

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, JUNE 4, 1903

NO. 23



*The business of legislators is to prohibit crimes, not to invent them.*

*It is not the opponents but the champions and upholders of sumptuary and unenforceable laws who are promoters of disrespect for law.*

*The real representatives of religious infidelity are those who advocate and uphold religious legislation, not those who seek to abolish it.*

*"Seven-day journalism" is as much an American institution as is the "American Sabbath." The fact is that the Sunday newspaper is a leading feature of the "American Sabbath" to-day. Those religious leaders who believe in the American "Sabbath" instead of in God's Sabbath should be satisfied with the sort of sabbath that Americans make, for they cannot make any other sort than an American sabbath.*

*The first day of the week belongs as much to the Free-thinkers and atheists as it does to Protestants and Roman Catholics, and the latter have no more right to expect that the law shall restrict its use to religious purposes than have the former to expect that it shall restrict its use to non-religious or anti-religious purposes. The business of the law is not to give one class a monopoly of the day, but to protect all in the right to use the day as they choose.*

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. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1903

No. 23

"We enjoy, in theory, an entire dissociation of church and state. Yet our coinage bears a devout motto, the President annually issues a proclamation of national thanksgiving, and even Congress is daily opened with prayer." Thus remarks the New York *Evening Post*. The things mentioned are not the only nor the most serious violations in this country of the theory of an entire dissociation of church and state. The *Post* should have mentioned Sunday legislation and enforcement and the exemption of church property from taxation.

The Pennsylvania legislature which enacted the now famous, or, to use the term of the papers which are now defying it, infamous, "press muzzler"—the law which in the face of an express and explicit prohibition of the State constitution attempts to abridge the freedom of the press so that "boss" politics and political corruption, so it is said, may the more freely flourish—doubled the pay of its chaplains and appropriated \$5000 to a sectarian religious institution. But there is no incongruity here. Legislative piety and state support of religion, as history abundantly shows, go hand in hand with political corruption and civil despotism. In this connection it is pertinent to recall the fact that the "boss" of Pennsylvania was one of the foremost champions in the United States Senate in 1892 of the demand of the churches that Congress re-

quire the closing of the Chicago World's Fair on Sunday. It was he who sent a Bible to the clerk's desk and had the Fourth Commandment (which he had carefully "inclosed in brackets" for the purpose) read as giving the "reasons" why Congress should require "the closing of the exposition on the Sabbath day."

It seems that the Papacy is working for another governmental "mission" to the Vatican. A dispatch from Rome under date of May 27 said:

Cardinal Rampolla, Prefect of the Propaganda, proposes that the agreements between Governor Taft and Archbishop Guidi relative to friars and their lands in the Philippines, shall, when finally reached, be brought to Rome by a special mission from the Philippine government for ratification by the Pope.

This may be only a rumor, but there need be no doubt that what it affirms is in thorough accord with the policy of the Papacy in this matter. It is her purpose to make this Philippine matter tell as much as possible in bringing the American government into entangling relations with herself. This is why she has prolonged the negotiations which the "mission" of last year was sent to accomplish. The more governmental "missions" to the Vatican she can make this Philippine matter yield her the better pleased she will be. It remains to be seen whether the Government, after the experience of last summer, will again walk into the "mission-to-the-Vatican" net spread for



it by the papal politicians. We shall be surprised if the Papacy does not attempt to use this Philippine matter to obtain the establishment of permanent diplomatic relations between the American government and the Vatican. That is a proposal that may be looked for before the negotiations are concluded.



According to the Boston *Herald* the discussion in the Massachusetts legislature of "the bill to permit Sunday fishing served to bring out the close relationship between Socialism and religious infidelity; the author and advocates of the measure were Socialists, and the opponents were Protestant Republicans and Roman Catholic Democrats alike." And so we are to take it for granted that Socialism is closely related to "religious infidelity" because the representatives of Socialism demand a partial repeal of the Sunday laws? And yet we are asked to believe that the Sunday laws have nothing to do with religion! There are more important facts than that mentioned which the discussion served to bring out. It showed that the Sunday question is a question of religion, and therefore a question with which the legislature has no business to concern itself and with regard to which there should be no legislation whatever; that in behalf of Sunday legislation, of the maintenance and enforcement by law of a religious institution and observance which they hold in common, "Protestants" and Roman Catholics, notwithstanding opposite political affiliations, are ready to combine forces and make common cause; and that those who seek in any degree to modify this religious legislation, to rid the statute books of this piece of church-and-state union, become in the eyes of the "Protestants" and Roman Catholics who support and defend it representatives of "atheism" and "religious infidelity." If the Sunday law were not a religious

law its champions would not have accused those who asked for its modification of "religious infidelity." By this accusation they simply convicted themselves and the law they were defending.



These remarks of the Boston *Investigator* (Freethought) with regard to "Sabbath protection," are worth repeating:

Why does the Sabbath need protection? We do not need to have any other day of the week protected. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday all stand on their own bottom. No one is paid a fat salary to look after these days. . . . Why are not ministers honest, and why do they not say that what they want protected is their superstition? . . . What has the state to do with Christianity that it makes laws compelling people to acknowledge this foolish superstition? The state cannot make men believe the dogma of the trinity, the immaculate conception, or of salvation by belief in Jesus. Why should it undertake to compel men to accept the Christian dogma of Sunday holiness? Is there anything just or fair or right in such compulsion? If our neighbor wishes to go to see God on Sunday we make no objection, but if we prefer to go a-fishing he asks the state to arrest us for "breaking the Sabbath"! . . . We have had this pious dogma of Sunday holiness crammed down our throats long enough. Sunday belongs to us as much as to Christians. It is not any one's day in particular; it is everybody's day. . . . Christianity takes infinite shapes, but, with the exception of Romanism, the "Sabbath Protective League" is its most dangerous guise. There is tyranny in its purpose. We should beware of any organization that attempts to cut down the proportions of religious freedom.

Our Freethought friends may be assured that in opposing "Sabbath protection" they are not opposing Christianity, but are rather standing for it. The great object of Christianity is religious freedom—soul freedom. Any organization, no matter what its professions may be, that is working to restrict religious freedom, that assumes to employ force in religious matters, is in that anti-Christian. And any organization or group of people, whether they call themselves Freethink-



ers or something else, who in the interests of true freedom oppose such anti-Christian purpose, are, as far as that matter goes, Christian. The "dogma of Sunday holiness" is Christian only in that it is held to by professed Christians. It is no part and parcel of Christianity, however.



That regular feature of the annual meetings of the Presbyterian General Assembly, the "report of the committee on Sabbath observance," was of course not omitted at the Los Angeles meeting. If this were simply a church matter we should not concern ourselves with it, but since it is not a mere matter of church discipline, but is a part of the program of Sunday enforcement, it is something that calls for outside notice. The report was presented on May 22, and "the Rev. Dr. I. W. Hathaway of New York and the Rev. Dr. Ramsdell of Washington," two leading Sunday-enforcement champions, "made stirring addresses in favor of the recommendations." Among the resolutions were the following:

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly hereby expresses its strong and emphatic disapproval of all secular uses of the day, all games and sports, all social functions, all traveling for pleasure, all excursions by land or water, all uses of this day as a day of convenience to do that which has been left undone during the past week, or to promote the secular interests of the coming week, both at home and abroad.

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly hereby expresses its emphatic condemnation of seven-day journalism which, in our opinion, is doing as much or more than any other one influence in the United States of America to wipe out the distinction of days and to secularize the Christian Sabbath. Seven-day journalism voices the intense commercial spirit of our age, that would rob both God and man of the rest day for financial ends; seven-day journalism causes a vast amount of Sunday labor; seven-day journalism is a most efficient enemy of the church of Christ; seven-day journalism prevents untold thousands of our citizens from attending divine services on the Lord's day, and unfits many thousands of

others for receiving the benefits of such service.

*Resolved*, That, as the United States Congress has recently pronounced legislation on Sunday to be illegal, we do therefore deprecate the practise of turning the clock backward in order to legalize the passage of bills on Sunday.

The distinguishing feature of the resolutions this year is the condemnation of "seven-day journalism." It is strange that for all they have to say about the Sunday newspaper the Sunday-enforcement champions never attempt to prosecute the publishers of these papers. Is it because they are too busy prosecuting small venders and boys for playing ball? After this severe arraignment of "seven-day journalism," which no doubt emanated from Dr. Hathaway, who is president of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union, we have a right to expect that he and other leaders of the Sunday-enforcement cause will give more attention to the publishers of Sunday papers and less to the players of ball and the venders of small merchandise.



It appears from later reports than were at hand when our note of last week was written that about fifty Jews were killed outright, nearly one hundred severely injured, and about five hundred less seriously injured in the Kishineff outbreak. Six hundred shops were sacked and seven hundred houses demolished and it is said 10,000 Jews are left homeless and destitute. Count Tolstoi and Maxim Gorky, the two foremost literary men of Russia, place the responsibility for the outbreak upon the Russian government and clergy of the state church, saying that they "keep the people in a state of ignorance and fanaticism," and that "the outrages at Kishineff are but the direct result of that propaganda of falsehood and violence [against the Jews] which our government conducts with such tireless persistence." The governor of the province and



the chief of police of the city have been removed by the St. Petersburg authorities. There seems to be little room for doubt that the local authorities abetted the outbreak. It has been declared in some quarters that the hatred of the Russians for the Jews was not because of religion, but because of financial and commercial relations between the two classes. Possibly the Jews are hated for other than religious reasons, but it is certain that the hatred consists chiefly of religious intolerance. The fact that the Kishineff massacre took place on the days of the Russian Easter celebration leaves no doubt as to its religious character. We do not know how true it is, but Jewish papers say that the people began the rioting just after leaving the churches, and that they were incited to their murderous work by the clergy in the churches. Meetings of protest and condemnation of the atrocity, and to raise funds to relieve the destitute, have been held in many places in this country. At an indignation mass-meeting at Carnegie Hall in New York on the evening of May 27, Mayor Low, Ex-President Cleveland, President Schurman of Cornell University, Rev. Dr. MacArthur and Mr. Edward M. Shepherd spoke in condemnation of the Kishineff atrocities and of the treatment of the Jews in general in Russia. A gratifying feature of some of the addresses was the recognition of the fact that Russia and her people are not the only offenders against human rights in the world to-day. Mr. Cleveland referred to the "mob violence and murderous assaults" upon Chinese and Italians in this country, and President Schurman and Mr. Shepherd declared that this Kishineff massacre was but a terrible manifestation of a spirit that seems to be taking possession of people in all lands and countries to-day. The world at the present time, they said, was having a recrudescence of savagery and

barbarism. Mr. Shepherd called attention to the riotous outbreak against a Jewish funeral procession in the streets of New York last summer as evidencing the fact that even in the United States anti-Semitism exists. Dr. MacArthur declared that he was ready to repudiate Christianity if it was responsible for the Kishineff atrocities. He said that the charge of ritual murder made against the Jews by some so-called Christians was originally an accusation made by the pagan Romans against the early Christians. Mr. Cleveland said such things as the Kishineff massacre "give rise to the distressing fear that even the enlightenment of the twentieth century has neither destroyed nor subdued the barbarity of human nature." The conclusion of his speech is worth preserving:

Protest against every pretense of civilization that permits medieval persecution, against every bigoted creed that forbids religious toleration and freedom of conscience, against all false enlightenment that excuses hatred and cruelty toward any race of men, and against all spurious forms of government protection that withhold from any human being the right to live in safety and toil in peace.



On the Sunday of the "week of prayer for the Sabbath," April 19, Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York, preached on the topic, "The Sabbath for Man." He vigorously condemned the construction which he said was now commonly placed upon the words of Christ, "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," declaring that it was not made for man to use as he pleased, but for him to use in his highest interests—the interests of his soul. He said that the Sabbath originated at creation, that the law of its observance was a divine, immutable law, embedded in the very heart of God's moral code—the Ten Commandments. He made an exceedingly brief and gingerly reference to the



matter of the change from the observance of the seventh to the observance of the first day of the week, remarking that the change was made by the church early in the Christian era, and intimating, but not positively affirming, that there was "apostolic" authority and example for so doing. This change, however, he intimated, was a matter of little consequence, since "the Sabbath is an institution and not a day." Of course he did not explain that the wonderful discovery that "the Sabbath is an institution and not a day," and that the law which commands the observance of the seventh day is a law commanding the observance of the first day of the week, was not made until sixteen centuries of the Christian era had passed, and that then it was made to meet the exigencies of the situation in which English dissenters found themselves as protesters against "popish leaven and superstition." They could not, or rather would not, give up Sunday observance, and of course they could not take the authority of "the Church" for it, for to have done that would have been to fly in the face of their own protests against "subjection to the ordinances of men"—would have been to admit the propriety of and obligation to observe church-appointed "holy" days. They got out of this dilemma by making the above discovery, and it was then that Sunday was first called "the Sabbath" and Sunday observance held to be keeping the Fourth Commandment. And that was only three hundred years ago! Of course the matter of "Sabbath" legislation and enforcement was not ignored. It was declared that since the Sabbath was made for man the state had the right to legislate concerning it—"to secure this *religious* day of rest, this *holy day for God*." This "principle," it was declared, had always been recognized in this country—this "Christian nation," as it was said the courts had

held it to be. It was further declared that Sabbath observance is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the belief in God, and that Deism is absolutely essential to the maintenance of order and government. Therefore, of course, in the interests of civil order, of government itself, "Sabbath" observance must be maintained by the state! The attempt was made to confirm this idea by citing the course of Robespierre in repealing the atheistical enactments of his fellow-revolutionists and "restoring the weekly rest day and the worship of the Supreme Being to France," the implication being of course that this was done in order to establish order and that it was impossible to have order and government without a national profession of Deism and a national "recognition" of the "weekly rest day." Of course it was not explained that the subsidence of the Reign of Terror came not with the enactment of Robespierre's religious legislation, but with the overthrow of Robespierre himself, and that at the very time when he was "restoring the weekly rest day and the worship of the Supreme Being to France" by legislative enactment he was causing and directing the wholesale executions which made the "Red Terror." One of the silliest things that we know of is the use that is made of the French Revolution by the champions of "Sabbath" and religious legislation in this country to-day. To hear them talk one would be led to suppose that that Revolution and its horrors were due to certain inconsequential things which happened in the midst of the Revolution itself. Not only do they set forth effects as causes, but they take for this purpose some of the most unimportant and ephemeral of effects. They seem to be convinced that the causes and explanation of the horrors of the French Revolution are all to be found in the atheistical antics of Hébert, Cloutz, and Chaumette. If



the legislative attitude of France with reference to Deism and the "weekly rest day" had anything to do with producing the French Revolution and its excesses it can be depended upon that it was not the attitude that was maintained for a few weeks or months, but the attitude that was maintained the rest of the time—the attitude that had been maintained during the generations and centuries preceding the Revolution. And what was that attitude?—Exactly the attitude that the champions of religious legislation and "Sabbath" enforcement would have a government maintain. The fact is that it was the monstrous abuses arising out of the practise by church and state of the principles to which the present-day champions of religious legislation hold that were the chief causes of the French Revolution. The union of church and state preceding the Revolution was one of the great evils which caused it, and the religion which demanded and maintained a union of church and state was chiefly responsible for the irreligion and atheism of the Revolution. Had France never undertaken to maintain Deism and religion by legislation she would never have repudiated them by legislation. The lesson of the French Revolution regarding the attitude that government should maintain with respect to religion is exactly opposite to that foolishly drawn from it by the champions of governmental religion. Another point of the speaker in the attempt to confirm the idea that the state must maintain "Sabbath" observance in its own interests was that "Sabbath-breaking" makes criminals. Several judges were quoted in support of the declaration that "criminal careers usually begin by disregard of the Sabbath." It is thus, of course, that theologians have always argued for the enforcement of their dogmas. It seems hardly credible that on Fifth Avenue in New York before an audience of intelligent people it

should be contended, or rather assumed as a matter of course, that the civil law in this country should maintain "Deism." How loth are the clergy, or some of them, to accept in practise the principle of the separation of church and state. They go as far as they have to go, but not an inch further. The maintenance merely of Deism would of course have been a modest demand upon the state by the church some time ago; but at this late day it is not modest at all. It is an assumption that is to be denied and resisted, for in it lurk all the evils of church and state union.



Although we have had little to say with reference to it for some time, the "National Reform" propaganda is not dead. State conventions in furtherance of this movement have been held in Nebraska and Colorado this spring, and conventions for a number of the Eastern States are being planned. And the organ of the National Reform Association, the *Christian Statesman*, shows indications of new life. We shall try to present before long an article on the present aims and activities of the "national reformers."



Greek fruit dealers in Pensacola, Fla., have organized to oppose Sunday enforcement against their business. They have provided a common fund for defending those who are arrested, and if prosecutions continue will have the courts pass upon the question of the application of the Sunday law to their business.



Our review two weeks ago of the "lay sermon" on "Sabbath observance" by a member of the staff of the Jacksonville (Fla.) *Times-Union* elicited a lengthy reply from the same source. This second "lay sermon," which appeared in the *Times-Union* of May 24, will be given attention in our next issue.



# Religious Liberty and the Australian Constitution

By W. A. Colcord

## II

FROM all that was given in the previous article it is clear that what was wanted by those who demanded a religious declaration in the preamble to the Australian constitution was an established religion, and power to legislate upon religion and to enforce religious observances, especially Sunday observance. They objected to the Commonwealth being debarred from passing any law for the establishment of any religion, or for imposing any religious observance. Those who, in the beginning of the movement, said all this was involved in the demand for a declaration of religious belief in the preamble to the constitution discerned correctly. Behind the demand for the apparently innocent and reverential religious declaration lay a desire for power to coerce men by civil law in religious matter.

Such a declaration in a civil compact by no means makes all the people who are parties to the compact religious. This declaration in the Australian constitution does not increase by a single individual the number of persons in the Commonwealth who have faith; nor does it give any guarantee or assurance that the rights and liberties of the people will be respected. The constitution of the United States contains no such declaration, and yet it is a charter of liberty. The constitution of the Southern Confederacy, which was organized to perpetuate human slavery in the United States, did contain such a declaration, and one very similar, in fact, to that inserted in the Australian constitution. Its preamble read as follows:

We, the people of the confederate States,

each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent federal government, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity—*invoking the favour and guidance of Almighty God*—do ordain and establish this constitution for the confederate States of America.

Mr. Holme said: "The Commonwealth must have a religion as a commonwealth, or it will not last." The United States government has had no religion as a government—having no religious declaration in its fundamental law, but instead a clause, like the one so much objected to in the Australian constitution by church leaders, declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—and yet it has stood for over one hundred years. The Southern Confederacy had a direct "recognition" of God in its constitution, and it went down in less than five years. This shows that such declarations do little toward preserving national governments. As foundations for laws of injustice and oppression they may do much to weaken such governments and hasten their dissolution. Let governmental recognition of religion be once established and there will always be religious organizations ready to take advantage of it and turn the power and influence of the state to their own ends and aggrandizement.

Sir John Downer, one of the Federal delegates, spoke most truly when he said: "For my own part, I think it is of little moment whether the words are inserted or not. Our piety must be *in our hearts*



rather than on our lips." The apostle John touches the keynote of the whole matter when he says: "If a man [or a nation either] say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

God loves justice and hates oppression. It is of little use for men to profess to love and fear God while at the same time they are oppressing or seeking to oppress His creatures, made in His own image. To ancient Israel He gave the command: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." They failed to do it, and became selfish, hard-hearted and oppressive toward one another; therefore He said to them again:

Thus saith the Lord: Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor; behold I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth.

If any are still inclined to doubt whether the religious declaration in the preamble to the Australian constitution, meager as it is, will not be made use of as we have indicated, or that there is no danger of the churches dominating the civil power in Australia, and therefore no need of any such clause as that now numbered 116 of the Federal constitution, let them read the following statements made by different speakers at an annual conference of the Evangelical Council of New South Wales, held in July, 1900:

A recognition of God had been made in the preamble of the Commonwealth Act, and the churches should now set before the people of these colonies their sense of the importance of the political union of the colonies, by bringing about in a more definite way, if possible, a federation of the churches.

They wanted to teach the legislative assembly of the colony that the Protestant church

was a force to be felt, and they could do it if they liked.

The Free Churchmen numbered, roughly speaking, about two-thirds of the people of this colony, and if they got into line they could bring about any legislation they might desire.

And the kind of legislation they, or at least their leaders, desire is evident from what was presented in last week's article—*religious legislation*. They desire the state to teach religion, and above all to enforce Sunday observance.

If it is right for Protestants to thus combine and get themselves "into line" to control politics and legislation, it is right for Catholics to do the same. Those Protestant leaders who recommend such methods to Protestants, cannot, with any show of consistency, object to the advice given to Catholics at the Catholic Congress held in Sydney in September, 1900, as presented in the following:

The necessity for registration with a view to the more effective exercise of the Catholic vote was insisted on in a paper read by Dr. D. A. Kenny, K.S.G., of Melbourne. If every Catholic adult in Australia entitled to vote would exercise his franchise, it would easily be possible, in Dr. Kenny's opinion, to return to each of the State assemblies, and also to the Commonwealth Parliament, a solid Catholic party, which should be able to exercise a power similar to that possessed by the great Catholic party in the German Reichstag. . . . The Catholic party would insure a just appreciation of the rights and interests of the body it represented. Dean Hogarty (Melbourne) concurred in the proposition of Dr. Kenny. It was most desirable that Catholics should be so situated with regard to the franchise that they could, when necessary, either help a friend or smite a foe.

Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object, or to produce a religious effect through politics, are always dangerous. All religious despotisms have commenced by combination and influence; and when that influence has begun to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power



has soon bent under it, and cruelty and oppression have quickly followed. The evils resulting from such movements do not depend upon the particular religion professed by those concerned in them, but are inherent in the movements themselves. The very principle of using civil power in religious things is wrong.

The way for Protestants to keep other religious organizations out of Parliament is not for them to organize and get into Parliament themselves, as many seem to think, but to teach all the people the Christian and true Protestant idea of civil government; that no matter what men are in Parliament, or what party is in power, they must, in their legislation, deal only with civil matters, and leave religion to the individual conscience and to God. This is the principle embodied in the 116th clause of the Australian constitution. And the fact that not only Catholics but professed Protestants are themselves seeking religious legislation, and power to enforce religious observances upon the people by law, is evidence that they are departing from true Christian and Protestant principles and adopting principles against the practise of which on the part of others they have, in the past, uttered their loudest and most solemn protests. It is proof that there are none too many safeguards to the rights and liberties of the people in the Australian constitution as it stands. It would have been well if clause 116 had forbidden the States as well as the Federal government from intermeddling with religion. Well did Mr. Barton, in the discussion of this question in the Federal Convention, say:

We must always recollect that humanity has a habit of throwing back to its old practises. Since a couple of hundred years ago we have been tolerably free from sumptuary laws. But there is in many quarters a great disposition to take to these laws again, and we may before many years have passed be over-

whelmed with them. . . . Who knows that there may not be a similar throwing back in regard to religious laws?

Yes; this is the danger of the times. Men are drifting back into ways which have cursed the world in ages past. This was revealed in the remarks of another Federal delegate, already referred to, who, in opposition to the clause guaranteeing religious freedom, 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.

That was the ground upon which Christians were persecuted and put to death in the Roman empire in the early centuries. Rome had a law prohibiting any man worshiping by himself "any new or foreign gods" not recognized by the public laws. It further provided that whoever introduced "new religions," the tendency and character of which were unknown, and whereby the minds of men might be disturbed, he should, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished, and if to the lower, be put to death. Notwithstanding Christ had told His disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel, the Roman government refused to "give the right" to the "infinitesimal minority" of Christians to indulge in the "extraordinary practise" of teaching a "new religion," and so it put them to death, belonging as they did almost wholly to the lower ranks. And this is the position taken now by some of the men called together to frame a constitution for the latest nation on earth! Evidently, as Mr. Barton observed, there is a tendency to go back to old practises, and to revive again the making of religious laws whereby men's rights and liberties shall be abridged or ignored.

How different the following noble ut-



terance by Mr. Gladstone, at the Lord Mayor's banquet, August 9, 1882:

We do not go to make war on the Moham-medan religion, for it is amongst the prominent distinctions of Christianity to establish tolerance [religious liberty he doubtless meant]; and we know that wherever the British rule exists the same respect which we claim for the exercise of our own conscientious convictions is yielded to the professors of every other faith on the surface of the globe.

The following extract from a proclamation issued to her subjects in 1858 by Her Majesty, the late Queen Victoria, is well worth inserting here:

Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our Royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favored, nor molested or dis-

By no implication nor construction can the Jews of to-day be held accountable for the crime of the crucifixion, nearly nineteen centuries since. The Jewish people, as a people, were not responsible for the execution of Jesus at the time. It was the act of a narrow-minded and malignant hierarchy. . . . If we would recommend our faith to the acceptance of our Hebrew friends, it is a poor and irrational way to accomplish it by showing an inimical spirit towards them personally or as a race. . . . The Jewish race gave us our prophets, our evangelists, our apostles. . . . Jesus himself never taught or showed an uncharitable spirit toward his fellow-countrymen. He wept and prayed over Jerusalem, but he never cursed its people.—*Western Christian Advocate*.

A monster demonstration in protest against the Education Bill took place in London on May 23. Fifty speakers, representing the non-conformist churches,

quieted, by reason of their religious faith or observance, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us, that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.

Referring to the constitution of the United States, Mr. Gladstone said that "among its greatest features none is more interesting than its full provision for the complete separation of church and state." The fact that there are in Australia not only leaders of religious thought, but strong and influential religious organizations, which would tear this same provision from the Australian constitution, and unite church and state, if they could, is evidence that there is a tide setting in toward the religious despotisms of the past.

the trades unions and the Liberal clubs, made addresses from twelve different platforms to immense crowds assembled in Hyde Park. A few days before the leading non-conformist clergyman of London stated in a public address in his church that he would refuse to pay the rates for the support of religious teaching assessed against him under the Education Bill. This declaration was warmly applauded by the audience. It seems that the final vote has not been taken on the Education Bill in the House of Commons.

The Buffalo (N. Y.) *Times* says that "Sunday ball playing is a harmless amusement," and that it is reminded by the objections that are made to "a game whereby a great deal of harmless pleasure is given to many and offense to none, save those who are always seeking offense," of Macaulay's commentary on bear-baiting: "The Puritans hated it, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators."



## 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.*

Besides the bill prepared by Mr. Geo. B. Wheeler for the purpose of emphasizing the religious character of the Sunday law there have been, says the organ of the New England champions of Sunday enforcement, five other bills "which threaten our Lord's day laws" before the General Court of Massachusetts at its present session. Three of these were "the annual attempts on the part of the liquor forces to extend the time in which liquor can be sold." They applied to all days alike, and threatened "our Lord's day laws" in that they permitted the sale of liquor on Sunday on exactly the same conditions as on other days. The other two belonged "to the group of annual Sunday fishing bills." One of them provided that "the law relative to fishing on the Lord's day shall not apply to the County of Worcester," and the other that "all such fishing in salt waters as is now lawful or may hereafter be lawful on week days shall also be lawful on the Lord's day." All these bills, including that of Mr. Wheeler, "were considered so dangerous in character" by the managers of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League "that a strong petition was unanimously voted" at the annual meeting of the organization and its sympathizers in a church in Boston in February "asking the legislature to refuse to pass them." After a hearing on the two fishing bills, at which Secretary Kneeland of the above-named organization spoke against them and the two members of the legislature who had introduced them and others made "the usual tirade against restriction of individual liberty and an appeal in the in-

terests of the working people who have no other time to fish than Sundays," the bill permitting salt water fishing on Sunday was favorably reported by the committee on probate and chancery by a vote of seven to four. It passed two readings in the lower house, but was overwhelmingly voted down when it came up for the third reading on April 9. The organ of the organization already named says "only about thirty members in the whole house of 270 voted for it," and adds significantly: "Their names are on record for future reference." "The discussion was long and heated," and as of course was to be expected, "the religious features of the bill were considered as well as the industrial." Indeed, judging by the report presented by the organ referred to, the religious features were the only features considered. We are left to the impossible task of imagining what could have been the "industrial" features of this bill regarding Sunday fishing in salt water. A "marked feature of the discussion was the absence of all party and denominational lines; Republicans and Democrats, Protestants and Catholics vied with each other *to defend the institution of God and humanity*, which was so seriously threatened by the vicious bill." Two incidents of the debate, which we are told "caused some excitement," establish the fact that the matter under consideration was, and was recognized to be, a matter of religion. One of these was a dispute as to whether baseball and other games were played on Sunday afternoons with the approval of the priests at the "Holy Cross College of Worcester," the author of the bill affirming that such



was the case and "Representatives Skeritt and Quinn and other Roman Catholic members" making a strong denial. The other incident was an attempt to fasten the charge of atheism upon the supporters of the bill. Representative Carey, its author, and a number of its supporters in the legislature, were Socialists, and Representative Quinn charged that they were atheists, because "Socialism is atheistic." This was denied by Representative Carey, but the organ of Sunday enforcement from which we are quoting says "it must be left to the future to settle that question." What that question has to do with civil legislation is not explained. The fact that it was raised simply shows that the champions of Sunday enforcement in this instance knew that Sunday legislation was religious legislation and that they felt that in maintaining the existing interdict of the law against Sunday fishing they were thereby defending and maintaining an "institution of God"—that is, a religious institution. The organ from which we are quoting says "the advocates of Socialism in the house left no doubt whatever as to their destructive attitude towards the Lord's day; any political body which holds its political meetings on that day must soon lose all sense of its *sacred* nature." It was zeal for the maintenance of the "*Lord's day*" and "*its sacred nature*" by legislation that moved the opponents of this Sunday fishing bill. This is evidenced again by the list of organizations which sent in protests against the bill. Some of the legislators "brought out the fact that the bill was opposed by the very best people of the State of Massachusetts" by citing the protests on file against it. According to the organ from which we are quoting the protests came from these sources:

New England Sabbath League; United Society of Christian Endeavor (international);

W. C. T. U. of Massachusetts; W. C. T. U. of Boston and vicinity; Congregational, Baptist, Methodist Episcopal and Universalist Ministers' Meetings of Boston and vicinity; Universalist Young People's Union (national); New England Methodist Episcopal Conference; scores of churches of different denominations; hundreds of citizens, bishops, pastors, business men and laborers.

The Boston *Traveler* said that the only explanation that occurred to it why the legislators refused to legalize what "they realize will proceed as usual along the shores of Massachusetts Bay" was that they thought perhaps "the refusal to legalize Sunday fishing would appease some people without doing harm to anyone." The above list leaves no doubt as to the class of people appeased by this action, and the reason why they are appeased is equally plain from what we have already presented. The *Traveler* made this comment in an editorial headed, "A Foolish Sunday Law":

Strong arguments were made in favor of the legalization of Sunday fishing. It was urged that it would give workmen who are imprisoned in the shops of the cities six days in the week an opportunity to get out on the ocean and enjoy the fresh air and rest which would come to them from such a change; that it would not in any way interfere with any man's liberties, nor public worship, and would be far less harmful [disturbing?] than the whirling of the street-cars, automobiles, bicycles, the playing of golf, etc. All these arguments are true, but nevertheless every man who beguiles a flounder or a perch from Massachusetts waters on Sunday is a criminal. Is this wise? No one expects that there will be any attempt to enforce the law, and it is safe to say that there will be as much salt water fishing as there would have been had the proposed bill to legalize it become a law. The only difference will be that the present conditions will tend inevitably to disrespect of law. What is the use of having on the statute books laws that are only to be disregarded? Laws that can be, that are intended to be, enforced are the only ones that should be passed. Perfunctory laws intended only as boogies to satisfy certain extreme elements should have no place in our State legislation.



There is a point here that it would be well for those New England champions of Sunday enforcement who are given to accusing as promoters of disrespect for "law" those who oppose their enforcement of religion by law, to take to heart. The Lowell *Mail* made this comment:

If fishing on Sunday should be prohibited then there are many other sports which ought to be, but are not, and which have never been taken into consideration at all by the laws. . . . It is not too much to say that Sunday laws should be consistent, that the day for Puritanical ideas has gone by, that the workingman is entitled to Sunday [as a] holiday, that he is bound to have it, and that there are a great many legal occupations and sports that he may indulge in that are a great deal worse than fishing. The workingman has a hard time at the best, and he should not be robbed of any of his privileges and liberties, which are few enough at the best.

The fact is that this fishing bill, like Mr. Wheeler's "civil rest-day" bill, served to exhibit the fact that it is not the interests of the workingman but a religious observance and institution with which the champions of Sunday legislation are concerned. In this instance they were fighting a measure proposed in the interests of the workingman by representatives of the workingman. So the usual pretension of regard for the workingman and his interests could not very well be made to serve the cause of Sunday enforcement in this instance. But the champions of this cause are resourceful, and when they cannot pose as the champions of the "poor," "enslaved" workingman they are not at a loss for some other "poor" thing to put forward as needing the protection of Sunday legislation. The Sunday organ from which we have been quoting says that at the hearing on the fishing bills "no valid argument was presented why the wise provision of the past to protect the lower creation from the ravages of man should be removed"! How all-embracing is

the sympathy and care of the Sunday champions! How long will it be before they will be insisting upon Sunday enforcement upon "the lower creation" as well as upon man? Of course the argument that the Sunday law against fishing is a measure for protecting the fish, which was used throughout in opposing the fishing bill, was just as much of a pretense and a blind as is the common argument that Sunday legislation is for the protection of the workingman. The Lowell *Mail* well said:

Certainly there should be laws preventing the extermination of fish, but Sunday laws will never do that. If a man can fish six days in the week the fish can't be saved on the seventh. If the fish need protection the open season should be shorter or the waters should be closed for a term of years sufficiently long to produce the desired result; but all this has nothing to do with Sunday laws.

Of course it has not.

---



---

# 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.*

---



---

### 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



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.