

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, JUNE 18, 1903

NO. 25



One of the first and highest of duties is to extend to others the rights which we claim for ourselves.

Instead of being awake to the importance of enforcing a day of rest, "labor" should be awake to the importance and the duty, both to itself and to society, of extending to others the rights which it claims for itself.

There is something more important even than the maintenance of a day of rest, and that is the maintenance of justice and the liberty of the individual, and these latter cannot be maintained if there is to be "enforcement" of a day of rest."

The Constitution is the supreme law of the Republic, and by so much as the Constitution ceases to be the supreme law to those having authority in and exercising authority for the Republic, the Republic ceases to be. Subordinating the Constitution to the will of Congress at one point under the national jurisdiction is a step towards subordinating it to the will of Congress at all points under the national jurisdiction. "The government of the United States cannot permanently endure part republican and part imperialistic."

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

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

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights, especially the rights of conscience. The only periodical in the United States especially devoted to the maintenance of the Christian and American principle of complete separation of church and state. The Sentinel is not a periodical of abstractions and speculation; it discusses live issues that deeply concern every individual.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Editorial Contributors:

A. T. JONES, A. G. DANIELLS, M. C. WILCOX
L. A. SMITH, C. P. BOLLMAN.

We believe in the religion taught and lived by Jesus Christ.

We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting civil government and submitting to its authority.

We believe that human rights are sacred, and that they indissolubly inhere in the moral nature of the individual.

We deny the right of any human authority to invade and violate these inalienable rights in any individual.

Therefore we deny the right of any civil government to legislate on matters of religion and conscience.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, free from all dictation, interference, or control on the part of civil government or any other external authority; or not to worship at all if he so chooses.

We also believe it to be our duty, and no less the duty of all others, to oppose religious legislation and all movements tending toward the same, to the end that all the people may freely enjoy the inestimable blessing of liberty, which is theirs by virtue of the unbounded wisdom and beneficence of the Author of their being.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Single copy, per year.....	\$1.00
" six months.....	.50
" three months.....	.25
To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year.....	1.50

CLUBBING RATE.

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

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

TO OUR PATRONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

11 West 20th Street, New York City

If your subscription expires this month, have you renewed? If not that is the most important thing for you to do now. Do not delay another day.

Has any one spoken to you about securing a club of our July 9th issue of THE SENTINEL to distribute to Christian Endeavorers in your community? If not start out yourself and see if you cannot secure a large club.

RESPONSES are coming in very nicely indeed from letters written concerning our Christian Endeavor Number to be published July 9, 1903. Many have signified their intention of doing all they possibly can to get this excellent missionary number into the homes of all Endeavorers in their communities.

In addition to the announcement made last week of articles to appear in the Christian Endeavor Number of THE SENTINEL, we can add that there will be one entitled,

The Church and Its Work,

by W. A. Colcord, which will help to make this number of THE SENTINEL a particularly fine one to use for missionary purposes.

The following are the prices which have been made for extra copies of the Christian Endeavor Number of THE SENTINEL.

10 copies,	15 cents,
25 copies,	35 cents,
50 copies,	70 cents,
100 copies,	\$ 1.25
5,000 or more	\$ 8.00 per 1,000.
1,000 copies,	\$10.00

Every city of 50,000 population ought to have at least 5,000 copies of this number distributed in it; every city of 10,000 or more ought to have at least 1,000 copies distributed in it. If all those living in the same place who wish extra copies of this number will order together, having all come in one bundle to one individual and then the distribution made there, they will be able to secure them at lower rates.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1903

No. 25

Not "human necessity," but religious zeal and in some cases religious bigotry, is what causes Sunday enforcement.



Sunday laws are for the protection and maintenance of *an institution*, not of human rights; they are for maintaining the peace of *a day*, not of the community.



Why should the law have anything more to do with the matter of rest for the workingman than with the matter of remuneration for the workingman? If the important matter of wages can be left to employers and employees, why cannot the matter of rest be left to them also?



Russia is a nation and government in which the theories of the "National Reformers" are in actual operation. It is a "Christian" nation and government, and officially "recognizes" God. There "Christian institutions and usages have an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." And there the Christian religion is desecrated as nowhere else to-day by tyrannies and persecutions in its name. The fact is that the terrible Kishineff affair was in a large measure the fruit of the "Christian nation" theory. Russia is badly in need of genuine reform, and the United States would be just as badly in need of it if it were thoroughly "reformed" in accordance with "National Reform" principles.

In a recent address Bishop Potter well declared that "the great stumbling-block in organized labor is that the freedom of the individual is invaded." And one of the ways in which organized labor is coming to invade the freedom of the individual to-day, and gives promise of invading it still more in the future, is in the matter of the observance of "a weekly rest day." The Jacksonville (Fla.) *Times-Union* writer, to whose article we gave attention last week, quoted a number of items from our "Sunday Enforcement" department in proof of the declaration that "labor is awake to the importance of the enforcement of a day of rest by law." Yes, "labor" is awake in this matter, as in some others. Organizations of workingmen, clerks, and tradesmen are more and more decreeing and undertaking to compel the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in their respective lines, and they frequently join forces for this purpose. But Sunday enforcement by and at the demand of "labor" is no more right nor just than it is at the demand of the clergy. Workingmen, clerks, and tradesmen certainly have a right to rest on Sunday if they want to, but they have no right, either by force on their own part or on the part of the law, to take the right to work on Sunday away from those who do not want to rest. It may be a good thing to have a weekly rest day, and to have everybody observe it, but it is not a good thing to bring this about by over-

riding and trampling upon the rights of those who prefer not to rest on the "rest day." Workingmen, clerks and tradesmen have the right to use every rightful and legitimate means to get all to observe the day on which they desire to have all rest, but they have no right to use wrongful and illegitimate means to that end. They must respect the rights of others, for the rights of others are as deserving of consideration as their own. Bishop Potter declares that organized labor's invasion of the freedom of the individual is something that "has got to be corrected." It certainly should be, for such invasion on the part of organized labor is just as despotic and inexcusable as it is from any other source. And one thing that organized labor will have to do before it can cease to be an invader of the rightful and necessary freedom of the individual is to cease "the enforcement of a day of rest," whether by law or without any law but its own arbitrary decree. But, alas! "labor" is just awaking "to the importance of the enforcement of a day of rest."

Leslie's *Weekly* says "the citizens of New York State are not alone in the determination that there shall be no further invasions of the Day of Rest in the selfish interests of any class of persons," and cites the prevention in Indiana of the passage of the bill to permit baseball playing on Sunday, and the coming to the State capital in Pennsylvania of "citizens from all sections of the State, to the number of thousands, to protest against the amendment of the Sunday law enacted in 1794." "In this protest," it is stated, "all the reputable newspapers of the State joined forces." We suppose this assertion is made on the assumption that no newspaper which did not so protest can be considered reputable. One of the best newspaper editorials against Sunday enforcement that

we have ever read appeared in the *Johnstown Daily Democrat* of February 12, when the agitation was at its height, and we do not believe that the attitude of this paper was very different from that of the press generally. It is certain that the great dailies of Philadelphia did not join in any protest in behalf of "the Sunday law enacted in 1794." The fact is that both the instances mentioned showed that the citizens who are determined "that there shall be no further invasions upon the Day of Rest" — that is no further modification of the Sunday laws — are nearly all religionists and act in the matter in behalf of what they conceive to be the interests of religion. Would it not be well if the citizens of New York and other States would settle upon the determination that there shall be no further invasions of the rightful and constitutional liberty of the citizen in the interests, yes, in the selfish interests, of a religious class, for that is what the Sunday laws are. The *Weekly's* invention of a new proper name for the Sunday institution is a little thing, but it is significant. The substitution of "the Day of Rest" for the "Lord's day," the "Sabbath," or the "Christian Sunday," is something that is indicative of an important step in the evolution of Sunday enforcement.

In the quotation given last week from M. Gohier's article it was stated that the United States government "in its infancy forbade the Pope the nomination of a single prelate, and refused to make any kind of recognition of the Holy See," but that "to-day the outcome of the Philippine issue is that the Pope has the official nomination of one hundred prelates within American territory." It is true that contrary to the policy of the government in its infancy, as promptly and unequivocally expressed by Benjamin Franklin to the papal nuncio in Paris in 1776, the American government has in

this Philippine matter become concerned with the appointment of papal ecclesiastics. But it is not true that the Government officially nominates the prelates in the Philippines, although there is reason to believe that it has been too intimately concerned with some of the appointments, which may have amounted to a practical nomination, although it can hardly be called "official." Only last week we were told in a dispatch from Washington that "the designation of Father J. J. Harty, of St. Louis, as Archbishop of Manila, is announced at the Papal *legation* here," and that "it has been supposed that his appointment would be particularly pleasing to President Roosevelt." Of course the Government and its officials should not be concerned with these appointments, but evidently they are, and in that Rome is not losing anything. Then, of course, the Government concerned itself with the friars in the Philippines, and undertook to say that a certain class of ecclesiastics should be removed from the islands and others more acceptable to the people substituted for them. There is reason to believe that it went too far in this matter; it certainly did in the way it tried to accomplish this result, for in doing so it was led into making a most pronounced "recognition of the Holy See"—such a recognition as Franklin and his fellow Americans would never have allowed, for they knew the danger of such a proceeding. And the Government did not accomplish its purpose after all. But the Papacy accomplished her purposes quite well, although not in the way of getting the Government to consent to officially nominate her prelates in the Philippines.



The St. Paul (Minn.) *Globe* thinks that "the seven-day newspaper and the seven-day journalist must respond" to the recent condemnation of "seven-day journalism" by the Presbyterian General

Assembly "or else plead guilty to the pursuit of an unworthy occupation and an evil mission on earth." It responds in this telling fashion:

Let us ask the devout preachers who signed that resolution the following candid questions:

Why is it any worse to give one's views to the world on Sunday in writing, than from a public platform?

Why is it any more evil for the editor to speak to his readers on Sunday, than for a preacher to talk to his congregation?

Is written speech on Sunday any more criminal or vicious than oral speech?

Why is the editor who writes his views on Saturday and rests on Sunday, the carrier making an early morning delivery in time also to attend his church, a sinful and wicked Sabbath-breaker; while the preacher, who also works hard in writing his sermon on Saturday for strenuous delivery from the Sunday platform, is not a Sabbath-breaker at all?

What is there in the essential missions of the editor and the preacher, what is there in written as against verbal speech, what is there in the necessities of the public, that should make the Sunday editorial an evil, and the Sunday sermon a godsend to the race?

Not all the public wants a Sunday sermon; while both those who do and those who do not want the sermon, want the newspaper. The only ground for the Sunday pulpit oration is the enlightenment, the inspiration, the entertainment which it furnishes; and why has not the Sunday newspaper the same ground for existence?

It would seem as though there were enough institutions on earth for the pulpit to attack, without an assault upon its greatest friend and co-laborer, the press. The Sunday newspaper has come to stay as much as the Sunday sermon. It is a fixture that is growing in demand and influence every year and month and week. There is no Sunday institution more strongly entrenched in public demand and usefulness. Our minister brethren themselves cannot get along without it, and they should co-operate with their ally rather than fight it with useless epithets.

Of course it must be conceded that as a general thing the Sunday sermon is superior mentally and morally to the Sunday paper. The remark of *The Interior* (Presbyterian) that "the comicalities" that are made the leading feature

of most of the Sunday papers are "as imbecile as can be devised outside an asylum for the feeble-minded," is not much of an exaggeration, and it certainly should "give one a heavy heart to think of a generation of Americans brought up on such pabulum" as is supplied by these "idiotic supplements" and other portions of the Sunday papers. But we hardly think it is true that "to hundreds of thousands of children these things are literature and life." But even if it is so, there is no sense in fighting the Sunday paper on the line laid down by the resolutions adopted by the Presbyterian Assembly. As long as it is attacked in that way such responses as the above will be a sufficient reply and defense. If the Sunday newspaper is an evil it is such because of the character of its matter and not because it is a *Sunday* paper. Not the day of its publication but the nature of its contents is what determines its character, and if it is to be attacked it should be attacked for what it is, and not on the irrelevant ground that it tends "to secularize the Christian Sabbath" and "prevents untold thousands from attending divine services on the Lord's day." If the Sunday paper is a demoralizing force because of the character of its matter it is not only stupid but wicked to oppose it in this latter fashion, for it is equivalent to saying that it would be all right if it was issued on any other day of the week than Sunday.



Another Roman Catholic ecclesiastic has joined Archbishop Quigley in publicly proclaiming that the triumph of Catholicism in this country, and by means of that in the world at large, is assured. At a banquet of the Maynooth Alumni Association in Chicago on May 27 "Rev. Father" Morgan Sheedy, of Altoona, Pa., was reported to have said among other things:

The future religion of this land lies in the

Catholic Church. It is now generally admitted that within a short time the United States will control the material world. It can be no less certain that the Catholic Church will direct the religious world.

The remarks of "Father" Sheedy "were cheered by the members of the association, who are priests and graduates of Maynooth College in Ireland, and other speakers seconded them in their speeches." We have noticed in one prominent Catholic journal a denial that Archbishop Quigley made such utterances as were attributed to him. We have seen no denial, however, from any other source. Whether this denial was prompted by the consideration which M. Gohier tells us influenced a leading Catholic prelate in this country to counsel prudence and forbearance last summer as the proper course for "the Church" in the Philippine matter—"lest public apprehensions should be aroused by a revelation of the power of the Catholic community now solid and formidable in the heart of the American nation"—we do not know. It is sufficient to say that it will require more than this denial to convince any one that the archbishop did not say substantially what he has been reported all over the country to have said. It would seem that the archbishop need not have waited until he saw "the Western parochial schools" and the state of affairs in Chicago before coming to the conclusion that the future will bring the triumph of Catholicism in this country. We have been told that at the farewell services in his honor held in the Catholic cathedral in Buffalo on March 2 "*all classes and creeds were represented to join in a fervent God-speed on his way to the Chicago archbishopric.*"

In addition to the hundreds of priests of the Catholic Church, the members of the Methodist Ministers' Association were present in a body at the pontifical mass, and many representative clergymen of the other denomi-

nations also, while the chief non-Catholic laity were conspicuous by their attendance.

The names of twenty-five clergymen were given by the *Buffalo Express* as being "among the Protestant clergymen present." With the body of Methodist ministers was the presiding elder of the Buffalo district of that church. Among the "many public officials" present were the superintendent of education and the city auditor, the latter, however, being a Catholic, and one of the speakers of the occasion. At the conclusion of the services "the archbishop passed around the church preceded by 133 altar boys and priests, and *everyone* knelt as he bestowed his blessing."

At the rear there was a file of tall policemen, the tallest men that Sergeant Ryan could single out for the occasion, and as the archbishop passed they bowed on one knee and removed their caps to receive the blessing of the archbishop.

At the risk of being considered narrow and bigoted, we venture to say that this and other not infrequent occurrences similar to it are noteworthy evidences that Rome is rising to supremacy in this country. The presence of the "Protestant" clergymen on this occasion would not have been so significant were it the case that Catholic ecclesiastics fraternize in a similar way with Protestants. But how many "bodies" of Catholic ecclesiastics, or even individual ecclesiastics, would attend a Protestant service and "join in a fervent God-speed" to a Protestant churchman? Though they may not know it, Protestants are surrendering to Rome and making easy her triumph in this country. Catholics did not fail to take note of this Buffalo incident. One leading Catholic journal asked, "What could be more gratifying?" and said: "It is plain from this that religious amenities in Buffalo are idyllic. While in many portions of the country social and political conditions show undoubted signs of moral decay, there are some hopeful symptoms

observable." An incident that should not be overlooked is that of the policemen. According to the reports some such incident takes place at nearly every great Roman Catholic service in the large cities. Military companies, professedly in the service of the State, are frequently mentioned as figuring in such services. It should not be difficult for any one to see that in this the principle of the separation of church and state is being disregarded in the interests of the Catholic Church. Such proceedings may be proper enough where there is an established church; in a country where there is not an established church they are out of place, for they are compatible only with a union of church and state, and can have no other tendency than to bring about such a union. Returning to Archbishop Quigley's utterance, why was it that he was convinced by the Western parochial schools that "the generation which follows us will be exclusively Catholic"? Is the coming generation being trained in those schools? Are the children of Protestants and non-Catholics as well as of Catholics being educated in them? It must be that this is the case, for how else could the archbishop have been convinced by them that "the next generation will be exclusively Catholic"?



Again the Supreme Court has upheld the doctrine that the Constitution is not binding in territory acquired by the United States until "extended" over it by special act of Congress. And again, as two years ago, this principle, which is fraught with such grave consequences, is sustained by the slender majority of one, and again one of the majority judges differs from the others in the reasoning by which the judgment of the court is reached. This late decision was rendered on June 1, just before the court adjourned for the summer. The question before the court was as to the legal-

ity of the proceedings in the case of a man who had been accused and convicted of murder in Hawaii after the islands had been annexed to the United States and before they had become a territory. The Constitution provides that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or other infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury," and it must be understood to require, in harmony with the common law practise, that the verdict of the trial jury shall be unanimous. In this case, in harmony with the methods in vogue under the independent Hawaiian government, there had been no grand jury indictment, and the conviction was by a majority vote of the jury. The Supreme Court was asked to declare the trial and conviction illegal and void on the ground that the proceedings were not in harmony with the Constitution. Notwithstanding Congress had itself provided in the annexation resolution that the Hawaiian laws "not contrary to the Constitution of the United States" should remain in force, it was held by the majority of the court that "no change in the government was contemplated" in the resolution and that it could not have been the intention of Congress "to interfere with the existing practice," and that therefore the proceedings were legal and valid. It was agreed that if the words of the resolution, "'not contrary to the Constitution of the United States,' be literally applied, the petitioner is entitled to his discharge" on the ground contended. It was thus admitted that if the view that the Constitution became the supreme law of Hawaii by virtue of its annexation had prevailed a decision opposite to that rendered would have been given. Thus, while the majority opinion confined itself to the annexation resolution, holding that "the status of the islands and the power of their provisional government were measured" by it, and that it was unnecessary "to recon-

sider the questions which arose in the insular tariff cases regarding the power of Congress to annex territory without at the same time extending the Constitution over it," the decision rendered was necessarily grounded on the proposition that the Constitution is not binding in territory acquired by the United States until Congress has formally "extended" it. It is therefore a re-endorsement of the ominous doctrine that Congress can govern outside the Constitution — that the will of Congress and not the Constitution is the supreme law in new territory until Congress chooses to make the Constitution supreme. Since the decisions of two years ago two new judges, Justices Holmes and Day, have succeeded Justices Gray and Shiras, who held with the majority in the former decisions. But this seems to have made no difference in the complexion of the court as to this question of the Constitution and new territory. As before, Chief Justice Fuller and Justices Harlan, Brewer, and Peckham, admittedly the very ablest members of the tribunal, constituted the dissenting minority. Justice Brown again delivered the majority opinion, and again Chief Justice Fuller and Justice Harlan delivered vigorous dissenting opinions. With marked emphasis the Chief Justice declared that it was plain to him that immediately upon annexation the Constitution of the United States became the supreme law of Hawaii. He declared that the construction put upon the resolution of Congress plainly providing that only laws in harmony with the Constitution should remain in force in Hawaii was a usurpation by the court of the law-making power. Justice Harlan "delivered his opinion in a manner even more forcible and dramatic than that of the Chief Justice." The following from his opinion is a good setting forth of the dangerous and un-republican character of the doctrine now sanctioned for the second time

by the supreme tribunal of the nation, and now declared by leading journals as likely to be the "controlling" doctrine of "the court in the future, no matter how constituted":

It [the majority opinion] assumes the possession by Congress of power quite as omnipotent as that possessed by the English parliament. It assumes that Congress, which came into existence only by virtue of the Constitution, may withhold the fundamental guaranties of life and liberty from peoples who have come under our complete jurisdiction, and over whose country we have acquired the authority to exercise sovereign dominion. In my judgment, neither the life nor the liberty nor the property of any person within a territory or country over which the United States is sovereign can be taken under the sanction of any civil tribunal, by any form of procedure inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States.

Can it be that the Constitution is the supreme law in the States of the Union, and in the organized Territories of the United States between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and yet was not the supreme law in territories and among peoples situated like the Territory and people of Hawaii, and over which the United States acquired all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind? A negative answer to this question and a recognition of the principle that such an answer involves, would mean that the benefit of the provisions designed for the protection of life and liberty may be claimed by some of the people subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the United States, but cannot be claimed by others equally subject to its authority and jurisdiction. It would mean that the will of Congress, not the Constitution, was the supreme law of the land for certain peoples and territories under our jurisdiction. It would mean that the United States may acquire territory by cession, conquest or treaty, and that Congress may exercise sovereign dominion over it, outside of and in violation of the Constitution.

It would mean that, under the influence and guidance of commercialism and the supposed necessities of trade, this country had left the old ways of the fathers, as defined by written constitution, and entered a new way, in following which the American people will lose sight of or become indifferent to those principles which had been supposed to be essential to real liberty.

It would mean that if this people do not retrace their steps, if the principles now announced should become firmly established, the time may not be far distant when, under the exactions of trade and commerce, and to gratify an ambition to become the greatest political power in all the earth, the United States will acquire territories in every direction which are inhabited by human beings, over which territories, to be called "dependencies," we will exercise absolute dominion, and where inhabitants will be regarded as "subjects," to be controlled as Congress may see fit, not as the Constitution requires nor as the people governed people may wish.

Thus will be engrafted upon our republican institutions, dominated by the supreme law of a written constitution, a colonial system entirely foreign to the genius of our government and abhorrent to the principles that underlie and pervade the Constitution.

I stand by the doctrine that the Constitution is the supreme law in every territory as soon as it comes under the sovereign dominion of the United States for purposes of civil administration, and whose inhabitants are under its entire authority and jurisdiction.

Of course the decision of the court is "a negative answer" to Justice Harlan's interrogation, and from it logically follows all that he points out. The *Springfield Republican* says:

According to the position of the majority judges, the Constitution is wholly without force or effect upon Congress in dealing with any territory or people under the jurisdiction of the United States and not embraced in the regular States of the Union; and an imperial system of colonies or dependencies can be engrafted upon the Republic, subject to a government as absolute and despotic and arbitrary as that of the Czar. To say that this is in harmony with the principles and system of government intended to be established by the Constitution of the United States is to violate the dictates of common reason and common sense.



An incident in President Roosevelt's late Western trip that should not be overlooked took place at Seattle, Wash. "Engineer Spillman, who as the senior engineer of the Pacific division of the Northern Pacific was selected to pull the President's train out of Seattle," was pre-

vented from doing so by "a committee of the engineers' brotherhood who went to the district superintendent and made a protest against the President's being pulled by a non-union man. So effective were the arguments that Spillman was deprived of his honor, and his place taken by a member of the brotherhood in good standing." The engineer was of course not a member of the engineers' union. This noteworthy evidence of the power of "organized labor" would be more reassuring if what is said in the quotation elsewhere from *The Independent* with regard to labor unions were not true. Only a few weeks ago no less a friend of organized labor than Mr. Clarence S. Darrow, who was the attorney for the miners' union before the late Coal Strike Commission, declared in a public address in Chicago that "the principles of labor organizations, as now managed, and those of the trusts and huge business consolidations are the same." Organized labor must find other principles of action or its power will be only a menace to society.

Considerable has been heard lately about preparedness for war being the best guarantee of peace. The President has been saying a great deal in favor of the building and maintenance of a big navy, because "the surest guarantee of peace is an adequate navy." The real reason why a big navy is wanted cropped out in the President's speech at Tacoma on May 22; when he said:

I ask for a navy primarily because it is the surest means of keeping peace, and also because, if war does come, surely there can be no American who will tolerate the idea of its having anything other than a successful issue.

It is because they cannot tolerate the idea of war having any other than a successful issue for them that the nations of Europe are groaning under their heavy burdens of militarism. It is not desire for peace, but the desire and determination to "whip the other fellow" when

"we" get into a fight that causes all this talk in favor of a big navy. And that desire is not an attitude that insures peace, by any means.

The first of a series of articles that have been prepared for THE SENTINEL by Mr. W. A. Colcord, an old friend and contributor, is given in this issue. The character of the articles to follow is indicated by this first one. They will set forth in a clear and simple manner principles of liberty that are to-day too little understood. The readers of THE SENTINEL, and all others into whose hands they will now place the paper, are to be congratulated upon what is now in store for them in these excellent articles, which are worthy not only of careful reading but of earnest study. It will sometimes be necessary to hold over an article for a week or more, but this will not matter so much, since each article, though logically connected with the one preceding and the one following, will be complete in itself.

During the present session of the French Chamber of Deputies two votes of confidence in the government's determined policy with regard to the religious associations have been taken. The last was on May 20, when after a heated debate the policy of the government was sustained by a vote of 313 to 237. A bill providing for the entire separation of church and state has been brought before the chamber by M. de Pressensé, but although it receives enthusiastic endorsement in some quarters, it is not likely to become law.

Because people should be good and true, it does not follow that they can be made good and true by legislation.

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

Principles too Little Understood

By W. A. Colcord

IT is hard for men to learn that the same rights which they claim for themselves they are in duty bound to extend to others, however widely they may differ from them. But this is the golden rule of life—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This is the true panacea for all bigotry, intolerance, and oppression.

No one himself desires to be coerced by others as to what he shall believe and practise in matters of religion, and no one ought, therefore, to assume or claim the right to coerce another in this respect. The liberty which each desires for himself he should freely grant to others. Men may be quick to recognize and claim their own rights while they utterly ignore and trample upon the rights of others. For each to demand his own rights is not the basis of true liberty. Each must recognize and respect the equal rights of others before freedom is insured.

"Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathern hearts forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No; true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
In earnest to make others free."

To help to a better and more general understanding of the great principles underlying human rights and liberties, as they relate to the individual, to the church, and to the state, is the object of this and succeeding articles which the writer has consented to contribute to THE SENTINEL. Principles which, if universally understood and practised, would insure peace on earth and good will among men ought not to be forgotten.

It is highly essential to understand correct principles. A principle is a funda-

mental truth; a comprehensive law or doctrine from which others are derived, or on which others are founded; a settled rule of action; a governing law of conduct. We never need be afraid of following a true principle. From the very nature of the case it cannot lead astray. The only danger lies in departing from it.

The principles of civil and religious liberty are such that they may profitably be considered and studied at all times. They are living principles, and are recognized or disregarded wherever people live and governments exist. The people of all nations either enjoy the blessings of freedom, or feel the oppressive hand of intolerance and persecution. It is, no doubt, true that these principles are likely to be more generally discussed and more vigorously defended when they are ignored than when regarded; but it is none the less a fact that they may be kept fresh in the minds of the people while they are yet heeded. In advocating them we may take the aggressive as well as the defensive; and the former method is worthy of the higher commendation, in that it is the only sure way of securing the blessings accruing from them, and perpetuating these blessings to the race. It is because these principles are allowed to be forgotten, and false ideas spring up and take their place, that they are disregarded. A field, in order to yield fruit, must be cultivated; only weeds and thorns thrive without cultivation. It has not yet ceased to be true that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Religious liberty is safe only while a knowledge of its principles is familiar to the people. It is to this fact that are due the laws of toleration and religious freedom in many of the modern governments of Europe, America, and elsewhere.

Through the great struggles of the past for freedom the people of these lands became familiar with the principles, and public sentiment demanded their recognition and expression in the laws of the land. But the histories of these great struggles are but little read, and less talked about, by the masses of to-day. Few read the works which chronicle these great conflicts for civil and religious liberty. They are not in large demand at the present time. These moral battles, upon the result of which so much depended, and which bequeathed to succeeding generations liberty of conscience and freedom of thought and expression, are not being fought over in the minds of the people to-day. The great underlying principles which actuated them, and carried them through to a glorious and successful issue, have largely faded from the memory of the present generation, and again the cloud of religious oppression, ever ready to overshadow and sweep away the dearest rights of man, hangs with threatening aspect over the world.

This being so, the question arises, Shall we keep these principles alive, or shall we let them die? Shall our children

be taught the blessings and the value of the rights and liberties so long enjoyed, or shall they grow up in ignorance of them? Shall the rising generation hear first the clear and logical voice of freedom and truth, or the ingenious sophistries which justify intolerance and persecution? It is often a great misfortune for one to hear the wrong side first, for first impressions are the most lasting.

To assist in perpetuating and extending a knowledge of these noble and important principles, this paper is published and these articles are written. To encourage all, both men and women, youth and children, to prize the blessings of liberty as a precious heritage is our object.

Human rights naturally divide themselves into two realms, civil and religious. With the former the state properly has to do; with the latter, the church. The subject, therefore, involves a consideration not only of the rights themselves, but of the natural and rightful province and work of the state and the church, and the relation which they should sustain to each other. The articles to follow, therefore, will deal especially with these two realms, the state and the church.

An ideal which more than any other one cause has shaped American institutions, which, indeed, has drawn to our shores a majority of our foreign-born citizens, is that of freedom. In recent years the labor unions have been conspicuous among the forces that have been breaking down this ideal. . . . The trade union program will not be what it ought to be until it finds a way to reconcile the discipline of organization, on the one hand, with a great measure of liberty reserved to its individual members and to non-unionists on the other hand. The trade union of to-day is tyrannical. It expects its individual members to submit their wills and to conform their conduct

to the authority of a leader, or to the decision of a majority which may be made up of the most incompetent, most unwise and most untrustworthy elements in the body. . . . We want in this country no workingmen who will sit down like abject slaves in the face of cruel wrongs that ought to be redressed. We want not any who are incapable of organization and the effective co-operation which it implies. But neither do we want those who are incapable of extending to other men the rights which they claim for themselves and who think that they have escaped from slavery when they yield their wills to tyrants of their own election.—*The Independent*.

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.

A committee of seven ministers, headed by Rev. J. T. Gibson, Presbyterian, waited on Mayor Hays at the city hall in Pittsburg, Pa., on May 26 and asked among other things that "efforts be made toward a more strict observance of the Sunday laws." Director of Public Safety Moore was called in, and a conference was held with the ministers. After the conference the mayor issued a statement, from which we take the following:

The address of the ministerial associations was discussed at considerable length with the visiting committee. The ministers were given assurances that the city administration would, in every way and by the use of very legitimate power, endeavor to conserve the welfare of the city. Director Moore, in his talk with the ministers, called attention to their statement that "the moral welfare of all classes is best conserved under the reign of righteous equitable government." "What is a righteous, equitable government?" the director asked. "We believe it cannot be righteous without being equitable, and that it is not a police duty to interfere with a citizen so long as his acts do not invade the rights of others. We must allow this principle to govern us. The police will, I assure you, preserve the quiet, peace and holiness of the Sabbath wherever it may be necessary. We promise to keep newsboys from calling their papers in the vicinity of churches, and we will stop all sales of un-necessaries, but we do not know that there is much business done on Sunday, except among a few of the small shops and stores. Neither do we feel called upon to issue and enforce an order suppressing entirely the publication and sale of Sunday newspapers." There was a long discussion of the Sunday newspaper question, but the mayor and director maintained that they saw no public necessity for attempting to stop the publication and sale of newspapers, but promised to assist in preventing the Sunday morning disturbances caused by the noisy cries of boys. Assurance was given that the illegal sale of liquor, especially

on Sunday, would be made to cease. The mayor said in conclusion that he was certain the ministers and the administration could work best together along the lines indicated by Director Moore.

Two years ago this summer a very strict Sunday-enforcement régime prevailed for several weeks in Pittsburg. It was brought to an end by the late Recorder Brown, who had been carrying it out, after a few talks with Mr. C. S. Longacre, a friend of THE SENTINEL then living in Pittsburg. After one or two conversations, in which the principles involved were clearly pointed out to him, the recorder readily acknowledged that Sunday enforcement was wrong, and in a short time revoked the Sunday-enforcement order. In an article to the press giving his reasons for the change of policy he included much that had been presented to him by Mr. Longacre. It would seem that the Pittsburg authorities are still influenced to some extent by the ideas and principles that were then heeded.



The W. C. T. U. in Houston, Texas, is carrying on a Sunday-enforcement crusade. On May 26 it issued this statement:

Petitions in behalf of Sunday closing in Houston presented to the council up to the present time have been signed by fifty-three churches, church societies, clubs and other organizations of the city, representing a membership of 5,600, and 400 voters and business men have given their individual signatures to have the Texas Sunday law observed in Houston. The Central W. C. T. U. has had printed and distributed 3,000 copies of the law from the Revised Penal Code of the statutes of Texas. Monday Chief of Police Ellis was presented with over forty petitions from different organizations, and over 300 individual signa-

tures for the enforcement of the law here, which, although many years on the statutes of Texas, has been violated just as many years.

On May 26 the mayor of Hamilton, Ohio, issued a vigorous "general order," "to take effect at once," in which among other things he directed the chief of police "to notify all persons operating saloons of the laws of Ohio regarding Sunday closing," and "to notify all persons conducting public dances that such dances must cease promptly at twelve o'clock on Saturday night." On this last point the mayor said: "The desecration of the Sabbath day by these dances continuing into Sunday morning is against public policy and welfare, and you are directed to see that this order is implicitly obeyed."

A meeting "to discuss the question of the enforcement of the Sunday laws" was recently held in the Central Congregational Church in Brooklyn. Dr. Josiah Strong, "president of the American Institute of Social Service," spoke on "The Civil Sabbath," and said "that the necessity of a civil sabbath, and of adequate laws to protect it, should create a public sentiment which will demand wise Sunday legislation and sustain its enforcement."

A "boss barbers' association" was formed in Madison, Wis., on May 25, and it was at once announced that "the barbers' union as a body proposes to carry out the provisions of the Sunday-closing ordinance to the letter, and close tab will be kept on those who are inclined to violate them." Two proprietors had been "averse to Sunday-closing," and had "threatened to test the legality of this bit of municipal law-making."

The Lansing (Mich.) *Republican* of May 27 reported that on that date, by a vote of fifty-eight to eighteen, a bill per-

mitting Sunday baseball in Wayne County was passed by the lower house of the legislature. It "was passed in the interests of the American League team," which had "been compelled to abandon its Sunday schedule by the pressure brought to bear by the different churches."

At 169th Street and Clay Avenue in New York on Sunday, May 31, two mounted policemen rode into the grounds where a ball game was in progress "and told the eighteen players and 200 spectators that they were under arrest." Five of the players, who were boys, were captured and taken to the police station. They were discharged at the hearing the next day.

At Detroit, Mich., on May 29 warrants charging "violations of the Sunday-closing law" were sworn out against eight Belle Isle "amusement promoters." The amusements that had been carried on on Sunday were palmistry, merry-go-round, roller toboggan, photograph tent, scenic railway, shooting gallery, phonograph exhibit, and spinning wheel.

Police officers at Waco, Texas, stated on May 26 that "there has been a little more laxness the past Sunday or two in the observance of the Sunday law." But "the officers are determined to keep in behind the infractors," and are "getting evidence against those who open their doors."

Resolutions "condemning the granting of permission for the landing of Sunday excursions in Hastings" were "unanimously adopted at the Methodist and Baptist churches" in Hastings, Minn., on May 24.

It was recently reported from Great Neck, L. I., that "warfare is to be waged against Sunday excursions to this village."

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.

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.**

LEGAL SUNDAY

Sunday laws and their enforcement has become one of the leading questions of the day. The subject is one of absorbing interest and much has been written upon it. Much, too, has been said by the clergy, by the lawyers, by the legislatures and by the courts.

Until recently, however, there seems to have been no very careful inquiry into the merits of the case of the legal Sunday—no open challenge of its right to exist.

In **THE LEGAL SUNDAY: Its History and Character**, James T. Ringgold, a member of the Baltimore bar at his decease, challenges Sunday's legal right to an existence. This book is a clear, logical, forceful presentation of a subject which is of vital interest to every American citizen.

"Legal Sunday" contains 252 pages, is bound in paper covers, and costs the small sum of **25 cents**.

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM

A straightforward discussion of the relation of the Christian patriot to earthly governments, and of the principles which should govern him. An important subject, too, in these days when so many seem befogged and uncertain as to their duties and responsibilities in this respect. **CLOTH, 40 Cents.**

THE GREAT NATIONS OF TO-DAY

In this the author plainly shows that the great nations of to-day are clearly mentioned in the Bible, and their destiny foretold. A most interesting historical and prophetic study, proving incidentally the inspiration of the Bible.

PAPER COVERS, 25 Cents.

THE MARSHALING OF THE NATIONS

This little booklet shows conclusively that the five great Powers actually hold in their hands the *power* and a greater part of the *territory* of the world. But there is a significance to all this that but few understand. Read this pamphlet and the meaning will be plain. Has a double-page, four-color map of the world, showing how it is now partitioned among the various powers. **PAPER COVERS, 10 Cents.**

Address,

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