods, clothing, wearing apparel of any kind, or boots or shoes.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

This bill "amends" the "Public Traffic" section of the Sunday law by the omission of the clause, "except that articles of food may be sold and supplied at any time before ten o'clock in the morning," and by the addition of the proviso at the end. It is therefore an enactment entirely prohibiting the sale or exposing for sale on Sunday of meats, groceries, dry goods, clothing, boots and

shoes, and "means that all stores, with the exception of tobacco, fruit and confectionery stands, must be closed as tightly as saloons on Sunday." While the measure was demanded by retail clerks and grocers' associations, we are told by the *Minneapolis Commercial Bulletin* that "it was the pet measure of the State Federation of Labor," and that that organization "was instrumental in getting the new law passed," and further that early in June this organization expects to make a "concerted movement" for the enforcement of the law. "Some def-

inite plan of procedure will be adopted," and "it is probable that, for the first time in the history of the organization, the federation will extend its work to all the smaller towns and villages throughout the State." So the law "will probably be rigidly enforced." The paper named above "hopes that every good merchant will make himself a committee of one to see that the new statute is given a good trial." At many points in the State the local authorities have already served notice on the merchants that the law must be observed.

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.

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.

Address all communications of a business nature, to
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
 11 West 20th Street, New York City

LAST week's issue, which was devoted largely to a discussion of the Sunday-law question in the State of Florida, has sold so well that we thought it advisable to print a second edition. As a result we have a number of copies on hand which we can supply to those who

wish them. Our friends in Florida have already sent in orders for nearly a thousand extra copies which they will use in different parts of the State.

This number, while it is devoted largely to a consideration of the Sunday question in Florida, is good anywhere, because the same principles apply everywhere. As a great many newspapers throughout the land have given space in their news columns to the agitation in this State, people the country over will be more or less familiar with the conditions as they exist there, so a copy of this number of THE SENTINEL will not come amiss.

While they last, we will make the following prices on extra copies of this particular number:

5 copies.....	7 cents.
10 "	14 "
25 "	35 "
50 "	70 "
100 "	\$1.25



It is very encouraging indeed to receive letters from our readers, from time to time, telling us how they appreciate the SENTINEL, and especially is this true when a subscriber appreciates the magazine so much that he writes when he has no other items of business. Such was the nature of the following letter, which we recently received:

"Dear SENTINEL: Let me tell you how well you look and how much better you fill your place as a weekly magazine than you did as a weekly paper or a monthly magazine. I do not want to be sorry that there are only sixty minutes in an hour, but we have so many good things—how can we find time for them all? Still THE SENTINEL cannot be spared."

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.,
New York City.

Oakland,
Cal.

18 West 5th St.,
Kansas City, Mo.