

LF 5085

THE

CAPTIVITY OF THE REPUBLIC

A REPORT OF

HEARING BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COLUMBIAN
EXPOSITION, JANUARY 10-13, 1893

AND THE PRESENT STATUS AND EFFECT OF
THE LEGISLATION ON

SUNDAY CLOSING OF THE WORLD'S FAIR

“Secular power has proved a satanic gift to the Church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the State.”—*Philip Schaff*.

BY ALONZO T. JONES

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION

1893

To the
more than 350,000 citizens
of the United States
who signed their names to the petition on page 4
this report is addressed
and
RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

CAPTIVITY OF THE REPUBLIC.

FEBRUARY, 1863, there was begun an organized movement by a religious combination, composed of the "evangelical" churches of the country, to get the government of the United States committed by direct legislation to a recognition of "the Christian religion," and a national adoption and enforcement of Sunday as "the Christian Sabbath," or Lord's day. They proposed first to accomplish their purpose by an amendment to the national Constitution, declaring this to be a "Christian nation," and "so placing all Christian laws, institutions, and usages upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

In 1888, May 21, Senator H. W. Blair introduced "A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship." And the 25th of the same month he introduced a joint resolution to amend the national Constitution so as to establish "the principles of the Christian religion" as the religion of the nation. These two pieces of legislation embodied the wishes of this religious combination; and immediately there was a strong effort made all over the country to secure the passage of the measures,—especially the bill establishing and enforcing the observance of Sunday.

To this movement in all its phases and all its purposes, we have been uncompromisingly opposed from its very beginning. Accordingly, as soon as these measures were proposed in Congress, we took steps to counteract it as far as possible. In order to reach Congress the most effectually, we circulated a petition, which was in effect, and was intended to be, a remonstrance against anything of the kind forever. That petition runs as follows : —

“*To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States* [Duplicate to the House of Representatives] :

“We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite ; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the national Constitution, that would in any way tend, either directly or indirectly, to give preference to the principles of any religion or of any religious body above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion ; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by the national Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.”

The Breckinridge bill to establish compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, by act of Congress, and also a bill to prohibit the delivery of ice in the District of Columbia on Sunday, were opposed in the same way.

To this petition, or remonstrance, we obtained more than *three hundred and fifty thousand bona-fide* individual signatures. By these and diligent efforts before congressional committees, the Blair legislation was delayed till it died, and the Breckinridge bill was defeated.

When the demand was made by this religious combination (which was now grown so as to embrace all the leading religious bodies in the country) that Congress should close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, this too was opposed with the former protests, and with the following one direct : —

“We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, hereby respectfully, but decidedly, protest against the Congress of the United States committing the United States Government to a union of religion and the State, in the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World’s Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation.”

A hearing was held by the House Committee having the matter in charge, April, 1892, at which we presented arguments on the line of these protests.

While we were circulating these petitions, many men were met who would not believe that there was enough of importance to the matter to sign their names to the petition, even when they believed that the petition was all right in itself. They would say, “I believe all that; but it is not of enough importance to pay any attention to. I would not take the time to sign my name to it, although I am in favor of all you are saying. No such thing as that will ever be done. There is not a bit of danger of it.” And because there were so many of that kind of people who did not believe that it would ever be done, it *was* done. And when they found out it was done, they began to try to have it undone. They began to wake up to see that they were mistaken, and that it had been done; and then seeing their mistake, they began trying to retrieve it by asking that the World’s Fair should be open on Sunday.

But our petitions could no more be used for opening the Fair on Sunday than for shutting it on Sunday, as they were against Congress ever having anything to do with the question of Sunday in any way; and for the additional reason that the reasons given for congressional action in opening the Fair were precisely the reasons that had been given for congressional action in closing the Fair. The Fair was closed for religious reasons only; and the same religious reasons were given for opening it. Therefore as our petitions and our work were against Congress ever touching any religious

question, or any religious observance, or any religious institution, for *any reason*; and against its ever touching any question for *religious* reasons; it followed that neither our petitions nor our work could be cast for *opening* the Fair, any more than for *shutting* the Fair. Our petitions and our work were all, and always, against Congress having anything to do with the question in any way, *on constitutional grounds and for constitutional reasons*. And when Congress had taken the step, and had done what it did, our petitions and our work were to have Congress take back the step and undo what had been done, *because* the step that had been taken and that which had been done, *was wholly unconstitutional*. So that our work, our petitions, and our principles were the same from beginning to end.

REASONS FOR OPENING.

The organized movement for *opening* the Fair on Sunday originated in Chicago. The Chicago *Herald* started it, and the city council of Chicago took it up, and drafted a memorial to Congress, which the city council, with the mayor at its head, as representatives from the city of Chicago, took to Washington, and presented, the first day of four days' hearing. This memorial had the endorsement also of the Directory of the Fair. Some of the reasons that were given upon which they asked that the Fair should be opened on Sunday, we will now give:—

“The wish of the Council is,—

“That the gates of the World's Columbian Exposition be not closed Sunday.

“That all machinery be stopped, and that noise be suppressed that day, *to the end* that quiet may prevail; which is in keeping with the Sabbath.”

That recognizes Sunday as the Sabbath, and of course there is a certain “quiet” that becomes it; and they wanted it open with the machinery stopped “that this quiet may

prevail." That is the same reason that the other folks gave why it should be shut on Sunday.

"That suitable accommodations be provided within the Exposition grounds for holding *religious services the Sabbath-day, to the end* that all the denominations may have worship conducted according to their several customs without obstruction or hindrance."

That is the same reason that the other folks wanted it shut—only that they want to have "religious services" *in their churches.*

"We recognize and rejoice in the fact that our country is and always has been a Christian nation."

And the leading reason urged by the churches for *closing* it, is that "this is a Christian nation."

"We believe that the United States *as a Christian country,* should open the gates Sunday as a recognition of the fact that in no branch of human interest or thought has there been more progress during that four hundred years of time than in the Christian Church."

That is exactly the reason that the other folks gave for shutting it: that the United States, "as a Christian nation," should shut the Fair on Sunday "as a recognition of the advancement made in Christian ideas."

"Would it not be a good thing to throw the sanctity of religious worship about the great temple dedicated to the things of use and beauty?"

And the reason given for shutting the Fair was that it would be a good thing to throw "the sanctity of religious worship" about *the whole Fair,* by shutting the gates entirely.

So you can see, the reasons that were given for opening it are precisely the reasons that were given for shutting it.

The *Chicago Tribune,* in mentioning the letter that Cardinal Gibbons wrote on the subject, introduced it in this form, in its issue of Dec. 3, 1892:—

"There is a strong and growing sentiment in some religious circles in favor of the repeal of the World's Fair Sunday-closing act. One eminent

divine after another is coming out in favor of this liberal movement. The possibilities for a series of religious demonstrations at the Park become more and more manifest. With the leading religious and moral teachers of Europe and America to conduct services every Sunday, with sacred music produced by choruses embracing, perhaps, thousands of trained voices, Sunday at the World's Fair will be *one of the grandest recognitions of the Sabbath* known to modern history."

So the other folks said, if the Fair be closed on Sunday, and the solemnity of the Sabbath overspreads it, and this nation sets the grand example of the recognition of the Sabbath, it will be "one of the grandest exhibitions of the Sabbath known to modern history."

More than this, those who worked for the opening of the Fair courted the Church interests precisely as the others did in working for the shutting of it.

As soon as these things appeared in print, I wrote a letter to Mr. Allen Moon, who had charge of our petitions and work in Washington, sending him these marked passages; and I said to him: "You can readily see that the reasons that are given by these people for opening the Fair are precisely the reasons that were given for shutting it. Now that being so, for us to join with them would be to recognize the legitimacy of the legislation and the reasons for the legislation, whereas every one of these reasons is directly against everything that we have been working for all these years in Congress. So this makes it plain enough that we cannot put a single one of our petitions along with theirs." We cannot take a single step along with them; we cannot work with them at all, or connect with them in any way in the way they are working, or upon the reasons which they give for opening the Fair. We will have to maintain the position that the legislation is not, and never was, right at all. The only thing we can do therefore is to hold that the thing ought to be undone. The only position which we can take is that the Sunday part of the legislation should be unconditionally repealed."

Mr. Moon immediately replied that he had seen these statements in the Chicago Memorial, and had already taken the position that I spoke of in my letter. At the same time I wrote an article which appeared in the *American Sentinel*, December, 15 1892, setting forth the same facts and taking the same position; saying:—

“Another significant phase of the contest is, that while Archbishops Ireland, Gross, and Riordan, of the Catholic Church, favor Sunday closing of the Fair, Cardinal Gibbons and other archbishops favor Sunday opening. While most of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and ministers of other professed Protestant churches demand Sunday closing, Bishop Potter, of the Protestant Episcopal Church and other prominent ministers of that and other so-called Protestant churches, demand Sunday opening. But whether the demand be for Sunday closing or for Sunday opening of the Fair, it is made by all these in the interests of Sunday, to promote its observance and the more to exalt it as the great ‘Christian’ institution.

“The conclusion of the whole matter is, that instead of there being a movement to have Congress abandon the usurpation which it has practiced, unconditionally repeal this unconstitutional legislation, and take its position again where alone it belongs, this is a movement to have Congress continue its usurpation, multiply its unconstitutional legislation, and confirm itself in the unlawful position which it has taken. Instead of insisting that Congress can never of right have anything at all to do in any way with the question as to whether Sunday should be observed at all or not, this is only an effort to have Congress decide what will best and most powerfully promote the observance of that day which Congress has already unconstitutionally and irreverently decided is ‘the Christian Sabbath.’

“This movement and the legislation which it demands is just as much in the interest of the church power, and is just as much to please this power, as was the original legislation of Congress on the subject. And the effect which it will have—the only effect which it can have—is only the more fully to confirm in the hands of the church power, the governmental authority of which that lawless power has already robbed the people.

“Because of all these facts the *American Sentinel* takes no part in this Sunday-opening campaign. Our position is just what it always has been. We do not, and never did, care the scratch of a pen whether the World’s Fair be open or shut on Sundays. We *do* care, and always have cared, more than can be told, whether the question should be decided by legislation; and whether the government should thus be surrendered into the hands of the church power. Against this we have always protested and

worked with all our might, both before and since it was done. Our demand is that all Sunday legislation of all kinds everywhere be unconditionally repealed. But there is no possibility of this ever being done anywhere. This we know, consequently our position is one of positive, uncompromising and everlasting *protest* against all that has been done, against all that is being done, and against all that ever shall be done, by law, in behalf of Sunday; whether to open the Fair, or to close the Fair, or anything else under the sun."

PRELIMINARIES TO THE HEARING.

Upon this, Mr. Moon told the chairman of the committee and the gentlemen who were managing that side of the question in Washington, that neither we nor our petitions could be counted at all in connection with the movement for Sunday opening, as such. The chairman of the committee asked Mr. Moon what our position was. He told the committee what our position was, and how many petitions we had there. Of course all the names that were gathered upon that first petition, nearly four hundred thousand, were just as good for this day as they were at first. They are *everlastingly* against the whole thing. When Mr. Moon told him what our position was, and the reasons for it, the chairman said to him in substance: "You write out your position as regards this legislation, and I will present it as a bill, in the House, so as to give you a basis upon which to present your petitions, and for your arguments to be heard." Mr. Moon, in that room, dictated to Mr. Thompson of Chicago, what we desired, and Chairman Durborow introduced it with his own name on it. Following is the bill:—

"52d CONGRESS, }
2d SESSION. } H. RES. 177.

"In the House of Representatives, Dec. 20, 1892. Referred to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition and ordered to be printed.

"Mr. Durborow introduced the following joint resolution:—

"Joint Resolution to repeal the religious legislation pertaining to the World's Columbian Exposition.

"Whereas, The United States Constitution specifically states that 'Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;' Therefore be it—

“Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the act of Congress approved August fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety-two, appropriating five millions of Columbian half dollars to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, by holding an International Exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, and sea in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, on the condition that the said Exposition shall not be opened to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and also that section four of ‘an act to aid in carrying out the act of Congress’ approved April twenty-fifth, eighteen hundred and ninety, entitled ‘An act to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, by holding an international exposition of the arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mine, and sea in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois,’ be, and the same is hereby amended so as to leave the matter of Sunday observance entirely within the power of the regularly constituted authorities of the World’s Columbian Exposition.”

It being understood that this bill was introduced with the understanding and for the express purpose of opening the way for us to present our petitions, and to be heard upon the question as we regarded it, we proceeded upon that idea. The arrangement for the hearing was made. Mr. Moon tells me that if the hearing could have been had before Christmas, he is perfectly satisfied that we would have been fully and fairly heard upon the principles which we hold, and which are expressed in this bill. But the hearing was not appointed until after the holidays, and Congress took a recess during the holidays, and when Congress reconvened, it was discovered that the chairman of that committee was another man altogether. Something caused him to repudiate all that he had done in this connection and shut out the principle embodied in that resolution, which he himself had introduced in order that we might be heard.

Dr. Lewis, the Seventh-day Baptist, went to Congress to be heard. He told me that he went to Mr. Durborow, the chairman of the committee, and asked to be heard. Mr. Durborow asked him what he represented, and what his argument was to be. Mr. Lewis told him that it would be upon

the point of the unconstitutionality of the legislation already adopted by Congress. Mr. Durborow told him that the committee had decided not to hear any arguments at all upon the *principle*, but only upon the *policy*, of the legislation; not to consider any question at all as to whether it was constitutional or not, but that Congress had done it, and it was presumed that Congress had the right to do it. And any mention as to the propriety of the legislation, would be entirely left out, and it was only to be considered now as to whether it would be better policy for the country to open the Fair or shut it on the Sunday that had been adopted by Congress.

When that was done, Dr. Lewis had nothing at all to say, and made no calculation to say anything. But the third day, and among the last minutes of the day, Mr. Durborow called upon him to speak, giving him five minutes. Dr. Lewis told him that he did not have anything to say, that he did not have his documents with him, and that he had no intention to speak under the circumstances. But Mr. Durborow rather insisted that he should, that he had five minutes to occupy if he chose. So he occupied them, though in a rather perfunctory way.

Samuel P. Putnam was there for the same purpose, having several thousands of petitions in his pocket. He is president of the Free Thought Federation of America. He went to Mr. Durborow for a portion of time to be appointed him, and he received the same information; that any arguments as to the constitutionality of the question, or the principle involved, were not to be considered at all, but only the policy of the legislation. That being so, Mr. Putnam made no further request. But he likewise was called upon to speak, but was given only a very few minutes, which he occupied as best he could.

I did not reach Washington long enough beforehand to learn all this. Mr. Moon knew it, but I did not have a chance to talk with him. My train was late, and I arrived

there only in time, by hurrying, to reach the committee room as the hearing was opened. So I did not have time to learn anything about the situation at all. After several speeches had been made, Mr. Thompson, of Chicago, came to me and asked me if I would take the balance of the time that day,—the last half hour. As I had written to Mr. Moon that whatever arrangements they should make, I would conform to when I got there, I supposed that was the arrangement, although it was not, strictly. I told Mr. Thompson that if they thought best, I would speak that day, but I would like to wait until after the American Sabbath Union had spoken; but if they would rather, I would take the time. And so when I began, I began on the only thing I knew; namely, to call in question the legislation. But that was the thing the chairman had decided not to have discussed. I noticed immediately that he was very restless. But I did not know what was the matter. It is true that the chairman made a statement in opening the hearing that I understand now, but did not fully then. He said:—

“The meeting to-day will be held for the purpose of giving a hearing to those favoring the legislation that is before the committee. I think it would be proper to state to the committee that the present case is somewhat different from the case as presented a year ago; and that the proposition before the committee is to *modify existing* law, not *create* law, as was the proposition a year ago. Therefore the discussion before the committee on this occasion it is expected *will be held very closely* within the lines of *modification* presented in the resolution before the committee, copies of which are on the desk, and which can be furnished to you, which provides for *the modification* of the closing of the gates of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday, by permitting them to be opened under restrictions as stated in these resolutions.”

That expression, “not to create law,” was the statement that I did not understand then, but do now.

It was fortunate, in another sense, that I spoke that half hour, because there was no time afterward when I could have had a half hour. The longest time occupied by anybody after

that was about twenty-five minutes, and the most of the fifty-seven speakers had only an average of about ten minutes allowed them.

Although the chairman shut out the argument I was making upon the Constitution, yet other members of the committee asked questions until the whole half hour was consumed; and every one of their questions was presented in such a way that I was compelled to strike the Constitution and the unconstitutionality of what they had done, in answering the questions, and so the argument they wanted to shut out was presented in spite of the efforts of the chairman. And the very things that he refused to listen to from us, on other points, were presented by others, in a great deal stronger way than we should or could have stated them. My argument before the committee was as follows:—

ARGUMENT OF ALONZO T. JONES.

Mr. Durborow.—You have just thirty minutes left, Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jones.—Mr. Chairman, I expect to speak in favor of this legislation that is now before the committee for a larger number of reasons than could be given in the half hour which I may have to speak; but I shall endeavor to touch upon such reasons as have not been dwelt upon very particularly hitherto. I shall start with one that has been touched by Mayor Washburne to some extent, but which may be referred to a little more fully, and then I shall go from that to the consideration of other points.

My first point is that this subject, of whether the gates of the World's Fair shall be closed or opened on Sunday, is a subject with which the national government has nothing at all to do. It is entirely beyond its jurisdiction in any sense whatever. There are three distinct considerations—

Mr. Robinson.—What church do you belong to?

Mr. Jones.—I do not see what that has to do with the question.

Mr. Durborow.—The gentleman certainly has the right to ask the question.

Mr. Jones.—Is he a member of the committee?

Mr. Durborow.—Yes, sir.

Mr. Jones.—Very well; I beg your pardon; I did not know that the gentleman was a member of the committee. I am perfectly willing to answer the question, though I cannot see what bearing it has upon this discussion.¹ I am a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. But I speak here to-day as a citizen of the United States, and upon the principles of the government of the United States. And I may say further that in the way that Congress has touched this question, I may probably speak upon it as a Seventh-day Adventist; as Congress has entered the field of religion already, we have the right to follow it there, if necessity should require.

What I was about to say is that three distinct considerations in the Constitution of the United States forbid Congress to touch this question. The first is well defined by George Bancroft in a letter which he wrote to Dr. Philip Schaff, Aug. 30, 1887, which reads as follows:—

“My dear Mr. Schaff: I have yours of the 12th. By the Constitution no power is held by Congress, except such as shall have been granted to it. Congress therefore from the beginning was as much without the power to make a law respecting the establishment of religion, as it is now after the amendment has been passed. The power had not been granted, and therefore did not exist, for Congress has no powers except such as are granted; but a feeling had got abroad that there should have been a bill of rights, and therefore to satisfy the craving, a series of articles were framed in the nature of a bill of rights, not because such a declaration was needed, but because the people wished to see certain principles distinctly put forward as a part of the Constitution. The First Amendment, so far as it relates to an establishment of religion, was proposed without passion, accepted in the

¹ Church membership is not a qualification for a hearing before a committee of the Congress of the United States.

several States without passion, and so found its place as the opening words of the amendments in the quietest manner possible. . . .

“GEORGE BANCROFT.”¹

This is shown also by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which says that “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” As no power has been granted to Congress on the subject of religion, *that* is reserved to the States or to the people. That is where we ask that this shall be left,—just where the Constitution has left it. It is a question reserved to the States. It is for the State of Illinois alone, so far as any State can have anything to say upon the subject, to say whether that Fair shall be opened or shut on Sunday. • If the State of Illinois should not say anything on the subject, it is still left with the people. It is for the people in their own capacity as such, to act as they please in the matter, without any interference or dictation by Congress.

Not only is this so on that point, but if the Constitution had not said a word on the subject of religion, there would have been no power in Congress to touch this question. But the people have spoken; the Constitution has spoken, and denied the right of the United States government to touch the question, and has reserved that right to the States or to the people. Not only did it do that, but it went farther, and actually prohibited the government of the United States from touching the question. This lack of power would have been complete and total without the prohibition, because the powers not delegated are reserved. But the people went farther, and not only reserved this power, but expressly prohibited Congress from exercising it. It is trebly unconstitutional for Congress to touch the question. It was so at the beginning of the government, and this is why we insist that this legisla-

¹ Schaff's “Church and State in the United States,” p. 137.

tion shall be undone, and leave the whole matter where the Constitution has left it,—to the States or to the people.

Mr. Houk.—The language of the Constitution, I believe, is that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion.

Mr. Jones.—I was going to follow this question a little farther, and notice that amendment. The amendment does not read, as it is often misquoted, “Congress shall make no law respecting *the* establishment of religion; but “Congress shall make no law respecting *an* establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” There are two meanings in this clause. When the Constitution was made, all that it said upon this subject was that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” Some of the States had established religions at the time; I think all except Virginia. Virginia had released herself in a campaign directly touching this question. The first part of the clause was intended to prohibit Congress from making any law respecting any of these religions which were established already in those States, and the second part of the clause prohibits Congress from touching the subject of religion on its own part, in any way. In the State of Virginia, from 1776,—with the exception of the interval when the war was highest,—to Dec. 26, 1787, there was a campaign conducted over the same question that is now involved in this legislation.

The English Church was the established church in Virginia, and the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and the Baptists sent a memorial to the General Assembly of Virginia, asking that as the Colonies had declared themselves free and independent of British rule in civil things, so the State of Virginia should declare itself free from British rule in religious things, and that they should not be taxed to support a religion which they did not believe, nor even any religion which they did

believe. And the English Church was disestablished. Then a movement was made to establish the "Christian religion," and to legislate in favor of the "Christian religion," by passing a bill establishing a provision for teachers of that religion. Madison and Jefferson took the opposition to that bill, and by vigorous efforts defeated it, and in its place secured the passage of a bill "establishing religious freedom in Virginia," which is the model of all the State Constitutions from that day to this, on the subject of religion and the State.

Now, then, that campaign in Virginia against the establishment of the Christian religion there, embodied the same principle that is involved in this legislation of to-day. And as that was distinctly shut out, so we ask that this shall be also, and Congress and the government step back to the place where it was before and where it belongs. Madison went right out of that campaign into the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, and carried with him into that convention the principles which he had advocated in this campaign, and put those principles into the United States Constitution; and the intention of all was, and is, that Congress shall have nothing at all to do with the subject of religious observances.

Washington, in 1797, made a treaty with Tripoli, which explicitly declared that "the government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion." And when Congress has legislated upon this question with direct reference to the Christian religion, therein again it has gone contrary to the express intent of those who made the Constitution and established the supreme law, as expressed in their own words. And for this reason we ask that the thing shall be undone, and Congress put the government right back where it was before that legislation was established, and leave the question where it belongs.

Mr. Durborow.—Your objections are simply constitutional?

Mr. Jones.—There are some others, but the foundation of all is the unconstitutionality of it. Those who sent up the petitions here, and those who worked for the movement in this Capitol, knew that it was unconstitutional when they asked it. A gentleman¹ who spent six months at this Capitol for this legislation, has argued for more than twenty-five years, in print and in speech, that any Sunday legislation by Congress, or legislation in behalf of the Christian Sabbath, would be unconstitutional. And yet he worked here six months to get Congress to do that without any change in the Constitution. For twenty-five years, he, with the Association to which he belongs, has been working to get an amendment to the Constitution recognizing the Christian religion and making this a “Christian nation,” so that there would be a constitutional basis for Sunday legislation. But now in the face of that twenty-five years’ history and work, and in the face of their own arguments, they have gone right ahead and got Congress to do it, when they knew it was unconstitutional.

Another reason why we ask the repeal of it is that it was secured upon false representations. The representations which they made to Congress in order to secure this legislation were all false. They represented before Congress that the mass of the people of the United States were in favor of their cause, which has been demonstrated over and over to be false. It was forcibly demonstrated in the city of Chicago not quite a month ago. There the American Sabbath Union held a convention,—a national convention. They had four mass-meetings the first night of the time in which the convention was held. One of those mass-meetings I attended. It was reported in the Chicago papers, of which I have copies

¹Rev. H. H. George, of Beaver Falls, Pa.

here. I will read the Chicago report of it, so that it will be seen that I have not put any of my feelings into it. The Chicago *Tribune* of Dec. 14, 1892, had this report:—

‘IT WAS VOTED DOWN.

“The American Sabbath Union suffered a defeat last night at one of its meetings, which so surprised the leaders present, that the incident was a veritable sensation. It was an unexpected blow, and the more grievous because it was administered by one of the most sabbatarian of all Christian denominations.”

Mr. Jones.— This was not the first instance of the kind, as some present here will remember.

Rev. W. F. Crafts.— That’s a good joke.

“The Union opened a national convention here yesterday afternoon, and made arrangements for four mass-meetings throughout the city last night to forward the movement. One of these meetings was held at the M. E. Church, South Park Ave., and 33d St. It was a small mass-meeting, but everything went on smoothly for a time, and the ‘American Sabbath’ had everything its own way. Dr. H. H. George, a leader in the movement, Mr. Locke, and others advocated the closing of the World’s Fair on Sunday, and vigorously denounced the efforts of the directors and of the mayor and city council to have Congress repeal the closing act. These speeches were warmly if not unanimously approved by frequent amens and clapping of hands. No one looked for any opposition, and so the following resolutions were drawn up in a confident and emphatic manner:—

“‘*Whereas*, We are informed by the Chicago press that our City Council, through the influence of Mayor Washburne, has appointed a committee of its members to go to Washington for the purpose of influencing Congress to reverse its action with reference to closing the World’s Fair on Sunday; and,

“‘*Whereas*, The Chicago directors have opened headquarters in Washington for the same purpose, notwithstanding the acceptance of two and one half million dollars appropriation from Congress on the express conditions that the gates should not be opened to the public on Sunday; and,

“‘*Whereas*, There are seven thousand saloons running open every Sunday, contrary to the State law; therefore, be it—

“‘*Resolved*, First, That we enter a most earnest protest against such official action on the part of the mayor and city council, in using such measures in opposition to the action of Congress, and spending the people’s

money in attempting to reverse the very conditions upon which the appropriation of Congress was received.

“ ‘Resolved, That we deprecate and condemn the action of the directors, who received the money from Congress upon condition that the Fair should not be opened Sunday (a *bona-fide* contract), and are now using all possible effort to influence Congress to set aside said condition.

“ ‘Resolved, That in our judgment it would be more proper for the mayor and city council to close the saloons on Sunday in accordance with the State law, than to endeavor to influence Congress to open the Exposition Sunday, contrary to law.’

“ There was applause at the end, and then the chairman of the meeting, Rev. H. N. Axtell, put the resolutions to vote. To his and others’ surprise the ‘ayes’ and ‘noes’ seemed equal, with the volume of tone apparently in favor of the latter. The chairman then said, that a rising vote would seem to be in order, and he requested all in favor of the resolutions, to stand up. The secretary counted thirty on their feet.

“ ‘All opposed will arise.’

“ The rest of the audience, with the exception of four who seemed to have no opinion on the matter, stood up, and the secretary looking astonished at the evident majority, paid little attention to counting heads, and declared that there were at least thirty-five against the resolution, and what seemed strangest was that many of them were women.

“ After a moment of wonder the chairman said he would like to have some explanation for the action of the majority.”

Mr. Jones.— I was there and gave the reason why we were opposed to the resolutions. The next day in their convention this thing was called up, and quite fully considered. And so I read the report from the *Chicago Times* of the following day :—

“ Gloom pervaded the meeting of the American Sabbath Union yesterday morning. The unexpected set-back received at the meeting held at the South Park Methodist Church the evening before, had dampened the ardor of the delegates, and only a baker’s dozen were in their seats when the presiding officer of that session, Dr. H. H. George, of Beaver Falls, Penn., called the meeting to order. The cause of the depression was the outcome of the meeting the night before. Four mass-meetings were held Tuesday night. At three of these, resolutions were adopted in favor of Sunday closing of the World’s Fair. At the other, the resolutions were defeated, the attendance, it is now claimed, being principally of Adventists.

That was the reason of the gloom which pervaded the Sabbath Union yesterday.

“The committee appointed to prepare a telegram to Congress reported the following:—

“‘The National Convention of the American Sabbath Union, meeting in this city, respectfully request our Congress, and especially the Committee on the World’s Fair, that no action be taken to repeal the Sunday-closing law. Mass-meetings were held in four different parts of the city last night to protest against this repeal as an act dishonorable to Congress and the nation.’”

“Dr. Mandeville was on his feet in an instant.

“‘That should not read, four mass-meetings, for one meeting was opposed to the resolutions,’ he said. ‘It should read three mass-meetings.’

“‘Yes,’ protested the committeeman, ‘but our resolution covers that point. It says the meetings were held *to* protest—it does not tell what they did.’

“But Dr. Mandeville would not be hoodwinked by any double dealing of the sort, and the resolution was made to say that three mass-meetings vigorously protested against the repeal of the Sunday-closing law.”

The Secretary of the American Sabbath Union for the State of Illinois wrote a correction to the Chicago *Evening Post*, in which he denounced those who voted against their resolutions as “brass interlopers,” and for having “massed their forces to defeat the object of this mass-meeting.” That opened the way for me to write a reply, which I read here as a part of my argument, and which explains this point a little more fully before this committee:—

“CHICAGO, DECEMBER 17.

“*Editor of the Evening Post:*

“I would not needlessly add to the afflictions of the American Sabbath Union, but in justice to the people denounced in Rev. Mr. McLean’s letter in the *Evening Post* of Thursday, as well as to bring that letter within the boundary of facts, Mr. McLean’s correction needs to be corrected. That he should not have a clear understanding of the situation at the South Park Church mass-meeting of Tuesday night, is not strange. He was not there. I was there, and therefore beg a little space to correct his correction. He states that the Seventh-day Adventists, ‘evidently supposing it would be a fine stroke of policy, in order to defeat the object of the meeting, massed their forces,’ from the region of the meeting, ‘with the result as published.’”

This is a total misapprehension. There was not a particle of policy about it; there was no thought beforehand of defeating the object of the meeting; and our forces were not massed. That there was no massing of forces will readily appear to all from the fact that while there are one hundred and ninety-four Seventh-day Adventists in this quarter of the city, there were only about forty at the mass-meeting. And whereas, there are fully three hundred Seventh-day Adventists in the other three divisions of the city—west side, north side, and Englewood—there were none in attendance at the Sunday Union mass-meetings in those three quarters. If we had done as we are charged with doing, at least three, instead of only one, of their mass-meetings would have been carried against their resolution. Mr. McLean ought to be thankful that we are not so black as he has painted us, and that they escaped as well as they did.

“But why should they denounce us? Was it not—”¹

Mr. Chairman.—(Mr. Durborow).—I don't want any more of such stuff as that. I do not see what bearing that

¹ What I was going to read further was this:—

“Was it not advertised and held as a mass-meeting? Had we not a perfect right to attend it? And had we not a perfect right to vote against any resolutions that might be offered? When we went to the meeting, as the masses were expected to go, were we to keep still when called upon to vote? And to remain silent when directly called upon, both by the gentleman who offered the resolutions and by the chairman, to explain our vote? In view of these facts, is it the fair thing for them to denounce us as ‘atheists,’ ‘religious anarchists,’ ‘brass interlopers,’ etc., as they have done? What kind of mass-meeting did they expect to hold, anyhow? More than this, what kind of mass-meeting is that wherein forty people can ‘mass their forces’ and defeat the object of the meeting? In all their meetings they missed no opportunity to proclaim over and over that forty millions of the American people are on their side of the Sunday question. In the meeting that night Dr. George vehemently declared that on their side were forty millions, while there were only about twenty-five thousand of the Seventh-day Adventists in the United States. ‘Forty millions of us,’ he shouted, ‘and we are not afraid. Forty millions of us and we have the government on our side, and we are not afraid of anything that the Adventists can do.’ Now if the people were so overwhelmingly in favor of the work of the American Sabbath Union, how would it be possible for a few, in proportion of only one in sixteen hundred, either to pack their meeting or defeat their resolutions? If their own representations were true, they would have had the house full and the galleries packed with people in favor of the work of the Sunday Union, and it would be literally impossible for all the opponents that could be ‘massed’ to defeat the object of the meeting. But when the facts demonstrated that their own mass-meetings were so slimly attended that forty people could largely outvote them and kill their resolutions and ‘defeat the object of the meeting,’ this in itself demonstrates that their claim of an overwhelming majority of the people in favor of Sunday closing of the World's Fair is a downright fraud. And this is what hurts them. As long as they can go on unmolested and uncontradicted in their misrepresentations, they are happy. But when an incident occurs that exposes the fraud in their claims, it grinds them.”

has on this question. Please confine yourself to proper lines of argument.

Mr. Jones.—It shows this, that their representation of forty millions of people—the masses of the country—is not true. When forty people can go to a mass-meeting and out-vote them, it shows that the masses are not with them.

Mr. Durborow.—We are here on a matter of changing some legislation. I think we might as well drop that. The congressmen undoubtedly knew what they were doing when they passed that bill.

Mr. Jones.—I am not casting any reflection upon Congress in this. I am not saying that the Congress knew that these representations were false. But is it not possible for congressmen to be deceived, and seriously to consider representations which were false?

Mr. Durborow.—I do n't think your whole argument is very respectful to the Congress of the United States.

You see he shut me off from showing that these representations were false and said he did not “want any more of that stuff;” but he got it. Rev. H. W. Cross, a Presbyterian minister from Ohio went to Washington to make a five minutes' speech. And the third day of the hearing, he set forth this matter stronger than I could have done. We think best to give just here his and other speeches on this point:—

SPEECH OF REV. H. W. CROSS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE.

“*Mr. Durborow.*—Rev. H. W. Cross, of Ohio, will speak for five minutes.

“*Rev. H. W. Cross.*—Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: The real object of my being here to speak a word, is in favor of intellectual honesty on the part of the orthodox churches. I am a minister of an orthodox church.¹ I notice in my territory that these church petitions are ex-

¹ At this statement, there was an audible, derisive snicker from the clergy present. It seemed to be a strange thing that a minister of an orthodox church should speak in favor of intellectual honesty on the part of the churches.

ceedingly delusive, as to the number of those that sign them or vote for them.

“Now, for example, in one instance in our State, the Presbyterians passed a resolution, saying that we represent so many, aggregating a certain membership; and then the Christian Endeavor Society, composed of many of the same church members alluded to by that Presbyterian Church, will pass a like resolution, and say we represent fifty, seventy, or one hundred members. And then it will be brought before the Sunday-school. And many of the persons who are counted as voting for the resolutions, will have been counted three, four, or five times; and it is almost on the principle of voting early and often — which is so much opposed in secular politics. I am a witness to this fact. There was one petition claiming to represent eighty church members that signed the petition to Congress, but they were not present at all. It was at a Sunday-school, and the vote was taken by the Sunday-school superintendent, and there were children that voted for those resolutions that were not old enough to know whether the expression ‘World’s Fair’ meant the pretty girls in the next pew, or the Columbian Exposition in Chicago.

“I deem it my duty to inform this committee of the facts in that case. The real animus of these petitions is religious. But you cannot tell by the wording of the petitions just what they mean; it is the spirit back of them that shows this. The columns of the religious press and the exhortations of class leaders and Sunday-school superintendents,— it is what they say to the few that were voting, that tell what these petitions mean. I deem our legislators thoroughly competent, intellectually and morally, to decide this question without any imperious dictation from any sect or group of sects, as to whether this opening of the great educational Exposition is consistent with the civil Sabbath. I notice a tendency in my own church papers, and in other orthodox church papers, to gloat over the fact that ‘we [that is, this group of denominations having this common-idea] have been strong enough by our own strength, to grasp Congress; we have hurled Congress against the Seventh-day Adventists, against the Seventh-day Baptists, and against the Roman Catholic citizens, and against various other of our citizens.’ Now it seems to me that is hardly a desirable thing to do in this country.

“I cannot speak to you, gentlemen of the committee, in the manner and to the extent that I had prepared myself, owing to the fact that I have but five or six minutes allowed me, and so I have simply presented these two points: that these petitions are exceedingly delusive as to the number who sign them, inasmuch as one and the same identical people have spoken many times, and in a great variety of instances, at conventions as individual signers, at Sunday-schools, as members of the Society of Christian

Endeavor — the same persons have voted again and again. And when you come to figure out the vast aggregate, it is exceedingly delusive, and if the interests of the civil Sabbath —

“*Mr. Durborow.*— Mr. Cross, your time has expired.

“*Mr. Cross.*— Very well, then ; I will leave my sentence unfinished. I bow to the decision.”

Rev. Minot J. Savage, of Boston, who followed Mr. Cross, remarked upon this point :—

“The former speaker has made reference to the statistics. I think, myself, that too much has been made of the statistics that have been presented. While the statistics were being read, I felt running through my mind a quotation from the Hon. Carroll D. Wright. I do not mean it as an insult to the gentlemen here ; but it struck me as being so witty and so apropos that I present it. Carroll D. Wright said that, ‘Figures will not lie, but liars will figure.’ I do not mean, gentlemen, that these people are, consciously, liars ; but when a man votes for a thing as a church member, and then votes for it as a member of the Christian Endeavor Society, and in the Sunday-school, and as a member of some temperance society, he does not make four men of himself in the process, and that ought to be remembered.”

Another speech which most powerfully set forth this that the committee refused to hear from us, was that of Mr. Thomas J. Morgan, a laboring man from Chicago. He had his speech written out to be read. But after hearing some of the church representatives, he was so stirred by their misrepresentations, that he, when he came to speak, forgot all about his written speech, the passing of time, and everything else, till the Chairman told him his twenty-five minutes were gone. We give his speech here also.

SPEECH OF THOS. J. MORGAN.

After stating whom he represented, and that he had received word “from three hundred and seventy-five labor organizations, coming from every town and city in the United States, in which there is sufficient industry carried on to promote or encourage the organization of a body of workmen,” and covering up to date “thirty-three States of the Union,” he said :—

“Now, Mr. Chairman, having stated the authority that is vested in me, I wish to say that I appear before this committee under very great embarrassment. I did not know until two hours before I took the train, that I should be able to reach this committee. I arrived here at eleven o'clock last night, and being in a new place, in unaccustomed conditions, I lost my sleep. In addition to that, I am just from the bench. You see [holding up his hands] I am a workman ; there are the callouses and corns that are a necessary incident to manual labor. I come unprepared by education to meet the arguments presented here, or to present my case with the force and fluency that gentlemen in the opposition have, having been forced by my condition to labor all my life-time since nine years of age, without a single vacation ; absolutely denied the opportunities of education except that which was wrested from my sleeping hours.

“I am also embarrassed by the fact that I find myself, for the first time in my life, in the midst of a lot of friends of labor, whose existence I never before was aware of ; and I am absolutely astounded as well as embarrassed at the statements they make. They not only claim to speak in the name of labor, such as we have it in the United States ; but, lo and behold, they speak with the voice of authority from my fellow-workers in Great Britain, from which country I came. Not only that, but they take the name of a man whom I honor more, possibly, than any other, and hurl authority from that source at this committee ;—that man is Karl Marx. They speak in the name of the Social Democrats of Germany also ; and I, being a Social Democrat, being an Englishman, and associated intimately with the reform movement in that country, and being here in the United States for twenty-three years an active labor reformer,—why, you can imagine my embarrassment and astonishment when I find myself in the presence of these advocates and friends of Karl Marx, the Social Democrats of England, and the friends of labor reform here in the United States. [Turning to the clergymen.] I regret exceedingly that I cannot grasp your hands in fraternal friendship. I am sorry that I have to say, Oh, save us from our friends. I am embarrassed in being compelled to say that I am here with authority to absolutely repudiate you, and charge you with false representation.

“When I heard the statements they made, I thought, I will approach this matter with kindness, gentleness, etc. ; I thought to myself, I hope I will have the power to deal with this question in the same spirit ; but I am afraid I have overstepped the limits already. I have this thing so near at heart that ordinary composure is absolutely destroyed when I find that we are attacked, that our interests are so misrepresented, that our desires and wants are so distorted by these men who claim to speak with authority.

“[To the Clergymen]. You bring men's names from England, who

are absolutely unknown. What is the matter with Joseph Arch? What is the matter with Tom Mann? What is the matter with Ben Tillott? Can you speak in their names?—No, you bring some unknown names here to add force to your misrepresentation. You have never been the friends of labor, and at this time you have no right to speak in that sense.

“When you brought your references here, my mind ran back at once to England, to Joseph Arch, a layman in the church, whose zeal for the Christian religion was too great to be contained. As a layman he taught, under the hedge-rows, the moral truths that Christ enunciated, and he found in his efforts to lift up his class that the whole array of the clergymen of Great Britain were against him, as we find the whole array of the clergy of the United States, except the Catholic Church, arrayed against us.

“[Voices from the clergymen expressing disapproval.]

“Possibly that statement I made that the *whole* clergy was arrayed against us is not strictly true. I hope to save myself from any statement that is not absolutely based upon facts. Possibly I would be right if I said that the evangelical churches of the United States, as here represented, are absolutely opposed to us and to our interests. Probably I should except the Catholic Church; possibly I will admit that. I tell you I am embarrassed. Possibly you will give me some consideration at least in that respect. I wanted to undo the work that you have been doing here, and I will do it to the best of my ability.

“Joseph Arch, to whom I referred, who now lives and from whom you have got no word, who was lifted from the hedge-row to the House of Parliament, was placed there by the people, and he promised to make it possible for them to live in decency and respectability. After he had accomplished that, the clergymen of Great Britain called him to a great meeting in Exeter Hall, at which there were present two hundred clergymen. They asked him to explain the purposes of his organization, and he did so. It was to lift the people out of absolute ignorance, into the comforts and decencies of manhood; it was to kill the saloon, to empty the jail, to give men in the agricultural districts a chance to live as decent human beings. He had accomplished a great deal in that direction, and he not only told the ministers, ‘We not only did it without your help, but we did it in the face of your absolute effort in antagonism.’ And he said, ‘After we have accomplished this work you call us to account! We give you the results of our work. We did that without your help. We will go right along. All that we ask you is that if you cannot see your way to help us, get out of the way and leave us alone to do our work.’ This is my answer to your English production.

“You speak here of the Social Democrats of Germany. What right have you? You have no authority at all. You go to work and take this

little bit, and that little bit, from the work of Karl Marx, the Social Democrats, and the result of their convention, and present it here with authority. I am a Social Democrat. I belong to that organization, and have done all I could to proselyte, in my humble way, the minds of the workmen of the United States, to the principles they hold. And I want to tell you clergymen that the principles held by the Social Democrats of Germany are the principles enunciated by Jesus Christ, and which you do not understand.

“ [Voices : ‘Hear, hear.’] ”

“ Mr. Chairman, I not only speak with this authority that I have expressed, but I want to call attention to the relative position that we occupy toward this World’s Fair matter, in comparison with this body of clergymen organized like a machine [turning to the ministers] — to call up one after another to do his portion of the work.

“ *Mr. Durborow.* — Mr. Morgan, the committee is at this end of the table.

“ *Mr. Morgan.* — My general statement as to my unfitness for this kind of work will excuse me, I hope. If the friends of the Church had been kinder to me when I was a child, had they taught me to read and write, I possibly would have been able to follow all the requirements of refined and common etiquette and society. Thanks to them, possibly I shall make some bad breaks, for which I ask to be excused.

“ I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that in addition to the authority that I have here set forth, I wish to say that we workmen of Chicago particularly and especially demand the right to be heard with more consideration than our opponents. As soon as the word went forth that it was proposed to have an exposition, a world’s exposition, in the United States, the labor organizations everywhere responded with gladness to that proposition; and as soon as it was settled that the World’s Fair should be held somewhere in the United States, Chicago workmen put forth their claim to Chicago as the proper geographical point to have a world’s exposition located. They backed up their request that Chicago should be the place, with petitions from labor organizations throughout the United States, to such an extent that Senator Hawley was able to stand up in the Congress of the United States and say, ‘I hold in my hand petitions from organized labor from every State in the Union, except New York, asking that the Fair shall be located in Chicago.’ That Fair was located there. But even before it was located there, the demand was made by Congress that Chicago should show its ability to conduct that Fair, by subscribing for ten millions of her stock. The workmen put their hands into their pockets, and with dimes and fifty-cent pieces and dollars subscribed for half a million of the stock.

“ What did the Church do? Did the churches demand that there

should be an exposition of the world's products and man's ingenuity? If they did, they did it silently. The workmen responded in this substantial fashion; and since then they have built the Fair, and consecrated it with their blood. Hundreds and hundreds of workmen have been killed and maimed in the construction of that mighty work. And I think that because of these reasons, what we have to say should have additional weight attached to it.

"Not only that; but giving all due credit to the master minds who designed and planned that wonderful exposition,—giving them all due credit,—the products exhibited there come from this kind of hands. [Holding up his own labor-hardened hands.] And after we have built the Fair, sacrificed our lives in doing so, after we have contributed by our ingenuity and labor in placing there the exhibits, these men, who had no hand in it, neither in designing, constructing, or in anything else connected with it, have come and shut the gate and *turned the lock* on us workmen! And then they come here with the miserable plea that they are instructed, that they are justified in speaking for labor! It is absolutely astounding, the assumption these men have in making their plea. I cannot comprehend how they could risk their reputation for veracity, for honesty, and for truth,—and that is all the stock in trade that the clergy have, and if that is lost, they are gone—how they could risk their veracity and honesty in making these statements. One of them comes here this morning, and says, 'I hold a petition from a labor Union in New York City.' What labor Union?

"*Rev. Mr. W. F. Crafts.*—The engineers of the United States

"*Mr. Morgan.*—Who?

"*Mr. Crafts.*—The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

"*Mr. Morgan.*—No! Look here; that claim, that statement that is made, that they do not duplicate things is basely, maliciously false. They *do* duplicate things. And they bring in a single petition from one of the local Unions in the State of New York, and you make people believe you have got another organization.

"*Mr. Crafts.*—Oh, no.

"*Mr. Morgan.*—Well, of course my comprehensive faculties are not equal to grasp your way of managing these things. [Laughter.] Another statement is made that because the engineers of the United States speak, that settles the question; that they are the most intelligent of all workmen in the United States. I absolutely repudiate that statement."

[Here Mr. Morgan spoke a few words touching some rather personal matters between the organization which he represented and the organization of engineers, which we

think it best for us not to seem to take any part in, by printing and circulating as widely as this document will be spread. — PUBLISHERS.]

“Then the plea is made that the opening of the Fair will necessitate extra work upon the part of the engineers. Let me call your attention to this fact, that if the World’s Fair is closed on Sunday, people will be absolutely prohibited from enjoying its privileges on that day. That day will be given to traveling. Men will start on Sunday, reach Chicago Sunday night or Monday, spend the week at the Fair, take the train at the latest hour Saturday night or the earliest hour Sunday morning.

“*Mr. Durborow.*—Mr. Morgan, you have been speaking just twenty-five minutes, and have consumed the time allotted to you. I understand that you desire Mr. Askew to follow you, and unless you give way to him, of course you would occupy his time.

“*Mr. Morgan.*—O, excuse me, Mr. Chairman; I did not think I had been talking so long. But really I would like to have a little more time. I have a paper here which I would like very much to present.

“*Mr. Durborow.*—If you have the consent of the other speakers, of course it will be all right.

“*Dr. H. W. Thomas.*—I will give you my time.

“*Mr. Durborow.*—Simply state a synopsis of your paper if you can, and give it as quickly as possible.

“*Mr. Morgan.*—I will read it as rapidly as possible, and you can read it at your leisure.

“[Reading.] In regard to the religious side of this matter, I wish to say that the workingmen attribute the action of Congress in closing the World’s Fair on Sunday to the activity and influence of the Protestant evangelical churches, and that in the accomplishment of its purpose, the representatives of these churches assume to be the guardians of the economical and moral interests of the working people, and in their name and behalf, urge Congress to close the gates of the World’s Fair on Sunday.

“We are here duly authorized by the only organized and formal movement made by workingmen in relation to the closing of the Fair on Sunday, to absolutely deny the right of these churches or their representatives to speak or act for us in this matter, and to prove to you by documentary evidence we present that all such representations made to Congress by these churches were wilfully or ignorantly fraudulent.

“In this connection we desire to call the attention of congressmen who may have been influenced by the action of these churches, and who are sincerely interested in the religious side of this question, to the fact that the indifference or active antagonism of the working classes toward the Church

is at present, and has been for years past, a subject of the most serious consideration by the clergy. We respectfully represent that one of the principal causes of this latent and active hostility to the Church is due to the fact that its representatives are so far removed economically and socially from the wage-working classes as to entirely fail to understand their wants, desires, and aspirations; and hence, as a result, when they do speak in our name, they misrepresent us, as they have in this case. This has occurred so frequently and universally that the respect and reverence for the Church held by the working people in the past, has been destroyed to such an extent that the Church itself has become alarmed. With a few exceptions, and upon rare occasions, a suggestion to have a clergyman open or participate in our conventions or mass-meetings would be met with contemptuous ridicule. Tens of thousands of wage-workers who like myself have passed from infancy to manhood within the folds of the Church, and in being forced from it have retained a fervid love for the moral principles taught by the Carpenter of Nazareth, realize not only the wickedness embodied in the acts of the clergy in shutting the workers out of the Fair, but also understand the effect it will have in further alienating the working classes from, and intensifying their hostility toward, the Church.

“Speaking as we do, with this intimate personal knowledge, we respectfully, but most earnestly, urge congressmen who have been influenced by religious considerations, to undo this ill-advised and injurious act of the Church.

“Rev. Mr. Martyn, in advocating the closing of the Fair on Sunday, declared that neither literature nor art had any effect whatever upon the moral status of the people. Our reply is that this statement is a libel upon literature and art and a monstrous insult to all scholars and artists, and an absolute denial of the advantages of secular education; whereas we insist that every advance in general knowledge is necessarily an advance in public morals, and that the knowledge of individuals, and hence their moral status, is affected largely by their environment.

“Place a workingman within the gates of the World’s Fair, bring him in contact with the wonders of nature as there shown, and the marvels of man’s production gathered from the whole world, and in open-eyed wonder he will be lifted out of his ordinary self, all his lowest and basest instincts and habits will be for the time submerged, and deep into his mind and heart will be pressed, as never before, a comprehension of nature’s varied resources, and the limitless ingenuity and power of the human mind, which will ever after be a profitable source of reflection, a subject of conversation, instructive alike to himself and his associates, that must necessarily make him a better man, a more skillful, and hence a more valuable worker and a more useful citizen.

"These conclusions are reached not from abstract reasoning, but through practical personal experience, and were I a clergyman or an active member of the Church, having the moral welfare of the people at heart, I would consider it an imperative duty not only to open wide the gates of the Fair on Sunday, but to advocate the organization of special means to bring the masses within its intellectual and moral influences on that particular day.

"In the consideration of the moral side of the subject, I asserted that the influence of a visit to the World's Fair would make the laboring man a more skillful, and hence a more valuable worker. To the great army of unknown inventors a day in the World's Fair would be an inspiration of inestimable value, not alone to themselves, but to the nation and to the human race. Again I speak from actual experience, being personally benefited by visits to expositions similar in character to the World's Fair, but in size and scope comparatively insignificant.

"Those guarding the industrial and commercial interests of Great Britain and France thoroughly understand this view of the case. In Birmingham, England, where I came from, one of the greatest manufacturing towns in the world, such exhibits on a small scale were permanent institutions. Special delegations of workers were regularly sent to the world's expositions of London and Paris, and from personal conversation with one of the French workmen delegated to visit the Centennial and the exposition at Vienna, I learned that the French people were equally alert to the importance of this particular matter.

"I am also advised by one of my associates, actively interested and aiding in this work of opening the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday, that in Germany, in the industrial towns along the Rhine, the workingmen's societies regularly sent delegations to both London and Paris to report upon the exhibits relating to their particular trades; and that such visits were so arranged, for economical reasons, that the delegates reached Vienna or Paris on Saturday night or Sunday morning, visited the exposition during Sunday, and departed for home Sunday night and Monday morning.

"Comparatively few of the workers in the United States have had the advantage of those stimuli to thought and invention, nor have the manufacturing and commercial class as yet reached a full realization of its importance. Hence I press this view of the matter, hoping that it may aid in opening the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday to the hundreds of thousands of workers in Chicago and its neighboring towns, and to encourage by that privilege the visits of as many wage-workers throughout the nation as may by months of self-denial and sacrifice save sufficient to pay the expenses of a visit to the World's Fair, such visit being necessarily limited to a few days."

Now I return to my own speech, where it was interrupted by the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. Jones.—Well, very good. I will take it, then, that Congress knew what they were doing. Here is the record of it in the Senate; that is where this part of the legislation began; because the legislation in the House touched only the closing of *the government exhibit*, and passed the House that way, and said nothing about closing *the Fair* on Sunday. When it came to the Senate, there this part of the legislation originated. I shall read from the *Congressional Record* of July 10, 12, and 13, 1892.

Mr. Durborow.—Well, it is no use to read that here. We are more familiar with that than you are yourself. What we are after is modification of the existing law.

Mr. Jones.—Certainly.

Mr. Durborow.—Now if you will argue on the point of the modification of the law, the benefits why this law should be changed and modified in accordance with the resolutions that are before this committee—that is what this committee has these hearings for.

Mr. Jones.—Well, that is what I am doing. I have given the Constitution as it provides, prohibiting this legislation; and when the Constitution prohibits it, then ought not the legislation to be undone?

Mr. Durborow.—This is not the place to argue that question.¹

Mr. Little.—I think you perhaps misunderstand the legislation that has already been taken. I agree with you as to the Constitution. But this legislation makes an appropriation, and accompanies the appropriation with the condition that the Fair should be closed on Sunday. For instance, you

¹At this point and by this statement, I would have been shut out entirely, had not other members of the committee asked questions which enabled me to fill up the time. And although it was his purpose to shut out the constitutional argument, yet the questions asked by others still brought up at every point the constitutional principle.

have no right to say to a gentleman walking along the street, You shall not go into that saloon; but if you give him \$5, you have the right to connect with it the condition that he shall not spend it in the saloon.¹

Mr. Jones.—I see your point. The argument has been made, and it was made when the legislation was before the Senate, that as Congress was appropriating the money, it had the right to put whatever restrictions it considered proper upon the use of the money.

Mr. Little.—But they were not forced to take the money.

Mr. Jones.—Certainly. But I deny that proposition. Congress had the right to put whatever *civil* restrictions she pleased upon the use of the money; Congress had no right under the Constitution, to put any *religious* restriction at all upon the use of the money.

Mr. Little.—Is it a religious restriction?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir; it is religious legislation entirely.

Mr. Houk.—Do you believe that it would be right for Congress to say that the Fair should be closed one day in seven?

Mr. Jones.—No, it would not be proper, for it all rests upon religious ground, and that is the only ground upon which Sunday observance or Sunday recognition rests. And the claim that the legislation was in the interests of the workingmen is contrary to the proceedings of the Senate. Senator Hawley said plainly, "Everybody knows what the foundation is; it is founded in religious belief." Senator Peffer said, "To-day we are engaged in a theological discussion as to the observance of the first day of the week." So that they

¹This is not admitted. For we have no right to bribe a man, even not to drink. And if Congress did this act upon this principle, as is here suggested, then it did add to the other evils of this legislation the element of bribery. And in fact this is precisely the view of it which has already been held by the American Sabbath Union. The President of the Sabbath Union has published that this act of Congress "puts a premium of \$2,500,000 on doing right. It proves in a concrete way that 'godliness hath great gain.'" And this whole idea we repudiate with all the rest of the evil thing.

considered it as religious, and religious only. Now, I repeat, they had no right under the Constitution, to put any religious restriction upon it. When they put that restriction there, and said that the directors should sign an agreement to close the World's Fair on Sunday, on the "Christian Sabbath," as Congress declared Sunday to be, before they could receive any money; they had just as much right to say that the World's Fair directory should sign an agreement to submit to Christian baptism before they could receive any of the appropriation.

Voice.—Or try Dr. Briggs.

Mr. Jones.—Yes. When Congress put upon this appropriation the condition that the directory should sign an agreement to shut that Fair on the "Lord's day," as Congress declared Sunday to be, before they could receive any of the money, Congress had just as much right to require that the World's Fair Committee should observe the Lord's supper before they could get any of the money. Hence, if Congress can define what the Christian Sabbath is, they can require anything else in the Christian religion.

Voice.—That is so.

Voice.—Is not this a Christian nation?

Mr. Jones.—No, of course not.

Mr. Jones.—When they go beyond the Constitution in one point for religion's sake, they can go beyond it on every point. What Congress has done in this respect in favor of Sunday only opens the way to do whatever else may be demanded by those who have secured this. And *it will be demanded*, for the *Christian Statesman*, whose editor is in the hall, has said that "the great Christian majority has learned, by response to its great petition, and its host of letters with reference to the World's Fair, that it can have of national and State governments whatever legislation against immorality it will ask unitedly and earnestly." And a preacher in Pittsburg, as soon as this bill had passed Congress, declared in a

sermon: "That the Church has weight with great political or governing bodies has been demonstrated most effectually in the late World's Fair matter, when the United States Senate, the highest body in the country, listened to the voice of religion and passed the World's Fair five million appropriation bill with the Church-instituted proviso that the gates of the great Exposition should not be opened upon Sunday. That grand good fact suggests to the Christian's mind that if this may be done, so may other equally needful measures. The Church is gaining power continually, and its voice will be heard in the future much oftener than in the past."

Voice.—The statement of an individual.

Mr Jones.—No, not the statement of an individual only; it is representative, because those who secured the legislation, those who presented the petition,—they did it as a grand combination, not as individuals, but as a combination. The National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the whole combination put together,—they worked for it for religious reasons; they demanded it upon religious grounds only, and did it as religious. The basis of it was declared to be the fourth commandment, when Senator Quay sent up his Bible to the Secretary of the Senate to be read there. Here it is in the *Record*. Who will deny that the fourth commandment is religious? Who will deny that the fourth commandment as given in the Bible is religious, and that the Bible itself is religious? I appeal to this committee: Has the Congress of the United States a right to put that Bible into its legislation and to make *that* the basis of legislation in this government?—No, sirs; the CONSTITUTION is the basis of legislation by Congress, and not the Bible. And the Constitution has shut religious questions from the consideration of Congress, and therefore has shut the Bible out of legislation by Congress. But the Bible was sent up that day, and this is the record:—

“*Mr. Quay.*— On page 122, line 13, after the word ‘act,’ I move to insert :—

“‘And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath-day.’

“The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The Secretary will have the kindness to read from the Book of Law I send to the desk, the part inclosed in brackets.

“*The Vice-President.*— The part indicated will be read.

“The Secretary read as follows :—

“‘Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy.’”

Mr. Jones.— You know the fourth commandment : I need not read it.

Voice.— Read it all.

Mr. Jones.— “Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work ; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates ; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

Voice.— Is that the seventh day or the first day ?

Mr. Jones.— The commandment says the seventh day, but in the face of this plain declaration of the Lord that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, the Senate has put its own interpretation upon that commandment, and has declared that the statement that “the seventh day is the Sabbath” means “the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.” Thus the Congress of the United States has taken the fourth commandment from the Bible and put it into its legislation, and has put its own interpretation upon that statute. If Congress can interpret the Bible in one point, it can interpret it on every other point. So that when it went beyond the Constitution of this country in this thing, it has put itself and the government in line with all the Church-and-State governments that have ever been,

and has assumed to itself to be the interpreter of the Bible for all the people in the land, and for all who come into the land. That is what has been done.

Mr. Houk.—Your argument is, then, that the quotation of that commandment by Senator Quay, and the insertion of that, incorporates the fourth commandment and the whole Bible into the legislation of this country?

Mr. Jones.—In principle it does. (Laughter.) Why not? What is to hinder it? When they can incorporate one part of the Bible for this occasion, what is to hinder their incorporating every other part of the Bible as other occasions may be presented? And therefore it is true that the incorporation of this part of the Bible here, does, in principle, incorporate the whole.

Mr. Houk.—That is a kind of general way to get God into the Constitution.

Mr. Jones.—Exactly. And that is what these are rejoicing at who have wanted all these years to put God into the Constitution. And that is why they say now, “We can have all we want, when we ask unitedly for it.” And this is true. This does give them all they wanted; for when Congress can do that in one point, who will deny its right to do it in any other point? When the principle is once established, the thing is all done. But it did put the fourth commandment there as giving the reason why the Fair should be closed Sunday, and as forming the basis of the legislation upon this question.

Mr. Durborow.—Now was the reading of the commandment an organic act of the Senate, of Congress, in doing any such thing as that?

Mr. Jones.—It was the organic act of Congress, because it was an inseparable part of the legislation itself: it was given as the basis of the legislation, and as containing the reasons for it.

Mr. Houk. — Then anything that a member says incorporates it in the act?

Mr. Jones. — Oh no, not necessarily. But let us consider how this was brought in. Senator Quay proposed an amendment. The House had passed a bill to close the *government exhibit*, letting the Fair alone. When it went to the Senate, Senator Quay introduced an amendment to close the whole Fair. His amendment was, “that provision has been made by the proper authority for closing the Exposition on the Sabbath-day.” That was the first step taken in Congress on the subject of closing the Fair, not the government exhibit, but closing the Fair. The Senate took that step, and in the taking of it, the fourth commandment was quoted by him who offered the amendment, and was adopted by the Senate as the basis, and as giving the reasons for the amendment. Now when this commandment was given by him, and read afterward by the secretary from the desk, as the basis of that amendment, and as containing the reasons for the legislation that was in the amendment, and when the Senate adopted that amendment by changing it to the first day of the week and calling it Sunday, and then the House confirmed their decision, — then it is as plain as day that the fourth commandment is put there and embodied in the legislation of the country by the definite act of Congress.

[The clock struck twelve and the time expired.]

Mr. Durborow announced that the time had expired, and said, “This will bring the discussion to a close for this day.”

That closed the hearing for that day. The chairman had shut out the constitutional argument and refused to have that go before the committee. Seeing that this was so done, the American Sabbath Union knew that their cause was safe; and after the hearing was over, they simply stepped outside the door in the entry way, and called a meeting of their Union, and passed a vote of thanks to the Lord for preserv-

ing the American Sabbath. They knew that when the constitutional argument was shut out, they had all they wanted.

The next day Elliott F. Shepard made the opening speech, and note how he started. The only thing that makes a congressman is the Constitution of the United States. He has no authority in this world but such as the Constitution gives him, and he has no right to listen to any argument that would not come within the Constitution. But they shut that out, and now see what they did listen to in the speeches that followed : —

REMARKS BY COL. ELLIOTT F. SHEPARD.

“I approach this subject with great reverence. When we come to *deal with heavenly things*, we should *put aside earthly things*, and should do very much as the Jews used to do in the temple at Jerusalem ; before they made their offerings, before they entered upon the service, they prepared themselves by ablution and by prayer for the proper discharge of their duties. Now when we come to consider the Sabbath, that it rests upon the law of God, that it is a revelation to mankind which no one would have thought of, that we owe it entirely to our Father which is in heaven, we ought therefore to come with the same reverential spirit to its consideration ourselves. . . . We represent the Christian sentiment of the United States of America. . . .

“We hope that Congress will maintain its dignity. We have resolved not to say one single word as to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of this law before this committee ; for to claim that it is unconstitutional here would be a reflection upon the committee, upon both Houses of Congress, and upon the President of the United States who approved this law. And you yourself very wisely took that last consideration entirely out from before the committee when you stated this was not the place to argue that question. Therefore we dismiss it without saying a single word. . . .

“When our blessed Lord was incarnate in Palestine, he approved and magnified that law, saying, ‘I come not to destroy, but to fulfill.’ And then he gives another point on the Sabbath, which was, that the ‘Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath ;’ and that ‘the Son of man,’ our Lord, ‘is Lord also of the Sabbath.’ In other words, it is a part of his patrimony, given to him by our Father who is in heaven, and *every one who attempts to cut it off in any way robs Jesus himself*. . . .

“And on the other hand, when we talk of elevating the people and lifting them up higher, can we get any higher principle, or any higher method of doing this, than that which was adopted by our blessed Lord himself? Not at all. And is it not rather to be thought that *these people who are especially consecrated to the service of God, are better able, through their consecration, and through their education, to inculcate what will best elevate the people,* than those who are ignorant of that sort of connection, and approach the subject from a lower and entirely different standpoint?”

“Now this day we are to present to you in brief speeches, the sentiments of the Christian Church and the common people of the United States in the various branches of that Church, and without any further introduction, I will ask that the roll should now be taken up.”

Joseph Cook, of Boston, closed his speech with these words:—

“Sunday is the tallest of the white angels now entering foreign lands. Shall we consent to allow Chicago now to rise up and stab this angel in the back, in our country? And shall we call down the goddess of liberty from the Capitol to assist at the murder? God forbid.”

Rev. T. A. Fernley, of Philadelphia, in his speech, told the committee that there was no authority for reconsidering the question, because there was no new evidence presented; that there was not a single new reason before the committee for opening the Fair on Sunday. And he said that therefore, “the only possible ground upon which you can reconsider this question is its unconstitutionality.” This confirmed the position that the chairman had refused to hear from us; so that everything they objected to from us, they got from somebody else.

They went on—not with heavenly arguments by any means—but proposing to “consider heavenly things.” They reined the committee up before the Judgment. Yes, “the Judgment will sit, and in that day it will be a consolation to know that you have acted right in the maintenance of the Sabbath to-day.” Here is part of a speech made by C. B. Botsford, President of the Massachusetts Sunday Protective League, before the committee;—

“Mr Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, and the friends and opponents of this measure: Allow me to call attention to one thing, and that is a fact to which we all assent. None of this company may be here in 1993. At that time all of us shall be of one mind in regard to the value and sacredness of the Lord’s day; for the sentence has gone forth, against every man, ‘Set thine house in order.’

“How fast they fall!
Those we have known,
As leaves from autumn branches grown,
Are quickly scared.’

“But while men die, the nation lives. May the God of nations so guide us and our posterity that ‘America’ may be sung until the end of time.”

Another, Rev. C. C. Adams, of Boston, representing the Evangelical Alliance, struck a regular religious revival key, and rung in the regulation death-bed scene. Here it is:—

“*Mr. Durborow.*—Rev. Adams, you will have three minutes.

“*Rev. Adams.*—I represent, sir, the Evangelical Alliance of Boston and its vicinity, comprising over four hundred ministers, who have put this document into my hands, which I shall present to you at their request:—

“The Evangelical Alliance of Boston and vicinity beg leave to present their unanimous and earnest protest against the proposed repeal of the act requiring the gates of the Columbian Exposition to be closed on the Lord’s day. That act gave proper expression to the Christian judgment of this Christian nation, and its repeal would be a grievous injustice to our history, our character, and our hopes as a people.’

“This paper, sir, was passed unanimously, Dr. Lorimer being present at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance.

“Mr. Chairman, when it pleased God to found this nation, he chose out of all the nations the very cream of the world,—the Huguenots of France, the Scotch and Scotch Irish of Scotland, the English, the Puritans, the Quakers, from England, the Dutch from Holland;—they came here and laid the foundation of this great Republic. The basis upon which they built was that of the Bible, the school, and the Sabbath. These, sir, are the great tap roots from which has sprung the great institutions of this country. To me it is a terrible thought that men would come now in this nineteenth century, after four hundred years of phenomenal progress, having attained to the position of being the richest and grandest nation of the world, that men would come now to hack at the root of that great fundamental principle of our government and of our people.

“Three weeks ago it was my painful duty to stand on the verge of eternity, and endeavor to hold back a great spirit that was about to leave

me. My feet almost touched the water. One spirit had to go, and I had to stay in the darkness. I trust, sir, that it will be many years before you or any member of this committee shall stand where I did. I felt myself on the verge of eternity. *But that day must come to each of us, and when it comes, sir, let me say to you, as a closing word on the side of the evangelical ministry of this country and the evangelical church of this country, it will be a pleasant recollection to come back to this period of your tremendous responsibility, and to feel that you, gentlemen, have stood by the side, and to the preservation, of God's holy day.*"

Rev. Green Clay Smith said : —

"The closer we adhere to the word of God as it has been interpreted for centuries by the wisest and best of men, following the good old path of our fathers, the better will it be for our nation and the human family. . . .

"We come hereto ask you courteously, but with earnestness not to abandon this law. . . .

"Christ is looking on to see if his people will revere his name and respect the day he honored as his own, and teach all nations to follow it as he has commanded."

The claim that this is a Christian nation, upon the authority of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, Feb. 29, 1892, was urged strongly and often; and that therefore Congress *should* close the Fair on Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. A printed argument(?) by a lawyer, a judge—S. B. Davis—of Terre Haute, Indiana, was sent up there, and distributed in piles on the tables of the committee, in which is the following :—

"The object of this brief is to call attention to the constitutional question raised on the Sunday laws, and to show that if it were granted that the act of Congress fell within the definition of a law, still there is no constitutional objection to it or to any legislation affecting Sunday.

"No longer ago than last February the Supreme Court of the United States, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Brewer, unanimously decided that—

" ' This is a Christian nation. ' "

" ' Rector, etc., Church of the Holy Trinity vs. the U. S. ' Decided Feb. 29, 1892. This decision is based upon impregnable foundations, both legal and historical.

“The common law of England is the law administered in all of the courts, Federal and State, except where modified by statutes.

“Blackstone says that ‘Christianity is a part of the laws of England.’ And it has been stated by courts of this country, frequently, that ‘Christianity is a part of the laws of the land.’

“The Supreme Court of the United States says, ‘This is a Christian nation.’ What is it to be a Christian nation? ‘It is a nation which is governed under Christian institutions in distinction from heathen or Moham-medan.’ The seventh day of time has been recognized by the great mass of people in the so-called Christian nations as a Christian institution, beneficial in its observance upon people, and a physical necessity. Therefore the governments, Federal and State, have incorporated it, in one form and another, into their laws.

“The real question, therefore, is, Shall the nation or the State set the example of violation of law? . . . The conscience of the Christian world protests.”

And Herrick Johnson, D. D., of Chicago, speaking for the whole religious combination, in answer to a statement that this is not a Christian nation, said:—

“The second point of the Mayor: ‘This is not a Christian nation.’ [It was not the Mayor who said it, but this is immaterial.—A. T. J.] Here the Mayor of Chicago and the United States Supreme Court differ, the Supreme Court having decided last February in express terms that this is a Christian nation. The Mayor might give us points for running a municipal government, but on a question of constitutional law we prefer the Supreme Court.”

Rev. Dr. Hunter said:—

“Gentlemen: I am authorized to speak for one and a half million Christian Endeavorers, who have spoken in the majority of their more than two thousand societies from every State in the Union, in District and State Conventions. . . .

“We hold that Congress was inside one of its legitimate functions when it conditioned the appropriation of two and one half million dollars upon the closing of the gates on Sunday; and with the Supreme Court of the United States, we hold that Congress had the right to take this action. Ours is a religious people. We hold that religion is a part of the common law. The Supreme Court of Feb. 29, 1892, says:—

“‘There is a universal language pervading them all, having one mean-

ing. They affirm and re-affirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people.'”

If anybody is inclined to think that that Supreme Court decision and declaration is of little consequence, I wish he had only been there to see and hear the use that was made of it, and how it was made the foundation of their claims and their efforts.¹

The climax of the whole thing was reached, however, when Rev. F. H. Mc Carrell, of Pennsylvania, threatened the curse of God upon the whole nation, if their wishes in regard to Sunday were not complied with. Here are his words on this point:—

“There is just one general reason, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to give why the gates of this Fair ought to be kept closed on the Sabbath. If these gates are open on the Sabbath, it will be perilous to us as a nation, and it will be perilous to Chicago, and to the interests of the Fair. There is one thing we are to remember; and that is, that *God still reigns*. God is still on the throne. *God has not abdicated*; and he has declared that the nation or the kingdom that will not serve him shall perish. And more than this, we are to remember that the ten commandments are the very basis of all of our laws, national and State, which subserve our liberties and our rights. . . . Now here is the fourth commandment in the very heart of these ten commandments, and that has never been repealed any more than has the fifth commandment, or the sixth commandment, or the seventh commandment, or the eighth commandment. And therefore we are to remember that if we touch this commandment of God, standing thus in the very heart of these ten commandments, we touch the honor of God; we touch the law of God, for Christ has emphasized that fourth commandment. He said the Sabbath was made for man. What did he mean by that? He meant thereby that it was not made for the Jew only, but for man everywhere, in every age and in every condition. He said the Sabbath was made for man. It was made for man in all ages, in all time. He said the Sabbath was made for man; it was made for man's highest good in every age of the world, for his good morally and physically.

¹ For a copy and a full review of this Supreme Court decision, and the original legislation on this Sunday-closing question, see *Sentinel Library*, No. 53. 43 Bond St., New York City, or Pacific Press, Oakland, California; price 15 cents.

“And therefore it is, dear friends, if we touch that fourth commandment, which lies at the very root of all other commandments, we touch the honor of God and the commandments of God. It has never been repealed, and *if we touch that God will bring a curse upon us as a nation*, because he distinctly told his people anciently that he would punish them for profanation of his Sabbath-day. And therefore it is, dear friends, that we as a nation cannot afford to touch this commandment. What it becomes us to do is, therefore, to set to the nations of the world a good example of the American Sabbath; set them an example of the Christian Sabbath; set them an example of the Sabbath as God has ordained it.”

Now the Constitution of the United States is the only thing in existence that gives to any member of Congress, senator, or representative, any power or authority. He owes his very existence, as a member of that body, to the Constitution. The Constitution defines his powers and the limitations of the exercise thereof. This is his only legitimate guide. That Constitution has not only not delegated to Congress any power in, over, or concerning matters of religion, but has specially prohibited it from exercising any power in, over, or concerning such matters.

But the undeniable record in this case shows that this committee of Congress did expressly and intentionally exclude from its consideration an argument based solely and exclusively upon the Constitution, and in this the committee did exclude from its consideration the Constitution itself; and instead of the Constitution, or questions or argument based upon the Constitution, which is the only authority for the action or even the existence of the committee or of Congress, the committee did sit in consideration of a religious question wholly, of “heavenly things” indeed, and did admit argument upon a religious basis only, from representatives of religious bodies only, all of which the committee is expressly prohibited by the Constitution from considering at all.

Could there possibly be a more complete reversal of the order of things established and intended by those who made

our national government and its Constitution? Could there possibly be a more direct revolution than has been accomplished in this case, in its inception, in its conduct, and as it stands to-day?

As for ourselves personally, we are perfectly content to be shut out, with our arguments, from being heard by a committee of Congress, when, in order to do it, the committee is obliged to shut out the Constitution itself from its consideration. We have always stood with the Constitution, pleading its provisions as they stand, and as they were intended by those who made it. There is where we stand now and ever. And with the Constitution we are willing to be excluded from the consideration of Congress. Abiding by the Constitution as it is, and as it was intended to be, on this question, we are in most excellent company.

Following is the argument of Mrs. Marion F. Washburne before the committee, Jan. 12, 1893:—

SPEECH OF MRS. MARION FOSTER WASHBURNE.

“Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Committee :

“Yesterday, I, together with the other delegates of the Chicago Woman’s Club, had the pleasure of listening to the arguments in favor of Sunday closing. Before I attempt to make any new points,—if any can be made after all this talking,—it might be advisable to answer some of the arguments advanced at that time. It may seem somewhat presumptuous for one feeble woman to endeavor to reply to such able and practiced speakers as were before you yesterday, if it were not for two things,—First, that I am as much in earnest in my belief that the Sunday opening will “work for righteousness,” as they are in the opposite view, and I have that courage of my convictions which is the birth-right of every American; and second, that the reverend gentlemen so kindly lessened my task for me by answering so many of their own arguments.

“To be explicit—the charge of greed, of self-seeking, and of many other malicious forms of selfishness was brought against, not only Chicago,

but the managers of the Fair, its directory, and the gentlemen of this committee themselves, as the only motive which could possibly influence them to give this resolution a fair hearing. But a number of the other speakers knocked down this house of cards, by declaring most emphatically that to open the Fair on Sunday would be to lose money. How can greed lead us into a money-losing scheme? Both arguments cannot be good, and you are invited to take your choice, to either declare yourselves the unprincipled money-grabbers which these gentlemen did not hesitate to call you, or to say that you really believe that if the World's Fair were opened on Sunday, no one would attend!

"Then the diversity of opinion as to the correct way to address a congressional committee, was very marked and very puzzling. — Some of them seemed to think that this was a Sunday-school convention, and exhorted accordingly, not hesitating to call down upon the patient committeemen, vengeance from on high if special sectarian views did not entirely rule the legislature. Others, however, rebuked their brother ministers for this untimely sermonizing and declared in so many words that talk about religion was not to the point, and 'that Congress' — I am quoting here — 'was not a tract society to distribute tracts on religious freedom.' I quite agree with the doctor. It is not a tract society for tracts either on religious freedom or on the fourth commandment. Its business is, as he said, to legislate for the rights of the people, and one of our immemorial rights is the right to worship God, each in his own way, whether in the church, in the silence of his inmost soul, or in the vast and impressive display of the highest of God's works, as shown to man.

"There was presented here the extraordinary spectacle of a *business* man declaring that the argument was one of *religious* feeling entirely, and of men vowed to *religion*, declaring that they spoke only from a *business* point of view. It was as if each distrusted the validity of the argument on the ground wherewith his life work had made him familiar, and believed himself safer on unknown territory. It reminds one of the story of the polyglot American who was said by his German friends to speak beautiful French, and by his French friends to speak beautiful German. There was not a business man here yesterday but saw the weakness of the *business* arguments, nor a clergyman but saw the flaws in the *theological* ones.

"There was one argument, — I mean, one bit of vituperation, which, as a Chicagoan I must really resent, — though it is hardly worth while, — and that is that it would be dishonorable in the city to use the money voted by Congress without accepting the condition attached. Now these gentlemen must know there has been no talk of that. But there is nothing dishonorable in asking Congress to remove a restriction which greatly decreases the

value of its gift. The fact that it has been so petitioned shows that Chicago feels herself uncomfortably bound by her honorable obligations, and would be glad to have them honorably removed.

“And, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, wasn't it a little hard, weren't you a little humbled, to hear this reverend body of petitioners 'talk down' to you? There were few of them who had any faith that you would be moved by any high religious or moral considerations. Most of them openly scoffed at the idea. And some of these men, pledged by their profession to avoid envy, malice, and all uncharitableness, not only implied the low moral tone of the men they were addressing, but said openly — I quote verbatim — that 'all the World's Fair was on the make,' and again that 'the milk in the cocoanut was the Sunday fee.' Would these gentlemen, whose business it is to uplift the people and the English language, have used these expressions before an ordinarily respectable church audience? But it was evidently considered, the sort of thing that congressmen are used to. Moreover, they threatened — and of all things, the boycott! The very tactics they preach against from their pulpits. And one man said that the 'religious boycott was justified by the deep prejudices of the people.'

“I have a profound respect and reverence, as all fair-minded people must have, for the man who believes in his religion and stands upon it against the world; but I have precious little respect for the clergyman, who, when he wants to win a worldly advantage, uses a worldly argument, making the admission that the heavenly one is insufficient for practical purposes. The man who claims to have faith in prayer, and yet descends to the boycott!

“I am aware that we who stand *for* the Sunday opening, make a poor show against the several millions of population (not counting families) which each one of these versatile men was able to represent here yesterday. I myself do not claim to represent more than a few hundred thousand. I am, perhaps, a little modest in this estimate, but modesty becomes a woman, if not a clergyman. [Laughter.] Joking aside, I know that we cannot possibly make as good a showing as some church societies, and the reason is that we are not organized as they are. The great mass of liberal and thoughtful people all over the country are not so organized that they can act as one, before such a committee, but their numbers may be — nay are — even greater than those contained in the societies here represented. They are simply quiet and tolerant private citizens, who, for the most part, are rather amused that any one should be intolerant. But while this organization of the evangelical churches gives them an advantage in being able to present petitions and speakers, *it is, gentlemen, a danger!* Our forefathers foresaw the danger of an organized minority coercing an un-

organized majority, and forbade this country a standing army; there is as much danger, or, as the history of religious persecution shows, *more danger, in the interference of an organized body of churchmen in the affairs of the State*, than in a standing army. Nothing can so undermine the liberty of a people as a belief that there is but one road to salvation, which all must walk, if not willingly, then by force.

“Did you notice the little remarks about Sunday traffic and Sunday mails, yesterday? Logically, if the arguments of these deluded leaders be held as valid for the closing of the World’s Fair, they must be held as valid against Sunday trains. Who seriously supposes that Congress would ever think of suppressing Sunday travel because of the religious prejudices of the people, whatever the Society of Christian Endeavor might say. Why, such an attempt would bring about a revolution — which shows what is the real sentiment of the vast bulk of the people.

“I am a Chicagoan, and might possibly prove the fact by being a little boastful and claiming the earth; but I do not think Chicago, nor even my loved country, marshals under its banner all Christianity. In other Christian countries the art galleries and exhibits are open on Sunday, and when, as one of the speakers yesterday averred, during the last Paris exposition the American exhibit was closed on Sunday, the French government thought the matter of sufficient importance to enter a protest. Shall we, when we invite the world’s nations to be our guests, reflect upon their religious observances, and force them, in company with the immense contingent *not* represented by the gentlemen who spoke yesterday, to accept Puritan institutions or be banned as unchristian? Shall we do all in our power to force them into a religious form against their wills? If these nations had heard some of the denunciations hurled against their ‘decaying, unsabatarian governments,’ they would not feel that we had been courteous or fair, and might, not unjustly, assume that they had been lured hither with the World’s Fair as a gigantic bait that they might be converted to the Christian Endeavor Society.

“Gentlemen, I am myself a Christian woman, and, after yesterday, I am almost tempted to explain what I mean by that word, for the Mosaic law is not to me all comprehensive, but I follow Christ’s interpretation of this same vexed question, and would keep the Lord’s day in the spirit of him who picked corn and healed the sick, and was rebuked by the reformers of his own time, and believe with the divine Teacher before whom we all bow, that man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man.”

What is the situation now as the legislation stands at the latest moment before this statement goes to press? Here is an article from the *Chicago Herald*, which gives the situation, as it was immediately after the hearing, and no man can fairly deny the correctness of the description:—

“SUNDAY CLOSERS LIKELY TO WIN.

“WASHINGTON, January 13.—It is anything but an encouraging prospect which the friends of Sunday opening of the World's Fair have before them. To-night it looks very much as if the Durborow resolution would be permitted to die a natural death in the Columbian Committee. A canvass of that committee fails to show a majority in favor of reporting it, and while it is not positively known that a majority is against it, all the signs point in that direction. The hearings which have taken place during the last four days have greatly hurt the Sunday-opening cause. Not that the advocates of closing have had the best of the argument, for they have not; but the publicity given to the matter throughout the country by this agitation has brought down upon Congress an avalanche of protests and appeals, from religious people and church organizations all over the country.

“The churches and the ministers are at work again quite as earnestly as they were a year ago, and with equal effectiveness. While there was no doubt a month ago that if a vote could have been taken upon the question of Sunday opening at once, a comfortable majority would have been found in both houses of Congress for opening, it is not now likely that the Durborow resolution can be carried through either body.

“Of the twelve members of the Columbian Committee of the House only four can be relied upon to report favorably the Durborow resolution. General Cogswell, who was counted upon till to-day, is now wavering. *The Methodist Episcopal Church has brought some influence to bear upon him* which he finds it difficult to resist. The odds are decidedly against the resolution ever getting into the House, and even if it shall be reported, no one can find a majority in its favor. The trouble is that a large number of members who believe in Sunday opening on principle and as a matter of right *are too timid to vote their convictions in the face of the organized opposition from the churches and ministers.* These statesmen argue that the men who want the Fair open on Sunday are reasonable men, who will not permit their judgment or their votes to be affected by failure to get what they want. While on the other hand *the church people who are for Sunday closing will, if their wishes are thwarted, lose their tempers, and at the next election, make trouble for those who vote against them.*

“This sort of cowardice or caution, combined with the fact that *the*

ministers who are making Sunday closing a sort of stock-in-trade have no hesitancy about bulldozing their congressional representatives or anyone else they can get hold of, offers an explanation of the changed condition of affairs with reference to this question."

Now, generally speaking, the people who want the Fair opened on Sunday are not church people. There are, it is true, a few ministers and some laymen who favor Sunday opening; but even these are not considered by the great body of the churches to be "orthodox." So that practically and generally speaking, the people who want the Fair opened on Sunday are not church people at all. Now it is argued, that these people "are reasonable men who will not allow their judgment or their votes to be affected by failure to get what they want in this thing, while on the other hand, if the church people do not get what they want, and have their way, they "will lose their tempers" and "make trouble" for those who refuse to yield to their demands. What is this, then, but to say, and to say truly, that the church people are worse than are the people who do not belong to the church? The people who do not belong to the church are reasonable men who will not lose their tempers. The church people *will* lose their tempers and make trouble. The people who do not care for Sunday and who do not belong to the church, will behave themselves and keep civil. The church men, the worshipers of Sunday, will lose their tempers and bulldoze everybody that they can bulldoze.

Here are some words from Senator Quay, which are of importance, both because of the statements which they make and because he is the one who introduced this question in the Senate. The *Pittsburg Leader*, Jan. 2, 1893, published in an editorial the following from the Senator:—

"Congress will not reverse its action. It is not a question at all about whether the opening of the Fair on that day will or will not benefit. But if Congress were to reverse its action, it could have no other meaning than that the United States, the greatest and most prosperous nation on this

earth, had declared officially through its chosen representatives in favor of desecrating the Sabbath and thus breaking one of the commandments. And Congress will not do that."

And after this hearing had been held, and the arguments had been made for opening the Fair, it was rumored that Senator Quay had brought up the subject in a Republican caucus, with the view of having a resolution adopted opposing Sunday opening. The correspondent of the *Chicago Herald* saw the Senator and asked him about it, and received answer as follows:—

"The question was not brought up in the caucus, hence I have no hesitancy in talking about it. I did confer with a number of Republican senators as to the expediency of adopting measures to kill the proposed bill or resolution. I am free to say that the resolution opening the World's Fair on Sunday cannot pass the Senate.

"I do not care what they do in the House, and I do not care if a majority of the Senate is in favor of it. It cannot pass. And other senators will stand here and fight it to the bitter end, and a majority even cannot pass it without adopting a cloture rule. I do not believe that a majority of the Senate are in favor of the resolution; in fact, I think the majority against it is as large as the majority in favor of the condition which we imposed in voting the appropriation. But even if the majority is on the other side, the resolution will not be permitted to pass the Senate without the adoption of a rule cutting off the right of debate and forcing a vote. The people of Chicago may as well give up this fight. They can't win it."—*Chicago Herald, Jan. 19, 1893.*

Thus *one man* proposes to, and if occasion offers, undoubtedly will, hold the government, and the whole nation even, to a wrong course, even though a majority of both houses of Congress and of the whole nation call for the opposite. And this at the bidding of an arrogant priesthood. What, then, becomes of the principle of majority rule? It is gone. And when the *minority* rules, then what becomes of government of the people. That is gone too. This is true. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, is gone. And in its place there stands the doctrine and the practice, of the *subjection of the people*, by the churches, and

for the churches. This demonstrates again the complete revolution that has been accomplished in this transaction.

A statement from Representative Reilly, of Pennsylvania, in the same dispatch to the *Herald*, is also worth inserting, for the reason (?) which he gives. It is as follows:—

“The present agitation, if continued, can only result in injury to the Fair. Attempts to have the law repealed only *result in stirring up animosity* toward the Fair and *creating antagonism on the part of the church people*. They can do the Fair much harm if they decide to carry out the threats they have already made, and I think the friends of the Exposition who favor Sunday opening *would act wisely in ceasing their efforts*.”

Representative Houk, however, has set forth this point most fully and most strongly, in a letter to President Higginbotham of the Columbian Exposition, printed in the *Chicago Tribune*, Feb. 5, 1893. The letter is too long to reprint here, as it fills about a column and a half of solid brevier type. He first cites an amendment which he had prepared, to open the Fair on Sunday afternoons only, with no traffic allowed within the grounds, and with provision made for “such services as shall be prescribed by the proper authorities of said Exposition; embracing sacred music, sermons, without preference of denomination or sect, and devotional exercises in conformity with the religious ceremonies, practices, customs, and the ritual of any of the great religions prevailing among mankind; and also embracing addresses upon natural religion and the physical sciences, as illustrating the wisdom, power, and goodness of God in the creation and upon the progress of human civilization.”

Next he declares:—

“It is my deliberate conviction that Congress was and is without any constitutional power or authority whatever to impose such a condition upon the grant of the appropriation from a religious point of view, which now seems to be the main if not the only ground insisted upon by those who so strenuously contend for its retention.”

He then says that the action of Congress imposing the Sunday-closing condition is only defensible, “if at all,” upon

the ground of the "police power of the government." But even if it were defensible at all, it could not be *defended* upon this ground after having been *enacted* upon distinctively and positively declared religious grounds and no other. "The intent of the law-maker is the law." And no act can ever be justly defended upon grounds different from those upon which it was enacted.

Next he says, it would be perfectly proper for Congress to revoke the condition and release the Exposition authorities from the obligation, if it saw fit to do so; and then he states the point which we are here considering, and which we print in full, as follows:—

"At this point I now beg to call your attention to certain existing facts. A most extensive religious agitation has been made to prevail all over the country, upon this question. Concerted action has been taken by the clergy and upon the question, as presented by them to their congregations, as to whether they were in favor of 'the desecration of the Sabbath.' An entire unanimity of sentiment has been obtained, of course, among the Protestant Christian churches at least, and other large organizations of Christian workers, against the repeal of the condition requiring the closing of the Exposition Sundays.

"From the nature, extent, and character of this opposition, based, as I think it is, upon an erroneous, though conscientious sentiment, rather than upon a deliberate and rational judgment, it occurs to me that in case it were possible to have the existing law repealed, it might after all ultimately result in serious detriment to the final success of the Exposition.

"I am deeply interested in that success, from every point of view—historical, patriotic, æsthetic, commercial, industrial, scientific, moral, and financial. I want to see it redound to the honor of our country, and of mankind at large, as it will to that of the unrivaled community and city, whose energy, intelligence, and liberality have given it the mighty and magnificent proportions it nowhere else on the face of the earth could have attained.

"I will sincerely deplore that mistaken (as I think) religious sentiment, now seemingly so prevalent, if it shall result in depriving so many thousands of people of the great benefits and elevating enjoyment that could certainly, under proper management, be made to result from opening the Exposition to the public Sundays. But if it shall at the same time have the effect of quieting the fears that seem honestly to exist; that 'our American

Sunday and rest day is in danger,' and will unite all denominations and sects and organizations in a hearty co-operation to promote the highest and best interest of the great enterprise, the deprivation, serious as it undoubtedly will be, may not be altogether without compensation.

"It is of the first importance, in my judgment, to the final success of the Exposition that there should be a harmonious co-operation on the part of all the people of the United States in its support. If the present law requiring the gates to be closed Sundays to the public, should be repealed by a vote of a majority in both the House and Senate, which does not seem to me at all probable, and the act should receive the sanction of the President, which seems to be equally improbable, it is certain that the religious element of the country, through all its organizations, would be deeply offended and would array itself in antagonism to the Fair.

"It is not a question whether such a course would be reasonable or not; and, while such action might be regarded as an exhibition of religious fanaticism, most remarkable under the circumstances, it is nevertheless true that a large number of good, conscientious, Christian people throughout the country, in their excited state of feeling upon this question, would be likely to pursue that course.

"I am in a position to have reliable information in regard to this matter, and although I firmly believe that the refusal to permit the Exposition to be opened to the public Sundays under the regulations I have suggested, will be a most deplorable mistake, I am also fully persuaded that the repeal of the existing law closing its gates would array the whole religious element of the United States (Protestant at least) against it.

"I have thought it my duty to state to you freely and frankly my views in regard to this important matter. I have been, as you know, from the inception of this great enterprise one of its most earnest friends outside of Chicago.

"The question now to be decided by the management is, whether it is advisable further to urge a doubtful contest upon a matter that is aggravating an already extensive and bitter hostility against Chicago and the Exposition, which even if ultimately successful would be as likely to be fraught with disaster as benefit to the enterprise.

"The Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition in the House, of which you are aware that I am a humble member, has now before it for consideration and determination the question, whether to report to the House an amendment to revoke the existing condition in regard to Sunday closing or by non-action permit it to remain as it is.

"With great respect I am, sir, yours truly,

"GEORGE W. HOUK,

"Member of Col. Ex. Com., H. R."

These statements from Messrs. Reilly and Houk, both members of the committee, fully confirm the statements of the Chicago *Herald* correspondent, that the church people, professedly Protestant at that, will cause such mischief, such trouble, and do such damage to the Fair and to the country, by losing their tempers and adopting bulldozing methods, if they do not have their own way, as would not be thought of by people who do not belong to the churches. And therefore for the success of the Fair and the good of the country, the government itself must be surrendered to, and run in the interests and at the bidding of, this most dangerous element in the nation !

This is precisely the position that has been taken also by United States District Judge E. S. Hammond. In a decision rendered Aug. 1, 1891, the Circuit Court of the United States for the western district of Tennessee distinctly established the doctrine of persecution in behalf of the observers of Sunday, in the following words : —

“By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom and the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State. . . . And the efforts to extirpate the advantage above mentioned by judicial decision in favor of a civil right to disregard the change, seem to me quite useless. . . .

“If the human impulse to rest on as many days as one can have for rest from toil, is not adequate, as it usually is, to secure abstention from vocations on Sunday, one may, and many thousands do, work on that day without complaint from any source ; but if one ostentatiously labors for the purpose of emphasizing his distaste for, or his disbelief in, the custom, *he may be made to suffer* for his defiance BY PERSECUTIONS, if you call them so, *on the part of the great majority*, who will compel him to rest when they rest.”

The Court was composed of Judge Howell E. Jackson, since appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and Judge E. S. Hammond. The decision was written by Judge Hammond. In the Memphis *Appeal-Avalanche*, Aug. 30, 1891, there appeared a four column article, dated August

12, by Judge Hammond, under the heading of "The Sunday Habit," which is little if anything else than a defense of the decision on this subject which had been rendered Aug. 1. In this article he confessed that "the logic of this [his] position may lead to a union of Church and State undoubtedly;" but that the support of Sunday by the civil power, by persecutions at the dictation of the churches, "is a necessity of statesmanship," upon "the policy of securing the public peace." The danger to the public peace if Sunday laws were disregarded, or attacked by a proposal to abolish them, is described in the following words:—

"We have lived so free of it in modern days that we forget the force of religious fanaticism, and he who supposes that its fury cannot be again aroused may be mistaken. . . .

"Christians would become alarmed, and they might substitute for the stars and other symbols of civil freedom upon the banners of their armed hosts, the symbol of the cross of Christ, and fight for their religion at the expense of their civil government. They have done this in times that are passed, and they could do it again. And he is not a wise statesman who overlooks a possibility like this and endangers the public peace. . . .

"*The civilian as contradistinguished from the churchman, though united in the same person, may find in the principle of preserving the public order a satisfactory warrant for yielding to religious prejudice and fanaticism the support of those laws, when the demand for such a support may become a force that would disturb the public order. It may be a constantly diminishing force, but if it be yet strong enough to create disturbance, statesmanship takes account of it as a factor in the problem.*"

These are the deliberate statements of representative men and officials, in official place, men who are in position not only to know, but in which they were obliged to consider the question in all its bearings. And when, having so considered the question, they set forth this as their deliberate conclusion, then nothing more is needed, and nothing more could be asked, to demonstrate that the church element that is managing the Sunday cause *is the most dangerous element that there is in the United States.*

That the government of the United States and the people of the whole nation should be deliberately surrendered into the power of this most dangerous and destructive element, is frightful.

That this pandering to this most dangerous and destructive element, and this deliberate surrender of the government and the nation to it, should be advertised and exalted as "wise statesmanship" by those who have done it, is terrible. It is not statesmanship of any kind, either wise or otherwise. It is shameful cowardice. It is a base betrayal of the supreme public trust — the rights of all the people.

But that this most dangerous and destructive element should be advertised and exalted as Christianity by those who have surrendered to it as well as by those who manifest it and impose it on the government, *is abominable*. It is not Christianity in any sense. It is devilry.

Yet in the face of this evidence and these open statements of these officials, that this church element that manages the Sunday cause is the most dangerous element in the nation,—so dangerous in fact, that the government and the whole nation must be surrendered to it bodily, in order to preserve the public peace, and even the government itself,—in the face of all this, these same leaders and managers of the Sunday-law cause evidently take great pride in advertising themselves as "the best people of the land," and "the law-abiding people of the country"! This is evident from the fact that they take occasion to announce themselves as such by preamble, and resolution, and speech, in their mass-meetings. They never lose any such opportunity to exalt themselves as "the best people," and "the law-abiding portion" of the community or the whole country even.

The fact is, however, that this claim is as much of a fraud as is all the rest of their claims. It is of the same piece as all the rest of their boasts. It is absolutely fraudulent. The fact is, that these very men are the least law-abid-

ing people in the United States. They have no respect for any law but such as their own arbitrary will demands and approves. Without the slightest hesitation, they disregard and override the supreme law of the government of the United States and of the government of the universe.

Proof.—The supreme law of the government of the United States, the Constitution, positively prohibits any legislation on the subject of religion. Yet, in spite of this, in utter disregard of the supreme law of the land, these men, by threats of force—threats of the loss of votes, the only force at their command—required Congress to legislate upon a religious subject, to decide a religious question, and to take their side in a great religious controversy. And in this they have plainly overridden the Constitution, and violated the supreme law of the land. *And they know it.*

Why, their action is as much worse than that of the average law-breaker, as the supreme law of the land is greater and more important than local statutes. The average law-breaker damages the *individual*; these supreme law-breakers damage *the whole nation*. The average law-breaker invades the rights *of the individual*; these supreme law-breakers have invaded and even swept away the rights of *all the people*. The average law-breaker disregards social order only in the locality where he is; while these supreme law-breakers strike at the very existence of social order by breaking down the chief governmental safeguard. For the average law-breaker, there is always a ready remedy in the regular forms of governmental order; but for these supreme law-breakers who have broken down the established safeguards of governmental order itself, where is the remedy?

These facts demonstrate that instead of their being truly the law-abiding portion of the people, these men are the chiefest law-breakers in the land—the most lawless of all the nation. Nor is this at all to be wondered at. For in order to accomplish this their bad purpose, they “gladly joined

hands" and hearts with the papacy — that power which the Lord designates as "the lawless one" and as the very "mystery of lawlessness" itself. 2 Thess. 2 : 3, 7. (Revised Version). For eight years continuously, the National Reformers advertised themselves as ready "to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they [the Roman Church] may be willing to exhibit it." After eight years of such endeavor, their wishes were rewarded by the following pronunciamento of the Catholic Lay Congress, in Baltimore, Nov. 12, 1889, which, as it passed the inspection of the hierarchy, before it was presented to the public, is the official response of the papacy in the United States, to the National Reform overtures : —

"There are many Christian issues to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics and *shape civil legislation* for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek an alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday."

And this, as the American Sabbath Union branch of the National Reform combination announced at the time, was done "*after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union.*" The whole statement is in these words : —

"The National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform."

Then in the same connection, this was announced as "a proposal of courtship." Following this, Archbishop Ireland, in a public meeting in New York City, in May, 1891, thanked God that "Protestants and Catholics" "stand together in demanding the faithful observance of Sunday." And as the "advances," the "proposal," and the "standing together" were all to secure "civil legislation" for the faithful observance of Sunday, the longed-for union was finally accomplished

when they succeeded in dragging the Fifty-second Congress into the now famous and no less infamous Sunday legislation.

Nor is it to be considered at all strange that they should show themselves so lawless as to disregard and override the supreme law of the nation, and join themselves to the very "mystery of lawlessness" to accomplish this lawless purpose. For, for all these years they have openly, both in actions and words, disregarded and overridden the supreme law of the universe,—the law of God which he proclaimed with a voice that shook the earth, and wrote with his own finger of fire on the tables of stone,—and they have followed the preaching, the precedent, and the authority of the mystery of lawlessness in the doing of it.

The Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, which he himself has named and appointed, which he declared with his own voice from heaven, which is his own, upon which he placed his blessing, which he made holy, and which he sanctified—*this*, the Sabbath of the Lord, is the sign of what Jesus Christ is to those who believe in him. The observance of it by faith—the true observance of it—brings into the life of the believer in Jesus, as nothing else can, the living presence and power of Jesus Christ. This is true, and every man may know it by faith in Jesus.

All these years they and the people have been told in the words of God that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." But instead of believing it, or allowing the people to believe it, they have disregarded it and declared that it is not so. They have taught the people that it is not so. They have put no difference between the holy and the profane (Eze. 23: 36), by telling the people that it makes no difference what day they keep. Thus they disregard the law of the living God, and teach the people to disregard it. Then after teaching the people to disregard the plain word of the law of God as to the observance of the day which he

has commanded, and telling all, in their own words that there is no command of God for the observance of Sunday, they join heart and hand with the mystery of lawlessness which has established Sunday instead of the Sabbath of the Lord, and set its own word and heathen customs above the law of God.

Having thus forsaken the Lord, and all true allegiance to his law, and gone over bodily and heartily and "gladly" to the mystery of lawlessness — having gone to such lengths as this in despising the law of the living God, it is not at all to be wondered at that they would despise the supreme law of the government of the United States, nor that they should require Congress, in violation of its solemn oath, to join in their high-handed enterprise and establish their lawless purpose, by the surrender of the power of the national government into their hands to be used at their lawless will, to enforce upon all, their lawless decrees.

And *these* are they who *pose* before the American people as "the best people," and "the law-abiding people" of the land! Such self-trumpeted glory is completely becoming. Such modesty fits them exactly.

We stated a moment ago, that, for the average law-breaker, there is always a ready remedy in the regular forms of governmental order; but for these supreme law-breakers who have broken down the established safeguards of governmental order itself, where is the remedy?

Ah! there is a remedy for this too. *It is in the hands of God, the Author of governmental order.*

Against all their attempts to do this great evil, we ever appealed to the Constitution, the grand charter and safeguard of the rights of mankind — the embodiment of the true principles of governmental order. And now that they have done the evil, and in the doing of it have overridden the Constitution, broken down this safeguard of the rights of mankind, and smitten the very citadel of governmental order

— now we appeal to the Author of governmental order itself. And our appeal is heard. We wait in perfect confidence. The just judgment will be rendered in due time.

WHAT WILL BE THE RESULTS?

It is worth serious inquiry as to what will be the effect upon the churches, of their taking the government of the United States into their hands, as they have done.

When we find what will be the effect upon the churches, it can easily be seen what the effect will be upon the State. And seeing the effect on both Church and State, it will be easy to know what the effect will be upon society as a whole.

Nor is this at all difficult. The results of this procedure have already begun to appear in such measure as to present a perfectly safe criterion. The outcome may be known without any theorizing at all. All that is necessary is candidly to consider *facts* as they stand before the people at the present moment.

The manner in which the churches succeeded in getting the government into their hands—this in itself contains a volume of instruction as to what the effect will be upon those churches. The resolution that was sent up to Congress from the “evangelical” churches in all parts of the country, after prescribing what Congress should do with respect to the World’s Fair; runs as follows:—

“*Resolved*, That we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth refuse to vote for, or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who shall vote for any further aid of any kind for the World’s Fair, except on conditions named in these resolutions.”

As all now know these threats succeeded, and both Senate and House yielded to this demand rather than to

risk the threatened loss of votes and jeopardize their "coming back again." It is likewise known that those who thus secured this legislation have repeatedly announced since, that this demonstrates that they can have anything they want, if they will only stand together in demanding it, and that they do intend to make such demands for further favors and further subjection of the government.

Now in view of these facts, here are some questions worthy of the candid attention of every honest church member in the land. If those who are already in Congress will thus play into the hands of the churches in order to "come back" there, then will not those who want to go there play likewise into the hands of the churches in order to get there? When, from this universal advertising, it is understood that the churches hold within their gift the offices and places of trust of the nation, then will not these same churches become the chiefest objects of the courtship and solicitation of the office-seekers of the land, and especially of the most unprincipled ones? Everybody knows that the only fair answer that can be made to these questions is, *Yes, they will.*

Then, in order to make their courtship and solicitation for office most effectual, these men will become church members themselves. And having joined the church for political purposes, they will use their membership for political purposes. And, so far as they are concerned, the churches will be but so many political clubs and coteries to be "worked" for all that can be made out of them. This is not theory, nor is it far-fetched; it is the plainly stated calculation of the leaders of the Sunday-law movement. For years it has been one of the standing principles of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union that "now, when it is a question of preserving the Sabbath itself, and guarding the homes which are the sanctuaries of Christ's gospel, we women believe that *no day is too good, no place*

too consecrated, *for the declaration of principles and the determining of votes.*"¹ And in an editorial notice of a Sunday-law meeting in New York city, the *Examiner* (Baptist) said : —

"Congress may change its mind ; the present is no time for jubilation ; but is (and we beg pardon for the phrase) a time for wire-pulling and hard fighting."

Now, when it is so openly and so brazenly announced by those who are occupying the leading positions in the churches, that their "holy day" and their sacred places shall be turned into political hustings, and that they will devote themselves to "wire-pulling and hard fighting"—when these take the lead in this, is it not inevitable that the office-seekers who would court their influence and votes will do the same thing? In fact, what else are these declarations of theirs but an open bid for such procedure on the part of just such classes as those?

Nor is political favor the only bid which these same churches hold out for the purpose of securing Sunday observance. The churches have financial as well as political gain at their disposal. In congratulating himself and his followers upon the success of their threatening efforts upon Congress, the President of the American Sabbath Union exclaimed : —

"The form of the law is happy. It gives a premium of \$2,500,000 on doing right. It proves in a concrete way that 'godliness hath great gain.'"

As these churches have it in their power thus to put a money premium upon doing the will of the Church, it is self-evident that in the nature of things they will speedily secure large accessions to their numbers in such "right" doing. When the Church is enabled thus to prove so readily in a concrete way, to her own satisfaction, that "godliness hath great gain," it is inevitable that there will be speedily added

¹ President Frances E. Willard's annual address, of 1887, Nashville National Convention.

to her numbers those who will be able to prove just as readily to *their* own satisfaction that "gain is godliness." And the deduction of these latter will be just as true and as honest as is this boast that the Church has already made.

Neither have they stopped with this attempt upon Congress and the World's Fair Directory. They are applying the principle in general practice. Witness the financial bargain — to give their moral and financial support — which the representatives of the churches of Englewood, Chicago, made with the Marlowe Theater to secure Sunday observance by the theater. The following from the Chicago *Daily News* Sept. 2, 1892 gives the facts in this case: —

"The Englewood 'church-and-theater' fight is for the moment, at least, over.

"A settlement has been arrived at between the contending parties, which is presumably satisfactory to both, though the terms are a little peculiar.

"The articles of agreement were drawn up at a joint meeting of the theater people and two of the church party, — Alderman Noble and Mr. J. Badenoch, Jr. The discussion commenced last night, and continued to a late hour, and only after prolonged inquiry this morning, was it possible to discover the terms of the settlement.

"Attorney J. McK. Cleland, president of the Englewood Young Men's Christian Association, who has hitherto been the fountain-head of information regarding the struggle, was at a loss how to reply when asked what settlement had been arrived at. 'You would better ask Alderman Noble,' he said, 'and talk with Mr. Fenn.'

"Alderman Noble could not be found, but Mr. Fenn was in his real-estate office at 79 Clark street.

"'I was not one of the sub-committee,' he said, 'and am not at liberty to tell you the facts about the agreement. Indeed, there are certain parts which are confidential between the committee and Mr. Miller of the theater. I may say, however, that there will be no evening performance after next Sunday.'

"'Are you satisfied with the settlement?'

"'Well, we have got all we wanted.'

"'At what cost?'

"'At no cost whatever.'

"'Then you should be perfectly satisfied.'

“‘Yes,’ said Mr. Fenn, in a rather dubious tone.

“A visit to Mr. Maher, attorney for the theater proprietor, solved the mystery of the reticence displayed by the president of the Y. M. C. A.

“‘What are the terms, Mr. Maher?’ the *Daily News* man asked, ‘and why this mystery?’

“The attorney smiled broadly. ‘There are just two points,’ he said. ‘In the first place there are to be no more Sunday performances after September 4; and secondly, the church people, excepting those who have a fixed and unalterable aversion to all theater-going, are to give their moral and financial support to the Marlowe theater.’

“‘Will they take stock in the theater?’

“‘No, sir; we still propose to own the theater. They will limit their financial support to occupying parquet seats and boxes.’”

Witness also the boycotting combination which the churches of the West Side, in the same city, entered into to secure Sunday observance by the dealers. The following is their preamble and resolution:—

“WHEREAS, It is contrary to the laws of Illinois and against the expressed wish of the people of Chicago, *propagated through the churches* and labor organizations through the agency of the daily press, for the clothing stores to open their doors on the Sabbath-day; and—

“WHEREAS, The citizens of the West Side, in mass-meeting assembled, on this Sunday, September 25, do earnestly protest against the continuance of this evil; therefore, be it—

“*Resolved*, That it be the sense of this meeting that we, the purchasing public of this, the West Side, do agree not to purchase any goods sold by any store that may keep open its doors on the Sabbath, and do further agree to exert our influence in every way practicable for the closing of stores on the Sabbath.”

This latter effort speedily bore living fruit, which is significant of the whole line of things which we are here pointing out.

This boycotting resolution to deal with nobody that opened on Sunday, was passed September 25. On October 11, another meeting of the same kind was held in another part of the city. The announcement and program were printed on a large leaflet which was about half filled with advertisements, among which we find one put up in this style:—

MILLINERY
FURNITURE
CARPETS
TRUNKS
BAGS
ETC., ETC.

A _____ & B _____
CLOTHING, DRY GOODS, HATS, CAPS, BOOTS, SHOES

Ladies and Gents' Furnishing Goods

4_ to 4_ M_____ Avenue.

We believe in the closing of shops and stores on Sunday, and have always practiced it.

Another one runs thus: —

PIONEER ADVOCATES OF SUNDAY CLOSING

Z _____ & CO.,

CLOTHIERS, HATTERS, AND FURNISHERS

Northwest Corner _____ and _____ Streets

NOT OPEN ON SUNDAY

These two advertisements are the veering of the weather-vane which show how that desire for the patronage of the Church will inspire and intensify the zeal for Sunday observance and its strict enforcement upon all.

More than this: we know of an instance wherein, in November, 1892, a money bribe was actually offered by the churches in a certain place, and the proposition was conveyed through a preacher, to secure the closing of a certain institution on Sunday.¹ And in perfect consonance with this, if not actually suggestive of it, the *Union Signal*, of Oct. 20, 1892, published editorially, from Joseph Cook, the statement that "there is more wealth behind the churches and the respectable portion of society than behind all the opponents" of Sunday closing. The statement is worth reprinting in full, as it is made in the very connection in which we have used it. It is as follows: —

"In view of the vigor with which the right of petition is exercised by the opponents of Sunday closing [of the World's Fair], we believe that

¹ For the reason that legal proceedings are pending in connection with this fact, we are not yet at liberty to give particulars as to place and persons.

it should continue to be exercised vigorously by the friends of Sunday observance, especially if there should prove to be the slightest danger of the reversal of the action of Congress. We urge alertness at all points of the compass, for our opponents are not likely to sleep, and portions of the press of the country favor them from obvious mercenary motives. So does the immense wealth behind the saloon. *But there is more wealth behind the churches and the respectable portion of society than behind all the opponents.* The forces of the churches are in this case substantially united, and are already triumphant in the preliminary contest."

Yet more than this: they are actually coddling the saloons to secure Sunday observance by them. The *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* (local organ of the American Sabbath Union) for October, 1892, reprinted an article from the *American Sabbath Union* (the national organ of the association of that name), entitled, "The Rochester Experiment," in which the Sunday observing saloon is flatly declared to be "reputable" and even of "good repute." It seems to be a report in the paper, from Rochester, New York, giving a flattering account of the progress of Sunday observance by the saloons. The article is long, and we can present only a few extracts. Here is one: —

"If liquor sellers can make as much, or nearly as much, by working six days as they can in seven, they will be foolish to deny themselves that extra day of rest."

And here is another: —

"A more important and controlling consideration is that the liquor closing movement is an effort to place this business under the protection of law instead of making it contraband, as the opposite policy has done. It is incredible that reputable men, as the large proportion of liquor sellers are, shall prefer voluntarily to place themselves under the ban of legal as well as popular disapproval."

And here is yet another, and stronger, too: —

"The effect of Sunday closing has been to sharply discriminate the reputable from the disreputable saloon, and certainly to the advantage of the former. How many of the reputable liquor sellers would wish to weaken *the good repute* of their establishments for the paltry patronage that disregard of their license obligations might secure?"

True, he states that "there is considerably more liquor sold Saturday night and used at home on Sunday than before the saloons were closed on that day." Nevertheless he declares, "It is better every way for these customers to get their supplies the day before, and keep their business closed."

And all these things are being done by the leaders and managers of the churches in the United States—and professed Protestant churches at that. How much worse could they do if they made no pretensions to religion at all? But when these things are all being done, not only by professed religionists, but by the very ones who set themselves forth as the representatives of Christianity itself, how infinitely worse it is than if done by persons making no pretensions to religion!

This is where the opposers of Sunday laws and Sunday observance are at a disadvantage. These Sunday-law workers can, and do, and will, employ measures and resort to means that no man of any principle would ever think of.¹ They will literally stop at nothing. With them the end justifies any and every means. The observance of Sunday, however secured, sanctifies every possible means that can be employed to secure it. This is evident from the facts which we have here set down—and that they *are* facts is patent to the whole people of the United States.

How exactly do these declarations and actions of these churches fulfill the prophecy that was spoken concerning them long ago—that they, as fallen Babylon, would "become the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird!" Rev. 18:2. That hold is now prepared. That cage is set. Its doors are open. And she is to-day holding forth the luring baits that will inevitably draw into her, every foul spirit and every unclean and hateful bird.

¹I told this to a theater full of people, at the Marlowe Theater, Englewood, Chicago, in August, 1892. And before two weeks were past, the managers of that theater saw it fulfilled.

And how much longer can the Christians stay in these churches and under these leaders and managers, without being partakers of their sins? *There are Christians in these churches* who are sighing and crying because of the evil and the abominations that are being wrought in them and by the managers of them. And to these now God sends the call, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4. There is but another step to take before her sins shall reach unto heaven, and God shall remember her iniquities. Rev. 18:2, 5.

There is another scripture that describes the whole situation and system of things as it exists to-day. It is 2 Tim. 3:1-5, and runs as follows:—

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away."

Think of it! a list of nineteen such dark iniquities as these, and all carried on by people having a form of godliness, a people making pretensions to Christianity! And, horrible to tell, they "shall wax worse and worse deceiving and being deceived." Verse 13. And the things which are to accomplish it are being done before the eyes of the people to-day. Is it not high time that whosoever would fear God should "from such turn away"? May heaven help the people to see.

In the Scriptures the Christian's relationship to Christ is described under the symbol of the marriage tie: "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

Rom. 7 : 4. "I have espoused you to one husband." 2 Cor. 11 : 2. And the individual Christian is in this represented as having been espoused "as a chaste virgin to Christ."

Such individuals gathered into fellowship form the Church of Christ. And the relationship to Christ of such collection of individuals is also described under the symbol of the marriage tie : "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it. . . . So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh ; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery : *but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.*" Eph. 5 : 25-32.

In accordance with this idea the Church of Christ, is represented in the Scriptures as the purest and fairest of women, leaning upon the arm of her beloved ; drawn to him with the drawings of his love ; her only thought being of her beloved, to her the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely, whose banner over her is love, and who would present her to himself "a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing ; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Such is the Church to Christ ; such is Christ to his Church ; and such is the relationship between Christ and his Church.

To such a church as this Christ committed his gospel to be by her made known to every creature. It is only such a church as this that can make known the gospel of Christ. That gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1 : 16. No one can make known that power who does not know that power for himself and in himself. And the Church can make known the power of God only by knowing that power in and for herself. And

that power being known only by faith, in the nature of things it is only by abiding faithful to her Lord that the Church could fulfill the work of the gospel committed to her trust.

Again: The gospel is Christ in men the hope of glory. Col. 1 : 27. This is what the Church of Christ is to make known to men. No one can make known Christ in men, who for himself does not know Christ in himself. It pleased God "to reveal his Son *in me* that I might preach *him*." Gal. 1 : 16. But Christ dwells in men only by faith. "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Eph. 3 : 17. It is evident, therefore, that the only way in which the Church can make known Christ in men the hope of glory, is to have, and to know, Christ revealed in herself. And as this is only known by faith, it is evident that it is only by abiding faithful to Christ that she can know Christ in herself or make him known in men.

Once more: In the gospel, the righteousness of God is revealed; and the righteousness of God only. And it is the righteousness of God only which the Church of Christ is to know, and which she is to make known to all the world. This is the ministry of the gospel which is committed to the Church of Christ. This righteousness is known only by faith, and revealed only to faith. "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. 1 : 17, and 3 : 22. As, therefore, this righteousness is known only by faith, and is revealed only to faith, it is plain that it is only by abiding steadfast in faithfulness to Christ that the Church can know or make known the righteousness of God which is revealed in the gospel.

The sum of all these counts, and of many more that might be given, is simply to demonstrate over and over that it is only by abiding wholly in Christ, by trusting in him entirely,

by depending upon him completely, by perfect faithfulness to him, that the Church can be what she must be in order to do what she is established to do.

Such was the Church of Christ in the beginning. Such is always the Church of Christ indeed. But such neither is nor has been the *professed* Church of Christ. For there has been an apostasy from Christ and from the true Church of Christ. In the apostles' days the warning was given, "Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:30. And there shall come "a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . For the mystery of iniquity doth already work."— 2 Thess. 2:3-7.

The Lord exalted his Church, and clothed her with the beautiful garments of salvation and righteousness, and endued her with the power of God and godliness, before the eyes of all the nations. He made her exceeding beautiful, and she prospered, and her renown went forth to all the world for her beauty; for it was perfect through *His* comeliness which *He* had put upon her. But not satisfied with the exaltation which the Lord gave, which could come and remain only through her own humility, a portion of the Church grew haughty and exalted *herself*. Not content with the beauty of the Lord, which he had put upon her, she prided *herself* upon her own beauty; and instead of trusting in him for her beauty, she trusted in herself. Not content that God alone should be glorified in her, she glorified *herself*, and lived deliciously. Then, trusting in herself, priding herself upon her own beauty, magnifying her own merit, and satisfied with her own sufficiency,—this in itself was to put herself in the place of God. Then it was natural enough that she should seek to draw disciples to herself rather than to the

Lord. Not only this, but having exalted herself, and magnified herself, and still trusting in herself, it was impossible for her to draw disciples to anybody but herself. Thus came the apostasy. And thus, instead of remaining the Church of Christ in truth, manifesting to the world the mystery of God and of godliness, she became, though still professedly the Church of Christ, only the manifestation to the world of the mystery of *self* and of selfishness, which is the very mystery of iniquity.

Pre-èminent in both phases of this career was the Church at Rome. She was pre-èminent in faith, insomuch that her faith was "spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. 1 : 8. She was also pre-èminent in apostasy, insomuch that this likewise has been spoken of throughout the whole world, and for nearly eighteen hundred years. As she had been so highly exalted and honored *by the Lord*, correspondingly low did she fall, and correspondingly dishonored did she become, when she exalted *herself*. As high as was her privilege while abiding in the faith, so correspondingly low was her degradation in her apostasy. As she had been perfect in beauty through the comeliness which the Lord had put upon her, so she became frightful in the ugliness of her own uncomely self-conscious pride of her own accomplishments, which were only evil.

POWER SHE MUST HAVE.

As she was now trusting in her own merit and her own sufficiency, and seeking to draw disciples to herself, she was left to her own inventions to attract them. She accommodated herself to the ways of the sun-worshipping heathen; she perverted the right way of the Lord, and spake perverse things. She decked herself in gold and jewels and costly array. By such means her adherents multiplied greatly. But lo! just here she encountered a serious difficulty: she found it impossible of herself to hold her converts in subjection to her bidding.

The chiefest trouble in this respect was in securing conformity to her will in the matter of the observance of Sunday as a holy day, which, instead of the Sabbath of the Lord, the sign of his power and authority, she had set up as the sign of her authority to command the obedience of men. To accomplish this, she realized the want of a power beyond herself, a power other than her own. The power of God was not open to her in this; nor, in fact, in anything else that she commanded, for none of these things had the Lord required. It is the Church's duty to obey God, not to command men.

True, the power of God was still for her and free to her, but the way to it lay only through sincere repentance, through humbling herself, confessing her sins, and separating from her heathen customs, and from all iniquity. This she would not do. But power she must have, and power she would have, even though it were illegitimate. Having forsaken the heavenly power, she now sought for earthly power. Having forsaken the arm of the Lord, she sought the arm of man. Having disconnected herself from the kingdom of heaven, she would now connect herself with kingdoms of earth. Still trusting in her own beauty, and her own bedecking of silk and gold and precious stones and pearls, and holding in her hands the proffer of rich gifts to any lover that would receive her pernicious advances and form an alliance with her, she finally succeeded, through Constantine, in gaining imperial favor and forming an adulterous connection with an earthly lord. The now unholy Church formed an unholy connection with the unholy State. And the very first fruit of it was an imperial law enforcing her will in Sunday observance; the next was the definite placing of the imperial authority at her disposal, with which to compel conformity, and to punish obstinate heretics.

Thus did she who had been espoused as a chaste virgin to Christ; she who had been joined in the bonds of pure and holy marriage to him who is perfect in power, in love,

and purity ; she who had known the blissful delights of his love,— thus did she violate her virgin vows, break her marriage ties, and became a bloody, murderous harlot, and' the very symbol of confusion. Accordingly, the next view that is given of her is this: "I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17 : 3-6.

And though in the course of time she had scattered her pernicious ways to all the heathen, and had indulged her lascivious propensities with every kingdom on earth, even yet the Lord would have healed Babylon. In the Reformation he sent a balm for her, if so be that she might be healed. But she would not. Therefore such as loved the Lord were obliged to forsake her.

But lo ! these that had forsaken her to join themselves to the Lord, instead of remaining faithful to him, followed her evil example, and forsook him and joined themselves also to the kingdoms of the earth in illicit connection. Thus it was with every professed Protestant church, except the Baptist, that ever had a chance, from the Reformation to the founding of the national government of the United States. This government, by utterly prohibiting to itself any connection with the Church or religion, intended to shut off all opportunity for any church to follow here the Romish-Babylonish example of joining itself to the national government, though even then and ever since, it was sorely against the will of some professed Protestant churches.

Yet in spite of this national principle of government, and in the face of the warnings of the history of eighteen hundred years, the churches of the United States for the last fifty years have been gradually drifting into the course of the original apostasy, and in the last fifteen years their progress in this way has been most rapid, until its culmination in 1892. We might here give representative facts with reference to the festivals, and fairs, and ring-cakes, and grab-bags, and fish-ponds, and kissing-bees, and sleeping beauties, and raffles, and selling young ladies by auction, etc., etc., all carried on in the church and for the church, showing the progress of this apostasy all the way; but what is the use of it when the final step has now been taken before the eyes of all the world?

Everybody knows that for several years the professed Protestant churches of the United States have boasted of the greatness of their numbers, but yet have openly and repeatedly—by pulpit, platform, and press—confessed their lack of power to maintain the observance of Sunday as the “Christian Sabbath” by their own adherents. But what have they done to recover this loss of power? Did they resolve to insist upon strict conformity to discipline on the part of these disloyal adherents?—No, no; instead of this, one prominent preacher lately expressed the sentiment that has pervaded all upon this subject, when he declared that he himself would go out of the church, as he stated it, “body, boots, and breeches,” before he would discipline a single one of them,

Did they resolve to preach the gospel fervently in the demonstration of the Spirit and power of God?—No; for in this they experienced the same difficulty that was met in the original apostasy—they were compelled to confess that there is no “thus saith the Lord” for Sunday observance. There was therefore no authority of God to which they could appeal to arouse the conscience, no word of the Lord

through which they could invoke the agency of the divine Spirit to touch the heart.

Did they then act upon this confession of no "thus saith the Lord" for the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, and turn about and seek to conform their ways to what the Lord has indeed spoken with his own voice, and written with his own finger with respect to the day which shall be observed?—No; they did not do this, either. What, then, did they do?

THEY DID THIS.

"*Resolved*, That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath."¹

For several years they offered themselves upon this bid to all takers. But until 1892, no opportunity was presented upon which they might act positively and decidedly upon the resolution which they had formed. The World's Fair enterprise, however, when it was taken up by Congress, presented the very chance for which they had been looking. Consequently, at this they acted together as one body in demanding the nation's recognition and support of Sunday sacredness, by the threatening resolution printed on page 65.

God has said that he "hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; *that they should seek the Lord*, if haply they might feel after him, and find him." Acts 17: 26, 27. Here are these churches which find themselves sorely in need of a power beyond themselves, and other than their own. But instead of meeting the Lord's mind, and seeking him, and so setting a bright example to all men, they turn their backs upon the Lord, and seek *the government of the United States*, and feel after it,—*and they found it, too.*

¹ Sunday-law Convention, Elgin, Ill., Nov. 8, 1887.

The Church of Christ is the Lord's appointed agency through which he would call men unto himself that they may find in him deliverance from this present evil world. Now here are these *professed* churches of Christ who find themselves overloaded with worldly influences and worldly practices. Instead of seeking *the Lord* for deliverance from this burden of evil, they seek, by the chiefest of worldly means, a closer alliance with the highest source of worldly influences and worldly practices! For deliverance from an evil which they know, they seek the very source of that evil!! For deliverance from the power of the world, they enter by force into the possession of the greatest worldly power!!! Was there ever a more complete apostasy than this? Could the example of the original apostate church be more exactly followed than it has been in this procedure? And that which marks how complete the apostasy is, is that in this even the Baptist Church is in large measure included. Even she who had always kept herself clear of such an illicit connection has been carried away in this evil tide of apostasy; and all together have joined hands with the original apostate church to make successful their determination to secure the power of earthly government.

Thus again, these who had been espoused to Christ, who had been joined to him in the bonds of heavenly alliance, have violated their vows and broken their marriage bonds to him who is perfect in power, in love, and purity. Once more these have forsaken the heavenly power and sought for earthly power. They have forsaken the arm of the Lord and have put their confidence in the arm of flesh. They have forsaken the heavenly Husband and have formed an adulterous connection with an earthly lord. Once more the unholy Church has formed an unholy connection with the unholy State. And once more the very first fruit of it is a national law expressive of her will in the matter of Sunday observance; and the rest of the baleful fruit of such illicit connection will inevitably

follow. Is it at all strange, therefore, that the following passage should have been printed, even some time ago, by a leading divine in one of the leading "Protestant" papers of the country? Discussing the question of the reunion of Christendom, he argued for it against certain ones, thus:—

"You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, *the mother of us all*, the church of scholars and saints, such as Augustine, and Aquinas, and Bernard, and Fenelon: the Church of all races, ranks, and classes, which already gives signs of becoming American as well as Roman. . . . You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful *daughter of a beautiful mother.*"

That was printed Feb. 9, 1888, in the *Evangelist*, New York City, one of the two leading Presbyterian papers of the country. And from that time to this, never have we seen or heard a single word of protest or dissent from any of the professed evangelical Protestant churches of the country. This states their relationship to "Babylon, the mother of harlots" as that of daughters; and even beautiful daughters, after the "beautiful mother." Their silence is consent that the relationship is correctly stated. And their *action* in forsaking their rightful Lord and entering into this illicit union with another is positive demonstration that the relationship is herein correctly given. For just as certainly as the original apostasy created "Babylon the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," just so certainly this apostasy in our day and in our country has created the harlot daughters of "Babylon the mother." She is the mother only of "harlots and abominations." By positive statement it has been said of them and for them that they are her daughters. By silence they have confessed it, and by action they have demonstrated it. And it is so. We are sorry; but so it is.

WE KNEW IT WAS COMING.

We have known for a long time that this evil thing of the union of Church and State would be created here. In 1886 the *American Sentinel* was established expressly to oppose it

and to expose the evil that is in it, and in the movement and the efforts that were being made to bring it about. From the first number of this journal that was ever issued, it has been telling the people that in the national government, though forbidden by the Constitution, there would be established a national religion; and that there would be national Sunday legislation at the demand of the churches.

All this is now done by the United States Supreme Court decision of Feb. 29, 1892, and by Congress, in the act closing the World's Fair on Sunday. In these two governmental actions there lies wrapped up, and only waiting for swift development, all that we have been telling about, and warning against, all these years.

We knew it was coming. We knew it would be done. And this is why we so continuously and so earnestly protested, and warned the people against it. We knew not exactly *how* it would be done; we only knew that it *would* be done. But we knew enough about the evil thing to be able to recognize it when it should be done, in whatever way it might be done. We have demonstrated over and over, by parallels of historical and ecclesiastical procedure, that this great evil must inevitably come as the result of existing conditions and of the efforts and aims of the churches; but our knowledge that it was coming *antedated by many years* both the existing conditions and the efforts and aims of the churches to bring it about.

The first thing that was ever done by the churches to bring this about was thirty years ago, *i. e.*, February, 1863; while on our part we have known for more than *forty* years that it was coming. The religious denomination that now publishes this pamphlet, published more than forty years ago that there would be formed in this government, though prohibited by the Constitution and the fundamental principles of the government, a union of Church and State, with national legislation establishing Sunday as the Sabbath, and

with the churches in possession of the governmental power to enforce Sunday observance.

More than forty years ago this denomination put this announcement in print, and then, and through all the years since, this people have preached everywhere that this was coming and would surely be done. And now that it has been done, and exists before our eyes, we see exactly and only what we have been looking for, all this time.

How then did we know that it was coming? We knew it by the word of God, in the scriptures of the prophets. The prophecy that announces it is in the thirteenth chapter of the book of Revelation; and there all may read it. In the first ten verses of that chapter there is given a description of the rise and career of a certain power under the symbol of "a beast." Then from the eleventh to the seventeenth verse inclusive, there is given the description of another power under the symbol of "another beast" and "the image of the beast." The first of these powers is also designated as "the first beast" and "the beast which had the wound by a sword." The full description of the first one is as follows:—

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshiped the dragon which gave power unto the beast; and they worshiped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth

shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.”

Every person not a Catholic, who knows the A B C of history knows that this is a vivid sketch of the papacy and its career up to 1798 A. D. Every such person knows that the one great power to which all the nations have done homage the most, and for the longest time, is the papacy. Every such person knows that the most blasphemous power that was ever on the earth is the papacy. He likewise knows that the one power that has made war with the saints of God, and has overcome them the most cruelly, and has persecuted them the most widely and for the longest time, is the papacy. We know that to say this is not considered as proper Protestantism for these days; but proper Protestantism it is, nevertheless. For all this is true of the papacy, and has been true of it for ages. And everybody, Catholic, or non-Catholic, knows that the papacy is the union of Church and State, with the Church in possession of the power of the State to use in enforcing her decrees, and compelling men to submit to her dictation.

The description of the “other beast,” or the image of the beast, is as follows:—

“And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; *saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by the sword, and did live.* And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both

small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."

This prophecy says that it would be said unto them, that "they should *make* an image to the beast." This would be to make an image to the papacy. The papacy being a union of Church and State, with the Church using the power of the State to enforce the doctrines of the Church and to compel submission to her decrees, the making of an image of this would be only to make or establish an order of things by which a union of Church and State would be created, with the civil power in the hands of the Church to compel submission to church doctrines, and observance of church institutions. But in order for this to be *made*, it must be that before this there was no union of Church and State in the place where this is to be done. As it is necessary to say "that they should *make* an image" of the papacy—that is, union of Church and State—it is plain on the face of it that this is said, and must be said, in a place where there is no union of Church and State, and where the Church has no control of civil affairs and no connection with the civil power.

Now where was there ever a place or a nation on earth in which there was no union of Church and State except in the United States alone? With the single exception of the United States government, there never was a government on earth, pagan, papal, or professed Protestant, in which from the beginning of its existence, as such, until this day, there was no union of religion and the State; in which the religious power had no control of, or connection with, the civil power. This is the truth, and any one may satisfy himself of it by thinking, whether little or much. This being the truth, it follows that in the United States is the only place on earth where it could be said that they should *make* a union of Church and State. Consequently in the government of the United States alone could the image of the beast—the image

of the papacy — be made. There are many other points corroborative of this, but this is sufficient for this place.

It was because of this prophecy of Rev. 13 : 11-17 that it has been preached and published, for more than forty years that there would be formed in the United States a union of Church and State, with national Sunday legislation — that there would be made here an image of the papacy. For instance: Forty years ago — January, 1853 — a little pamphlet of about seventy-five pages, perhaps $2\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ inches in size, was published, giving a brief exposition of Revelation 13, and especially that part in verses 11-17. On this point there was then written and printed the following : —

“The two-horned beast says to *them that dwell on the earth*, ‘Make an image.’ The dwellers on the earth, or territory of this beast, it seems, have a part to act in this work. This clearly marks *the United States as the scene of action*. This is the manner in which laws are made here — by the representatives of the people. As all men by the Declaration are declared to be equal, it became necessary that some course should be taken by which all could have equal privileges in the construction of the laws. If the whole mass were called together, there would be an endless discussion and no laws made. Therefore the people were to elect such representatives as would carry out their principles; and they were to meet and make laws, which, when passed, should be considered the laws of the people. *The image is to be formed by the people or their representatives.*

“It appears probable to us that *this Sunday institution* is the very point on which this union will be effected. Here is a point on which all Protestant sects can unite. A point which we may safely say is *the important item* in the faith of Protestants is their Sunday worship.

“Verse 15. — ‘And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.’ From this text we may draw two conclusions : —

“1. The image of the beast is to be made in the same territory where the two-horned beast rules; for the two-horned beast can exercise that authority in no territory but its own.

“2. That it already has it in its power to give life to the image of the beast, or cause the decree to be made and executed. Is it not in the power of the United States to pass such laws? They declare ‘all men shall be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of their own con-

sciences.' We see the mass hold the first day of the week as a holy day. If a memorial should be sent in to Congress with 1,000,000 names signed to it, declaring that their rights were infringed upon, and praying them to pass a solemn enactment that the first day should not be profaned by labor, how soon the result would be a law upon the point.

"Were the United States, as a body, to pass a law that Sunday should be kept holy, or not profaned by labor, there would be, I conceive, an image to the papacy; for the law would then be in the hands of the Church, and she could inflict penalties on those who did not obey the Sunday institution."

Now bear in mind that on the strength of that scripture prophecy, this was printed forty years ago—in 1853. And no man can deny that in 1892 the very things were done which in this exposition of the prophecy were said would be done. The churches professedly representing millions of petitioners, did this year memorialize Congress, with threats, in behalf of Sunday sacredness; and as the result Congress responded, as expressed by Senator Hiscock:—

"I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands, and not stand here hesitating or quibbling about it. . . . I should make this closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day."

And as expressed by the representative "Christian lobbyist" of the churches:—

"I have learned that we hold the United States Senate in our hands."

Yes, as shown by the "hearing" herein reported, they have the Senate, and Congress, and the law, and the government in their hands by which to sustain Sunday as a sacred day and prevent its desecration. By the prophecy we knew forty years ago that it was coming. And by the *facts* we know now that it *has* come. The prophecy is fulfilled.

Again: Nine years ago, in 1884, this same denomination printed the following on the same prophecy of Rev. 13:

11-17:—

“By this first beast is represented the Roman Church, an ecclesiastical body clothed with civil power, having authority to punish all dissenters. The image of the beast represents another religious body clothed with similar power. The *formation* of this image is the work of that beast whose peaceful rise and mild professions render it so striking a symbol of the *United States*. Here is to be found an image of the papacy. When the churches of our land, uniting upon such points of faith as are held by them in common, shall influence the State to enforce their decrees and sustain their institutions, then will Protestant America have formed an image of the *Roman hierarchy*.”—“*Great Controversy*,” Vol. IV, p. 278.

This has been done. The churches of our land *have* united upon the Sunday issue, and then united with the Catholic Church itself, and in this unity they have influenced the State to enforce the Church decree for Sunday observance, and to sustain the Church institution of Sunday. They have done it. And in the doing of it, they have made the living image of the papacy in this land. Nine years ago we published that this would be done; and now *it has been done*. On the strength of the prophecy we published that it would come; and on the strength of *facts*, everybody may know that it *has* come. The prophecy is fulfilled. The image of the beast is made, and lives, in the United States to-day.

Once more: Eight years ago, in 1885, this same people published on the same subject these words:—

“To secure popularity and patronage, legislators will yield to the demand for a Sunday law.”—“*Testimony*” No. 32, p. 207.

Last year (1892) the churches made their demand for a Sunday law. They presented their memorials and petitions backed up with such persuasive words as those which follow from Presbyterian churches in Brighton, N. Y.; Parma Center, N. Y.; and Rochester, N. Y., and recorded in the *Congressional Record* of May 25, 1892, thus:—

“*Resolved*, that we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth, refuse to vote for, or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representa-

tive, who shall vote for any further aid of any kind for the World's Fair except on conditions named in these resolutions."

To secure the popularity and patronage which were thus put up at public auction by the churches, our nation's legislators assembled in Congress *did* yield to the demand for a Sunday law, and did enact such a law in three distinct ways and places; and for the reasons as stated by themselves, thus:—

"If I had charge of this amendment in the interest of the Columbian Exposition, I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands, and . . . I say to the junior senator from Illinois [Mr. Palmer] *he had better yield* to this sentiment, and not let it go out to the country that there is the slightest doubt that if this money shall be appropriated, the Exposition will be closed on Sunday. . . . I should make the closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day."—*Senator Hiscock, Congressional Record, July 13, 1892, p. 6755.*

And again upon this demand for Sunday law, in the same debate, it was said:—

"Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it, . . . I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. Write it. How would you write it? . . . Word it, if you dare; advocate it, if you dare. How many who voted for it would ever come back here again? None, I hope. . . . You endanger yourselves by opposing it."—*Senator Hawley, Id., p. 6759.*

It was the same way in the House. A dispatch from Washington to the Chicago *Daily Post*, April 9, 1892, gave the following from an interview with a member of the House Committee on the World's Fair:—

"The reason we shall vote for it is, I will confess to you, a fear that, unless we do so, the church folks will get together and knife us at the polls; and—well you know we all want to come back, and we can't afford to take any risks."

"Do you think it will pass the house?"

"Yes; and the Senate too. We are all in the same boat. I am sorry for those in charge of the Fair; but self-preservation is the first law of nature, and that is all there is about it,"

Further and emphatic evidence on this point has already been given, on pages 52, 55, 57, and 59.

In the light, and upon the strength of the prophecy, we published nine years ago that they would do it. And now in their own words, we can publish and do publish, that they *have done* it. The prophecy is fulfilled. The image of the beast is made, and lives, in the United States to-day.

That which now remains is for it to go on and cause all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive the mark, and carry on the general and universal boycott upon all who refuse to keep Sunday, by which no one may buy or sell save he that has the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. But upon this,—

WHAT SAITH THE LORD ?

“And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.

“And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.

“And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, *If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.*

“And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them. And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand

a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for thee to reap; *for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped.*"

Just here while all are to be compelled to worship the papacy and its image, and to receive its mark, the Lord sends the everlasting gospel to all, calling them to *worship him* alone, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters, for the hour of his judgment is come. And the sign which he himself has set up that men may know that he is the Lord, the true God, who made heaven and earth and the sea and the fountains of waters, is the Sabbath of the Lord. Eze. 20:20; Ex. 31:17; 20:8-11. There is also made the announcement of the fall of Babylon; and then the dreadful warning against obedience to the decrees of the papacy anywhere, or its image here in the United States. And the next thing that follows is the coming of the Lord to reap the harvest of the earth. And the harvest is the end of the world. Matt. 13:39.

And this is how we have *known* all these years that there would be a union of Church and State formed in the United States with national Sunday legislation. This is why we have been telling the people by voice and pen, in every place and in every way, all these years, that this was coming. Now it is here, and no man can deny it. Here are the words which we published years ago that *it would come*, and no man can deny that. Men may disbelieve it, but they cannot deny it; they may reject it, but they cannot disprove it.

While we were telling it, many would not *believe* it, and said it would never come. We *knew* it, and published that it would come. Now it has come. It is here. And this demonstrates unmistakably that we were right, and they were wrong. To all these we now say, Come now and stand with us that you may be in the right *now* on this great question.

And there are other things *yet to* come from this which *has* come, which are to be told. And we are going to tell these things as we have told the others; for they are true.

That the "evangelical" churches of the United States have taken possession of the governmental authority of the United States, is plain to every one who will candidly consider the subject. That they purpose to keep this power and use it, they have plainly and repeatedly declared.

We are inquiring what effect this course will have upon the churches, and through them upon the State. So far, we have found that the effect upon the churches has been, stating it briefly, to commit them to open apostasy from the Lord and from his gospel; to make them the chiefest law-breakers in the nation, even the destroyers of government itself; and to form them into the grandest system of bribery that this nation ever saw — bribery in politics, bribery in business, and bribery in amusements. And all this, that they may be confirmed in their effort to make void the law of the Most High.

The churches profess that the course which they have taken is essential to the preservation of the State, and in this, the salvation of the nation. This view was also taken and plainly stated in the debates in Congress upon the bill.¹

¹ Senator Hawley said:—

"This very day and this hour, I would not for the wealth of ten expositions, have upon my shoulders the responsibility of having decided the question wrongly upon what may be a turning-point in the history of the United States. Open the Exposition on Sunday and the flood-gates are opened. . . . I ask you to regard that which is of immeasurable importance in *the salvation of a nation*, the great, profound sense of religious obligation." — *Congressional Record*, July 12, 1892, pp. 6699-6700.

Senator Colquitt said:—

"Without legislation relating to the great contests that are going on in this country, without the interference of bayonets, without calling upon the militia, without the marshaling of armed forces, if there is one palliative, if there is one preventive, if there is one check, if there is one remedy that is going to cure all of these discordant elements of strife and bloodshed, *it is the observance of the Sabbath-day* and the observance of the restraints of our home in addition." — *Ibid*, July 13, 1892, p. 6755.

Senator Frye said:—

"I believe that *the salvation of this country* depends upon the nearness to which it approaches the Sabbath of the early days. We have been wandering from it from time to time, getting away from it. The sooner we get back to it, the better it will be for this Republic." — *Ibid*, July 12, 1892, p. 6703.

What effect, then, can such a course have, and only have? We have before shown how that it was to help her bear an over-weight of worldliness and worldly influences, that she grasped the arm of the State and formed this illicit connection with worldly power. We there pointed out the utter incongruity of seeking deliverance from an evil, by a positive alliance with the chiefest source of that evil; and how the only effect this could have upon the churches would be infinitely to increase the burden which they already found themselves unable to bear alone. How can *that* save the nation?

The Church of Christ is the divinely appointed means through which God would call the nations *to seek the Lord* that they might find him and be delivered from this present evil world: what, then, when these professed churches of Christ themselves seek the power of *this present evil world*, join themselves to it, and put their dependence upon it? How can *that* save the nation?

The Church of Christ is the divinely appointed agency to "*persuade men*" to join themselves *to the Lord*; what, then, when these professed churches of Christ *threaten* congressmen in order that they themselves may succeed in joining themselves *to the government*? How can *that* preserve the State or save the nation?

The Church of Christ is the divinely appointed agency to persuade men to send up their petitions to *the Lord* for help, and for deliverance from every burden and from every evil: what, then, when the professed churches of Christ themselves send up their petitions to *men*, even though the men be congressmen, and though the petitions be backed up with threats? How can *that* save the nation?

Both society and the State are already cursed with the insatiable demand for office, or position of trust, in return for political service rendered: what, then, when the professed churches of Christ make this the very chosen channel through which they would make successful their aims upon the State? What effect, then, can this have upon society

and the State, other than to increase this curse even to ruinous depths ?

Bribery is already become so common as easily to frustrate the will of the people in any general election : what, then, when these churches take the lead in "bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments," all whom they can seduce to compliance with their arbitrary will, regardless of the will of the people, whether expressed in the supreme law or in the direct voice of the people ? What can be the effect of this upon the State, other than to increase in untold ratio the already too general corruption ?

By the enactment of wholesome laws, the people have been doing their best to protect themselves from the rule of the tyrannical spirit of the boycott. But how can the people protect themselves from this despotism, when the churches control the law-making power for the general community, and make the boycott in all business relations their chosen means by which to force submission to their will in the local community ? What, then, can be the effect of this, other than so to cultivate the spirit of spying and treachery as to destroy mutual confidence and individual integrity, set every man's hand against his neighbor, and fill the land with deceit and violence ?

Lawlessness is already so prevalent as almost to threaten the existence of a republican form of government ; what, then, when the professed churches of Christ at one leap, land themselves in the lead in this, by disregarding the *supreme* law, overriding the Constitution, and taking the governmental authority out of the hands of the people and into their own lawless hands ? In this they have accomplished their long-announced "object" "to change that feature of our fundamental law" which declares that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." But how can this preserve the State ? How can this save the nation ? What effect indeed can it possibly have other than

to produce here that condition of lawlessness and confusion, yet of ecclesiastical despotism, that is always created by attempts of the Church to rule?

Here, then, are these churches professing to be the churches of Christ, yet having gone away from him, their rightful Lord, and joined themselves to another; professing to minister the power of God, yet depending upon the power of man. Professing to minister the *gospel* of Christ, they actually minister the *laws* of men. Professing to *persuade* men with the message of *justification* by *faith* in Christ, they actually *compel* men by the *condemnation* of the *law* of men. Professing to lead in the way of righteousness, uprightness, and sincerity, they actually lead in the way of unrighteousness, corruption, and deceit. Professing themselves to be models of Protestantism, they have actually joined hands with Romanism, and follow her customs, and require all to receive the sign of her authority. Professing to be the example in all things good, they actually set the example in the chief things that are bad.

There is but one thing more that they can possibly do in this direction, and even this they will do, that is, enter into alliance with Satanic power itself, by joining hands with Spiritualism. This they will do as certainly as they have done that which they have done. Then will be completely fulfilled the prophecy which *now* is but partly fulfilled — Rev. 18 : 2, 3. We have already shown how these churches have presented themselves as “a cage of every unclean and hateful bird;” but *then* the whole of the verse will be fulfilled, and the world will hear that cry of the angel of the Lord which comes “mightily with a strong voice saying, Babylon the great, is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the mer-

chants of the earth have waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies."

At the same time there is "heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rev. 18 : 4, 5. Thank the Lord, there are yet some of the people of God in these churches. There are yet some Christians there. But they cannot remain there much longer without becoming partakers of her sins. They cannot stay there much longer and remain Christians. They cannot stay there much longer without receiving of her plagues, and of the judgments of God upon her iniquities. Her judgment cometh and hasteth greatly. "Strong is the Lord God that judgeth her."

The yielding of the merchants to her boycott will do them no good, for it is written :—

"And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her ; *for no man buyeth their merchandise any more*: the merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odors, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men. And the fruits that thy soul lusted after are departed from thee, and all things which were dainty and goodly are departed from thee, and thou shalt find them no more at all. The merchants of these things, which were made rich by her, shall stand afar off for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing, and saying, Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls ! For in one hour so great riches is come to nought." Rev. 18 : 11-17.

The popularity and patronage which legislators hope to have from pandering to her desires, will likewise do them no good, for it is written : "A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with

violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down and shall be found no more at all." Rev. 18 : 8, 10, 21.

Such being the final result to the churches, of this course of evil in which they have even now gone so far; and the churches being one with the State in this course; it is inevitable that the ruin of the churches will be the ruin also of the State. Therefore it is as plain as A B C that this course upon which these churches have entered means the destruction of the State and the ruin of the nation. What they in their apostasy and bad ambition promise shall save the nation, only proves its speedy and awful ruin. This is certain.

Not only is this evident from what has already been said, but this same thing has been worked out once in history, for the instruction of all people and nations, showing clearly enough just what the result must be. In the original apostasy, the Church succeeded in joining herself to the State, promising like this to save the State. The means then employed by Constantine and the bishops, in establishing the "Christian" religion and making that a "Christian State," were the same as now employed here, and were such as to win only hypocrites. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of the Sunday laws the Church then, as now, secured control of the civil power to compel all who were not church members to act as though they were, hypocrisy was made compulsory; and everybody who was not voluntarily a church member and a hypocrite, was compelled either to be a hypocrite anyhow, or a rebel. And as in addition to this, all were required to change or revise their faith according as the majority in the councils changed and decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit; dissimulation and fraud became a necessity of life; and the very moral fiber of men and society was vitiated.

The pagan superstitions, the pagan delusions, and the

pagan vices, which had been brought into the Church by the apostasy, and clothed with a form of godliness, had wrought such corruption that the society of which it was a part could no longer exist. From it no more good could possibly come, and it must be swept away.

“The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theater-going, intemperance, lewdness,—in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude but simple and morally vigorous barbarians.” “Nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen, world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilization, prepared in the old Roman empire, was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit.”—*Schaff*.

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. For a hundred years the dark cloud had been hanging threateningly over the borders of the empire, encroaching slightly upon the west and breaking occasionally upon the east. But at the close of the fourth century the tempest burst in all its fury, and the flood was flowing ruinously. And finally, in 476, when Odoacer, king of the Heruli, became king of Italy, the last vestige of the empire of Western Rome was gone, and was divided among the ten nations of barbarians of the North.

Wherever these savages went, they carried fire and slaughter, and whenever they departed, they left desolation and ruin in their track, and carried away multitudes of captives. Thus was the proud empire of Western Rome swept from the earth; and that which Constantine and his ecclesiastical flatterers had promised, as these have now promised one another, should be the everlasting salvation of the State, proved its speedy and everlasting ruin.

In that case the Lord made the savage nations of the North the instruments of his judgment in sweeping away the mass of corruption which the union of Church and State

had built up there. But in this case where can any such instruments be found? There are none. Civilization has encompassed the earth. Not only that, but in this case "all nations" are involved in the corruption. Where, then, shall the Lord find a people to execute his judgment and sweep away *this* mass of corruption? For the reasons given, they cannot be found upon the earth. A people is found, however, and here is the Lord's description of them:—

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: *a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like*, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. Before their face the people shall be much pained: all faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks; neither shall one thrust another; they shall walk every one in his path; and *when they fall upon the sword, they shall not be wounded*. They shall run to and fro in the city; they shall run upon the wall, they shall climb up upon the houses; they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining: and the Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" Joel 2: 1-11.

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called the Word of God. *And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.*

And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. Rev. 19: 11-16, 19-21.

“And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.” Matt. 24: 31. “And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints.” Rev. 15: 2, 3.

OUR POSITION BEFORE AND NOW.

As for us, all these years, with our time, our money, and our lives, we have protested against the doing of this great evil; and now in the same way and by the same means, we protest against the thing since it is done. We protest against the evil principle itself, and we protest and shall continue to protest against any and all the consequences of the principle.

We had the right to protest against the establishment of a national religion; and we have the right to protest against this national religion now that it is established. We had the right to disagree with the ecclesiastical combination which was bending every effort to secure the establishment of a national religion; and now that they have secured exactly what

they have been demanding, we still have the same right to disagree with them. We had the right to dissent from the propositions, the doctrines, and the dogmas of this ecclesiastical combination, before the United States government took their side of the controversy and championed their cause; and we have the same right still. In other words, we have, and every other man has, the divine and everlasting right to dissent from any and every religious organization on earth; and when the government joins a religious organization, then we have the same right still; and the right extends now to that of refusal of obedience to the government itself, *in so far* as it is joined to the religious organization.

The one great object of the grand movement to secure governmental recognition of religion was to secure legislation by which Sunday observance could be enforced throughout the nation, backed up by national power and influence. We protested against their movement, and disputed their right, to use the governmental power for any such purpose. Now that they have secured it, we still dispute their right to use it. We had the right to dissent from their claim of right to use the governmental power for any such purpose; and we have still the right to dissent from their use of the governmental power for this purpose.

We had the right to refuse to keep Sunday when it was required by the churches *without* the aid of the government; and we have the same right to refuse to keep it when it is required by the churches *with* the aid of the government. In other words, governmental aid of churches in enforcing their dogmas and ordinances cannot take away any man's right of dissent from those dogmas and ordinances. The government does wrong in aiding the churches; and men do right in dissenting from both churches and government in the things wherein they are allied.

It was lack of power to convince the people that they ought to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, that caused the

churches to demand the governmental power to aid in compelling the people to do this. Lacking the power to *persuade* the people, the churches resorted to power to *compel* the people to observe the ordinance of the Church. The religious controversy, as to whether Sunday is a sacred day or not, has been going on in the United States longer than has the movement to secure the recognition or declaration of the national government, that it is. Those who demand that Sunday shall be observed have admitted over and over again that "there is no divine command for it." And this is true. And the effort of these churches to secure the alliance and aid of the government was only an effort to get the national government to take their side of this controversy. They now have the government committed to this. In the effort to gain this they have been boastful, and arrogant, and insolent enough, in all conscience, as has been abundantly shown by their own words all these years. If any one is inclined to think they will be any less so, now that they have their wish, then the writer only wishes that one could have sat where he did, in the gallery of the House, when the final vote was taken by which Congress committed the government to their side of the controversy, and could have stood where he did in the committee-room at the Capitol where this hearing was held, and could have seen and heard their exultation.

In this act of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, Congress has distinctly taken sides in a religious controversy. Congress in this, and the Supreme Court in its decision, have committed the government of the United States to the decision of a religious controversy. Neither the act of Congress nor the decision of the Supreme Court, will convince the Jew, or the Christian who observes the seventh day, that Sunday should be observed. No more will the National Reformers be able to convince these with the aid of the power which these acts give, to inflict pains and penalties upon dissenters.

We disagreed with the National Reformers before ; we disagree with them now. We denied before, that Sunday should be observed ; we deny now that it should be observed. We refused before to keep Sunday ; we refuse now to keep Sunday. We rejected before, the National Reform claim of right to use the governmental power to compel anybody to keep Sunday ; and although they have secured the use of the power, we reject now their right to use it.

All these years we have denied the right of Congress to legislate in behalf of Sunday or any other religious rite or institution. We denied this wholly upon *principle*. We protested against Sunday legislation because it is religious legislation. We would have protested equally if it had been proposed to legislate in behalf of the seventh day or any other religious day. We can appeal to our record throughout, as clear evidence that this has always been the one grand feature and reason of our protest against Sunday legislation. And as long as the question had maintained this standing only, so long would this have still been the prominent feature of our protest. Now, however, the question has changed. Congress has now legislated upon the subject, and maintains the propriety of the legislation. Congress has now decided, and has committed the government to the decision, that Sunday is the Sabbath and shall be so observed. And now we protest against it, not only because it is religious legislation, but for the additional reason that *it is not true*. In this act, Congress has committed itself and the government to a falsehood.

Sunday is not the Sabbath. Sunday is not the Lord's day. Sunday is not in any sense a sacred day. As before stated, the chiefest advocates of this Sunday legislation admit in writing that there is no divine command for the observance of Sunday in any way. They know that the only authority for it is the authority of the Church. And if they do not

know, they, and everybody else who will look into the question may learn, that "the Church" which is authority for Sunday sacredness is *the Catholic Church*, and that alone. And they may likewise know that professed Protestants who keep Sunday, are following the authority of the Catholic Church, and that alone, for there is no other authority for Sunday observance whether by church rulers or governmental statute. And Congress in requiring the observance of Sunday, is requiring submission and obedience to the authority of the Catholic Church, for there is no other authority for Sunday observance.

It was therefore perfectly fitting that in the chief speech that was made in favor of the Sunday bill in the Senate (the speech of Senator Hawley of Connecticut), the chief place in the speech should be given to the views of Catholic archbishops upon the subject. But the authority of the Catholic Church is no authority at all; it is only usurpation and fraud, and its Sunday sacredness is a falsehood. Therefore it is that the Congress of the United States, in legislating in behalf of Sunday observance, has committed itself, and the government of the United States, to a falsehood. And not only to a falsehood, but to a *papal* falsehood. And we refuse to recognize it or yield any respect to it as either true or right.

The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, and Sunday is not the Sabbath. The seventh day is the Lord's day, and Sunday is not. The seventh day is the sacred day and the only sacred day, and Sunday is not at all a sacred day. For thus saith the Lord:—

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and

earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2 : 3.

This is our position and our protest now and always.

CONCLUSION.

We know that in this contest, there is, and will be, arrayed against us, all the power that earth knows, with this power under the direction of the papacy, and the whole combination stirred up and urged on by Satan from beneath. But above all this we *know*, and are glad in the knowledge that Jesus Christ is with us, and he has said to us, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, . . . and lo ! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Christ has said it. It is so, and we know it. Therefore though all the power that earth knows be arrayed against us, we shall come off more than conquerors through him that hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood. So that we may boldly say, "The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me."

We know that we shall be reproached. We know that we shall be denounced. We know that "anarchist," "infidel," "atheist," and every other opprobrious epithet will be applied to us. We know that we shall be despised, and that we shall be even the despised of the despised. We know that we shall be counted, and made, of *no reputation*. But we rest perfectly easy in our trust in Him, and our complete dependence upon Him, who "made *himself* of *no reputation*," in order that we might have his matchless *character*. We know that we shall have *no reputation*. But ah ! we know that we have the divine *Character* of Jesus Christ, which is well

pleasing to God. For "now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." And we do believe in him, the glorious Son of God. Thanks to his dear name. It is not true that "the dearest treasure that mortal times afford, is spotless reputation." It is everlastingly and infinitely true that the dearest treasure that either mortal or immortal times afford, is spotless *character*. And that is alone the character of Jesus Christ, which was wrought out in his humiliation. That character is ours as an everlasting gift by faith in him. Men may take away our reputation. But we do not care for that, as we have a character which they cannot touch, for it is the gift of God.

We know that a general boycott will be placed against us by which we can neither buy nor sell, nor conduct any business. But for this we do not care. For we "have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; *if so be* that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8:15-17. "Joint heirs with Christ," are we? Of what is he heir? God hath "appointed him *heir of all things*, by whom also he made the worlds." Heb. 1:2. He being heir of all things, and we being joint heirs with him, we therefore are just as certainly heirs of all things, as is he. And so he tells us, "All things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come: *all* are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." 1 Cor. 3:21-23. So when they take away from us all things of earth, we still have left all things in heaven and

earth. And God has promised that our bread shall not fail ; but that bread shall be given us, and our waters shall be sure. Isa. 51 : 12-14 ; 33 : 16.

We know that the time will come when men will think that he that killeth us will be doing God service. And we know indeed that a decree will go forth that we shall even be killed. But for this we do not care. For "this is the record, that God *hath given* to us *eternal life*, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life." *And we have him.* He gave himself a free gift to us, and he is ours. Christ is our life, and our life is hid with Christ in God, and *no man can touch it.* Therefore we fear not them who can kill the body, but after that have no more that they can do. Christ is our life. He is the Life-Giver. And he can and will raise the dead.

Christ, Christ is our refuge, our hope, our confidence, our power, our righteousness, our wealth, our life. And we stand in this contest with no other calculation nor consideration.

So we are not at all uneasy, nor any way in doubt as to the outcome. We knew that this was coming, which has come. We know that the rest of the events which we have pointed out as connected with this, *will* come, as surely as this already *has* come. And we know that the culmination of all these events, is that grand, triumphant scene, in which the prophet "saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire : and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty ; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy : for all nations shall come and

worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.
Rev. 15 : 2-4.

This is what we have in view. This victory, this triumph is promised to us; and it will surely come. For it we wait patiently and confidently. And to all the people we say as did David to Abiathar: Abide thou with us, fear not; for he that seeketh our lives seeketh thy life: but with us thou shalt be in safeguard. 1 Sam. 22 : 23. "Come thou with us, and we will do thee good: for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel."

APPENDIX.

EXTRACT FROM

SPEECH OF MAYOR WASHBURNE.

Before House Committee on World's Columbian Exposition.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: I was but recently notified that I might be called upon to speak before this committee. The subject is one of such vast interest, touching as it does the welfare of nine tenths of our population, I do not feel at liberty to decline to speak for want of proper preparation. The issue now raised, in order that it may be intelligently settled, must be clearly drawn and distinctly understood. It is not a question of abstract right or wrong; it is a question touching the absolute right of a vast majority of our entire population, now numbering over sixty millions of people, to enjoy the benefits of this great international Exposition. It is also a question whether the government of the United States will keep its faith with the nations of the world of all races and religions which is contained in the invitation to join with us in this great international Exposition. The preamble of the act of Congress passed April 25, 1890, creating the World's Columbian Exposition, says:—

“*Whereas*, Such an exhibition should be of a national and international character, so that not only the people of our Union and this continent, but those of all nations as well, can participate, and should, therefore, have the sanction of the United States; *therefore*, be it enacted,” etc.

When your honorable body used the words, “the people of our Union,” nothing less was meant, nor can these words be made to cover less, than the entire people, and if it be our entire people for whom this Exposition has been created, you must so legislate as to benefit a majority of those for whom you created this enterprise. You should not now legislate so as to deprive a majority of its benefits. If you legislate in favor of ten millions of those who protest against a Sunday opening, although they may be more numerous in this capital and their voices may be the loudest in demands, you will not have complied with your obligations and the assurances you have held out, nor met the demands of the less noisy but more numerous fifty millions of people. Moreover, this

exhibition created by Congress is, in the act of its creation, declared to be of international character, "so that not only the people of our nation and this continent, but those of all nations as well, can participate." This exhibition is to be the work of all the peoples of every race and creed. The Mohammedan and Hindoo, the people of China and Japan, all of whom know nothing of our Sabbath; the Jews, who observe another day; the peoples of Europe, who regard Sunday as a day of recreation; people without creed or religion, as well as people of every creed and religion, will participate in this Exposition. To keep our faith with all these people, this Exposition must be managed and conducted in all respects as near as may be upon a common ground, upon which all may come together. It is not *Christian* nations or people that you have invited, but *all* nations; and it is because all the nations and peoples of the earth are asked to participate, that you have declared that this Fair ought to have the sanction of the United States. I submit that good faith requires that the religious views, whether of a part or the whole of our people, in regard to Sunday observance or otherwise, should not be obtruded into the conduct of this Fair and upon the nations thus invited to participate, by any act of our own national government.

Another branch of this question touches, possibly, a constitutional principle. If the demand be that which is commonly accepted as the demand — that the World's Columbian Exposition shall be closed upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, in order to testify to the world that this nation as a government recognizes the Christian religion as the religion of the land — if this be the ground upon which the closing of this Exposition is demanded, it is not justified by the principles of our Constitution. The Constitution of the United States, framed by those whose wisdom has never yet been questioned, provided, in Article I [of amendments], that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." The fathers of our Constitution appreciated too well the evils and abuses that might result from permitting the Congress of the United States to legislate at all upon matters of religion or the observance thereof, or upon any question involving the religious beliefs of our people. They were descendants of a heroic people who had been persecuted and driven from the lands of their birth by such abuses of the functions of government. Our Constitution contemplates that, so far as federal legislation is concerned, religious beliefs and religious observances, as well with respect to days as to doctrines, shall be left untouched. You might as well impose upon the management of this Exposition the condition that a Jew or a Hindoo or Buddhist or heathen should be barred from its gates, as to say that the day of the week which is regarded as the Sabbath by a few of the people who are asked to participate, should be observed.

One is no less a violation of the spirit of the prohibition of the Constitution, with respect to the powers of Congress, than the other. If Congress is prohibited by the Constitution from making any laws respecting an establishment of religion—if it could not properly impose conditions as to religious creeds or the observance of religious rites or ceremonies—it is, I submit, equally improper in any law to designate any day, season, or time, and to compel its observance in obedience to any religion or creed. This would clearly establish a religion by federal law, and when you are asked to compel this Fair to close upon the first day of every week, in order to recognize the Christian Sabbath, and in obedience to that religion, you are asked to do that which plainly violates the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. This would then be done in national obedience to, and national observance of, a religion. And if you cannot close the Fair on Sunday on this ground, namely, as an act of national obedience to an observance of a religion which you shall thus recognize and follow in federal law making, upon what grounds and for what reasons can you shut its gates in the face of 50,000,000 of our own people, and of participating nations who do not know our Sunday, and who now demand that it shall be opened? I am only asking of you that the spirit of our Constitution, the welfare and wishes of a large majority of our common people, the good faith to the nations of the world, be considered and observed.

You must not think, because skilled orators are here opposed to a change in the present law, because the greatest noise is made by those who first secured this section in the law, because your doors are darkened by a well-dressed few, advocating Sunday closing, that you have heard the voice of the American people. Those who appeal to you for Sunday closing or an American Sunday are those who will not themselves be deprived of the privileges to see this Fair by reason thereof.

If your exhibition be for the rich and independent, my voice is silent; if it was conceived for the common people, we may well ask before too late, "Who are the people? where may they be found? and when called, from whence will they come?" Will the response be from those who can command their time and attend when they will—the wealthy or the well-to-do? If so, no exposition was needed to lay before them the treasures of human industry gathered from the world. The preamble of the Constitution reads, "We, the people of the United States." In their name and for them you govern; to them alone you must make answer. To know who are the people we must first know who made history and sustained government.

It was for the common people that John, upon the field of Runnymede, placed his signet upon Magna Charta. It was the common people who swung the ax which severed Charles's head upon an English block. It was

the common people who brought Louis to the guillotine and made republican France a possibility of the future. It was the common people who fled from tyranny to the wilds of our then unknown continent to escape religious intolerance, and who cleared our forests, drove back the savage, and bred a fearless posterity who dared rebel against the encroachments of arbitrary government, and who have given us a Constitution in which religious freedom, as well as personal liberty, is guaranteed. It was the common people who first hammered their plowshares into those bayonets which immortalized Bunker Hill, and baptized a republic on the ramparts of Yorktown. It was the common people who carried our victorious flag on the seas in 1812, and who bore that same banner from '61 to '65. It was the common people who gave us a government, preserved its Constitution, and sank into unknown graves upon a thousand hillsides, which annually blossom with the product of a free nation

Who are the common people of this day who are asking that they may be recognized in their rightful and most righteous demand? Go forth over all this broad continent and seek them out; they will not be found in abodes of wealth; they will not be found conducting the affairs of commerce, but you will find them by millions among those who gather every sheaf of grain from ocean to ocean, and from the eternal snows to the eternal heat. You will find them by millions in the bowels of the earth, disarranging nature's laws to pamper man's increased appetite. You will find other millions answering the stars of heaven with the reflected light of a thousand furnaces upon a thousand plains. Knock upon the doors of every factory, every mill, and every hive of human industry, and millions more will answer the summons. Pass through our cities, and every brick and nail and stone and timber drawn together for the creation of buildings of commerce and for the housing of the multitude, represents the labor of a citizen; every hand hardened by honest toil, every brow made moist with the sweat of honest labor, is the badge of that citizenship which makes the common people.

The common people are not rich. Six days do they labor that they may live, and on the seventh, which alone they have for that purpose, consider it no crime to inhale God's air in parks, in groves, and fields, where nature speaks alike to all. To them it is no crime to study man's work upon the first day to benefit one's children and one's self, and they cannot submit to learn this national and international lesson at the price of bread to those at home. This enterprise was created for the common people and not those who would exclude from life the beauties of creation, the voices of birds, and the lights of intelligence on the first day of every week; not for those whose palaces conceal collected treasures from many continents; not for those whose wealth and cultured minds have exhausted travel or explored continents. Fifty millions of people, poor in purse, but rich in

enterprise and intelligence, are the constituency you serve, and every extra day you give to them will bear fruit a thousand fold ; deny them this, and you rob them of money, time, and instruction. If you now refuse the demand of the common people, and their voices appeal to deadened ears, *they will speak* upon some future day *as they have always spoken* when their demands, founded upon justice, based upon equity, and born of necessity, have been refused.

EXTRACT FROM

SPEECH OF SAMUEL GOMPERS,

President of the American Federation of Labor, before House Committee on Columbian Exposition.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee : The case in its general sense has been so well represented by the representatives of the city of Chicago, that I doubt the advisability or the necessity of referring to that branch of the subject in a general way. I desire to say that as one who has been a resident of the city of New York nearly all my life, and one who would have been a member of the Board of Directors, had the World's Columbian Exposition been located in the city of New York, that I feel a peculiar interest in this matter. I not only appear here in pursuance to the instructions of the great organization I have the honor to represent, but also in compliance with my own wishes and feelings upon the subject.

I well remember the discomfiture I endured, the feeling of disappointment that I underwent, when at the time of the Centennial Exhibition held in 1876, in the city of Philadelphia, I, then only a resident of New York, within a radius of one hundred miles of the city of Philadelphia, was unable to visit that exhibition because of the very fact that it was closed upon the only day that I would have had an opportunity to attend it ; and all through the months that that exhibition was open, each Sunday, each recurring Sunday, a pang went through my heart and through my mind at the thought that I was deprived of the opportunity of visiting the handicrafts and the results of human ingenuity. Not only for myself did I feel this, but since then I have made the acquaintance of hundreds of men in the city of Philadelphia, who, although residing there at that time, were unable to visit the exhibition because of the fact that it was closed on Sunday. There are thousands upon thousands of the residents of the city of Philadelphia, thousands and thousands of people within a radius of a few hundred miles of Philadelphia, who were deprived of the opportunity of visiting the exposition then, because it was closed upon Sunday.

I deny the right of any man or number of men to speak in the name of the wage-earners of America, and to say that they favor the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday.

After all, this is a practical question. Is it not true that those who oppose the opening of the World's Fair on Sundays, recognize this fact,—that the men and women who labor, who work six days in the week, should have an opportunity of visiting the World's Fair on one? Is it not true that the best day for them to visit the Fair would be on Sunday? I know that there are some patent processes proposed by which workmen shall be shipped like cattle to Chicago; but let me say that the workmen of this country ask for no such patent processes; they ask for opportunity and justice, not charity, or any other consideration.

We are willing to pay our way when we go, and if we cannot pay our way we will stay at home; but when we do want to go, when we have laid aside a few pennies every week in order to enable us to take advantage of possible reduced fares or possible commutations that are accorded to us by reason of our own representative, we want the opportunity to visit the Fair on all days of the week that we can devote to it. We say that this Fair is more in the interests of the toiling or wealth-producing masses of our country, than of any other particular class, if I may be permitted to use the term "class" in distinguishing the people occupying different positions in society.

This is to be an Exposition of the handicrafts, the wonderful genius of the peoples of this world. The organization I have the honor to represent maintains that you will give us the opportunity of going to that World's Fair every day of the week. If men and women desire to kneel at the altar of their God on Sundays, no one denies them that right. I would with my whole effort, with my whole life, with every power that I may be possessed of, raise my voice and do what I could in order to insure the right of every man and woman and child to pray and preach, and preach and pray, as long and as steadfastly and as fervently as they may desire; but I do say this, on the other hand, that the right to do everything which is not a wrong against the laws of our country and the morals of our people, is not wrong, and should be allowed.

EXTRACT FROM

SPEECH OF REV. DR. W. H. THOMAS.

Before House Committee on Columbian Exposition, Jan. 13, 1893.

There was perhaps an almost unanimous agreement that in this great year of 1893, there should be held in this land a commemorative Columbian Exposition: and when the nations of the earth were asked to take

part in this, they gladly responded. So far there has been a happy agreement, not only in national, but in international, or world thought. The differences of opinion, or the disagreements, have arisen in reference to two facts: one is the Sabbath, and the other is the nature of this Columbian celebration; or, in other words, what the Sabbath is, and what it stands for; and what the World's Fair is, and what it stands for; and what should be the proper relation between our American Sunday, and this world exposition.

A reference was made very beautifully to the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, — "They would not land on Saturday because it would necessitate work on Sunday, and so they waited until Monday." We honor their conscientiousness; but they had precisely these conscientious views of the Sunday when, a little later, they pressed and hanged the life out of fellow human beings, in Salem, because of witchcraft. Salem and Plymouth now have electric cars. The observance of the Sabbath is not so strict; but the humanity of the people has advanced most wonderfully.

This question of conscience, gentlemen, must be considered in its true light. Conscience is not set to determine what is right; conscience simply says, Do what is right. Every form of revelation should guide man in his judgment as to what is right; and it is precisely this in its broader interpretation that is leading the people of this country in such vast numbers to ask for a liberal construction of the Sabbath,—not to interpret it by the conscience of England when the intense phases of Sabbath observance were hers; not to interpret it in the light of what the Pilgrim Fathers thought. We honor their memory; they did what they thought was right; and we honor every man that stands for his conscience. I take off my hat to any man's conscience; but I ask the privilege of talking to his judgment, and the judgment will follow the conscience.

It ought to be conceded that we on the other side have at least conscience, and are sincere, if we have not such far-seeing judgment. We believe it is for the good of the world that in a proper way this Exposition be opened as a great school, intellectual and moral, for the people. We believe it is not only a mistake, but a positive sin, to close it.

We all see the necessity that some one shall labor; and we all see that connected with this there will be more or less noise and confusion on Sunday. Did any of you brethren ever attend a great religious convention? Did you ever know of one made possible without a great deal of work by somebody? Did any of you ever attend a great camp-meeting? Was there not a great deal of work connected with that camp-meeting? You talk about taking in money at the door; what is the difference between taking it in at the door, and asking the people for it as soon as they get in? [Laughter.] You cannot separate an amount of labor and business from

any great movement. I want to say that the directors of the Fair in Chicago—and I know these gentlemen—have never contemplated a free, open show there. They are studying the good of the people, and how the day can best be employed.

It has been said here that the railroads will not have less labor if the Fair is closed. Surely people will come on Sunday, and they will stay until Saturday night, and go home on Sunday.

We have to face a condition of things, and that condition of things is this: There will be from two to three hundred thousand people in Chicago every one of the twenty-six Sundays; vile places will be open; the churches would not hold a decimal fraction of the people, even if you could get them to them. A condition of things exists there; and we there say it is best to have the Fair open in the afternoon, and stop the machinery; we would be agreed to this. And if the national capital has anything not good enough to be shown on the holy day, let them cover it up! [Laughter.] And if any State in the union feels that its products are not good enough to be seen—its lessons of art and literature and morality—not good enough to be seen on Sunday, let them cover them up. It is their perfect right, and we would be glad to see them do it. And if any of the preachers are too conscientious to come during the week because it is open on Sunday, we shall only be sorry. I think most of them would not hesitate to take the train Monday morning because it ran all Sunday night to get there, and they would perhaps complain if it was behind time. I think most of us stop at hotels when we know those hotels sell liquors. You cannot separate the holy—what we call good—and the evil. We have got to move along with these things mixed together.

And if the government closes its part of the Exposition, and some of the States close theirs, there will be the expositions of the Old World, and we can look at these; and they cannot cover up the buildings, *nor the blue sky, nor the great, beautiful lake* right there. And if we can have religious services, all right; I would be willing to work in them, whether these other brethren would or not.

But I do not want any such pretense as this. I argue it is *right to open it.* And then if it is opportune and proper to have services, have them; but do not open the gates on that ground; *open it on its right merits.*

And I think that it is not unfair that I offer at least a mild protest against the unjust criticisms upon the men of Chicago, the women of Chicago, and upon our city as such. Is it our fault that God stretched a lake for three hundred miles north and south, and settled the fact that there should be a city on the lake, because it is on the highway? Is it our fault, or to our credit, that, twice burned down, we have rebuilt? Is it our fault that Chicago has a million and a half of people, and will soon be

the largest city in the United States? Are we to blame for it? Are we to blame because Congress voted to hold the Fair there? Are we to blame because we are doing everything we can to make the Fair all that is possible? Are these commissioners to blame, having accepted the decision of Congress, and upon that, accepted the money,—are they to blame because they asked Congress to reconsider this?

Now we must admire the earnestness and ability of the ladies and gentlemen on the other side of the question. I confess I admire their ability, and I applaud their earnestness; but we can hardly approve all their methods. In the first place, they have assumed from the beginning, that to open the World's Fair on Sunday is a desecration of the Sabbath; that the nations would be sanctioning the trampling of the American Sabbath into the dust. They have assumed all that,—*the very question at issue*; and on that supposition, they have gone before the people and have asked for petitions, and they have got, they say, thirteen million, representing what?—Gratuitously assumed to be the evangelical churches of this country. Thirteen million of them. Multiply that by three, and they get thirty-nine million,—over half the population; and I think if they had had a little more time they could have got fifty million. We have to suppose that a great deal of this is voting in bulk. Is it true of the many churches, is it true of Protestantism, that preachers can deliver over the judgment and consciences of the people of their churches?—I think not.

And then I think we have a right to complain, further, that there has been a steady effort, not only here but elsewhere, to cast suspicion upon those representing the other side; and if it were merely a personal matter—unbrotherly, not to say ungentlemanly, as it has been—it should receive no word or notice here. It is done with the deliberate intent of prejudicing the jury, just as has been the effort to prejudice the jury against the directors at Chicago. These are honorable men, American citizens, working for the good of the Fair, and for the good of the people; and if they believed the Sabbath in any sacred sense was in danger, they would rush to its support as quickly as any man in this room. I know these men; I know the heart of Chicago; I have lived and worked there for twenty-three years.

Why this effort to prejudice our cause by saying that “only two preachers from all the United States could be got to argue it?”—“one a Trinitarian,—that is, he thinks God is so *one* that he is not *three*; and “the other preaches in a theater in Chicago!” Probably our ideas of the value of sanctified brick and mortar are not as exalted as the ideas of some of these brethren. We do not draw these great lines between the sacred and the secular, as they do. We think that a theater or any other convenient place is just as sacred as a church, when it is used for a sacred purpose.

And why? — what does it mean upon this question if one of these preachers has been disturbed in his church relation, and, after a quarter of a century of hard work, driven out? What has that to do with this question? Have not others been driven out? and are they not trying to drive still others out? Not only this, but we fared less kindly with the American Sabbath Union, for which I have a high respect. When this question was up in Chicago, they characterized the opposition as disreputable. Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore, disreputable! Bishop Potter, of New York, disreputable! Robert Collier, David Swing, disreputable! The seven or eight hundred of the noblest women in Chicago, the Woman's Club representing the mothers and wives, much of the culture and wealth of that city, disreputable! Casting a stigma upon the other side! Thank God, our side does not call in any such justification. We respect the conscience and the ability of these men; we differ from them in judgment, and hence we plead our side of the question.

And, gentlemen, there is a great question at issue here, one of the greatest almost in the history of our country for many years,— *the question of the government and religion*. I do not criticise the action of Congress. They represented what they supposed to be the will of the people, as it was their duty to do. But there is a feeling over this country, deep and growing, that *the old love of power, that has been the curse of Christianity in the past*, making it a part of the State, making heresy treason,— that this old love of power is *not entirely dead*. This thing of conscience is a strange thing. If it should ever come that moral power through legislation becomes effective power in this land, who could trust the consciences of those who wield it? The persecutors of the past were conscientious men; the hangers of those who perished in the East, for witchcraft, were conscientious men. It is the glory of this land that the civil and the religious are separated, and let them stand forever separated!

And I tell you there is growing sentiment on our side; there is no doubt of it. What does it mean when all these laboring millions speak? I suppose if we had the exact fact of the petitions, they would stand about this way: Quite a number, perhaps a majority, of the evangelical churches, as the subject has been presented, would say, Open the Fair on the Sabbath; the preachers — a part of them — of the evangelical churches would say, Close it; and yet not all of them. There is a growing sentiment, and it would be the most unfortunate thing, in my mind, if that Fair is closed on Sunday. If closed, and the millions are there, and Sunday comes, they will ask, "Why is it closed? Why can't we go in to see what we have produced, and the world has produced?" "The government has said, 'You can't go in.'" "Why did the government say so?" — At the request of the vanishing, moribund idea of the Sabbath — not the real Sabbath — but

a special form of its observance. And what will be the result?—The result will be to make wider the gap—already too wide—between the people and the church. Already too wide is the gap.

SPEECH OF MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

Before House Committee on Columbian Exhibition, Jan. 12, 1893.

Mr. Durborow.—Miss Anthony, If you desire to speak, you may have two or three minutes.

Miss Susan B. Anthony.—I have been invited to come here by several gentlemen who are on what is termed the liberal side of this question, and that is on the side of an open Fair.

I remember very well the Centennial in Philadelphia, and I remember Lucretia Mott, and that she never stepped her foot within the gates of the Centennial simply because of the bigotry that shut the doors on Sunday. I have always venerated her conscience in that matter. And I believe that the Fair should be open.

While sitting here listening to these different speeches, I was looking back to the days when Philadelphia did not allow Sunday street-cars. Everybody had to walk on Sunday. And what a long struggle it was to get the street-cars to run on that day. What Philadelphian, what churchman, or minister would propose to stop the street-cars in Philadelphia or any other city on Sunday? And then I remember the Art Gallery in Philadelphia; what a long struggle it was to get that Gallery open; and now it is open. And I remember when the Central Park in New York was first established. There was a general outcry against allowing the people to go to it on Sunday. And I remember that I went up every Sunday on purpose to vindicate my religion. And it was the joy of my life to see poor washerwomen, both black and white, come up to the Park and enjoy it. Then they had another big, long fight before there was any music allowed in the Park on Sunday. And now we have music in Central Park on Sunday, and the poorest of the poor, who can get five cents up and five cents back, can go and enjoy that music on Sunday afternoon. Then there was another big fight against the Metropolitan Museum in the Park in New York. I do not believe that any one will say that it produces immorality, that it does anything but give to the poor the opportunity of becoming educated in the grand and glorious results of human skill.

I hope the Fair will be open. I want to speak in behalf of women especially. I know scores and scores of women who are saving their

money to go to Chicago and spend a week during the Fair ; and if the Chicago Fair Committee and if the Congress of the United States say that they shall sit quietly outside those gates, and shall not be allowed to go in and study the wonders inside those gates,— I think it is a tyranny that should not be practiced by the Congress of the United States.

THE Fifty-second Congress expired March 4, 1893, without any reversal of its acts in the matter of Sunday closing. In fact it did even worse than this, it took another step in the enforcement of Sunday sacredness, at the dictate of the churches. The following is the record :—

SUNDAY CONCERTS IN PENSION OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. Quay.—I present a petition of sixty clergymen of the City of Washington, which I ask to have read.

The Vice-President.—The petition will be read if there be no objection.

The Chief Clerk.—The petition is as follows :—

To the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

A PETITION.

Whereas, It having been announced by the Inaugural Committee through the daily papers that, as a part of the program for the inaugural ceremonies, three concerts by the Marine Band are to be held in the Pension Office building, on Sunday, March 5, proximo; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States, *in deference to the Christian sentiment of the nation* clearly and unmistakably expressed by the religious press, the pulpit, and by petition, has by legal enactment closed the doors of the Columbian Exposition on Sundays :

Therefore, believing to permit the holding of such concerts on Sunday by a band of musicians connected with one of the great departments of the government in a government building which is occupied by another great department, and as a part of the ceremonies connected with the inauguration of *the President of this great Christian nation*, by and with the sanction of her chosen rulers, would be a *national sin*; believing also that such desecration as proposed is unprecedented, would result in incalculable harm, and would be used as an authority and example for the complete secularization of Sunday :

We earnestly petition that orders be issued forbidding the use of any government building for such purpose on that day.

Signed by W. R. Graham, pastor of Congress Street Methodist Protestant Church ; W. Sherman Phillips, pastor of Mt. Tabor Methodist Protestant Church, and many others.

The Vice-President.—The petition will be referred to the Special Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Mr. Quay.—In this connection I desire to state that I took pains to ascertain whether the statements of the petitioners are correct. In the *Washington Post* of Sunday last I find a paragraph which I ask the Chief Clerk to read. It will be observed that the music by the Marine Band is not exactly sacred.

The Vice-President.—The Chief Clerk will read as requested.
The Chief Clerk read as follows:—

SUNDAY MORNING, MARCH 5, 10 O'CLOCK.

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. March, "Excelsior" | Mrs. G. B. Peet |
| 2. Overture, "Robespierre" | Litloff |
| 3. Song, "The Lost Chord" | Sullivan |
| 4. Selection from "Faust" | Gounod |
| 5. { a. "Slumber Song" } | Schumann |
| { b. "Arabesque" } | |
| 6. Cornet Solo, "Inflammatus" | Rossini |
| Mr. William Jaegar. | |
| 7. "La Benediction des Poignards" | Meyerbeer |
| 8. "Scenes Picturiques" | Massenet |
| 9. "A Trip to Mars" | Fanciulli |
| 10. Patriotic Song, "Hail, Columbia" | Fyles |

SUNDAY AFTERNOON, 1 O'CLOCK.

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. March, "The Evening Star" | Fanciulli |
| 2. Overture, "King Lear" | Bazzini |
| 3. Sacred Song, "The Holy City" | Adams |
| 4. Poem Symphonic, "Les Preludes" | Liszt |
| 5. "Siciliana" and "Intermezzo" from "Cavalleria Rusticana" | Mascagni |
| 6. Fantasia, "The Voyage of Columbus" | Fanciulli |
| 7. "Nearer, my God, to Thee." | |
| 8. Selection from "Queen of Sheba" | Gounod |
| 9. March, "The Army of the Potomac" | Fanciulli |
| 10. "My Country, 'Tis of Thee" | |

SUNDAY NIGHT.

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. March "The Calumet" | Zimmerman |
| 2. Overture, "Village Festival" | Keefe |
| 3. Euphonium Solo, "Rocked in the Cradle of the Deep" | Rollinson |
| 4. "Scenes in Switzerland" | Langey |
| 5. { a. "Pilgrims' Congress" } | Wagner |
| { b. Song, "The Evening Star" } | |
| 6. Grand Fantasia on National Airs | Zimmerman |
| 7. Czardas's "Last Love" | Brahms |
| 8. { a. "Traumerci" } | Schumann |
| { b. "Adieu" } | |
| 9. "The Happy Hunting Grounds" | Schubert |
| 10. Patriotic Song, "Star-Spangled Banner" | Bucallosi |

Mr. Quay.—To show that these concerts are to be held for the purpose of obtaining money, I send up a paper to be read. It is not signed by the officials in charge of the inaugural ceremonies, but it is on their official paper and furnished in response to a request for information.

[Inaugural ceremonies, March 4th, 1893.—General Committee: James G. Berret, Chairman; Alex. Porter Morse, secretary; Charles G. Glover, treasurer. Executive Committee: James L. Norris, Chairman; J. Fred. Kelley, secretary; William Cranch McIntire, corresponding secretary; James L. Barbour, Henry L. Bischoe, Gen. H. V. Boynton, Alexander T. Britton, John Joy Edson, Rear-Admiral S. R. Franklin, U. S. N., Lawrence Gardner, Curtis J. Hillyer, Robert O. Holtzman, J. Harrison Johnson, Charles C. Lancaster, George W. Mc Lanahan, Theodore W. Noyes, John W. Ross, Francis A. Richardson, Richard Smith, Michael I. Weller, Beriah Wilkins.]

HEADQUARTERS, LENOX BUILDING,
1425 NEW YORK AVENUE,
Washington, D. C. ———, 1893.

Price of ball tickets, \$5.

Price of concert in morning and afternoon of Sunday and Monday, 50 cts.

Price of evening concerts Sunday and Monday, \$1.

Programs have not yet been issued.

Mr. Quay.—In view of these facts, although not exactly in order at this time, I ask for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

Mr. Mc Pherson.—Before the Senator offers his resolution, I should like to inquire what the paper relates to which has just been read by the Secretary. I could not understand from the language whether it is a petition from our own people or from citizens of a foreign government. I was unable to ascertain from the reading what language it is printed in. I should like to know to what the whole matter relates.

Mr. Quay.—The whole matter relates to the question whether the persons in charge of the inaugural ceremonies have by lawful means obtained the pension building for the purpose of holding musical concerts there next Sunday. That is the allegation of the petition which has been read and which is signed by, I believe, sixty ministers of the city of Washington. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows :—

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to inform the Senate whether authority has been given for the use of the building of the Pension Office by any person or persons on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, for musical concerts at which a pecuniary charge is made for admission.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

LETTER FROM THE ACTING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,

In response to Senate resolution of Feb. 28, 1893, relative to the use of the Pension Building for Sunday concerts.

MARCH 15, 1893.—Laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
WASHINGTON, March 14, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a resolution of the Senate, under date of the 28th ultimo, as follows :—

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to inform the Senate whether authority has been given for the use of the building of the Pension Office by any person or persons on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, for musical concerts, at which a pecuniary charge is made for admission.

In response, I beg leave to submit herewith a copy of correspondence relating to the subject, from which it will be observed that permission to use the Pension Office for the purpose referred to in the resolution was expressly refused by the Secretary of the Interior.

The building has not been used on Sunday for such purpose.

Very respectfully,

GEO. CHANDLER, *Acting Secretary,*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
WASHINGTON, March 1, 1893.

SIR: My attention has been called to the fact that it is the purpose of the inaugural committee to open the Pension Building on Sunday, the 5th instant, for one or more musical entertainments, at which a charge for admission will be made.

I have to inform you that, in granting the use of this building for the inaugural ball, it was not contemplated that the building should be open to the public on Sunday, and, as there will be opportunity on the subsequent day, during which the building is at the disposal of the committee, to give the concerts referred to, the use of the Pension Building on Sunday for that purpose will not be permitted.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary.*

COL. JAMES G. BERRET,

Chairman Inaugural Committee, Present.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
WASHINGTON, March 1, 1893.

Respectfully referred to the Commissioner of Pensions for his information, and who will take such measures as may be necessary in order that the views herein expressed be carried into effect, and that the Pension building be closed to the public on Sunday the 5th instant.

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary.*

[Telegram.]

LAKEWOOD, N. J., March 1, 1893.

The Secretary of the Interior:—

I am strongly opposed to the use of the Pension Building for a Sunday concert on the 5th instant, and object to regarding such a thing as a feature of inauguration.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
WASHINGTON, March 1, 1893.

Hon. Grover Cleveland, Lakewood, N. J.:—

Your telegram received. Orders were issued already, forbidding the use of the Pension Building on Sunday, and I am gratified that this action is in accordance with your wishes.

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

WASHINGTON, March 1, 1893.

SIR : Since my letter to you of this date, relative to the use of the Pension Office Building for a musical entertainment on Sunday next, I have received a telegram from Mr. Cleveland, of which I inclose a copy, expressing his strong opposition to the use of the building for a Sunday concert, and objecting to such concert as a feature of the inauguration. I also inclose for your information a copy of my reply thereto.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary.*

COL. JAMES G. BERRET,

Chairman Inaugural Committee, Present.

This closes the official record of the churches and the Fifty-second Congress, on the question of National Sunday observance. And the unquestionable evidence of that record is, that the governmental power of the United States is in the hands of the churches, and is being used by the churches for their own aims and purposes. A union of Church and State, after the very image of the papacy, has been created and established here by the proceedings shown in this official record. This great evil has been done. *And it can never be undone.* The result of it will be what has been pointed out in the body of this pamphlet. This is certain, and the order of coming events will only demonstrate it before the eyes of all the people.