


THE SENTINEL OF LIBERTY



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

VOLUME 15.

CHICAGO, AUGUST 2, 1900.

NUMBER 30.

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.

Moral obligation can never be the basis of civil law.



The Lord says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath."



The "Christian world" says: "The first day is the Sabbath."



The Lord enforces the observance of his day by the spiritual law of love.



The "Christian world" enforces the observance of its day by the physical law of force.



A truly "civil Sabbath" could not possibly be anything but a holiday. It could never be a holy day. Holy things are not civil, and civil things are not holy.



No country in the world ever established a weekly rest-day, forbidding both labor and amusement upon it, except from religious motives.



Civil law is not designed to conserve moral *right* but civil *rights*.



Freedom of conscience means not only liberty to *think*, but liberty to *do*.

Just government must guarantee not only freedom of the mind but liberty of the body as well in everything which does not infringe the equal rights of others.

Civil Government and Religion.

The evils of a union of church and state are so well known—or, rather, the more patent evils are so well known—that in this country but few are found who are ready to defend such union in plain terms. But a good many declare that they are in favor of religion and the state. But this is a distinction without any material difference.

What is meant by religion and the state is a religious state; that is, a state which recognizes and fosters religion, but has no religious establishment, or no state church, such as they have in England, and in most Roman Catholic countries.

Of course the state ought not to be anti-religious. To be anti-religious would be to be against religion, and clearly the state has no right to assume an attitude of hostility to religion. But this is very far from saying that the state ought to be religious. It is not at all necessary that the state should have any religious character whatever. It should be non-religious. A state need have no more religious character than a bank or a mercantile concern. Nobody ever speaks of a "Christian bank," or a "Christian mercantile establishment." Every member of a firm may be a Christian and yet the firm itself have no religious character, and make no religious profession. It is simply a business concern organized for purely business purposes. And that is just what every state ought to be—simply a concern created for the transaction of public business.

NO CHRISTIAN BANKS.

A bank may have among its stock-holders, and even upon its board of directors, some men who are Christians and some who are not Christians. But the Christians do not feel that they have any duty

to impose their religion upon the non-Christians by any official act. They may as individuals go just as far as they see fit in promulgating the tenets of their faith; but nobody ever heard of a Christian director of a bank saying to his fellow directors, "Now, in as much as a majority of us are Christians, and in as much as this bank was established by Christian men, with capital inherited from Christian fathers, we must so amend our articles of incorporation as to show that this is a Christian bank." And nobody ever heard of any sort of a business institution undertaking to impose the religion of a part of the individuals who composed it upon all the individuals composing it. This idea of collective responsibility for the religious views and practices of the individual does not obtain anywhere except in church and state affairs. It obtains in the church because the church exists for the very purpose of promulgating religion. It exists in the state because of the false, theocratical idea of civil government which has come down to us from the days of Constantine. The idea is destructive of individual responsibility and engenders despotism.

THE STATE AND RELIGION IN ROME.

This idea of a religious state is not Christian but pagan. It comes not from Christ but from Rome. Rome was pagan, but intensely religious. The gods were to be recognized in every walk of life and at every turn. One could not attend a social function, nor even partake of a meal, without either honoring or denying the gods. And to deny the gods was to be guilty not only of sacrilege but of treason against the state, for the state was the chief god—the embodiment of all the gods. Moreover reverence for the gods was thought to be essential to good citizenship. Religion was maintained by the state, not primarily for the good of the individual, but because it was the bulwark of the state.

Exactly the same argument is urged to-day for the support of Christianity by the state that was urged for the support of paganism in Rome. The idea is just as pagan to-day as it was two thousand years ago; and it is just as much opposed to true piety now as it was then.

B.

The Problem of Self-Government.

In a discussion of the question "What is self-government?" The Outlook labors to give the impression that self-government, as applied to nations and peoples, is a very complex thing, and that only when the various problems it presents in a given case have been solved so that there is clear sailing for the new ship of state, ought the privilege of self-government to be intrusted to any people.

Thus The Outlook proceeds to reason after this fashion in regard to Cuba:

"What shall we do in Cuba? Withdraw our forces? recall General Wood? leave the Cubans to govern themselves? This is the formula. But no sooner is there some indication that this formula is to be acted upon by the United States, than representative men of property, who have everything to lose and nothing to gain by revolution, appeal to us not to withdraw and leave them to the mercy of the revolutionists. America has promised to Cuba her independence; and so far as we can see no one desires to cancel that promise, though some think it was made too hastily and not wisely. But when is Cuba 'pacified'? Is it pacified because it is at peace while our troops remain there to keep order? And who are the people of Cuba to whom the duties and responsibilities of government should be handed over by us? Are they all the men and all the women? or only all the men? or only all the white men? or only all the native-born Cubans? or only the men who have some measure of intelligence or some property interests, or both? These and kindred questions come in to perplex the real man of affairs, who has to consider the property interests involved, the industries just coming into existence, the schools just established, the sanitary laws reluctantly recognized and obeyed for the first time in Cuba's history. Such questions cannot be cavalierly dismissed with the formula, 'self-government.'"

In like manner The Outlook takes up the case of Porto Rico:

"What shall we do in Porto Rico? The figures are somewhat in doubt, but apparently not over five per cent of the inhabitants can read and write. Does self-government mean that the ninety-five per cent shall be put under the government of the five per cent? Does it mean, on the contrary, that the men of intelligence and property shall be put under the government of the ignorant and the propertyless?"

SELF-GOVERNMENT A RIGHT.

Many other like questions may be asked; indeed, it would be hard to set a limit to the questions that might be anticipated in considering the fitness of any particular people for self-government. But is it necessary to consider such questions at all. Is the right of self-government at all affected by the questions that may be raised as to the results that may follow from its exercise?

If King George III. had been allowed to settle to his own satisfaction the various problems relating to the question of the fitness of the American colonies for self-government, before granting them self-government, would those colonies ever have become self-governing? As any one who will read the history of that time may know, there was as much doubt in the minds of the king and parliament respecting the colonists' capacity for self-government, as there is now in the mind of The Outlook editor respecting the like capacity among the late subjects of Spain. Nor was there wanting that which seemed

fully to justify their opinion. Among the rebellious people which overturned the king's authority in the States, the elements of a stable government were not conspicuous; and for years after the new nation set out upon the pathway of self-government, it presented but a sorry spectacle among the powers of earth. It was without finances or credit, it was torn by internal dissention which ripened into open strife, the colonies were jealous and suspicious of one another to such a degree that harmony between them seemed impossible, and the situation grew worse instead of better, until it seemed that the new fabric of self-government would inevitably fall to pieces. Those who predicted its downfall stood pointing at it the finger of scorn, and justifying their own wisdom. But the republic survived, and out of the conflict of discordant views and parties, under the inspiration only of the love of liberty, were developed the elements of stability and strength which established the new nation upon a solid basis of prosperity and crowned the experiment of self-government with triumphant success.

But the colonies would never have become self-governing if they had waited for the British parliament to raise and solve all the problems involved in the experiment of self-government for that time; and if the like questions respecting Cuba must be considered and settled in Congress before Cuba has independence, it may safely be affirmed that Cuba will wait long for self-government.

The right of self-government for any people is an independent right, and not a privilege dependent upon decisions made by the finite wisdom of men. The problems that may arise from the inauguration of republican government in Cuba, or in any land, are beyond the power of any man to foresee. Those problems which appear greatest in anticipation, may prove to be but minor ones in reality, while really formidable difficulties may arise which were wholly unforeseen. The American Republic came near being split asunder by a civil war, which no one foresaw at the beginning; and as the problem of self-government is not one which the foresight and wisdom of one people can settle for another, so the right of self-government is not one to be regulated by the authority of one people over another. It is a right independent and unalienable.

So long as a colony of ants can maintain self-government, so long as the bushmen of Central Africa can live and flourish independently of the advice and authority of their superior fellow-men, and so long as the gospel message proclaims self-government to all men as a duty, and pledges the power of God for its accomplishment in any and all in every land who will receive that message, let not that right be denied to any under the plea that they are not fit to

receive the boon. The only people not fit for self-government are those who do not want it, who prefer despotism in its place.

The Independent and the Catholic Church.

The New York Independent is supposed to be a Protestant journal. Nevertheless it contains some things that have a strange sound coming from a Protestant source. For instance, in its issue of July 26 the Independent says:

"The appointment of Bishop Blenk, an American priest who speaks Spanish, as head of the Catholic Church in Porto Rico, seems to be accomplishing most desirable results in the way of restoring the loyalty of the people to the Church."

In capitalizing "church" in this case we have simply followed the Independent. When a Catholic says "the Church" he not only means the Roman Catholic Church, but he implies thereby that there is no other church. Probably the Independent uses the same term only by way of courtesy; but it is impossible to say, since it regards "restoring the loyalty of the people" to the Catholic Church as a "most desirable" result.

However this may be, the Independent waxes quite enthusiastic over the work of the new Bishop of Porto Rico and says:

"His appointment as bishop gave the island a man who had become acquainted with its condition, and who was an enthusiastic American, and who thus quite escaped the traditions and suspicions which had hampered the Church so long as it was under Spanish dominion. Last February he issued a pastoral letter exhorting the people to cling to their faith and to be true to the flag of their new country. He promised them that after a period of testing their power of self-government they might expect to be received as one of the States of the Union. This letter was read in all the churches."

The Independent seems to see no impropriety in the bishop's telling the people what they may expect from the government. But it may be said that this is only the bishop's opinion. Very well; be it so. Other governments have found that in dealing with colonies largely Catholic, it is sometimes quite necessary to have bishops who have opinions in accord with the government, or rather to have the government in accord with the bishops; or at least to so far yield to the wishes of the bishop as to keep his influence on the side of the government. Henry IV. and Prince Bismarck are not the only civil rulers who have gone to Conossa, nor is there any assurance that there may not be yet many others to travel the same road.

In order to maintain harmony between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, governments have sometimes insisted upon a voice in the appointment of bishops. But this can be only when "the Church" is

supported in whole or in part by the government. Therefore as this government has no financial interest in "the Church," it seems altogether more likely that the government will be compelled to yield to "the Church" than that "the Church" will yield to the government.

Of course where each attends strictly to its own affairs there can be no clash between church and state; but as "Rome never changes" it is not a supposable case that "the Church" will not demand things in Porto Rico that are not in harmony with American principles. If she don't get what she wants "the Church" well knows how to make things very uncomfortable for the civil authorities in such communities as "our new insular possessions." B.

Prayer in Political Conventions.

(From the Lutheran Witness.)

The incongruity of opening political conventions and similar assemblies with prayer is being discussed in the daily press. It has been found, namely, that these prayers are frequently applauded when they chance to suit the tastes of the members of the convention. One of our religious exchanges, while expressing itself as being shocked at such occurrences, thinks that such conventions "need divine guidance." "The Witness" agrees that such conventions "need"—emphasis on need—divine guidance, but denies that this divine guidance should be prayed for in the way indicated. Prayer is an outflow of faith; unbelievers cannot pray. Prayer is an act of worship, and believers must not make pretense of worshipping before the throne of God in company with those of whom they know that these dare not come before Him. Prayer is an act of confession, and those who are not agreed in doctrine should not make a vain show of unity by ignoring, in public, the differences which keep them apart. Christians should pray in private, and in concert with their brethren, for divine guidance in behalf of the State officers, etc., and should insist that the public "praying" in secular and mixed assemblies be done away with.

A Tale of Two Nations.

THE MONARCHY OF THE MASTER, NO. 2.

Thus came the King breaking dawn for a new kingdom and a monarchy of a kind hitherto unknown in the world. When his disciples strove as to who should be the greatest, Jesus called them unto him and said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister. And whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant. Even as

the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." This is an utter and entire reversal of all earthly principles of monarchy. The principle of earthly governments is that all men shall defend and save the king; but in the kingdom and monarchy of Christ it was the king who gave his life in the defense and for the salvation of every member of the human family. In another place he told the striving disciples, "Be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren . . . neither be ye called master: for one is your master, even Christ; but he that is greatest among you shall be your servant."

In the kingdom of Christ, royal position is measured by willingness to serve, instead of a willingness to accept service, by a willingness to give up those so-called natural rights, rather than by a willingness to maintain and defend them at all hazards.

Peter on one occasion came to Christ saying, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? until seven times seven?" Jesus said unto him, "I say not unto thee until seven times; but until seventy times seven." Such was the law of the kingdom of God. It should be the law to-day with all who truly live in the kingdom of God. And again he said, "Take heed to yourselves; if thy brother trespass against thee rebuke him; and if he repent forgive him; and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, 'I repent,' thou shalt forgive him." This was the law of the kingdom of Christ.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said," he tells his people, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love that which loveth you what reward have you? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye even more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

All of this comes well from the Master's lips, from

the One who when he was reviled reviled not again, who when he suffered threatened not but calmly commending his spirit to his God gave birth to these glorious words, the light of which has illuminated the ages, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Such was the monarchy of the Master. It needs not to be said that in the human sense of the word it was no monarchy at all, but in the deepest, truest sense, as our better natures will admit, it is a monarchy of the most noble and lofty nature, a monarchy of service and sacrifice, a monarchy of self-surrender and self-abnegation, but a monarchy which in the endless ages of eternity will prove itself more powerful to set up and establish an enduring kingdom where rebellion and insurrection will never come than all the systems which earth has ever devised.

"Conquering kings their titles make
From the captives that they take;
Jesus from a mightier deed,
By the captives which he freed."

P. T. MAGAN.

Reformation or Deformation.

PART II. PROPHECY.

In the preceding paper it was, I trust, made plain that attempts by government to reform or to foster either religion or literature, not only invariably fail, but produce the opposite from the desired effect. Even were it possible for government to invariably lend its influence and support to the right side, it could not then produce one impulse of genius or one heart throb of true piety. But governments are fallible and erring; they are also necessarily conservative, and so opposed to the progressive truth. Buckle says, "After a careful study I think myself authorized to say, that for one instance in which a sovereign has recompensed a man who is before his age, there are at least twenty instances of his recompensing one who is behind his age." (History of Civilization. Vol. I. Page 495.) It was this which Jesus foresaw when he forbade his church all appeal to force, "Lest while they gather up the tares they root up also the wheat." "Almighty God created the mind free, and all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness."—Jefferson.

One of the chief values of history is, that through it, by means of the past, we may read and understand the present and the future.

There is to-day a religio-political Christian citizenship movement, identical in motives and methods with that of the fourth century. This movement to-day, like that of the fourth century, proposes to make this a Christian nation by law, and to so control matters

that in the end only Christians can hold office. By these means they propose to usher in the reign of Christ.

PUTS A PREMIUM ON HYPOCRISY.

However good the intentions, there can be but one result. The movement puts a premium on hypocrisy; and as soon as it is seen that the church is the only road to political preferment, all office seekers will become externally very pious, and will seek and gain admission to the church. Under those circumstances only an honest man will have the courage to stay outside the church. The only possible result to the church is foretold in Revelation where the prophet says it will become, "The hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird." The rule and reign of such a church will be the rule and reign of evil, not of good. It matters not how good and pure the intentions of the religio-political leaders now may be, this can not change the final result. Jonathan Edwards, I think it was, once remarked that, "Hell is paved with good intentions."

The leaders of this movement propose to suppress by law all forms of vice and immorality. Especially do they propose to stop all Sunday labor and amusements, and to give the monopoly of that day wholly to the church. Exactly this was attempted, and by the same methods, in the fourth century, but with a result diametrically opposed to the welfare of the Kingdom of Christ.

WOULD NOT QUESTION MOTIVES.

We would not to-day seek to question or to analyze the motives of the men and women who are working so persistently for religious laws; but in the light of history, we prophesy that the outcome of the movement will be the ushering in of a carnival of vice, crime, and intemperance such as the world has seldom or never seen. Let us coolly, and without prejudice, study the facts, and see if this will not be the only possible outcome.

One of the very first efforts of this movement to-day, is to see that all saloons are closed on Sunday. This is done professedly as a temperance measure, though it remains to be proven that drunkenness on Sunday is either more harmful or more wicked than on other days. It may be that Sunday closing of the saloons in some instances does prevent a man from starting in on a spree; yet the Voice, one of the leading prohibition papers, says of such closing, "As a temperance measure it has little merit. It is just as practical to get the Sunday supply of whisky or beer as of steak or roast. When the Omaha mayor began shutting up the Sunday saloon in that city, men had a dry and dreadful time for the first Sunday under that policy. They had not dreamed it to be a serious

purpose of the mayor. They were not caught a second Sunday, however; they got an abundant supply the Saturday before."

ANOTHER EVIL.

But there is another, and an evil side even to Sunday closing. Who can not see that a law forbidding murder or theft on Sunday only would necessarily sanction and legalize those crimes six days in the week? So if the business of selling liquor as a beverage, to produce paupers and lunatics, and people temporarily insane, and so liable to commit crime,—if this is a crime at all, all Sunday closing laws legalize it, and throw around it the respectability of government on six days in the week.

But this movement, as far as possible, proposes to stop all Sunday labor, and so make what is honest work on other days, a crime on Sunday, punishable by fine and imprisonment. This is to create a crime by law. Such artificial crimes are much more liable to be committed by well meaning young men than are real violations of human rights. But even such an arbitrary law once broken, the young man is treated as a common criminal. He is fined and imprisoned along with drunkards and thieves. He is disgraced before the community, and loses his own self respect, and so is started in the downward way. All laws that create artificial crimes, tend also to create real criminals.

Again, these laws enforce idleness on Sunday, for all men know that such laws can not reach the heart and enforce those divine sanctions which, to the true Christian, make the Sabbath very different from a day of idleness. All enforced Sabbath keeping, therefore, is simply enforced idleness, and it is a familiar proverb that the Devil always has work for idle hands to do.

WOULD PROHIBIT SUNDAY CARS.

But this is not the worst. This movement proposes to stop all Sunday excursions, and as fast as possible, all Sunday trains, and so take away all means of getting into the country from the overheated and overcrowded city, on the only day when most people can have a chance to go. Doctor Evart gives their reason for this: "The Sunday train is another great evil. They can not afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations."

WOULD STOP SUNDAY PAPERS.

They propose to stop the publication of all Sunday papers. This can not be to give those who work on the papers their Sunday, for the work on the Sunday paper is done largely on Saturday, and the work on the Monday paper is mostly done on Sunday. Dr. Evarts here also gives the real reason why it is the

Sunday and not the Monday paper that is to be stopped. He says, "The laboring classes are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday paper, and allow the hour of worship to go by unheeded." They propose even to stop the Sunday street cars. In Toronto, Canada, a city of two hundred thousand inhabitants, the church people have thus far prevented the running of Sunday street cars; and this they have done in spite of the petitioning and the persistent effort of the common people to secure this cheap means of transit on their one leisure day in the week. Because of this fact, Toronto has been held up all over the United States, by the religio-political workers, as the pious and model city, a sample of what they hope to accomplish in this country.

Thus they propose to take from the poor man in our large cities every means he has of getting his family even to the parks of the city on the only day of the week he has for recreation and rest. There can be no denying the motive of this. It is an indirect effort to force church attendance. The writer, with many other ministers, was present at a hearing in the Massachusetts Legislature on these very points. From the speeches made by nearly every minister, it was so plain why they wanted everything but the church closed up on Sunday, that an agnostic arose, and in a ringing speech boldly accused the preachers of wanting a monopoly of the day. One of the Boston clergymen indignantly expressed his surprise that any man in the nineteenth century should dare to publicly make such an accusation. But before he sat down even, he gave his case entirely away by saying, "I maintain that the church can not compete with the theaters and the museums, and the places of public resort." The reverend gentleman was reminded that the church once did compete with the circus and the theater, and with all the sports of the pagan world, and that she triumphed over them, and went forth as on a white horse conquering and to conquer.

If the church lacks that power to-day, instead of seeking a monopoly from the state, she should seek more power from God.

The great cry to-day is that the masses do not want to attend church. If the masses do not want to attend church now, will they want to do so more when the church has cut off every avenue of escape, and they plainly see that she is trying to force them to attend? Every one who knows human nature at all, or who even understands his own heart, must answer, NO. Now, these men who do not want to attend church can go to the seashore, and to the country, and, if they will not of their own free wills attend the church, there is no better place for them on earth than the seashore and the country. God, through

Nature, often speaks to men who will not listen to the preaching of his word by the human voice.

Out upon the mountains, where the yawning canyons are beneath, and, above, the mighty rocks thrust up their thundersplintered pinnacles into the sky, how small man seems! But how near, and how great, and grand is God! Down by the seashore where the mighty waves come rolling in, and dash against the rocks, how the beating of the waves sometimes seems but the ceaseless pulsation of His mighty heart, and one can not but feel that it throbs in sympathy with human woe and human heart-ache and human need! Ah yes, many a man has first come to know God by seeing him revealed in nature, and the man who is shut up most of the time in a large city is peculiarly susceptible to the beauties of the woods and hills. But, take away the opportunity of the masses for going to the country or the seashore on Sunday, and what will the masses do on that day of leisure? They will not attend church, for they will not attend church now, and they will be more determined than ever not to attend church, when they see that the church is trying to coerce them.

SUNDAY LAWS INCREASE DRUNKENNESS.

What will they do? The question is not difficult to one who knows human nature as it is. On Saturday night, John will say to Henry, and Charles, and William, "Come to my house to-morrow, I will have a case of beer in the back kitchen, and we will have a quiet game of cards, and so I think we will be able to spend the day." Next week, William or Henry will return the compliment, and so on. No liquor will be sold, nothing can be done to prevent a man from taking a social glass with his friends in his own house. And so innumerable little drinking clubs will spring up, and thousands of young men who are too self-respecting to go to a saloon for their first glass, will thus acquire the appetite for drink. Instead of the voice of God in nature, they will have only the influence of the back kitchen, and the cards, and the drink.

Do you say this is only a speculative theory? The writer admits that years ago he first saw it as such. Reasoning from cause to effect, he was driven unavoidably to this conclusion; but since then, he has seen his conclusions verified. In that professedly pious city of Toronto, on Saturday afternoon, any one who will, may see the streets dotted with wine and beer wagons delivering drinkables to be used on the morrow. There are no street cars on Sunday. The multitudes can not get away from their hot tenements. They do not care to go to the church that has persistently refused them the cheap transportation they have so often asked for. So they must devise some way to spend the day.

If any one still doubts the truthfulness of this picture, here is a quotation to the point from Dr. Charles Roads, published in the New York Christian Advocate. This doubtless will be an authority to many, and it fully proves the point in question. "The Brooks High License law of Pennsylvania was rigorously applied in Philadelphia in its first year, 1889, by four judges sitting as the license court. They reduced the number of the saloons from fifty-five hundred to sixteen hundred, and inspired such terror concerning violations of the law in the sixteen hundred that in one particular—that of suppressing Sunday selling—there is practically complete success. These apparent gains, however, are offset by a steady and alarmingly accelerating increase in the consumption of beer and distilled liquors, which the internal revenue laws show to be far beyond the growth of the population; by the great extension of the bottling business, which by energetic peddling has introduced beer into tens of thousands of homes hitherto free from it, and where now, as we know by many inquiries, it is freely given to children; by young men's clubs, notoriously organized for drinking purposes, becoming very numerous and liberally furnished with all sorts of drinks on Saturday afternoon, which by the evasion of monthly dues are really Sunday saloons, thronged with men and boys all day."

Now, both by reason, and by actual appeal to facts, the dark prophecy, which at first may have startled the reader, has been abundantly proven. The writer hopes that all who read may take warning, and have nothing to do with any method of attempted reformation which will inevitably mean deformation, and destruction in the end.

G. E. FIFIELD.

The Puritan Attitude Toward Toleration.

(From a "Review of the Puritans," by Thomas Coit, D. D., member of the New York Historical Society.)

That toleration was excluded from the very idea of religion by Puritanism, is evident from the fact that, in the Larger Catechism, one of the heinous offences against Heaven under the Second Commandment—a virtual commission of idolatry—is the "tolerating a false religion." Many will perhaps look into some edition of that Catechism, published now [1845], and say I am incorrect. Let them know, that the loss of the quoted words is only a modern improvement. The unexpurgated original reads as I state, as anyone can satisfy himself by examining an edition as early as my own, viz., of 1768. When the sin of toleration ceased to be a sin, I know not. The edition quoted proves, that toleration continued its sinful existence to the verge of the American Revolution. * * The Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms virtually entertain the idea avowed by the Catechism, when they say the

civil magistrate is "to put forth his coercive power as the matter shall require." But these, too, have fallen into desuetude * * and when they began to give "an uncertain sound" it is equally impossible to tell.

It is of little consequence. Suffice it to know what genuine Puritanism has been; and also, that its disavowal of toleration has been no inoperative theory. That this disavowal was no mere idea, is evident from the fact that Pym once boldly broached it in a Puritanic British Parliament. He "asserted that it was the duty of the legislature to establish true religion and to punish false"; and how cordially they believed him and acted out his doctrine, history has recorded with many a sigh and tear.

This, however, is quite enough to show how, in England, Puritanism, though it had once groaned for toleration, made others afterward groan for its own lack of it. Come we now to the land where it was (poetically) an exile from the pearl of great price—the enjoyment of an unmolested conscience. Did it there display no anxiety to molest the consciences of others? Let us see.

And first of all, Master Cotton, whom thy contemporaries esteem so "famous," I call thee upon the stand. Hear his "awful words," as Shepard truly characterizes them. * * "It was toleration that made the world anti-Christian, and the church never took hurt by the punishment of heretics." Again: "The Lord keep us from being bewitched with the whore's cup, lest while we seem to detest and reject her with open face of profession, we do not bring her in by a back door of *toleration*, and so come at last to drink deeply in the cup of the Lord's wrath, and be filled with the cup of her plagues."

Shepard was a worthy pupil of Master Cotton; for he goes if possible a step beyond him, and ascribes toleration to the Father of Lies. * * "'Tis Satan's policy," says he, "to plead for an indefinite and boundless toleration; as Chemnitius excellently shows from those words, Mark 1:24, 'Let us alone.' He calls it *diabolica machinatio in conciliationibus religionum*; i. e., Christ may have his kingdom if he will let Satan alone with his, and so both of them live lovingly and quietly together." So Shepard not only asserts his doctrine, but with the help of the profound Chemnitius establishes it, with due exegetical propriety. * * *

The very year succeeding [1673], heard as loud thunder against this luckless subject of toleration. "I look upon toleration," says President Oakes of Harvard University, "as the first-born of all abominations." This, too, was said in an Election sermon; and as that, according to Belknap, "may generally be accounted the echo of the public voice," it is the unanimous dictum of a Puritan community.

Of all Puritan classics, however, on the subject of toleration, the author of the "Simple Cobbler of Agga-

wam" bears away the palm. He makes it so ineffably revolutionary, that it empties on earth the contents of the bottomless pit, and overturns the throne itself of the Absolute Supreme. Speaking in one place of a shoal of sects, which toleration would disenthral, he describes it as "In a word, room for hell above ground." In another he says, in a figure I never saw paralleled, "To authorize an untruth by a toleration of state, is to build a scone against the walls of heaven, to batter God out of his chair."

I will give but one quotation more, and that shall be from Hubbard, the historian, to show how the Puritans abated their intolerance by the most studious gradations—conforming it carefully to those times when, as Justice Story has told us, persecution became less frequent because it was less safe. "And indeed," says he, "let the experience of all reformed churches be consulted withal, and it will appear that disorder and confusion of the church will not be avoided by all the determination, advice, and counsel, of synods or other messengers of churches, unless they be a *little acuated* by the civil authority*. All men are naturally so wedded to their own apprehension, that unless there be a coercive power to restrain, the order and rule of the gospel will not be attended."

And these were the men who thought Archbishop Laud "the chief of sinners" because, esteeming themselves too fondly "wedded to their own apprehensions," he employed some of their own beloved "coercive power," and "acuated" church discipline "a little" by the civil authority, that they might attend to what he, as their spiritual guide, deemed the gospel's order and rule! * * *

Such were the men who denounced the intolerance of the Church of England. But a few years previous, and you would have thought them (in words, that is) the most disinterested champions for liberty of conscience the world ever saw. Toleration! Oh, it was their favorite and ever unworn theme, when they wanted to inflict their "levellism" in church and state upon an audience in a cathedral, whose revenues they might spoil as lawfully as Israelites could Egyptians.

Theocracy in China.

Hon. Charles Denby, former United States Minister to China, in The Independent.

The Chinese government has been said to be patriarchal. In its actual administration it is undoubtedly patriarchal. The emperor is sire, and his officers, down to the head man in every village, occupy the position of father, just as a man does of his household. But behind the patriarchal system, and controlling it, is the principle of theocracy. No nation in the world in its administration of the law

*Acuated—the word means, "made sharp as a needle."

acknowledges so directly its responsibilities to the rule of heaven. Judged by governmental acts, nowhere does the deity so completely rule and control the destinies of men as in China. In the greatest, as in the smallest, affairs, heaven sways the conduct of the emperor and all his officials, and the people. When Ching Tang, founder of the Shang dynasty, B. C. 1766, and Wu Wang of the Chau, B. C. 1122, took up arms against the emperors, it was claimed that they had not fulfilled the decrees of heaven, and for that reason they had forfeited their right to the throne. I saw an altar in the Temple of Heaven, which was struck by lightning, burn up. The next day, by an imperial decree, punishment was awarded the guardians of this great edifice because of its destruction. I inquired of a learned Chinese how it was possible for any government to punish an official for the plain and direct act of nature, or of God, in which he had no concern whatever. I was told that heaven would not have destroyed the altar unless a sin had been committed—that some wrong had been done, and it had to be punished by the state.

It was said that even if the guardians had done no wrong, their predecessors must have committed a crime, because the deity would not have destroyed the temple unless somebody had been guilty of wrongdoing. By the same line of reasoning the law of China reconciles with the idea of justice the punishment of the insane. It is freely admitted that an insane person does not know what he is doing—that no moral guilt attaches to his act. Nevertheless, when he murders his father, as sometimes happens, he is condemned to suffer the punishment of the Ling-Chir; that is to say, he is slowly and deliberately cut to pieces by severing one by one his members from his body. This severity is accounted for by the statement that the deity would not have made the man insane unless he, or some one connected with him, had committed a crime, and that crime must be punished.

Among the rulers of the world the Pope alone approaches the Emperor of China in the claim to be the vice-regent of Heaven. They alone interpret the decrees of the deity. No senator of the United States, who ascribes everything that has been done in governmental affairs to the divine command, is more eloquent on that subject than the emperor in his official papers. His ascending the throne is described as his "receiving from heaven and revolving nature the government of the world." In the announcement of his ascent to the dragon seat he proclaims that his predecessor, "the dragon charioteer, became a guest on high." He speaks of the divine utensil devolving on his "contemptible person," and goes on to say that with veneration, "I receive charge of heaven's great concerns."

He is the high priest, too, of his nation. Three miles south of the palace in the Chinese city, the Tien Tan, or altar of heaven, is situated. Here the emperor, accompanied by the princes of his family and his nobles, goes at the winter solstice. On this day the houses on the route are all closed up. The side streets are barred with matting, and the foreigners are requested not to go on the streets which the imperial *cortege* must traverse. If any one peeps he is shot by the guard. In a compound, surrounded by three miles of wall, amid dense groves of locust, pine and fir trees, there is a second wall which surrounds the sacred buildings. As in all temples in the East, there is a copse of enormous old cypress trees, and in the midst of them stands the great south altar. Williams says of it:

"This most important of Chinese religious structures is a beautiful triple circular terrace of white marble, whose base is 210, middle stage 150 and top 90 feet in width, each terrace encompassed by a richly carved balustrade. A curious symbol of the number three and its multiples may be noticed in the measurements of this pile. The uppermost terrace, whose height above the ground is about 18 feet, is paved with marble slabs, forming nine concentric circles—the inner of nine stones inclosing a central piece, and around this each receding layer consists of a successive multiple of nine until the square of nine (a favorite number of Chinese philosophy) is reached in the uttermost row. It is upon the single round stone in the center of the upper platform that the emperor kneels when worshiping heaven and his ancestors at the winter solstice."

Nearby is the great furnace, nine feet high, faced with green porcelain, and ascended on three of its sides by porcelain staircases. In this receptacle is consumed at the yearly ceremony a burnt offering of a bullock entire and without blemish. Formerly the emperor went to the Temple of Heaven in a car drawn by an elephant. The elephant was still in Peking when I was there, but of later years the emperor is carried in a chair borne by sixteen men. He goes first to the Chai-Kung, or "palace of fasting," where he prepares himself by lonely meditation for his duty. His followers likewise prepare themselves for the occasion by fasting, ablution and change of garments.

In the Temple of Heaven there are no signs, placards, images or memorials. With magnificent simplicity, imitating the ancient Jewish rites, as the representative and high-priest of one-fourth of the human family, the emperor worships the unknown god, Shangti. Who was Shangti? Here the layman had better pause. It is not his business to discuss theological questions. The missionaries have worried for many years over this subject. If Shangti was a deity, then his worship bears no resemblance to idolatry, but the religious thinker generally asserts that he was not

an entity, not the Jupiter, nor the Jehovah, but that he represents heaven; that is to say, pantheism. Williams, the great missionary, diplomatist and author, disposes of the question as follows:

"The idea that the Chinese have of heaven seems to be pantheistic, and in worshipping heaven, earth, and terrestrial gods they mean to include and propitiate all superior powers. If, as seems probable, the original idea of Shangti, as it can be imperfectly gleaned from early records, was that of the Supreme intelligence, it has since been lost."

I cannot see how this idea has been lost. As was done six thousand years ago, so to-day the emperor performs the ancient rites, and worships Shangti, and invites him to banquet with his imperial ancestors. Nothing ever changes in China. This is the religion of the state. For the people there are three sects, usually called Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, or rationalism. Among the gentry and literati naturally Confucianism is the most popular, because it is no religion at all; it is simply philosophy. Confucius had little to say about religion. He confined himself to man's duty to his neighbor, and let the gods alone. He did not teach the duty of man to a higher power. In our day he would have been called an agnostic. Williams says:

"He admitted that he did not understand much about the gods, and that the obligations of man lay rather in doing his duties to his relatives and society than in worshipping spirits unknown. 'Not knowing even life,' said he, 'how can we know death?'"

I shall imitate the modesty of Confucius and not undertake to discuss a subject that I know nothing about—the purpose of this article being simply to show how theocratic principles enter into the actual administration of governmental affairs in the Chinese empire.

Among the resolutions adopted at the recent meeting of the W. C. T. U. of Manitoba, held at Portage la Prairie, was this one touching Sunday observance:

Resolved—That we guard our Lord's day, and that we co-operate with the Provincial Lord's Day Alliance in endeavoring to secure better enforcement of the same. That we do our best to assist trainmen in obtaining Sabbath rest by discouraging Sunday traveling, Sunday newspapers, etc., and that we aid, by all the influence we possess, every endeavor to attain this object, not only for trainmen but for merchants, mail clerks, milkmen, and all whom we know are laboring on this day.

The "Provincial Lord's Day Alliance" is an organization formed for the purpose of securing the legal enforcement of Sunday. It is of the same character exactly as the various "Lord's Day" and "Sabbath" unions, associations, and alliances in the United States. The one dominant thought in all of them is to compel by civil law the observance of a religious institution.

NEWS, NOTES AND COMMENT

It is reported that Russian soldiers are perpetrating atrocities on women and children in China.

* * *

Recent events in South Africa indicate that the Boer war is not yet over. Within three weeks the Boers have outgeneraled their opponents in a remarkably skillful manner. Lord Roberts is calling for reinforcements from England, and all the seasoned men available are being sent out to him.

* * *

It is announced that President McKinley's "policy will be to cooperate with the Powers for the relief of the foreigners in Peking if alive, and of punishment of their murders, if dead. The United States will furnish its full quota of men and warships and bear a share in all needed expense, but the United States will not be a party to any alliance hereafter for the dismemberment of China or the acquisition of territory."

* * *

It is now announced that within a few months Cuba is to have "independence," but with limitations:

"1. The foreign relations of Cuba to be managed through the American government at Washington.

"2. Cuba to have no power to declare war without the consent of the United States.

"3. The United States Government to have a veto power over legislation increasing the Cuban debt beyond certain limits to be set forth in the new constitution.

"4. The United States to have a certain well-defined supervision over the Cuban treasury.

"5. The United States to retain for a period of years, if not indefinitely, control of the fortifications which command the port of Havana and other important cities of the republic."

* * *

The Houghton County (Mich.) Ministerial Association has started the boycott on the Houghton Daily Mining Gazette. A dispatch to the Chicago Chronicle says that at numerous churches in the copper district, Sunday, July 22, the services were "devoted to a plea for boycotting this newspaper, which started a Sunday edition four weeks ago and has contumaciously refused to suspend the same at the behest of the allied preachers. At the churches whose pastors preached against Sunday newspapers printed postal cards were distributed for signatures of subscribers

ordering the newspapers stopped immediately. The pastors are now bending their energies toward destroying the circulation of the paper and are personally circulating papers ordering subscriptions discontinued for signatures of all subscribers amenable to pastoral admonition. The newspaper is owned by a stock company, comprised of the leading bankers, mining and professional men of the district."

* * *

German newspapers bitterly arraign President McKinley for his reply to the Chinese request for intervention.

When it was announced that under certain conditions the President would accede to the Chinese appeals, the most moderate of the organs declared Mr. McKinley was presuming too much.

For instance, the Hanover Courier declared that to treat with China in such a manner was treason to the other allies and should result in the enforced withdrawal of American troops from the international force. Had Mr. McKinley not held back the exact conditions on which the American government would interfere, such criticism might not have been offered, but as it is, the German papers continue to denounce the administration.

* * *

The New York Evening Post, speaking of Lord Salisbury's address to the missionaries meeting in London, in which he practically implied that the imprudence of missionaries in China was a contributing cause to the existing troubles, says:

"But one at least of the missionary boards has taken up this challenge of the British premier. The secretary of the China Inland Mission wrote to the press to explain how the rules of his society explicitly directed missionaries to refrain from appealing to British consuls to 'demand the vindication of real or supposed rights.' The regulations add: 'Under no circumstances may any missionary on his own responsibility make any written appeal to the British or other foreign authorities.' The China Inland Mission has been in existence thirty-five years, and in that time has planted one hundred and twenty-five stations in ten of the interior provinces. Its missionaries have gone far beyond the reach of gunboats; yet in all this time only one missionary has lost his life through the violence of the people. On the other hand, British consuls have testified in the most unmistakable terms to the value of the work of the Inland Mission in conciliating the natives, so that they observe a more friendly attitude toward all foreigners. If Lord Salisbury were to apply his cynical analysis to diplomacy in China, and to the seizure of Chinese territory, by nominally Christian nations, he would come nearer the exciting cause of the outbreak."

* * *

Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Bristow's report detailing conditions as he found them in the

Cuban postal service has been made public, and reveals the existence of a state of affairs almost without a parallel. Mr. Bristow does not spare any of the minor thieves like Neely and his confederates. He also makes complete exposure of Rathbone, the director general, who was suspended last month.

Mr. Bristow finds that Neely's embezzlements aggregated at least \$131,713, and says this will be increased by the discovery of additional sales of surcharged stamps, but will not exceed \$150,000 in the aggregate.

Mr. Bristow says he was justified in recommending the removal of Director General Rathbone. There is no doubt that in the matter of unauthorized per diem allowances, personal expenses and warrants cashed and unaccounted for he unlawfully appropriated to his own use money of the Cuban revenues.

* * *

The Chinese doctrine of "public sin," described as follows by a writer in the Forum, is based upon the same wisdom which moves some people in the United States to charge upon others or upon the Government the responsibility for public calamities:

"In China there is a failure in duty known as 'public sin,' which means the sin of an official in allowing calamities such as floods or drouths or famines to visit the people. An officer temporarily deprived of his rank until he should repair the breach in the bank of a river, caused by excessive rains, said to the writer, 'It is difficult to escape public sin.' Li Hung Chang, viceroy of the province, was deprived of his yellow jacket for the same 'sin.' An official had just been appointed to take charge of repairs on the Yellow River, when a more serious breach occurred. In reporting the matter he humbly acknowledged his sin and begged the emperor to fix his punishment. The emperor forgave him for the reason that he had just entered upon his office, and so was not fully responsible for what had taken place."

"Allies Are Now at Odds."

Under this heading, a London dispatch of recent date says:

The latest news from China is very disquieting; it is said that there is considerable dissension among the allies on account of Russia's attempts to control the railway between Taku and Peking. It is reported that the czar's officers have intimated that they intend to control the lines of communication until the war is over. After that they say they will restore the railway to the Chinese.

At the same time the French are said to be endeavoring to obtain a monopoly of the tug-boat service on the Peiho river, with the intention of sharing Russia's complete domination of the right of way to the Chinese capital.

Admiral Seymour and the British residents in Tientsin are said to be in open revolt of the plan proposed by Russia, as they consider it a direct menace to British interests and calculated to interfere seriously with the advance of the Peking expedition.

The mutual jealousy of the great world Powers is the ominous feature of the present situation in the far East, from every standpoint except that of China. It certainly threatens to plunge the world into war. It may result simply in preserving the integrity of Chinese territory.

Cannot Be Secured by Legislation.

It is pleasant to note that among some few at least of those who are laboring for the promotion of Sunday observance it is coming to be recognized that this end cannot be secured by legislation. Thus in the report made by a committee of the Congregational churches of Massachusetts, at the session of the General Association, held recently, we find the following:

"3. It is not worth while for the friends of the Sabbath to look to the legislature of Massachusetts for help. The tendency of recent legislation is to weaken the force of existing Sunday laws. It *may* not be many years before most of them will be swept from the statute books. Our chief confidence must be in the living God and in enlightened and quickened Christian sentiment. Old, threadbare truths and principles must somehow be freshened in the public mind. Frequent reiteration in the pulpit, in the Sunday-school, in the prayer-meeting, in the Christian Endeavor Societies, of the claims of the Lord's day upon the individual, upon the church, upon the state, and upon the community, is absolutely indispensable. It must be 'line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little.' The educational process is the most potent and hopeful factor in the problem."

By all means let the battle for the preservation of Sabbath observance and for the claims of one day as against another, be fought out by appeals to the intellect and the heart, and not by appeal to force. Force never settled any question; force has no rightful place save where the question has been already settled. The question of Sabbath observance, as to its necessity and the day to be set apart thereby, is an unsettled one, save as each individual has settled it for himself. When force steps into the arena of intellectual controversy it only adds distracting elements which make the situation worse than it was before. Truth asks no aid from force. It will win in the end, and the use of force in the contest would only delay the hour of victory.

Let the friends of the Sabbath cease looking to legislatures, and look to the Lord; let them cease petitioning legislatures, and petition the divine throne.

Then will they be enabled to make real progress toward the final establishment of Sabbath observance in the earth, though the settlement of the controversy may not come in the way which they had planned.

The Evils Will Remain.

It is thought by some that the contest now going on in the Established Church of England, between Ritualists and anti-Ritualists is hastening disestablishment. "The Ritualists," says the Outlook, "are represented by an extremely aggressive militant organization called the English Church Union. The union has just issued a protest against the decision of the Archbishops [against Ritualism] and although there is in the protest only a veiled hint of what may be done in case the protest is of no avail, the unpromising members of the union declare that, if their particular interpretation of the Prayer-Book is to be denounced by the courts, it would be better to have disestablishment at once. Though by no means a Ritualistic organ, The Outlook agrees to this opinion. The Ritualists are really doing what the Nonconformists have done in other days and are doing today—they are upholding the Protestant tradition, that is, the right of private judgment; and that right logically involves, sooner or later, separation of church and state. The protest of the English Church Union is not likely to delay but to accelerate disestablishment."

But whatever may be true of the legal status of any particular ecclesiastical organization in England, that country will never be free from practical church and state union. It may be that some of the grosser features of such union, such as direct financial support of the clergy, will be done away, but the more subtle evils will remain forever.

The Question Answered.

The Torch of Reason says: "If there is a good God he should let honest Freethinkers know that he exists; the fact that he does not, proves that he is not."

This question was answered long since, and the answer the editor of the Torch of Reason may read in Paul's letter to the Romans, Chap. 2, verse 20: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by [perceived through, R. V.] the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so they are without excuse." "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork."

To prove that "one day in seven" is necessary for rest, is not to prove that there should be laws for rest on Sunday.

Would Probably Be Prosecuted.

A reader in a State having an iron-clad Sunday law without "the usual exemption" in favor of those "who keep another day," sends us several newspaper clippings—reading notices of Sunday excursions, which he says are well patronized by many of the best church people of that place. "And the ministers never say anything against them. I do not think they dare to. I do not know what some of their members would do if a seventh-day keeper should do some work on Sunday."

Well, judging by what has been done in other places, the Sabbatarian would be prosecuted. It is true that persons who are not Sabbatarians are sometimes prosecuted for Sunday work, but they are not half as likely to be thus prosecuted as are those who keep the seventh day. The reason is not far to seek. Sunday work coupled with Sabbath-keeping is a practical protest against the dogma of Sunday sacredness. It is not the Sunday work that "hurts" so much as it is the keeping of another day.

Dr. Crafts On the Army Canteen.

Dr. W. F. Crafts, not unknown to the readers of The Sentinel, has this to say about the Army canteen:

"Numerous papers are arguing that the administration has done a beneficent work in nullifying the anti-canteen law on the ground that the beer-selling canteen keeps soldiers from whiskey selling 'dives' outside. No proof is given that at any specific place the outside saloon has been displaced—in fact they have increased—but the sufficient and crushing answer is that where most of our soldiers have been through all this anti-canteen controversy, in Manila, Cuba, and Porto Rico, the President and War Department have had full control of saloons on the outside as well as inside."

Dr. Crafts, if we mistake not, wrote the anti-canteen bill, which, after it became law, was "repealed" by the United States Attorney-General. The friends of the law, blame the President, not for the decision against the law but for accepting without question a decision so clearly without any substantial foundation. It would seem that a law could not be made more explicit than the anti-canteen act.

There are certain duties which men are bound to render to "Caesar"—the state—and certain other duties also which men are bound to render to God. Matt. 22:15-20. If men fail to render to God that which is his, they commit a grievous wrong, but this does not confer upon the state authority to step in and command those things which have been withheld from the Lord. If our children fail to show to us that love and respect and obedience which is our due from them, our neighbor across the street may be shocked, but he is not thereby authorized to step in with a club

and compel our ungrateful children to perform their duty. We would resent such an intrusion, and no more is our divine Parent pleased that the state should step in and command from his earthly children, under threat of legal penalties, the performance of any act showing love and reverence for him. Such an offering to the Lord would be only an insult. "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." The most that the state can do therefore in enjoining upon men the duty of Sabbath observance, can result only in their offering to God that which is abomination in his sight.

An Iowa paper says that "the question of Sunday baseball playing is receiving considerable attention in Des Moines at present, and two or three arrests have been made."

The fact that baseball and other games are prohibited on Sunday equally with labor and business, proves conclusively the religious motive back of them. The much-talked-of "civil Sabbath" is simply a religious institution enforced by civil law.

The *great* objection to the Sunday paper on the part of the believers in Sunday sacredness, is not the fact that some Sunday work is done in producing the paper. The amount of work actually done on a Sunday paper on Sunday, is much smaller than the work done on the Monday paper. The *great* objection to the Sunday paper is that so many people read it instead of going to church. It is in this respect a rival of the preacher; and the average Sunday preacher feels that he has a divine right to a monopoly of the day. While he does not ask the government directly to compel the people to go to church, he does demand that civil laws shall be so framed and administered as to reduce to the minimum the possibility of going anywhere else on Sunday. Of course very many people, if shut up to the choice of spending the entire day at home or going to church would go to church.

The Hong-Kong correspondent of the New York World, writing to that paper under date of June 12, says that "the American troops are practicing in spots in the Philippines a policy beside which a bandit law is a tame affair." The authorities, he explains, have decided that "the rebellion must be 'kept down' and in spite of peace proclamations the soldiers resort to horrible measures with the natives."

Continuing his seemingly almost incredible story, the World's correspondent says:

"Since the war was officially declared to be ended we have killed more Filipinos than the Spaniards did in both rebellions. Captains and lieutenants are sometimes accusers, judges and executioners. If half a dozen natives, more or less, are shot on suspicion of being our enemies, no news of it reaches the military governor, who wants none."

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 year 55 cents

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

ADDRESS,

SENTINEL OF LIBERTY,

324 Dearborn Street, - - CHICAGO, ILL.



Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, \$3 a year; four months, \$1. Sold by all newsdealers. **MUNN & Co., 361 Broadway, New York**
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

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.

THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

The International Religious Liberty Association.

The following numbers are now ready:

No. 1.

THE LEGAL SUNDAY.

This is one of the most faithful and interesting histories of the "American Sabbath" ever written.

256 pages. Enameled Covers. Price 25 cents.

No. 2.

Is Religious Liberty Imperiled by Sunday Laws?

The best thing on this subject ever printed.

Twelve pages. Price 1 cent.

No. 3.

THE NATIONAL W. C. T. U. CONVENTION.

Seattle, Wash., Oct. 25, 1899.

Report of Religious Liberty discussion, with prefatory note and conclusion by Mrs. S. M. I. Henry, National W. C. T. U. Evangelist; together with other matter bearing upon the question at issue, all selected, approved and arranged by Mrs. Henry.

Thirty pages. Price 2 cents.

No. 4.

THE PRESENT CRISIS AND OUR DUTY.

A most timely treatise on a live topic.

Thirty-six pages. Price 2¼ cents.

No. 5.

The National Government and Religion.

A sixteen page tract containing both the Congressional Sunday mail reports quoted in AMERICAN STATE PAPERS. These reports have never been printed before in cheap form.

Price 1 cent.

No. 6.

Primary Principles Distinguishing Between the Spheres of the State and Religion.

Nothing better has ever been written on this subject.

Fourteen pages. Price 1 cent.

No. 7.

THE CONFLICT OF THE AGES.

By GEORGE E. FIFIELD.

An excellent tract.


Fourteen Pages. Price 1 cent.

Address,

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION,

324 Dearborn Street,

CHICAGO, ILL.



CHICAGO, AUGUST 2, 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 latest report from China asserts that the Chinese are holding the European and American envoys as hostages, pending negotiation for cessation of hostilities.

King Humbert of Italy was shot and killed at Monza, last Sunday evening. The king had been attending a distribution of prizes in connection with a gymnastic competition. He had just entered his carriage with his aid de camp amid the cheers of the crowd when he was struck by three revolver shots, fired in quick succession. One pierced the heart of his majesty, who fell back and expired in a few minutes. The assassin was immediately arrested and with some difficulty saved from the fury of the populace.

Last week a Negro desperado in New Orleans shot and killed a policeman. A mob gathered to execute summary vengeance, and the result is that thirteen persons are dead, including the policeman, first shot; and about forty are more or less seriously wounded, several fatally, it is thought. One perfectly innocent Negro woman was shot by the mob in her own home, and a large Negro school building was burned. The Negro desperado was at last discovered hidden in a house, which was finally set on fire and burned to dislodge him. Before being killed himself, the hunted man fatally shot six of his assailants.

It now seems almost certain that the Chinese government and not irresponsible rebels, merely, is at war with practically the whole world.

All the Powers concerned seem to be of the opinion that notwithstanding official reports to the contrary emanating from Chinese sources, all the foreign representatives in Peking have been murdered. There appears to be no reasonable ground for thinking otherwise.

As might readily be imagined, no event of modern times has so stirred the world as has this monstrous

crime against civilization. Troops are being sent to China as rapidly as possible by the Powers most deeply interested. In despatching a number of troops to China last Friday, Emperor William is reported to have said to them:

"If you meet the enemy you will defeat him; give no quarter; make no prisoners; let whoever falls in your hands be doomed. Just as a thousand years ago the Huns, under their King Etzel, made for themselves a name, which to this day is a mighty one in tradition, so may your appearance make the name German be feared for a thousand years in China, so never again will a Chinaman dare to look askance at any German."

Emperor William further explained that every heathen cult, even if it were the most beautiful, must succumb to the first actual trial of strength. He also expressed the hope that this war would carry Christendom into all China.

It is admitted that the provocation is great, but to the credit of the European press be it said that outside of Germany the Emperor's utterance has been severely criticized.

One of the most interesting articles in the Ladies' Home Journal for August is "Why I Am Opposed to Pies," by Mrs. S. T. Rorer. "In my close observation in the last twenty years," writes Mrs. Rorer, "I find very few people in our common struggle for existence who can for any length of time eat carelessly of complex foods. At forty or fifty a man may perhaps have accumulated wealth, but not health; and of what earthly use is the first without the second? Many persons in the generation gone before have eaten pies at least once a day, but they have not had meat three times a day, nor have they rushed at our pace. They gave more time to the digestion of the pie. People who recommend these rich foods rarely know anything of their complex conditions, and still less of the complexity of digestion."

Number 9 of the Religious Liberty Library is now ready. It is one of our best religious liberty tracts, and ought to have a wide circulation. It is entitled, "Christian Citizenship, or the Moral Regeneration of Society." This is a topic upon which very many people are ready to read, and this tract is just what every one ought to have. It can be had at only 60 cents per hundred. Order of the International Religious Library Association, or of your Tract Society.

Legislation may preserve the forms pertaining to a religious institution, but it cannot preserve the spirit of life within them, without which the institution is a dead letter. This applies to all Sabbath legislation.