

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XIX

WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 4, 1904

NO. 5



" Sunday laws create mythical crimes for a specified period."

" The time has fully come when the true nature of Sunday laws should be set forth and considered."

" Christian patriots " who employ, or seek to employ, the civil law and the civil courts to maintain a religious observance are in that thing neither Christians nor patriots."

" A law to oblige people to conform to any one or any system of religious tenets savors much of profanity, inasmuch as it virtually prescribes the particular kind of worship which the Deity is authorized to receive according to the statute in such case made and provided."

The Christian religion " suffers no man to judge another ' in respect of an holy day, or of the Sabbath days.' " " It denies the moral right of a man to act contrary to his conscience, and forbids him to coerce others to act against their consciences and to conform to religious creeds they in their consciences disown."—See

" What religion is that which claims for its professors a right to work, play, and traffic on the Sabbath day of others, and withholds from others their equal right to work, play, and buy and sell on theirs? What religion is that whose professors oblige others to respect their " sabbath days " more than they hold themselves bound to respect the " sabbath days " of others? What religion is that which allows one portion of the community to do by others as they will not allow others to do by them? "—See page 75.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

A weekly publication devoted to the maintenance and defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore opposed to any violation or compromise of the principle of separation of church and state. Non-sectarian and non-partisan in the application of principles.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Published by

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.,
222 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.

To whom all communications of a business nature should be addressed.

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 months50
"	three months25
To foreign countries in Postal Union,	one year	1.50

CLUBBING RATE.

5 or more copies to one address, one year70	per copy.
Club rate for three and six months in proportion.			
Special terms to agents. Sample copies gratis. Correspondence solicited.			

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

It was recently reported from Winona, Minn., that the ministers of that place would "on Sunday, January 31, start an agitation in favor of reform and a higher respect for law."



It is reported that "the ministers in a number of Iowa towns have joined in a protest against the custom of holding funerals on Sunday." "They object on the ground that it adds too much to the Sunday duties of themselves and others who are more or less indirectly connected with funerals."



It is announced that the New York American League baseball club "has completed arrangements to play fourteen Sunday games within the limits of Greater New York during the coming season." There has been no Sunday ball playing by professional teams in New York in recent years, and it is very likely that this departure, which it is stated is in response "to a popular demand," will meet the decided opposition of the champions of the "Sabbath" by law.



It was recently reported from Patterson, N. J., that "prominent members of the liquor dealers' association have been visited by clergymen and asked to close their places on Sunday," and that these members "expressed a willingness to do so provided all saloon-keepers would do so." We shall yet see clergymen and saloon-keepers united for Sunday closing, and when we see it we shall see clergymen virtually endorsing and supporting the saloon six days of the week.



Under the heading, "Sabbath Law Wins," the McPherson (Kan.) *Republican* of January 18 reported: "The regular annual contest at the college under the auspices of the Irving Memorial occurred on Saturday evening. The question discussed was, Resolved, That Sunday observance should be compulsory in the United States. The question was ably discussed on both sides, but the affirmative side won. The judges were Rev. L. C. Schnacke, Prof. Wm. Sinclair, and Hon. B. B. Grattan."

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XIX

WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 4, 1904

No. 5

Neither Christian Nor Patriotic

“The Christian patriots of our land stand ready to wage any battle, at whatever cost, to maintain the sacred character of the Lord’s day inviolate,” recently wrote the pastor of the First Reformed Church in Philadelphia in defending and upholding the Sunday-enforcement crusade in that city. This clergyman stated very accurately the purpose of the clergymen who engage in the work of Sunday-law enforcement. Their purpose in the matter is “to maintain the sacred character of the Lord’s day.” It would have been interesting had this clergyman explained where he and other clergymen, or any other persons, get the warrant for using, or assuming the right to use, the civil law and the civil courts to maintain the sacred character of a religious observance and institution. It would also have been interesting had he explained what warrant those who thus employ, or assume the right to thus employ, the civil law and the civil courts have for considering themselves Christian patriots in the matter. It is strange that this American, Christian clergyman does not know that those Americans who employ, or seek to employ, the civil law and the civil courts to maintain a religious observance are in that thing neither Christians nor patriots, but are antagonizing and violating the principles both of their country and of the Christian religion. Those whose re-

ligion and patriotism moves them to employ, or to demand the employment of, the law and the courts to maintain a religious observance have a religion that is not Christianity and a patriotism that is not true loyalty to their country. When “the Christian patriots of our land” who insist upon employing the civil law and the civil courts “to maintain the sacred character of the Lord’s day inviolate” cease so insisting, and instead have regard for maintaining inviolate the sacred principles of their country and of the Christian religion with respect to the matter, they will be warranted in considering themselves Christians and patriots in the matter, and not before. And until they do thus turn about it will be the duty of all who are Christian patriots indeed to stand ready to wage any battle, at whatever cost, to maintain the sacred principles of Christianity and Americanism in the face of this work of antagonism and treason to them on the part of the mis-called “Christian patriots of our land.”

✦

The “Sabbath” in Congress

Gen. William Birney, who has been watching the matter, informs us that from present appearances it is doubtful if the bill “to further protect the first day of the week in the District of Columbia,” which was introduced in the House of Representatives on November 24, will be given the honor of a committee

hearing during the present session of Congress. But it seems that this is not the only Sunday measure that has appeared in Congress at this session. In the Senate on January 18 Senator Penrose, of Pennsylvania, introduced "a bill to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices in the handling of money orders and registered letters." It prohibits the issuing or paying of money orders or the registering of letters by post-masters on Sunday. The measure was referred to the Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, of which Senator Penrose is chairman. In the consideration of this bill the committee should consult the report on "Sunday Mails," made by the Senate Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, and adopted by the Senate on Jan. 19, 1829. In that report was clearly and eloquently enunciated the principles which should determine the action of Congress with regard to legislation of the character of the bill in question. And it seems that action of Congress in the matter of "Sabbath observance" is being sought in another direction. In the Senate on January 13 Mr. Platt, of Connecticut, "presented a petition of thirty citizens of Afton, I. T., praying for the enactment of legislation allowing railroad employees a day of rest and Sabbath observance;" and on January 22 Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, "presented a petition of sundry citizens of Westville and Stillwell, I. T., praying that the laws governing railroad work in that Territory be so amended that railroad employees be allowed a day of rest and Sabbath observance." These petitions either imply that the law does not now guarantee and secure to the railroad employees civil and religious freedom so far as Sabbath observance is concerned, and are prayers for the remedying of that deplorable state of affairs,

or else they are requests to have Congress legislate in the interests of "Sabbath observance." They are of course the latter, and therefore ask for something which Congress should not grant.

+

Stricter Sunday Law for New York The Sunday bill introduced in the New York legislature on January 14 by Assemblyman Monroe was thus described the next day in the *Brooklyn Eagle's* "Legislative Calendar and Digest":

Assembly Bill—Introductory No. 26. "An act to amend the penal code relative to the sale of prepared meats, salads, and cheese on Sundays." Amends Section 267 so that it will read: "All manner of selling or offering for sale or delivery of any property on Sunday is prohibited." The present enactment reads, "public selling." The exception in the present law that articles of food may be sold before 10 a. m. is removed. A provision forbidding the sale of prepared tobacco, milk, ice, and soda-water in places where groceries and vegetables are sold is introduced. Prepared meats and fish, salads, and cheese may be sold between 5 and 8 p. m., and between June 15 and September 15 butter, milk, and ice may be delivered up to 10 a. m., but the places where they are sold shall not be open to customers. This bill is of great interest to grocers as well as to inhabitants of cities, many of whom have found the Sunday laws sufficiently severe as they stand.

In making a note of the introduction of this bill two weeks ago we had the impression that it was a modification of the present law, but this is not the case. It increases the scope and strictness of the law against Sunday selling. It is so framed as to completely close grocery stores on Sunday, and in effect to largely restrict the sale of articles which have long been allowed to be freely sold on Sunday. It has been reported that the Federation of

Labor of New York State would attempt to secure the passage of a bill for "the closing of grocery stores on Sunday" at the present session of the legislature, and this bill is evidently that measure. The press dispatch announcing the introduction of the measure stated that Assemblyman Monroe was a member of an important committee, and that "his legislation stands an excellent show of going through the assembly."

✦

A Travesty on Justice

One thing that we omitted to note in the record of the Philadelphia Sunday-enforcement agitation is the fact that on December 11, when the grand jury was being denounced by the advocates of Sunday enforcement, a mass-meeting was held by the small dealers for the purpose of protesting "against the enforcement of the blue laws of 1794 against small dealers," arousing "sentiment against persecution," and defending "the action of the November grand jury in calling attention to the injustice done." In the course of his remarks Mr. F. B. Robertson, the chairman, said:

Dr. Mutchler claims that fully 80 per cent of the candy and cigar dealers want to close their places on Sunday, but I defy him to produce the names of 10 per cent. Mr. Vail says that no cripples have been prosecuted, yet I can name more than 100, many of whom have been fined. This estimate does not include the many widows who have suffered.

Dr. A. H. Lewis, editor of the *Sabbath Recorder*, spoke at the meeting, and among other things said:

The president of the Sunday-closing society said last Sunday that your city was the worst governed in the United States. It must be terribly misgoverned when they can't get at the graft-

ers, straw bail takers and promoters of vice, but use its courts of justice to persecute honest men and women who are trying to earn an honest living. These men know that this law cannot be enforced, that the Baldwin Locomotive Works make locomotives and the railroads use them on Sunday, yet they persist in arresting persons who are too weak to defend themselves.

Sunday laws do not deal with actual crime; they create a mythical crime for a specific period. Transactions good, wholesome and desirable are changed by the Sunday law in a second of time from wholesomeness to criminality, and law-abiding citizens become criminals when the clock ticks the first second after midnight. Twenty-four hours later, at the same instant, the crime-creating hours cease. But in Philadelphia scores of men and women are held as criminals awaiting punishment for wholesome deeds done during the sacred hours created by the State of Pennsylvania one hundred years ago! Such a travesty on justice cannot endure the light of the twentieth century many years, and the greater shame is that it can exist at all. The worship of God should be left to a man's conscience, and no legislation can affect that. The Sunday law in creating leisure creates a demand for these very things that you men sell. They certainly can't stop the liquor traffic by making a man idle on Sunday, because during his recreation is when a man who uses liquor will want it most, and get it, too. Let there be a statute granting to every employee one day's rest in a week if he wants it, but let this rest be permissive rather than mandatory, and let the liquor question be separated from every question involving the rights and duties of legitimate business men.

It seems to me to be a pretty mean transaction for a man to make a purchase, thereby bribing a dealer to break the law, and then arrest him for doing so. How the speak-easy proprietor and those in evil dens must laugh as they see a man who has perhaps sold a shoestring on Sunday dragged off as a criminal, while they remain unmolested.

“Sabbath” Association’s Discomfiture — Some Comment Commenting on the decision of Judge Martin, of Philadelphia, which we printed last week, the *Jewish Exponent* says:

Judge Martin’s decision, rendered in the Court of Quarter-Sessions last week, that a person employed by the Sunday-closing association to ferret out violations of the Sunday laws is himself a violator of the law if he does the work on Sunday and is paid for it, and that the buyer is in the same position as the seller, is not only good law but good sense as well. Judge Martin, in his opinion, naturally followed the precedents set by the supreme court in construing the act of 1794, as he was bound to do; but in so doing he discusses the question in a broad and liberal spirit, and with a comprehensive knowledge of the historical as well as the legal aspects of the question. Now that this particular mode of conducting the work of the Sunday-closing association has been declared unlawful by a learned and careful judge, it behooves its sponsors and leaders to bow to the majesty of the law which they themselves have frequently invoked against a large number of persons who were induced to violate the law by the association’s agents — a method of procedure which is not calculated to commend itself to the ordinary sense of fairness and decency. It is always a pleasure to see the petty persecutor of harmless and helpless people “hoist by his own petard.” If this antiquated law must be enforced, let it be enforced without discrimination or favor.

In noting the action of the grand jury in condemning the Sunday-enforcement crusade and rebuking the “Sabbath” Association for the same, the *Sabbath Recorder* made this good comment:

Philadelphia is cursed by a brood of crimes and criminals of all kinds as few cities are, and as to Sunday observance, the larger dealers and the stronger business enterprises disregard the law at will; but the Sabbath Association, knowing that these stronger interests can defy the law, has persisted

in the persecutions which the grand jury has denounced. Christianity, to say nothing of actual and genuine Sabbath reform, has been discounted and injured through the course pursued by its representatives; for justice and fair play are fundamental elements in Christian practise. The fact is that the Sunday law of Pennsylvania is so nearly dead, is so effete and out of joint with the best sentiment of the years and the people, that it cannot be enforced except in such cases as those noted above. If it were ever vigorous, it is now too weak to do more than perpetuate petty persecution. Before the grand jury condemned these cases of persecution thoughtful men had condemned the law as the creator of fictitious crime. It takes acts and transactions which are wholly good, permissible and desirable at all other times, and makes them criminal for a specific twenty-four hours. When the clock marks midnight honest work, the work of widows to support fatherless children, and of cripples to keep themselves from becoming paupers, is changed to crime, and the farce is gone through with again the next midnight, when crime becomes a thing to be commended, and criminals become wholesome citizens. Inconsistency could not go farther than this law does. If the representatives of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association demur at this, they must fall back upon the historic fact that this Sunday law belongs to the state-church system, that it was and is a religious institution which seeks to compel all men, regardless of faith or conscience, to be idle on Sunday, according to the dogma of certain denominations of Christians, which proclaims Sunday to be the Sabbath, sacred time, which men may not disregard without being sinful, and legally criminals whom the state must punish. The time has fully come when the true nature of Sunday laws should be set forth and considered. Unless this is done, and men heed the behests of logic and the voice of justice, matters will grow worse and worse. That the Philadelphia Sabbath Association should have carried its foolish and unchristian persecutions far enough to call forth the rebuke administered by

the grand jury is another proof of the fact that "whom the gods wish to destroy, they first make mad."

✦

Church and State in Panama

The question of the relation of church and state was a live one in the convention which is drafting a constitution for the new government of Panama. A dispatch from Panama under date of January 23 reported:

Heated debates on religious questions marked the sittings of the constitutional convention held last night and this afternoon. Several of the members favored an arrangement similar to the one existing between the Colombian government and the church, while others favored the absolute separation of church and state. At this afternoon's sitting the discussion of the matter was progressing with apparently no prospect of a conclusion being reached, when Dr. Amador proposed the following:

"The profession of all religions, as also the exercise of all forms of worship, shall be free, without other limitations than respect for Christian morality and public order. Nevertheless, it is recognized that the Catholic religion is that of a majority of the inhabitants of the republic, and the laws will provide assistance toward the foundation of a seminary in the capital and missions for savage tribes."

This was approved. Article 14, which was also the subject of discussion, was approved. It is as follows:

"The ministers of religion are excepted from charges for and employment in the public service, civil or military, remuneration for which is made by the public treasury."

To this article there were a few exceptions.

This compromise on the separation of church and state was of course due to the opposition to the separation of church and state on the part of the

representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, who in this country have the face to stand up and unblushingly declare that that church is and always has been in thorough accord with the principles of the government of the United States in that respect. On January 4 this was reported from Panama:

Francisco Javier Junguito, the Bishop of Panama, has gone to Barranquilla, Colombia, to meet the Rev. Vicco, apostolic delegate from the Vatican to Colombia, with the object of arranging ecclesiastical matters pending between Panama and the republic of Colombia, and securing proper representation of the Vatican at the capital of Panama. The intention of this [the Panama] government is to separate church and state, and that question will be seriously discussed by the Bishop and Delegate Vicco. Since the Catholic Church in the Spanish-American republics is so closely allied with the government and the affairs of state, it is a foregone conclusion that any attempt by a government to sever or limit its relations with the church will not be met with favor at Rome. Hence it is expected that the proposed action of the Panama government will meet with considerable opposition.

And evidently it did. This, and not the Jesuitical declarations of her representatives in this country, shows what the position of the Roman Catholic Church is in the matter of the separation of church and state. She believes always and everywhere in the union of the Roman Catholic Church with the state, and she never fails to demand and insist upon that union wherever it is possible to have it. She professes — no, her representatives profess, for she never goes even that far — allegiance to the principle of separation of church and state only when and where it is policy to do so.

The "Holy See." Since the overthrow of Maximilian, in Mexico, and the United States 1867, "there has existed a complete separation of church and state" in Mexico, and the government has dispensed with the blessedness of diplomatic relations with the "Holy See." The Vatican is now, and has been for some time, attempting to restore this blessedness to Mexico. On January 5 an "apostolic delegate to Mexico" was appointed by Pius X, and it was announced that this was "considered by Vatican authorities to be the first step toward the resumption of diplomatic relations between Mexico and the Holy See." But on January 15 it was reported from Rome that "the Vatican authorities have been informed that the appointment of Mgr. Serafini, Archbishop of Spoleto, as apostolic delegate to Mexico cannot lead to the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Mexico." Evidently and fortunately Mexico proposes to continue to dispense with the blessedness which the Papacy is so anxious to bestow upon her. The later dispatch also stated:

The late Pope Leo made several attempts to have the Catholic religion given official recognition in Mexico, but President Diaz constantly and insistently refused to comply with Pope Leo's wishes, although not opposed to Catholicism, which prospers in Mexico more than it does in any of the other Latin-American republics, where it is the state religion. The new apostolic delegation to Mexico will have exactly the same powers and limitations as that of the apostolic delegation at Washington.

How many Americans are aware of the fact that the "apostolic delegation at Washington" means exactly the same thing with regard to the United States that this recently appointed apostolic delegate to Mexico means with regard to that country? It means

nothing less than an attempt on the part of the Papacy to establish diplomatic relations with the government of the United States. The late Pope Leo also made several attempts to have the Catholic religion given official recognition by the government of the United States—attempts more assiduous and persistent than were made with regard to Mexico. The appointment of an "apostolic delegate" to Mexico is in the view and purpose of the Vatican authorities a move toward the establishment of diplomatic relations between Mexico and the "Holy See;" and in the view and purpose of those same authorities the appointment of an "apostolic delegate" to the United States ten or twelve years ago was a move toward the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the "Holy See." The maintenance of an "apostolic delegate" to Mexico means persistence by the Papacy in her attempt to establish diplomatic relations with the government of that country, and the continuance of the "apostolic delegation at Washington" means persistence by the Papacy in her attempt and determination to establish diplomatic relations between herself and the government of the United States. Is that scheme to succeed?

✦

A certain man who recently attempted to dictate to the speaker of the House of Representatives as to a committee appointment is referred to as "the legislative agent of the labor-union interests at Washington." There is another man at Washington who is the legislative agent of the church-union interests. We have not heard of his attempting to dictate committee appointments, but he does boast of having caused and prevented legislation by Congress.

An Indictment of New York's Sunday Law*

X

Thoroughly Inconsistent with the Religion on Which It Purports to be Founded

I HAVE shown that the statute law on which we are treating violates the natural, inalienable and equal rights of man, and that it contravenes the express provisions of the constitution of this State. I am now to prove, as I promised, that law to be "inconsistent with the maxims and precepts of the Christian system of religion on which it purports to be founded."

It may be thought superfluous, unnecessary, and irrelevant to attempt to show that the law in question is discordant to the sectarian creed of any particular religious sect. Religious sectarian tenets are not the indispensable or essential criteria by which the equal rights and liberties of mankind are ascertained or tested. The religious system of Mahomet leaves but little

religious or political liberty to be exercised or enjoyed by the professors of that faith. Not so with the Christian system. The whole body of its moral doctrines and precepts, so far as it bears on the question under review, inculcates "the benevolent principles of rational liberty" which recognize the equal rights of "all mankind." It admits the data I have taken, it accords with the inductions I have made, it supports the conclusions I have drawn — in short, it is consistent with all the arguments and reasoning by which I have proved the provisions of the law in question to be at variance with each other, incompatible with the equal rights of man, and adverse to the express provision of the constitution of this State. That religion, in its greatest purity, now holds the same moral doctrines it espoused when the Jews endeavored by law to force the Christians against their consciences and religious creeds to keep the Jewish Sabbath day.*

It enjoins on man the observance of that general rule of moral rectitude, to do by others as they would others should do by them.

It teaches man to award to his fellow man the like rights and privileges which he claims to have and exercise himself.

It binds no man to respect the "sabbath days" of others more than others are bound to respect his.

It denies the moral right of man to act contrary to his conscience in any

*Seventy-seven years ago there was published in New York a pamphlet, a transcript of the title page of which is as follows: "The People's Rights Reclaimed; being An Exposition of the Unconstitutionality of the Law of the State of New York Compelling the Observance of a Religious Sabbath Day, and Erroneously Entitled 'An Act for Suppressing Immorality,' Passed March 13th, 1813. Addressed to the People of the State of New York. New York, 1826. A. Spooner, Printer, Brooklyn." Its publication was called forth by the revision of the State laws then taking place and certain attempts that had been made "to effect an extension of the erroneous principles and provisions of the Sunday laws." Although the *excuse* for New York's Sunday legislation has been somewhat changed since then, it being now professedly for the prevention of "crimes against religious liberty and conscience" (although still coming under the general heading of "crimes against public decency and good morals"), whereas then it was "for suppressing immorality," it remains the same in principle, object, and effect, and the masterly and unanswerable indictment of the law as it then was made by the unknown author of the above pamphlet is still a masterly and unanswerable indictment of the law as it now is, and incidentally of all other Sunday legislation. The widespread disposition now manifested to uphold and "to affect an extension of the erroneous principles and provisions of the Sunday laws" makes the matter in this pamphlet very pertinent to-day, and hence we are publishing it in full in THE SENTINEL.—EDITOR.

*We do not know to what the writer refers here. The "Jewish" Sabbath was enforced by law (of the state) only in the ancient theocracy, as we understand it. During the Christian era that is a privilege that has been enjoyed exclusively by the "Christian" Sabbath.—EDITOR.

matter, especially in religion, and forbids him to coerce others to act against their consciences and to conform to the religious creeds they in their consciences disown.

It awards to every man an equal right to the free and undisturbed enjoyment of his conscientious opinions in matters of religion, and allows no man to be persecuted by his fellow man for conscience' sake.

It suffers no man to judge another "in respect of an holy day, or of the sabbath days." Col. 2:16.

It unreservedly concedes the moral right of one man to esteem one day above another; and—

It as unequivocally asserts the equal rights of others to esteem all days alike. Rom. 14:5.

It allows every man a right to be "persuaded in his own mind," to think and act "in respect to the sabbath days" according to the dictates of his own religious tenets.

It admonishes mankind against despising and persecuting one another for their different opinions and practises relative to such indifferent matters as ceremonial observances. Romans 14.

It does not hold man in bondage to those "weak and beggarly elements," the observances of "days, and months, and times, and years." Gal. 4:10.

It disclaims the use of justices of the peace and constables or any magistrates, or other carnal weapon in the hands of civil government, to support a religion which professes to be so strongly founded in eternal truth, that "the gates [or powers] of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18.

But if such are the doctrine and moral precepts of the Christian religion, what religion is that, the language of which is yea and nay, and which, like the law in question, first forbids labor and recreation on the first day of

the week as acts of immorality, and then permits it to be done by some, on condition that they do not believe it immoral to do so!!

What religion is that which, like the law in question, deems it moral to buy and sell milk, fish and small meat on Sunday, and immoral to traffic in other articles?

What religion is that which allows milk, fish and small meat to be bought and sell milk, fish and small meat on morning of the first day sabbath as a moral traffic, and prohibits the trade in the same articles at any other hour of the day, as an act of immorality?

What religion is that which permits the buying and selling of large quantities of small meat as a moral act, and prohibits the traffic in small pieces of large animals as intolerably wicked?

What religion is that which suffers milkmen and their horses to labor on Sunday, to carry milk about to sell, and prohibits tinmen and their horses to labor, and carry about and sell the pans to put it in?

What religion is that which allows its professors to make their menservants and their horses which are within their gates to labor on their sabbath day to gratify their pride or administer to their pleasure or convenience, by rolling them in pomp and splendor in gilded coaches to their houses of humiliation and prayer; and at the same time denounces others as meriting the lash of penal laws and eternal misery who ride on the same day on useful business or innocent recreation?

What religion is that which is offended by business or amusement carried on beyond the sight or hearing of its congregated votaries, who endure with exemplary patience the rattling of their own horses' hoofs and chariot wheels at the threshold of their own temple doors in time of public worship?

What religion is that which obstructs with iron bars the public highway, the common right of all, lest passing carriages should interrupt devotion; and at the same time permits its professors to ride in coaches past other's churches to their own, while it prevents others passing theirs for the like or other purposes?

What religion is that which allows vessels to go and come from sea on Sunday, and which at the same time interdicts traveling by land, and aims to prevent inland navigation* as licentious?

By what species of logic can the going and coming of vessels to and from sea on Sunday be called a work of necessity or charity, and the sailing of vessels up and down our rivers and canals be proscribed as an act of immorality?

What religion is that which allows, nay, which obliges, steamboats, horseboats and other ferryboats, for the accommodation of people traveling on business or for pleasure, to ply across our rivers on Sunday, and would interdict others plying up and down the same rivers for the like or other purpose, as an act of immorality?

What religion is that which allows one man or one sect to judge another "in respect to the sabbath days"?

What religion is that which claims for its professors a right to work, play and traffic on the Sabbath day of others and withholds from others their equal right to work, play, and buy and sell on theirs?

What religion is that whose professors oblige others to respect their "sabbath days" more than they hold themselves bound to respect the "sabbath days" of others?

What religion is that which claims for its votaries a right to act agreeably to their own conscience "in respect to the sabbath days," and obliges others to act against their conscience and to conform to religious tenets they disbelieve?

What religion is that which esteems "one day above another," and forbids others the equal right "to esteem all days alike"?

What religion is that which holds mankind in bondage to those "beggarly elements," the observance of "days," and "times," etc.?

What religion is that which in so many instances allows one portion of the community to do by others as they will not allow others with impunity to do by them?

To these and other questions of the like import which I might propose the same answer may with truth be given; viz., that it is a religion inconsistent with itself, inconsistent with the equal rights of man, adverse to the free exercise and enjoyment of his religious opinions as guaranteed by the constitution of this State, and consistent only with the provision and operation of the law on which we are treating, and which exactly tallies with it! Inconsistency is error. Truth alone is consistent with truth. There can be but one true religion, and that to be true must be consistent, not only with itself, but with every other truth. But such a mass of inconsistent, heterogeneous measures as are indicated by the questions last proposed, and which are produced and attempted to be enforced by the law in question, is neither the emanation of a true religion nor the result of a sound civil policy.

Again, it is said that religion teaches and enjoins on man his duty to God; and morality, the duty of men to each other. Whether this definition is cor-

*Attempts have frequently been made to prevent travelling on the canals on Sunday, and to stop the public mail.

rect or not, or whether weak, finite, ignorant man can do any essential service to Infinite Wisdom or Almighty Power, or anything more pleasing in the sight of Boundless Goodness and Immaculate Justice than to endeavor to make the offspring of the great First Cause — the children of his Heavenly Father — happy, are questions which I mean not now to agitate. It will however not be denied that religion as well as morality enjoins on man kindness to his fellow beings, to do them all the good he can, and make them as happy as he has it in his power to do. But man cannot be forced by statute law to be kind or benevolent to any one. Though he cannot be coerced to acts of kindness, he can be restrained from doing injury to others, or else incur the penalty for the aggressive act. Self-defense against injury is a natural right, nay, a duty indicated by the involuntary and irresistible impulse of our nature, implanted in the very constitution of our being. When assailed and too weak for self-defense, nature impulsively dictates a call for help, and indicates the right to obtain the aid of others to protect us from injury, reclaim our violated rights and punish the aggressor. It is for this cause that a union of strength is natural and necessary. It is for these purposes that civil government is instituted. It is from this source alone that government can derive any righteous power. Government may therefore acquire the right to regulate the intercourse of man with his fellow man, and enforce the performance of their moral duties so far as to restrain them from doing injury to one another; but has no right to attempt by law to regulate the religious creeds of men.

As I have before in substance remarked, there is no need of any statute law to compel people to act accord-

ing to the dictates of their own conscientious religious creeds. And as no one has a right, moral or religious, to act against his conscience in matters of religion, he cannot depute to others a righteous power to compel him to act against his conscientious religious creed. The legislature, therefore, have no moral or political right whatever to judge any portion of their constituents in respect to religious "sabbath days," or of any "holy day," or to interfere in their religious faith at all, except, in pursuance of the provisions of the constitution and the benevolent principles of rational liberty, to prevent that "act of spiritual oppression and intolerance" by which any are constrained against their conscience to conform to the creeds of others.

If the legislature possessed a right to prescribe one point of religious faith, one sectarian tenet, they would have an equal right to prescribe another. If they have a right to prescribe any one or any number of religious tenets, they have an equal right to proscribe any one and every other. For the right to prescribe any implies the right to proscribe every other sectarian tenet, and then it would follow that the legislature would have a right to prescribe the religious opinions and worship of mankind, and thence regulate by law man's communion with his God! In truth a law to oblige mankind to conform to any one or any system of religious tenets savors much of profanity, inasmuch as it virtually prescribes the particular kind of worship which the Deity is authorized to receive according to the statute in such case made and provided. So impious a measure, so monstrous an absurdity, when arrayed in its true character, or presented, as here, in its naked deformity, would not for a moment be admitted or advocated by any body.

SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT

This department is designed to record what is being done throughout the United States and elsewhere in the way of Sunday enforcement. Necessarily the items in most instances must be a bare recital of the facts. The principles involved are discussed elsewhere in the paper.

The Omaha (Neb.) *Bee* reports that the mayor of that city has "proclaimed that all public dancing on Sunday shall cease in Omaha from this time on."

+

It was recently reported from Minneapolis, Minn., that "the barbers' union is likely to start a crusade against the boss barbers who keep their shops open on Sunday." It is "the belief of the members that the Sunday-closing law should be enforced."

+

The saloon-keepers of Ripon, Wis., having been "ordered to close on Sunday," have sent a communication to the city council "demanding that the Sunday laws be enforced as regards all other establishments, such as stores, restaurants, livery stables and bowling alleys."

+

In Washington on January 20 "Assessor Darneille, in league with the District excise board, decreed that no club in the District [of Columbia] shall hereafter sell intoxicating liquors between the hours of 10 a. m. and 1 p. m. on Sunday. "This rule was determined upon after many months' consideration."

+

At Marion, Ind., on January 14 "a test case to determine if pumping oil on Sunday is a desecration of the Sabbath was decided in the local court in favor of the oil men." The suit had been instituted "by church people of Vanburen," and "it was alleged in the complaint that the work was not a necessity, but the defendants proved that if a well were closed down for a day water would drown it out, and it would require three days of pumping before oil would flow again."

+

At Muncie, Ind., on January 10 "officers of the journeymen barbers' union were instrumental in having a number

of boss barbers arrested for violating the Sunday-closing law." "Warrants were sworn out before a justice of the peace and served by constables," and an attorney was secured to prosecute the cases. "This is not the first time the boss barbers have been arrested, but only another attempt of the journeymen barbers to have the law regarding the closing of the barber shops on Sunday observed."

+

At La Crosse, Wis., on January 15 a joint committee of the master barbers' and journeymen's unions, which had been appointed "to settle the differences between the local barbers caused by the countenancing of Sunday shaving by Linker Bros., W. H. Webb, and others," met and "drew up an iron-bound stipulation to be affixed to the regular agreement which will abolish all Sunday shaving." "In case any of the employers refuse to sign the amended agreement their union cards will be taken from them."

+

The Abilene (Kan.) *Reflector* of January 9 reported: "A committee from the W. C. T. U. called on County Attorney Towner to-day and asked that all meat markets, confectioneries and other business houses be compelled to close all day Sunday. If this is not done the organization proposes to begin prosecutions. A committee of ministers also called to protest against the City Mills running on Sunday. They stated that the proprietors had refused to shut down on Sunday, and said they would file complaints if this is not done."

+

At Dalesville, Ind., on January 17 a performance of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was given "behind locked doors" to prevent the arrest of the members of the troupe "on charges of playing on Sunday." A constable and

several deputies who had stationed themselves outside the entrance attempted to capture the players at the conclusion of the performance, but were eluded. "This is the second time trouble has resulted from Sunday performances in Dalesville, and more is expected." "All the churches are bitter against the theater management."

✦

A correspondent reported from Hamburg, Iowa, under date of January 15: "We are having a recurrence of Sunday-enforcement agitation in this place. A petition has been passed among the merchants by a clergyman, and a Sunday ordinance of a very drastic character has been presented to the council. It shuts off everything but eating houses and 'works of charity and necessity.' It failed to go through at the council meeting last night, but its supporters are working to get it through at the next, meeting, and also threaten to enforce the State law. I think this has been the fourth or fifth time that an attempt of this sort has been made here."

✦

The Huntington, (Ind.) *Journal* of January 6 reported that "affidavits have been filed against parties in Warren township for violating the Sunday game law, and arrests will in all probability be made to-day." It stated that the game warden was "going after the violators of the law strenuously," and that a number of persons in that vicinity had been "made to suffer the consequences." The next day, under the heading "Sunday Law Violators Caught," it reported: "Marshal Nevius and Officer Bush arrested two violators of the Sunday game law, by the name of Grolinger and Boozinger, at Andrews last night. These are two men who have evaded arrest for several weeks, but were finally spotted and placed in jail in this city. Another of the violators, White by name, is now serving his sentence."

✦

The Iowa Poultry Association recently held its annual poultry show at Des Moines. "It had been the intention of the management of the show to charge an admission fee on Sunday the

same as on other days, and thereby greatly help out their much depleted financial condition. The city officials heard of the intended plans and notified the association management if they insisted on carrying out their plans for making an admission charge on Sunday, they would be prosecuted for violation of an ordinance which provided that no admission charge should be made to any show or exhibition in the city limits on Sunday." The show was kept open, but no admission fee was charged, with the result that "the exhibit closed with a deficit, and the officers determined that the next exhibit should not be held in Des Moines."

✦

Under the head, "More Sunday Law," the *Butternut* (Wis.) *Eagle* reported on January 10: "It seems that the Sunday law is not to be enforced against saloon-keepers alone, but against other business men as well, as appears from the following notice which we publish verbatim by request:

"Mr M Lauridsen i have Bin informed That you ar Opening your Barber Shop on Sunday now if you ar you had Beter not for The next Time i Shall Comence Proseadings against you

"'James Dygert'

"Mr. Lauridsen wishes to say to the people of Butternut that he came here a stranger for the purpose of making his home; that he does not wish to offend or injure any one, and, being a stranger, has no desire to mix up with either side, but would keep open on Sunday forenoon if allowed to do so; neither is it his desire to interfere in the business of others, either on Sunday or any other day." And Mr. Lauridsen has a perfect right to expect that others shall not interfere with him in his business either on Sunday or any other day.

✦

There are not lacking indications that saloon-keepers and clergymen will yet become allies in the matter of Sunday enforcement. On January 20 the *Milwaukee* (Wis.) *Press* published the following dispatch from Appleton un-

der the heading, "Saloonists and Sunday Closers May Unite for State Enforcement of the Sunday Law:" "With the practically assured assistance of the mayor and common council and the strong endorsement of the committee of Sunday closers, together with other pastors in this city, it is possible that within the next few weeks a great petition will be started, asking Gov. La Follette to enforce the State Sunday-closing law throughout the Commonwealth. Local saloon men say they are perfectly willing to close their places of business on Sundays, but they do not want their business usurped by dealers in other nearby cities. The scheme is to start a petition in this city, and with the co-operation of pastors and others in other cities start a similar

petition in other municipalities, asking the chief executive of the State to use his power in seeing that the State law providing against the prosecution of unnecessary work on Sundays is observed in every city, town, and village in Wisconsin. A considerable percentage of Appleton's liquor dealers voluntarily closed their places last Sunday. Many more will close in a like manner next Sunday, and the great majority in the city express themselves as being perfectly willing to continue so to do as long as the law is made mandatory upon all."

✦

At Minnesota Lake, Minn., on Sunday, November 15, "every business place was closed Sunday for the first time in years."

Will YOU Not Make Use of One or Both of These Blanks?

Send THE SENTINEL to some one else if you are taking it yourself. Remit by Postoffice or Express Money Order. Where paper money or silver is sent the letter should always be registered.

Blank for one year's subscription

Publishers **Sentinel of Christian Liberty**,
222 N. Capitol St., Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen: Find inclosed one dollar (\$1) for which please send **The Sentinel** to the following address for one year, beginning with the issue of

..... 1904
 Name
 Place
 Street or County State

Blank for six months' subscription

Publishers **Sentinel of Christian Liberty**,
222 N. Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen: Find inclosed fifty cents (50 cts.) for which please send **The Sentinel** to the following address for six months, beginning with the issue of

..... 1904
 Name
 Place
 Street or County State

A Friend of The Sentinel and What He Thinks of It

Publishers of The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,
222 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.:

Your letter informing me that my subscription to The Sentinel of Christian Liberty has expired is just received. Of this fact I was aware,



COLONEL P. T. TURNLEY

and had just written to you that I regretted to stop it on account of age and illness. I write propped up in bed at my comfortable home again after several weeks in a hospital in Chicago, twenty miles below here. I do not at present recall what I said in my letter, but surely I said nothing in derogation of your most excellent publication, The Sentinel of Christian Liberty, which I have so greatly enjoyed for years past. I have taken it myself for many years, and also have sent it to many others in several States. **I consider The Sentinel of Christian Liberty one of the best and most instructive publications in existence,** and I am glad its office has been established at the national capital. Its columns are replete with what is useful and instructive to the citizen, and in full accord with the very basis on which we founded our government, and also with the true doctrine—the true Christianity—that Christ taught. I am now in my eighty-third year, and always heretofore have been of rugged and robust physique—yet withal two months ago I was stricken with an affliction which disables me from any activities and from my literary work, and even deprives me of the calmness of mind to read much. This is why I discontinued The Sentinel, as also half a dozen other publications. I feel that my life is drawing to its close, and that what little mental work I can do must be applied to arranging my personal and family affairs. Still, when I can get to the postoffice (which is a mile from my home) I will remit a subscription to the valuable little print, which may be mailed either to me or to any other person you may think will read it. By the way, it occurs to me this moment that our little city library may not have a copy coming to it. I will ascertain, and if not I will have one sent to it. **Every man and woman in this nation ought to read just such a publication as The Sentinel of Christian Liberty.**

With best wishes for your success, I am

P. T. Turnley

Highland Park, Lake Co., Ill.,
November 26, 1903.