

THE SENTINEL OF LIBERTY

"If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not."—Jesus Christ.

VOLUME 15.

CHICAGO, JULY 19, 1900.

NUMBER 28.

THE SENTINEL OF LIBERTY.

(Continuing American Sentinel)

Published weekly at 324 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois,

BY THE

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

Entered at the Chicago Post Office as Second-Class Matter.

Subscription price, - - - \$1.00

L. A. SMITH, }
C. P. BOLLMAN, } - - - - - Editors.

All men ought to keep the Sabbath, but no man ought to be forced to keep the Sabbath. Religious service must rest wholly upon love, not upon force.

The "will of the majority" in religion is no more binding upon the minority to-day, and no safer a guide, than it was in the days of Noah, Abraham, or Elijah.

Christians cannot possibly be the "salt of the earth" at the ballot box; at such a place a Christian counts for no more than the most ungodly person on earth, since they stand on a perfect equality in the right to vote. One Christian can "chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight"; but not at the polls or the primary. Christianity cannot count in the sphere of politics.

The Creator gave the world only one sun and one Sabbath, and it is as possible to create another sun by legislation as another Sabbath, or to maintain one by legislation as to maintain the other. There can be only one day sanctified as the Sabbath in the same week,—only one day set apart from all other days as a day of rest. We must take the Sabbath institution as it comes to us from God's hands rather than from the legislature.

The only protection that is needed from the state is the protection of men in the enjoyment of natural rights.

Because a certain thing may be clearly for the public good, it does not follow that its enforcement should be attempted by law. Most people will admit that the extension of Christianity is clearly for the public good, but few would advocate its promulgation by legislation. It is clearly for the public good that men should regard the laws of health, but here again law is powerless to secure the end desired. And so in a multitude of other cases.

The Decline of Sunday Observance.

Almost every writer and speaker in behalf of Sunday legislation has something to say about the "increasing desecration of the Lord's day." "The Sabbath is imperiled," we are told, "by a growing tendency to secularize it, to neglect its religious privileges, to substitute the vulgarities of the Sunday press for communion with higher and sweeter themes, to devote its sacred hours to travel, to excursions of pleasure, and to mere social functions." This is the statement made by Rev. R. F. Sample, a leading Presbyterian; and the like lament is heard everywhere from his contemporaries in the work of Sunday reform.

There is no reason to doubt that Sunday desecration is increasing. The statements made by the friends of Sunday upon this point are no doubt substantially true. But those who are calling for Sunday laws as a remedy for the evil, as they view it, entirely miss the lesson that should be learned from it touching the preservation of the Sunday institution. The very fact that public regard for the day is fast being lost, is evidence that it is beyond the power of legislation to stay the decline that has overtaken it.

Regard for an institution cannot be put into the

hearts of the people by law. Human statutes and acts of legislatures are powerless to control those influences by which an institution—as the Sunday sabbath—gains or loses in the belief and affections of mankind. Formerly Sunday was much more generally observed than it is to-day, because there was a more general belief in its claims as a sacred day, and a more general regard for it as such; now that belief and regard are on the decline, and no law can save the institution from the resulting disintegration.

The only remedy for the situation must be something that will influence the minds and hearts of the people in favor of the claims made for Sunday as a sacred day. How such a remedy can be found, we do not know; indeed, we do not believe it can be found at all. The Scriptures evidently do not afford a foundation for belief in Sunday as against the claims of the seventh day, and while men can reasonably doubt the genuineness of its claims they cannot be expected to have any regard for it beyond that which may arise from purely selfish motives. With the Catholics Sunday rests upon tradition and the authority of the Catholic church, and this is the only stable foundation upon which the institution can be based. Protestants must either go over to this foundation for the day or see it lapse into complete decay and ruin. But if they go over to Rome's foundation they will be no longer Protestants. Which course will they take? Will they give up Sunday or go back to the ground of tradition and church authority as the basis of religious obligation, which they abandoned at the Reformation? Evidently they must soon do either the one or the other; and meanwhile there is being held out to them the alternative of accepting the claims of the seventh day Sabbath of the fourth commandment, resting upon the word and authority of inspiration alone.

Sunday Then and Now.

"Sunday labor must be stopped," says "Sunday Reform Leaflets." "It is undermining our Christian civilization; and, so long as it continues, an immense number will be kept away from religious influences, preparing for that mental and moral state out of which come labor troubles, strikes, and riots; and worse things may be expected under separations from religion."

This is exactly the argument used in favor of Sunday laws in the fourth century. First Sunday work kept the people away from "religious influences," that is from the churches, therefore work was forbidden. Then the people being idle, they resorted not to the churches, but to the theaters, which kept them "away from religious influences"; therefore the theatres were prohibited on Sunday. The result was that the people

all became so "good" that the empire is called even to-day the "Holy Roman Empire."

Those who refused to be "good" were killed, and this order of things continued for many centuries. It is true that the major portion of that time is known as the "Dark Ages," but there are a good many people who seem anxious to see the history of the "Holy Roman Empire," the Inquisition, and the Dark Ages generally, repeated in this land and in the twentieth century, soon to dawn upon the world.

A Christian Citizenship Evangelist.

"The National Christian Citizenship League, moved by profound spiritual passion for the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, and after prayerful consideration," says its organ, The Social Forum, "has concluded to add to its other lines, a department of evangelistic work. However much we may realize the inadequacy and deplore the partial failure of present religious effort, we nevertheless know that in the past there has been a deep spiritual fire associated with the old life. Smoldering and dormant it may now be, but as in other times in response to the soul's intensest yearnings and man's supremest need, the breath of God will again fan it into a purifying flame that will sweep over the land, and pride and vanity and the idols of the heart will be dissolved before it like chaff in a furnace. * * *

"We believe that the essential weakness of present-day methods, both in religion and reform, is the failure to address the heart as well as the head. We believe the heart when powerfully appealed to and profoundly stirred will apprehend the right with more unerring accuracy than will the head; that with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and when the emotions are deeply agitated they will overflow, suffuse and compel the assent of the intellect, when confession will be made unto salvation. Believing this, the National Christian Citizenship League propose earnestly to seek a revival of spiritual fervor and power, assured that only through such a revival can Christ's righteousness be realized, the Christ-life be incarnated in our own and the evils that menace our collective life be abolished."

By "our collective life" the Social Forum means our political life. And this new movement proposes to unite religion and politics, and to appeal to the religious sentiments and feelings of the people to move them to political action. This can mean nothing less than practical union of church and state, first of all in the individual and then in "our collective life."

We are not of those who believe that one can be an honest man in private life and a rogue in public life;

or a saint in the church and a sinner in politics. If one's religion is worth having it will make him honest wherever he is. But this is quite a different thing from saying that "when the emotions are deeply agitated they will overflow, suffuse and compel the assent of the intellect."

We want no government by camp-meeting or revival methods. Government by "the emotions" "deeply agitated" by fervid appeals to religious sentiment is just what they had in Spain and the Netherlands under the sway of the Inquisition. Another form of it is seen to-day in the Boxer uprising in China; while our American Sunday laws are due to the same cause—deep religious feeling rather than sanctified common sense.

The Christian Citizenship League is pursuing either a phantom, or the deamon of church-and-state union. If the first, their efforts must be fruitless of practical results; if the second, their success could bring only wide-spread ruin; first of American liberty and American manhood, and secondly of the Republic itself.

B.

Christianity and Politics.

Pastor Friedrich Naumann, who is a prominent figure in the ranks of practical Christian workers in Germany, has published a book on "Democracy and the Imperial Power," in which he shows that Christ's teachings furnish no rule for guidance in politics. Consequently the publication has produced "a deep and disappointing sensation" among those within the circle of his influence, who were looking for an opposite view to be set forth. "The author," we are told, "has been one of the most active representatives of the Christian Socialist agitation, which has seen in the application of the teachings of Christ to the social and political problems of the day the panacea for all the ills that affect humanity." Now the former "Christian Socialist" has withdrawn from the position he held as such touching the application of Christ's teaching to politics, and states the conclusion at which he has arrived, in these words:—

"Jesus Christ was not a politician. The attempt has often been made to extract from the never-failing fountain of his Word the rules that should control political thought and action. Protestants, too, have made such attempts, and in former years the author of this book has joined in these efforts. But the result of all these studies has been the conviction that the moral ideas of the Master are of such a general character, being intended for application to all manners and conditions of men, and are so purely ethical and abstract in their nature, that they do not furnish a guide to conduct in specific cases nor answer such questions as, What should be our politics in the period of industrialism, or our attitude toward social democracy,

or even toward aristocracy? Jesus thereby does not decrease in value for us; but we are not able to deduce our political tactics from him."

"Jesus Christ was not a politician"; that states the whole truth of the matter in a nutshell. And because he was not a politician, he did not enter into the arena of political strife, and his words and example furnish no rule by which to guide political activity. And as the life of Christ is Christianity, now as well as nineteen centuries ago, it follows that Christianity knows nothing of politics. The aims of Christianity are not to be attained by political means. Christ's kingdom is not of this world.

We commend the results of Pastor Naumann's study of this subject to all those in this country who are trying to set up the kingdom of God or establish righteousness in the earth through political reform-parties or by any political agency. An earnest and candid investigation of the question in the light of the words of Jesus Christ, will, we trust, be the salvation of many from one of the most dangerous of modern delusions.

S.

Christians should hold their citizenship on high. A country is not safe till the citizens are seeking the Better Country. The supreme loyalty to one's fatherland is loyalty to one's Father in Heaven. As the spirit of mammon is the ruin of the land, so the spirit of other-worldliness is its salvation. It prevents undue wealth. It checks ambition. It avoids friction between worker and worker. It makes men faithful. It empties saloons and builds up homes.—Amos R. Wells.

Duty of Civil Magistrates Towards Religion.

The civil magistrate either respecteth that religion and worship which his conscience is persuaded is true, and upon which he ventures his soul, or else that and those which he is persuaded are false.

Concerning the first, if that which the magistrate believeth to be true, be true, I say he owes a three-fold duty unto it:

First. Approbation and countenance, a reverent esteem and honorable testimony, according to Isaiah xlix, Revelation xxi, with a tender respect of truth and the professors of it.

Secondly. Personal submission of his own soul to the power of the Lord Jesus in that spiritual government and kingdom, according to Matthew xviii, I Cor. v.

Thirdly. Protection of such true professors of Christ, whether apart, or met together, as also of their estates, from violence and injury, according to Rom. xiii.

Now, secondly; if it be a false religion (unto which the civil magistrate dare not adjoin, yet) he owes:

First. Permission (for approbation he owes not to what is evil), and this according to Matthew xiii, 30, for public peace and quiet's sake.

Secondly. He owes protection to the persons of his subjects (though of a false worship) that no injury be offered either to the persons or goods of any. Rom. xiii.—Roger Williams.

The Ontario Sunday Law.

As perhaps most of the readers of the Sentinel know, the Ontario Sunday law has been before the Court of Appeals of the Dominion of Canada to test its constitutionality. The most of the time May 22-28 was devoted to the hearing of the case by that court in Osgood Hall, Toronto. Some very interesting facts were brought out during the hearing, and some very strange positions were taken. The question is, whether the provincial government of Ontario has the right to enact a Sunday law, or whether this power rests solely with the Dominion government (of Canada). By the Act of Federation, all criminal laws belong to the Dominion government, and the provinces have no right to make or alter criminal laws. Sunday laws have recently been classed in Nova Scotia as criminal laws. If this decision is correct, then the Sunday laws of the provinces are evidently unconstitutional. So the matter was carried up for a final hearing.

The Lord's Day Alliance made a very strong effort to have the constitutionality of the law established. Two eminent lawyers argued the case for three days before the court in behalf of the Sunday law. The lawyer for the other side of the question used but one half-day.

It was very persistently affirmed by the lawyers for the Lord's Day Alliance that the question is not in any wise a religious one, also that it is not a question of morality. It was stated that the name of the institution as it appears in the law, the Lord's-Day Act, might give to the matter a religious appearance, but that was misleading. Though the day is called the Lord's day, yet the law concerning its observance is purely a civil statute, regulating the conduct of men with each other. It was also stated that the violation of the law did not embrace anything immoral. When asked by the judge how this could be shown, or why the speaker took this position, the reply was "because there is nothing in the violation of the law that affects a man's conscience."

This is certainly a very interesting statement, and we wish it might be proclaimed in the ears of men everywhere, that there is nothing in the violation of Sunday laws that need disturb any man's conscience. But this would be strange doctrine for Sunday law ad-

vocates across the line from us, surely. But the statement is just as good there as here.

Another very interesting position that was taken by the Sunday law advocates was that it would be an impracticable thing to have a national Sunday law, that each province should be allowed to make its own Sunday laws. The argument in favor of this position was that it would not be fair, for illustration, to ask Quebec to conform to the ideas of Ontario people in regard to Sunday observance, that these French speaking people had very different ideas of Sunday observance than we of English extraction have, and they should be allowed to have laws in conformity with their customs and ideas. On the other hand, it would not be right for Quebec to ask Ontario to adopt her ideas of Sunday observance, and that as there are various notions about Sunday observance in the various provinces, therefore each province should be allowed to make its own Sunday laws.

This is again very important information for Sunday law advocates everywhere. Hear, all of you. A national Sunday law—the very thing Sunday law agitators are clamoring for—is an impracticable thing. Then, forever abandon the project. Different races and different provinces and states differ in their ideas of Sunday observance, and so it would be unjust to make a law bringing all to a compulsory observance of the same law.

But why stop with the State or Province? Suppose in two adjoining counties men differ in their ideas of this matter, why is it any more just to have a Sunday law applying alike to both counties? And further. Suppose that in two adjoining neighborhoods the sentiment is different, yes, suppose two families living side by side differ in their ideas concerning the rest day. Shall we have a law applying alike to both? Provinces are only neighborhoods grown large. The rights of one man are of precisely the same nature as those of a collective body of men. The folly and absurdity of any government, state or nation, presuming to establish a Sunday law was most clearly evident to the attentive listener to the above arguments.

Let these two points be remembered, that Sunday observance is not a matter of conscience (of a well-instructed conscience at least), and that the idea of a national Sunday law is a farce, on account of its manifest injustice.

F. D. STARR.

Recently, Lord Minto, Governor-General of Canada, was in Toronto on Sunday. According to newspaper reports, early in the day he attended service at St. James Cathedral, and after that entertained guests at lunch. When the time for Lord Minto's departure arrived a guard of honor, consisting of the Forty-eighth Highlanders, with their band, escorted

the viceregal party to the train, which left Sunday evening for Ottawa.

"The circumstance," it is said, "has caused much pain among the strict 'Sabbath-loving' people of Canada. Rev. Dr. Milligan, pastor of St. Andrew's Presbyterian church, took occasion to administer a rebuke from the pulpit, and in many quarters Lord Minto's action has been condemned."

The Catholic Standard and Times on the Philippine Situation.

Mention is made in our "News, Notes and Comment," of Bishop McFaul's recent utterance concerning the duty of Catholics to make their influence felt "whenever bigots attempt the invasion of our rights."

Still more recently the Bishop has written to the editor of the Catholic Standard and Times (Philadelphia), saying: "No Catholic political party is intended, neither are we to act as Catholics in obtaining our rights, but as American citizens—and employ the means guaranteed to citizens. Our people are asked to imitate representative non-Catholic laymen, who go before local boards, State Legislatures and the National Congress in behalf of their rights as citizens or for the redress of grievances. * * * This is a campaign of education—not only for Catholics, but for non-Catholics as well. Bigots have too long dragged our religion into politics for their own selfish ends. We propose to put a stop to this mixing up of our religion with politics, and to prevent discrimination against us as American citizens simply because we are Catholics. It cannot be doubted that the grievances we are suffering at home and in our new possessions would never have occurred, at least they would soon have been removed, if we had made known our sentiments in legitimate channels with that strength of purpose which would have made an impression upon those in authority."

As intimated elsewhere, the Catholics look at such things in a very different light from that in which most Protestants view them. For example, a few years since when the Protestant churches that had been receiving governmental aid for their Indian schools, voluntarily relinquished it, the Catholics refused to do so; and the act passed by Congress at that time, providing that after a certain date no more such appropriations should be made, is one of the "grievances" of which they complain.

Taking Bishop McFaul's letter as a text, the Catholic Standard and Times says:

"The present is not a time for irresolution. It is not enough that Catholics consider their position, pass resolutions and speak through the newspapers. They have voices and votes. These they must use with the

earnestness of men who know what they are about and determined to carry their resolve. They are American citizens, and they have the same rights under the Constitution as all other classes of citizens. When they see other citizens banding together for the purpose of making an attack on Catholic institutions and Catholic principles and Catholic property, they would not deserve the name of American citizenship to stand idly by while such an outrage on the Constitution was being contrived."

It will be remembered how active certain Catholic prelates were at the conclusion of the Spanish-American war to secure the "rights of the church." These "rights" had reference of course to the condition of affairs under the church-and-state regime in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines.

Referring to this phase of the question, the paper we quote says: "There is confiscation in the air. Many portents point to an assault upon the property of the religious orders in the Philippines, in breach of the treaty with Spain."

The Standard and Times then quotes the Brooklyn Eagle, "one of the best informed papers," which "gives, on the authority of its Washington correspondent, a statement made to him by 'an Administration official high in authority,' to this effect":

"The friars are to be gotten out of the Philippines, but at this time it is impossible to say how their expulsion is to be effected. Navy and army officers have reported that much of the trouble and discontent in the islands is the result of the influence of the priests. While we know that this sect has been violently opposed to our government and that efforts were made by its members to aid and encourage the rebellion against the authority of the United States, we regard the friars as more menacing to the interests of the natives than to the United States. The whole subject of their future is to be decided by the Philippine Commission, which has full power to dispose of the matter. Of course, we are being kept advised as to what is being done and the final decision will have approval of the Washington authorities.

"Numerous complaints have been received by the American authorities, to the effect that grounds and buildings have been seized in the past by representatives of the Church in the Philippines. The titles thus involved are to be searched by officials at Manila and an attempt made to restore to the rightful owners all property that has been wrongfully confiscated. After this has been done the serious task of determining what shall be done with the friars in regard to their future occupation of the Philippines will still remain. Owing to their great number and the wealth of their possessions, it will not be practicable to do as Captain Leary did at Guam—merely to ship them out of the island. Some scheme will be devised, however, by which the power of the friars will be greatly lessened."

Upon this the Standard and Times says:

"When we bear in mind the composition of the Philippine Commission, there can be little wonder that Catholics should feel the deepest apprehension. Meth-

odist and Baptist and Presbyterian are howling like famished wolves for the spoils of the monasteries. * * * Not one of them a Catholic, not one of them a man in whose impartiality a Catholic can have implicit confidence. * * * Catholic interests in the islands which were until lately colonies of Spain have no defenders now but the Catholics of the United States. Let the full meaning of this fact be grasped by every Catholic here worthy of the name. Let it be borne in mind how difficult it is to get any news of a reliable character from those places on any subject, and then it must be seen how little chance there is of the Catholics in Porto Rico and the Philippines at least of getting their voices heard or their wishes respected. We say nothing of Cuba, which is not altogether in our power—as yet—like these other territories. If there were never a howl for confiscation from the disinterested (?) Christian sects, it would be an imperative duty of the free Catholics here to come to the aid of the millions of their co-religionists thrust outside the palisade of the Constitution while deprived of the protection of the friendly government of Spain. They are groaning under the evil of taxation without representation. They are neither American citizens nor Spanish colonials. They are tongue-tied and reduced to the position of the dumb animals without the benefit of a philanthropic society such as that which interposes between the quadruped brute and the biped brute. They cry to their fellow Catholics here to stand between them and an irresistible power whose force is being utilized, and may be still more crushingly utilized, for the purposes of a conscienceless and hypocritical propaganda of bigotry. This is the most immediate subject of concern for American Catholics.”

It must be evident to everyone, that the government at Washington has some very difficult questions with which to deal in its recently acquired colonies.

The treaty of peace with Spain provides that “the inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.” And again: “Judgments rendered either in civil suits between private individuals, or in criminal matters, before the date mentioned [Aug. 12, 1898], and with respect to which there is no recourse or right of review under Spanish law shall be deemed final.” And yet, again: “The rights of property secured by copyrights and patents acquired by Spaniards in the island of Cuba, and in Porto Rico, the Philippines and other ceded territory, at the time of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, shall continue to be respected.”

Much as justice may demand it, we do not see how, under this treaty, there can be even any review of titles of property in the Philippine Islands; to say nothing of the expulsion of the friars and the confiscation of property held by them prior to, and at the time of the signing of the treaty of peace.

It has been asserted that much of the property held by the friars was acquired something after the manner of Ahab's acquisition of Naboth's vineyard (See 1 Kings 21). “Whenever a man had a desirable planta-

tion, they would trump up some charge against him, have him arrested, and, without investigation, shot; and the property was turned over to the monks.”

But this was done under color of law; and according to the treaty, which is “part of the supreme law of the land,” there is now no recourse that did not exist under the Spanish regime.

The fact is that by the war with Spain, and by the treaty of peace, the United States have been brought face to face with some very perplexing questions. We do not impugn the motive of the Philippine Commissioners, nor of the representatives of the United States who framed the treaty, but we do seriously question whether, within the provisions of that treaty, substantial justice can be done as between friars and Filipinos.

B.

The State as the Protector of Liberty.

(From “Religion and the State,” by A. Hovey, D. D.)

In the great natural right to liberty of action is included that of public worship, provided the same is peaceful and orderly. This indeed is the highest exercise of true liberty. Without it freedom is only a name, or, rather, it is a misnomer. If men may not obey their religious convictions in the worship of God, if the highest mandates of conscience may not be expressed in action which does no violence to the rights of other men, it is useless to speak of liberty, for it does not exist.

When, therefore, Christians of any name ask for protection in public worship, they seek for no especial favor or distinction, but only for that which the state owes to all, whether Protestant or Papist, Jew or heathen. For all men are entitled to pay their homage without annoyance, in public or in private, to whatever being they please. In fact, every assembly of the people, called together for a purpose not criminal or seditious, must be protected from disturbance.

A company of atheists, whether scientific or philosophical, has, in the eye of civil authorities, the same right to meet and proclaim unbelief, as any body of Christians has to meet for the service of God. For the state is not charged with the duty of ascertaining the true faith and supporting it, but with the duty of asserting the equal freedom of all men to think and act for themselves in matters of religion while they pay due respect to the rights of one another.

It is a sad confession of weakness for any body of Christians to seek aid from the civil authorities in maintaining religion. It is a reproach to the Saviour, and to the agencies provided by him, when men call for the sword to turn the crowd in his favor. Let the friends of Christ be protected like other men in their natural rights, and trust to his grace and truth for the rest! Then will they never be put to shame.

Must, then, the idol worship of the Chinese, who swarm the Pacific Coast, be protected by all the power of the state? Undoubtedly it must, according to the view of civil government maintained in these pages; or, rather, the liberty of the Chinese to worship thus must be defended, unless their worship can be shown to violate the natural rights of other men.

The language of Roger Williams is not too strong: "It is the will and command of God, that a permission of the most paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or anti-Christian consciences and worships be granted to all men in all nations and countries." ("Blondy Tenent," etc., p. 38. See Vol. iv. Publications of the Narragansett Club.)

But does not the state indorse the action when it protects the actor? By no means; it simply performs its own duty in conserving the freedom of the people, leaving at the same time with every one of them the responsibility of his own conduct towards God.

There is no better reason for holding the state to be implicated in the guilt of an idolator whose liberty it guards, than there is to believe it a sharer in the grace of a Christian, whose freedom to worship God it vindicates. Indeed, a course of argument that would make earthly rulers accountable for the abuse of the religious liberty which they assure to the people, would make the Creator and Redeemer of men responsible for the abuse of their moral freedom. A proper consideration of this fact would relieve the consciences of many who seem to have a sort of confused notion that "the powers that be" have some control over the religious belief and conduct of their subjects.

But this is not all. The view of civil government as an ordinance of God for the protection of men in the exercise of their natural rights is the only one that will justify Christians in claiming protection from the state while they preach the gospel in heathen lands. For clearly it is absurd to ask the rulers of a heathen nation to concede to missionaries their rights to teach freely a religion which those rulers and their people believe to be false, while the magistrates of a Christian nation refuse the same liberty, as a right, to emissaries and teachers of idolatry.

To say that the Christian religion is true, and idolatry false, is no reply to this; for if it belongs to the rulers of one nation to decide for the people what is the true religion, it belongs to the rulers of every other to do the same, and it is impossible to deny that, if they decide the matter at all, they must decide it honestly, that is, according to their belief. And so, acting by the light which he has, the emperor of China would proclaim Buddhism or Confucianism to be the true religion, and refuse protection to Christian teachers; the emperor of Russia would proclaim the orthodox faith of the Eastern Church, and deny

protection to Methodist preachers; the king of Sweden would endorse the Lutheran creed and turn the power of the state against Baptists living in his cities; and all these rulers would perhaps adopt the words of John Cotton, in his letter to Richard Saltonstall, justifying the cruel punishment of Obadiah Holmes in Boston, saying that their "toleration" and "indulgence" could not be extended to any person acting "against the order and government of our churches, established (we know) by God's law and (he knoweth) by the laws of the country."

It is cause for amazement that any thoughtful American can believe that the state, as such, ought to patronize Christianity in one place, if it may not do the same for Buddhism in another; or, in other language, that a Christian ruler is authorized to obey his conscience, while a heathen ruler is not. Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind, and act accordingly, is the lesson of an apostle to the early Christians; and the same great teacher inculcates the duty of respect for even the scruples of a weak conscience.

Either, then, Christians have no right to claim protection from the state in preaching the gospel to the heathen, or the duty of the state is simply to protect men in the exercise of their natural rights, without attempting to act for or against any form of religion. That the latter view is correct, the writer firmly believes; and believing it would insist upon religious freedom for all—in China, or Sweden, as well as in the United States.

But though human government has no control over religious faith or worship, it is bound to conserve with sacred fidelity the liberties of the people against all persons or influences that would destroy them; and, therefore, if any religious sect were known to deprive certain members of their personal freedom, it would be the duty of the state to restore this to them. If there were religious houses in which persons who entered them freely, perhaps in early life, were believed, on good probable evidences, to be kept against their will, the state would be under obligation to make diligent search, ascertain if possible the facts of the case, and prevent the use of any physical restraint abridging liberty. By so doing it would simply accomplish the purpose of its existence; by refusing to do this it would, in a measure, forfeit its right to be. For, according to the view laid down in this investigation, the sphere of its action is well defined, including the protection of personal freedom, the limits of its service clearly established, and the probability of any collision with any proper spiritual authority infinitesimal.

Indeed, the perfect distinctness with which, on this theory, the ends of civil government can be explained,

and the ample scope which it leaves for the spiritual reign of Christ over the minds, consciences, and hearts of men, are strong reasons for believing it correct. When truth is discovered, it is commonly found to be simple and harmonious. When the various duties and relations of men are clearly apprehended they will be seen to be self-consistent and indubitable.

Petition to the Premier of New Zealand.

By People Suffering Religious Persecution in Rarotonga, Cook Islands.

The following copy of a petition to the premier of New Zealand, by natives of Raratonga, an island of the Cook group, has been sent us by Dr. J. E. Caldwell, who is in charge of the Medical Mission established there by the Seventh-day Adventists. It is a plea for such aid as the New Zealand premier can render by his influence as a high official under the British crown, in relieving a people suffering religious persecution at the hands of other people under British authority. Since it was prepared a great and calamitous change has, if reports be true, come over the situation in the island; peace has given place to war, with its accompaniments of murder and destruction. How far this terrible change may have resulted from the persecution inflicted upon the natives, as the petition sets forth, we cannot yet say; but it is directly traceable to the recent innovation of establishing Sunday by law in the place of the seventh day, contrary to the preferences and life-long custom of the people. And most certainly also this armed resistance by the natives has been altogether contrary to the teaching and counsel of those who have stood by the natives in their adherence to seventh-day observance:—

Rarotonga, May, 1900.

To the Rt. Hon. Richard Seddon, Premier of New Zealand:

Sir:—In my possession are a few facts familiar to the people dwelling on Raratonga, to which I am ready to call your attention, in behalf of humanity, for so far as I am aware they have never been reported outside of Raratonga either in official dispatches or by newspaper correspondents.

I have the honor to be a representative of the Seventh-day Adventist Mission established in the Cook Islands six years ago. I came here in response to an invitation of the Parliament of Cook Islands extended in 1893 to our society to send to this group a physician. I have no personal grievances which I care to mention to you,—no political ambition to serve,—and the religious principles which I hold in common with those of nearly every member of the society which I represent are such that I cannot take an active part in any political agitation either for or against the present administration. But Saint Peter tells us in his first general epistle that governments are instituted in

the providence of God for the “punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well.” In my opinion, this government is not accomplishing that end for the natives, therefore, in order that the people generally, and our fostering government in particular, may not be in ignorance of real conditions prevailing in this dependency, and hoping that, being known, the evils may in some way be corrected, I deem it my duty to inform you that for nearly six months shocking intimidations and religious persecutions have been practiced on this island to such an extent as to make it a discredit—even a cause for shame—to the protectorate, in the eyes of those who know the facts.

I will here attempt to mention only a few isolated facts as they have come to my notice.

A house of worship erected by natives independent of any society, on land owned by an Ariki who was in sympathy with those who built it, was condemned by another Ariki, threatened to be burned down, and afterward had its doors nailed up by the police, as it remains at the present time, depriving its owners of its use.

Six deacons and one native missionary belonging to the London Missionary Society’s church were fined for their refusal to attend the meetings of that church in its regular worship, and for meeting for worship instead in their own home district prayer meeting houses on a day different from that of the L. M. S. meetings. These services were entirely independent of the services of any rival society. That this was religious persecution may be seen from the fact that the court discriminated between the deacons and the native pastor, fining the deacons four pounds sterling each, and the native pastor five pounds, for the same offense.

Between thirty and forty individuals were assembled in a group by court summons and fined one pound ten each, while a deacon in the same group was fined two pounds ten, all for a similar offense to that above described.

Two mataiapos (high chiefs) were fined one pound ten each for giving sympathy and aid to a movement to build a house of worship independent of the L. M. Society’s authority, though at that time they were entirely independent of any rival society. When one of the two yielded and agreed to follow the Ariki in matters of religion, his fine was remitted. After several weeks the other one was excused from paying his fine upon his yielding to the continued demand of his high chiefs to forsake the assembly of those who continued to worship according to the long established custom of the people of the group.

Three mataiapos were berated by an Ariki not their own (some say that this was without precedent among natives) under the charge of having trampled

in their Ariki, when the only particular in which they are known to have offended was in their failure to attend the religious services of the L. M. S. when invited to do so by the Ariki.

More than a score of natives of all ranks were called up by their Ariki by means of the police, and harangued for more than half an hour with threats, and slanders, and false statements against members of a rival society. The threats were that if they, the auditors, there assembled by the police, did not cease to attend the regular services of the rival society mentioned, they would be prosecuted, fined, banished to Manuae or to a foreign country, or evicted from their own houses, which of course stand on tribal lands.

There are four missionary societies now at work on the Cook Islands.

The controversy which was the occasion of the above described persecutions was the change of the weekly rest day.

In May, 1899, the local committee of the L. M. S. in meeting assembled at Tereora (so says the Karere, the local organ of that society), decided to recommend a change of their regular weekly services from the seventh to the first day of the week. This, of course, they had a right to do. The movement was not popular among the natives of the group. Probably more than 90 per cent of them objected to the change, many from conscientious scruples, for the native Bibles declare that the seventh day is the Sabbath (Exod. 20:10).

Being encouraged by a law which Parliament passed at its last session (it is said that there was difficulty in persuading the members to pass it), that society effected the change named after Christmas, 1899, and since that time has held its regular services on the first day of the week instead of the seventh, as before; but for the first few weeks—until the authority of the courts could have time to produce an effect—the number attending in most villages was very small, indeed.

I have never heard it charged that the natives who suffer persecution have broken any law. They have simply claimed the right—and still claim it—to rest and worship on the seventh day in harmony with their understanding of their Bibles, and their practice also for more than seventy-five years under the leadership of the same society to which all their persecutors now belong. Apparently every effort of their former teachers to persuade them that the new way is the better has only confirmed them in the belief that the change rests wholly upon human authority. A great majority of them have never enjoyed the privilege of receiving Bible instruction from the teachers of any other society.

Thus it is seen that what amounts to a new relig-

ion has been brought to the island and its dogmas are being enforced by law contrary to the will of the people; and that the new religion includes both a new practice and respect for a new source of authority in the realm of religion, not before taught the natives; for until their confidence is established in some human right and power to change God's law they cannot be easily induced to abandon that law as taught them for more than three quarters of a century, and which seems so plain to them as they read it in their native Bibles. All they ask for is relief from persecution.

I have briefly stated facts as I have observed them.

Should additional witnesses be desired to establish the above statements they can be furnished in abundance if the witnesses are guaranteed immunity from punishment and annoyances for testifying against their Arikis.

Under the present system of land tenure the people hold their property at the pleasure of their Arikis. Many of them have told me privately in confidence that they greatly desire freedom from the serfdom they now suffer, by the introduction of English laws, that they may enjoy civil and religious liberty as it is enjoyed by the English-speaking people and Maoris of New Zealand, and this wholly without my introducing the subject or suggesting such a change. Without a guarantee of protection it would require great boldness for them to testify publicly to any facts which would compromise their Arikis. I once knew a number of them to be prosecuted for signing a petition to His Excellency the Governor of New Zealand, because their Arikis were then under an influence which did not favor the petition. At that time the sentence was suspended, and remains suspended to this day, with the warning that if they ever dare to do so again their punishment will be severe.

Though the Arikis are directly responsible for these persecutions, I beg leave to say that I have much sympathy for them, thinking it probable that since they have neither literature nor a knowledge of history, they have no proper conception of the enormity of the wrongs they are doing their people, having been induced, possibly, to adopt that policy from outside influences.

Hoping you may have a pleasant voyage and reach your home again with renewed strength, I have the honor, sir, to be

Your obedient servant,

J. E. CALDWELL,

Superintendent of Raratonga Medical Mission of Seventh-day Adventists.

If the "civil" Sabbath were really a civil institution, it would not be the source of so much uncivil action on the part of its supporters.

NEWS, NOTES AND COMMENT

In commenting upon the recent arrest and fining in North Carolina of a Seventh-day Adventist cripple for selling candy and peanuts on Sunday, the American Israelite says: "It is an acknowledged fact that these people are the best of citizens, noted for their temperance, industry and frugality. In almost every instance they have not been arrested because they were obtrusive in their Sunday labor, or in any way disturbed people who observed that day, but simply because they differ in their belief from the predominant Christian denominations. There is something besides anti-Semitism in this world."

Yea, truly there is "something besides anti-Semitism in this world,"—something radically wrong. It is the same spirit of intolerance that killed Cain, sold Joseph into bondage, crucified Christ, made millions of martyrs during the Dark Ages. And the end is not yet.

* * *

"While a minister was offering public prayer at the opening of the great political convention on July 4," says the Michigan Christian Advocate, "a strong band came marching into the hall with every instrument tooting or clanging. The worldly methods are noisy, and too often drown the contemplative moods. This is true in the case of all men. In this special instance it was a great pity that the devotional moments of skilled politicians should be at all shortened. They are all too brief already in every party."

We don't want to discourage prayer, but if there is a place where it is utterly inappropriate that place is a political convention. There is no more reason why a political convention should be opened with prayer than that the polls should be opened by prayer. The idea that "skilled politicians" feel any true devotion at such a time, except devotion to party, is absurd.

* * *

Baseball playing on Sunday is unlawful in Michigan, according to a decision just rendered by the supreme court of that State. The case arose over a game of ball at Owosso, Mich., and the prosecutor was a Methodist clergyman. The Sunday laws are not religious at all, we are told; but for some reason it is always a clergyman that is seeking their enforcement. The facts of this case are thus stated by the Inter Ocean:—

"By statute in Michigan games of baseball are for-

bidden on Sunday, and when a game was announced through the papers for a certain Sunday, the Methodist clergyman called up the sheriff by telephone the night before and notified him that the game was advertised to take place. The sheriff contends that he made an effort to stop the game, but nevertheless it was played. Then the clergyman published an open letter to the sheriff in two local newspapers, charging him, in severe language, with intentional neglect of duty. Thereupon the sheriff began an action for libel and recovered a verdict for \$1,000—\$50 damage to his office and \$950 for damage to his feelings. The supreme court reversed this judgment, holding that it was the duty of the sheriff to prevent the game, and if the players persisted in proceeding with it it was his duty promptly to arrest them. The court held further that a statute forbidding ball games on Sunday is constitutional."

* * *

"We are among those," says the Michigan Christian Advocate, "who believe that an intelligent and enthusiastic patriotism is included in our Christian religion."

If the Advocate is correct, then the Chinese Boxers must be, if not Christians at least "not far from the kingdom," for they are patriotic to the point of fanaticism.

Patriotism is a virtue only so far as it is love of correct principles. If it means no more than love of a certain portion of territory within certain boundaries, either natural or political, it is only an animal instinct, more strongly developed in some beasts and birds than in man. If it means love of the society and institutions of one's country, then it is a virtue only to the extent that that society and those institutions are worthy of confidence and support. Imagine intelligent patriotism in this sense, among the common people in Turkey, Italy, or Russia. It is impossible. But men may be just as truly Christian there as in the most favored lands. "Patriotism" is too often the sentiment of fools and the bulwark of tyrants.

* * *

Among the inconsistencies of professedly Christian people which furnish atheists with an opportunity to rail against Christianity and in their own eyes justify themselves, not the least is the attitude of most churches toward the restriction of Sunday traffic. The following illustration is furnished by the Freethought Magazine:

"A convention of Christians recently passed the following resolution, which we clip from the Chicago Tribune:

"Resolved, That we give the weight of our influence to every legitimate movement which tends to abolish the sale of intoxicants on the Lord's day, and we urge the complete closing of saloons on Sunday."

"Now, if saloons are good things they ought to be open on all days of the week, and if they are a bad

thing they should be open on no day of the week. How would a resolution of this kind sound:

“Resolved, That we give the weight of our influence to every legitimate movement which tends to abolish highway robbery on the Lord’s day, and we urge that this crime be entirely prohibited on Sunday.’ And everybody knows that humanity suffers ten times more from the work of saloons than from the highway robbers.”

The Michigan Christian Advocate has this to say concerning the charges of political methods in the late Methodist conference in this city: “One delegate to the general conference wants to testify that there was no cause to set afloat stories of political wire pulling. He deliberately states that ‘these stories originated with persons who fail to get the recognition they think themselves entitled to. Everything was open and above board, and the efforts to secure the election of certain men were made in a perfectly fair and open way.’ Other men give an opposite report. Which shall we believe? Which is right? Believe both. Both are truthful. Both bear veracious testimony. The only difference between them is that one doesn’t know and the other does. One neither saw nor heard anything improper, the other did.”

The charge that political methods were used does not necessarily mean dishonest methods. Political conventions are sometimes conducted in a perfectly “fair and open way.”

The Advocate is doubtless correct: one man saw things the other did not see. He was not a wise justice who discharged a man accused of stealing a pig, because while only two witnesses testified positively that they saw the defendant steal the pig, twelve witnesses testified that they did not see him steal it. The ignorance of one man concerning a fact, however monumental that ignorance may be, cannot offset the positive knowledge of another man, however limited that knowledge may be.

Some time since we made mention of the movement on foot for the federation of all Roman Catholic societies of this country. Recently Bishop McFaul, of Trenton, N. J., has taken occasion to urge that this be done. He says that the influence of such a union “should be felt in our State legislatures, and in the National Congress, whenever bigots attempt the invasion of our rights.” Of course in the Bishop’s view “bigots attempt the invasion of our rights” whenever any attempt is made to keep the Catholic Church from getting whatever she happens to demand. The Bishop says that the twelve million Catholics have no influence in the country proportional to their numbers, that few Catholics can get an office; while the sects are so united that if a legislature interferes with their smallest claim they besiege the legislative halls and

frighten the lawmakers into submission. It is time, he says, for Catholics to “rush to the front,” and awake from their torpor.

So far as the reports state, the Bishop did not distinctly state just what direction this new activity should take; but it has been suggested that one thing he had in mind was the American public school system—including the Indian schools. They are indignant that Congress should have decreed the end of appropriations for religious schools; they think it a great wrong to them.

“Wearied by the useless waiting for assistance from the present government, the Catholics of Spain,” says the Catholic Mirror, “have demanded from the ministry permission for the foundation in Madrid out of their own means of a purely Catholic university, similar to the one at Louvain, Belgium.”

And this is just what the Catholics of Spain ought to have done in the first place. No government on earth ought to give one cent in any way either to found or to maintain sectarian institutions either educational or otherwise.

It is stated that an order will soon be issued for the election of members of an assembly to form a constitution for Cuba. The apportionment will be on the basis of one member for each one thousand inhabitants. The chief justice of the island, two of the insular secretaries, the civil governor of Havana, and the rector of the University of Havana will sit in the convention with the elected representatives.

At a recent meeting of leading Filipinos to consider the question of securing a satisfactory peace, a paper was prepared stating a number of conditions which they deemed essential to that end, one of which was the expulsion of the friars. Upon this point the whole assembly were unanimous and earnest. In the comments elicited by the incident the general opinion is expressed that the friars will be left undisturbed in their possessions.

According to the latest official Roman Catholic census, which is said to have been “very carefully prepared,” there are in the United States 10,129,677 Catholics.

The religious journals of India are said to be criticizing the viceroy, Baron Curzon, for disregard of Sunday. The Church of England papers are consistent, however, inasmuch as they criticize him even more severely for travelling on Good Friday.

Civil and Religious Marriages Again.

"It is well-known," says the Lutheran Witness, commenting upon the question of civil marriage in Cuba, "that the Roman Catholic does not recognize the validity of any marriage ceremony which has been solemnized by any one not a priest of his church. Accordingly, in countries where the Roman Catholic is the state religion, no civil marriages are permitted. This was the case, e. g., in Cuba and Porto Rico under Spanish rule. The exorbitant fees charged by the priests for performing the marriage ceremony brought about a great looseness in morals and a prevalence of concubinage. When our authorities took charge of the islands they, of course, sought for means and ways of abolishing this state of affairs. In his endeavors in this direction the governor-general of Cuba jumped to the opposite extreme by forbidding all except civil marriages."

It is denied, however, by the Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia, that civil marriages were not permitted in Cuba under Spanish rule. Be that as it may, however, the American governor-general certainly made a serious mistake in decreeing that all marriages should be civil. Those who for any reason prefer the religious ceremony are certainly entitled to it. From the standpoint of the state marriage is merely a civil contract. But Roman Catholics are taught from childhood that it is "one of the seven sacraments of the church." In the eyes of a Catholic a civil magistrate might just as well assume to administer baptism as to celebrate marriage. However erroneous this view may be, there is no reason why the state should interfere with it. It is all right to require the clergyman to report all marriages to the proper civil officer and to safeguard the rights of the contracting parties by requiring them to procure a license, etc., but to require that the vows be exchanged before the magistrate, and that he alone shall have authority to declare the parties husband and wife, is an unwarranted interference in religious belief and practice.

The Lutheran Witness very properly says that "the State cannot relinquish its right to superintend and guard the institution of matrimony." Nor should the State by any means recognize only religious marriages. But we cannot agree that "if the government of our country should see fit at any time to take away from our pastors the right to solemnize marriage and restrict it to the civil authorities, we Christians with a good conscience might content ourselves with holding a divine service in which the divine blessing is implored upon the already married couple, in accordance with the word of Paul that 'everything is sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer.'" While we do not hold that the religious ceremony is essential, we do hold that to forbid it or even to make it

secondary to a civil ceremony before a civil officer is an unwarranted abuse of civil power, an infringement of religious liberty. The American authorities in Cuba should hasten to correct the wrong they have done not only to Roman Catholics but to pious, self-respecting Protestants as well. B.

A New Origin of Labor Troubles.

The editor of "Sunday Reform Leaflets" suggests a new cause of "labor troubles, strikes and riots." Strikes are not due to injustice and oppression on the part of employers, as many have mistakenly supposed, but to the low moral state of the working men, due to the general laxity of the Sunday laws!

When the labor forces come to understand this they will of course cease to strike for better wages, for the recognition of labor organizations, etc., and will strike only and always for Sunday laws that will hermetically seal everything on Sunday except the churches, prohibit the Sunday paper, and give free rein only to the Sunday preachers.

NOT OPPOSED TO RELIGION.

The writer is not opposed to religion, but is most decidedly opposed to any and all attempts to force religion upon anybody; and that is the real design of Sunday legislation.

Everybody ought to be religious. Everybody ought to keep the Sabbath. Everybody ought to go to church. Everybody ought to help to support the gospel. But nobody ought to be compelled to do any nor all of these things. The gospel is not force, but love. It does not drive men, but beseeches them. It does not threaten punishment, but offers pardon from a penalty already incurred. In all of which the gospel of the Son of God is very unlike the gospel of the legally enforced Sunday. B.

Whither Are We Drifting?

The American Law Review is the leading law publication of this country. In its issue of May-June the American Law Review has an editorial that should be read by every American citizen. In this editorial the editor of the American Law Review paid an entirely deserved tribute to the character of the queen of England and concluded his remarks thus:

"Many of us feel that she is in a sense our queen, and whenever she wants the American boys to fight for her honor, or even for her political rights, they will embark or cross the Canadian frontier for that purpose in such numbers as will tax British resources to arm and equip them—every one of them 'spoiling for fight,' and they will acquit themselves as gallantly as their Canadian cousins have done in South Africa."

Is it not significant that such stuff as this should appear as an editorial in the leading law publication of America?

Does it not behoove the plain, everyday American to ask himself, "Whither are we drifting?"—*Omaha World-Herald*.

It is Now a State Affair.

(From the *Chicago Journal*.)

The field secretary of the Presbyterian board of foreign missions, the Rev. Thomas Marshall, has expressed an opinion upon the Chinese situation that, if lacking the goriness and intolerance of the recent utterances of Bishop Cranston, is at least unhappy in its phraseology. "The church believes," says Mr. Marshall, "that the government should enforce its treaty rights, and when it does we shall take advantage of the opportunity to preach the gospel."

Religion, standing amid rice fields strewn with Chinese slain, calls upon the survivors to repent ere they share a like fate.

That is the picture suggested by the words of the field secretary; and it is an unpleasant picture.

Just at this stage of the proceedings "enforcement of treaty rights" means shot and shell. Mr. Marshall tells us that the church is watching with approving eye the flight of the shells and the smoke of the volley-firing, ready, as soon as a silence falls upon the battlefield, to rush in and preach the gospel; or, as Mr. Marshall puts it, "to take advantage of the opportunity."

This attitude of the church militant is not even heroic; it lacks even the courage of the old crusaders, who did not wait until the heathen host had been soundly thrashed and cowed by a third party before they began their peculiar style of injecting the gospel.

Another of Mr. Marshall's sayings is that "the Chinese can not stop the work of civilization and evangelization which has stirred up the anti-foreign element of the orient." The church at large will hardly thank Mr. Marshall for the frank confession contained in that defiant sentence. Indeed, the church at large will not thank him for anything he has said that we have quoted, any more than it thanked Bishop Cranston for his sanguinary utterances; for they reflect discredit upon the whole missionary system.

This is an excellent time for the missionaries to refrain from offering advice or encouragement to the sword of the nation. What was mainly a church affair has become wholly an affair of state.

It is announced that Secretary-of-War Root will call upon Congress at its next session for a standing army of not less than 75,000 men, in order to cope successfully with the situation in eastern Asia.

What Imperialism has Done for India.

(From the Letter of a Native Hindu.)

"God help the people of India!" said Donald Smeaton, a member of Lord Curzon's council, to Reuter's agent at Bombay the other day; "Great Britain and Ireland owe a debt to the Indian peasant, a debt of millions upon millions." We know that India annually remits to England a sum estimated between £20,000 and £30,000 for home charges, pensions, interest and the like. We know that the people of India are virtually debarred from the highest posts in India, except a very small percentage, and that £15,000,000 are annually paid to European officials employed in India and sending all their savings to Europe. We know that our ancient industries, like weaving and spinning and dyeing, have been killed by European competition, and that the land is so heavily taxed in many provinces that the peasant cannot save in good years for years of bad harvest. We know that an army is kept in India, and paid for by India sufficient for England's imperial requirements over the best part of Asia and Africa. We know that our finances are adjusted by executive councils in India and in England, in which the people of India have no seat, and that in the taxation of India we have no voice. These are some of the burdens we bear in India, and these are some of the causes of the famines from which we periodically suffer. Will Englishmen add to them the burden of paying for British forts and armies, British establishments, and wars in various parts of Africa and Asia—from the Suez Canal to Mozambique, from the Tigris to the Malay peninsula? Will the English conscience reconcile itself to thus proceeding in a year when 90,000,000 of people are affected by the worst famine that India has ever known, and 5,000,000 are actually attending relief centers? After the famine of 1770 and the desolating wars of Warren Hastings, the great Minister Pitt brought in his Indian bill in 1784 to give us a better government. Is there no statesman in England at the present day who will give us a new India bill, moderating land tax, reducing expenditure, opening up the higher services to the people of India, and giving them some control over their finances? Is there no Englishman of this generation who will stand up for justice to India?

Archbishop Chapelle announces that he has carefully studied all points of the religious question in the Philippines, and will soon make a report on the subject to the pope. His report to the Filipinos on the same matter seems already to have been made.

A "better enforcement of the Sunday laws" is reported from Palmer, Mass.

Our New Publications

Christian Patriotism

A study of the principles that should govern the true Christian patriot in his relation to earthly governments. 104 pages. Paper, 15 cents; cloth, 40 cents

The Glad Tidings

A verse-by-verse study of the book of Galatians. By DR. E. J. WAGGONER
265 pages. Paper, 25 cents; cloth, 60 cents
Also published by the Review and Herald

House We Live In

A book designed to assist mothers in teaching their children how to care for their bodies
By MRS. VESTA J. FARNSWORTH. 218 pages. Cloth, 75 cents

Marshaling of the Nations

How the five great nations of the world—Britain, Russia, United States, Germany and France—are fulfilling prophecy. Illustrated by a special series of maps. Price, 10 cents

Testimonies on Sabbath-School Work

A compilation of the writings of MRS. E. G. WHITE on Sabbath-School Work
128 pages. Cloth, 25 cents; limp leather, 35 cents

Why Are You Not a Christian

An earnest appeal to those who are out of Christ. By W. N. GLENN
8 pages. Price, 50 cents per 100

Labor and the Money Power

An intensely interesting description of the present relation of capital and labor from a prophetic standpoint. By GEO. W. RINE, B. L. 32 pages. Illustrated. \$2.00 per 100

An Astronomer's View of Our Father's House

An account of an imaginary journey among the heavenly bodies. By a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society. 24 pages. Illustrated. \$1.50 per 100

Pacific Press Publishing Co.

OAKLAND, CAL. 39 Bond Street, New York City
18 West Fifth Street, Kansas City, Missouri

What Is Christian Patriotism?

The question often arises as to what is the proper relation of the Christian patriot to his government. The true principles are, of course, to be found in the Bible, but a new booklet has just been prepared by Alonzo T. Jones, entitled "**Christian Patriotism**," that plainly and forcibly points out the right position for all to assume.

It is a Biblical, original, and thoroughly common sense treatise on this important subject, and is of vital interest just now. Every SENTINEL reader should have a copy.

Price in Paper Covers, 15 cents

ADDRESS,
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
Oakland, Cal. 39 Bond St., New York City.
Kansas City, Mo.

TRADE EDITION, PRICE \$1.50. "Desire of Ages."

In answer to an urgent demand we have gotten out an edition of "Desire of Ages" without illustrations, in small compass, on light paper, for the convenient use of those who want to carry a copy with them when traveling. There is also a class who do not feel that they can afford to pay \$3.50 for the beautiful subscription edition. To all these this plain edition will appeal.

It contains all the text of the subscription edition, including General and Scriptural Indexes and Appendix, but no illustrations except the frontispiece.

THE TRADE EDITION is 5½x7½ inches in size, and contains 1042 pages.

PRICES:

Cloth, - - - - - \$1.50
 Full leather, round corners, - - - - - 2.00

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
 39 Bond St., New York City.

Kansas City, Mo.
 Oakland, Cal.

PAGAN COUNTERFEITS in the Christian church

By C. A. S. TEMPLE.
 A vivid presentation of the pagan festivals, rites, and usages which the author finds in the Christian churches of to-day, together with two chapters on Freemasonry, which ought to be read by every Mason who professes to be a Christian. 187 pages, paper covers. Price 25 cents. Address House nearest to you.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
 39 BOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

OAKLAND, CAL.
 KANSAS CITY, MO.

SUBSCRIBE FOR . . .

THE SENTINEL OF LIBERTY.

A paper set for the defense of liberty, both Christian and Constitutional, and opposed to everything tending toward a union of church and state, either in name or in fact.

You Need this Paper

—AND—

Your Neighbors Need It.

If you are not familiar with this subject you will be surprised, not only at what is proposed, but at what has been already done in the direction of nullifying the constitutional safeguards of liberty of conscience.

Single copy of the paper:

One year..... \$1.00
 Six months..... .50
 Three months..... .25

In clubs of five to twenty-four, to one address, one year.....75 cents

In clubs of twenty-five to forty-nine, to one address, one year, 60 cents


In clubs of fifty to ninety-nine, to one address, one year55 cents

One hundred or more, to one address, one year.....50 cents

ADDRESS,

SENTINEL OF LIBERTY,

324 Dearborn Street, - - CHICAGO, ILL.



CHICAGO, JULY 19, 1900.

Any one receiving The Sentinel of Liberty without having ordered it, may know that it is sent by some friend. Those who have not ordered The Sentinel need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

The Illinois State Epworth League, in session last week at Peoria, very sensibly tabled, with only one dissenting vote, a motion to send a telegram of greeting to President McKinley. The fact that the President of the United States is a member of some church should give that church no mortgage on him as a public official; nor should it give the President any mortgage on the vote of the denomination to which he belongs. The League did itself credit.

The presence of a formidable army of U. S. troops in China, joining with the armed forces of Europe in putting down the "Boxer" movement and exacting satisfaction for the fearful outrages perpetrated in Peking, is to be looked for at an early date. It is reported that troops are now being dispatched from this country and from the Philippine islands, for this purpose. The United States will thus join the "concert of Europe" in China; but will it be as easy a matter to withdraw from that concert as to join it? Is it, in fact, a difficult thing to foresee a time in the near future when United States territory in Asia will lie side by side with that of the powers of Europe; so that American isolation from the territory of European nations, and from the political strifes of the Old World, will be a thing of the past?

"The popular fury," says the Catholic Mirror, "which has broken loose in China is expected by some to advance the cause of Christianity and civilization by the opening which it affords to the nations of the West to divide and conquer. Had the dealings of these same nations with the heathen empire been founded upon principles of equity and justice, religion might have had opportunity to diffuse itself by its own sweet pervasive way, instead of relying upon armed force for an ineffectual conquest."

Nothing is more true than that the progress of the real gospel has been hindered rather than helped

by appeal to force. It is true that conquest has opened the way for missionaries to go where they could not otherwise have gone. But were not the very obstacles which have been removed by force, due in the first place, in very large measure, at least, to the use of force?

The first missionaries of the cross had absolutely no human power to which to appeal for protection. They were not followed by traders greedy of gain. No "Christian" nation stood ready to annex the territory they penetrated. The ships that carried them to foreign lands in their cabins did not have their holds filled with death and destruction in the form of intoxicating liquors. These are a few of the things that have hindered the progress of the gospel far more than armed force has ever helped it.

The Sunday School Times has a note which states a truth that should be borne in mind by every Christian. It is this: "If we could only present Christ as he really is, how surely men would be drawn to him without the pressure of our clumsy urging! Says Mr. Sankey, out of his lifelong experience, 'People come to Christ, I find, in a very simple way.' Not through argument or persuasion, so much as through simple presentation of Christ as he is, do men accept him."

Of course that which is true of "the pressure of our clumsy urging," is doubly true of our brutal attempts to compel.

"The liberties, civil and religious," says the Vulcan (Colo.) Times, "for which the founders of this great republic insisted, are being assailed to-day and often successfully. It is the present danger and menace of this people. How few see it!"

Apropos of the Indian famine and of the utter inadequacy of the relief measures, the Springfield Republican says: "What a melancholy reflection it is that so many millions of pounds sterling and American dollars should be expended on unrighteous war; instead of in relief of the greatest human distress by starvation and cholera."

Do not forget about those maps offered in last week's Sentinel, illustrating the present "Eastern Question," for the nominal sum of 15 cents. Send in your orders now; the supply is limited.

Truth may be held by a sect, but can never become sectarian.