



"Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political."

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, JUNE 8, 1893.

NUMBER 23.

## American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, } CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.  
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

LET it never be forgotten that no act is a violation of the divine law simply because it is done on Sunday. That law knows the first day of the week only as one of "the six working days." The contention that an open Sunday Fair is a violation of the divine law is sheer assumption.

GIVING reasons why the World's Fair should be closed on Sunday, the *North-western Christian Advocate* says:—

Then, again, a great many people believe in abiding by the law until it has been adjudged unconstitutional or void by the courts authorized to sit in judgment on it.

Then why do not the Methodists abandon their illegal and unchristian boycott of the Fair? There can be no boycott without conspiracy, and under both State and Federal laws conspiracy is crime. The boycottter is a law-breaker.

SUNDAY as a holy day rests only on the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. No text of sacred Scripture so much as intimates that the first day of the week is in any wise different from the other days allotted to secular affairs. Neither Christ, the apostles, or the Apostolic Church honored Sunday above other days. Neander says: "The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them and from the early Apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday."—*Rose's Neander, page 186.*

REFERRING to the World's Fair controversy, the *Mail and Express* remarks that "men who rebel against the laws of God are not expected to obey human enactments when interest and inclination point in another direction." This is true; and being so it behooves people to keep an eye

on the *Mail and Express*, for it is in open and persistent rebellion against the divine law which says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The issue between the first day and the seventh,—the Sunday of the Papacy and the Sabbath of the Lord,—is fully joined, and the *Mail and Express* is on the side of rebellion against the Lord of the Sabbath.

### The Image to the Beast, or a Union of Church and State in the United States.

As shown in an article in these columns last week, the first beast of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation is the Papacy,—a church seeking to civil rulers for power and support instead of looking to her Lord for the divine power which he promises to all who put their trust alone in him. An *image* to the beast must be a like union of Church and State. And as we discovered last week, that this country meets the specifications of the prophecy as to the time and manner of its rise, so we shall discover that here the Church has ceased to lean upon her Lord and has turned to the State for power to compass her ends and maintain her waning moral influence.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that:—

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

This order of things was generally accepted as satisfactory until in February, 1863, when an organization was formed at Xenia, Ohio, for the purpose of securing a religious amendment to the Federal Constitution. In 1864 this organization was merged into or became what has since been known as the National Reform Association, the avowed purpose of which has from the beginning been—

To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian Nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. *Art. 2, National Reform Constitution.*

In forecasting the practical workings of the Government under the proposed National Reform regime, Rev. M. A. Gault,

a district secretary of the association, said in the *Christian Statesman* of Jan. 13, 1887:—

Our remedy for all these malific influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it.

In 1888, Mr. Gault published the following in the same paper:—

We need to correct our unfortunate attitude under the First Amendment, which restrains Congress from prohibiting the free exercise of any false religion.

May 22, 1889, Rev. W. P. Gray, secretary of the Missouri Sabbath Union, defined the movement thus:—

I, for one, do not believe that as a political maxim, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And I believe with Mr. Gault on this, I think. And so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law. *Christian Statesman, July 4, 1889.*

Scores of similar quotations might be given showing that the purpose of the National Reform Association is and always has been to bring about in this country what they are pleased to term "a union of religion and the State," but which would be to all intents and purposes a union of Church and State.

Not much, however, seemed to be accomplished along National Reform lines until the organization of the American Sabbath Union in 1888 united the various elements favorable to ecclesiastical dictation in civil affairs. Then the influence of the various religious bodies being directed toward the accomplishment of a single object, namely, governmental recognition of Christianity, the civil power began to bend under it, and the result was that in less than five years a representative of the American Sabbath Union said: "We have learned that we hold the United States Senate in our hands."

For years the National Reform Association had been disseminating its doctrines by circulating among judges and other State and Federal officials, papers and other publications setting forth what they are pleased to term "the principles of Christian Civil government." The first fruit of this to attract public attention was the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered by Justice Brewer, Feb. 29, 1892, that this is

a Christian Nation, and reading almost like a chapter from a National Reform manual.

\*This decision ignored the spirit and intent of the First Amendment to the Constitution, and directly contradicted that part of the "fundamental law of the land" (Art. VI of Constitution) expressed in the treaty with Tripoli in 1797, which declares that:—

The Government of the United States is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion.—*American State Papers, page 54.*

In this act the United States Supreme Court assumed the prerogative which belonged only to the people, and virtually made law, supreme law, instead of interpreting law in harmony with the supreme law of the land, which by oath they were sworn to do.

#### WHAT NATIONAL REFORMERS THINK OF IT.

In the *Christian Statesman* of June 25, 1892, one of the secretaries of the National Reform Association said:—

Is not this the time to remember that the United States Supreme Court has officially declared [in a document that reads as if largely gathered from the National Reform Manual] that this is a Christian Nation?

The *Pearl of Days*, the official organ of the American Sabbath Union, May 7, 1892, says that this decision—

Establishes clearly the fact that our Government is Christian. *This decision is vital to the Sunday question in all its aspects*, and places that question among the most important issues now before the American people. And this important decision rests upon the fundamental principle that religion is imbedded in the organic structure of the American Government—a religion that recognizes, and is bound to maintain, Sunday as a day for rest and worship.

In its issue of May 21, 1892, the *Christian Statesman* said:—

"Christianity is the law of the land." "This is a Christian Nation."—*United States Supreme Court, Feb. 29, 1892.* The Christian Church, therefore, has rights in this country. Among those is the right to one day in seven protected from the assaults of greed, the god of this world, that it may be devoted to worship of the God of heaven and earth.

This shows that these National Reformers and "Christian" politicians recognize in this decision a foundation for all they have ever asked in the way of religious legislation; and that all they have desired would be fulfilled in the "development" of that which was here brought into existence and established. They at once seized upon this, and the development began immediately to take place.

Prior to this time several Sunday bills had been before Congress but not one had become a law. Now, however, a new energy was manifested. All doubt of the constitutionality of such legislation seemed to be removed, and a demand was made upon Congress for some legislation closing the gates of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday.

May 25, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Johnstone, of South Carolina, precipitated the discussion of the Sunday-closing question, by offering an amendment to the clause of the sundry civil bill, then under consideration, appropriating funds for the Government exhibit, as follows:—

*Provided*, That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be available unless the doors of the Exposition shall be closed on Sunday.

After two days of the most boisterous and exciting scenes witnessed during this

session of Congress, another provision was substituted for this and passed the House, May 26, as follows:—

*Provided*, That the Government exhibits at the World's Columbian Exposition shall not be opened to the public on Sundays.

This was carried by a vote of 131 to 36. In this the House of Representatives committed itself, to an acknowledged act of religious legislation, and by a vote of almost four to one.

#### THE SENATE CONDITIONED THE ENTIRE APPROPRIATION ON SUNDAY CLOSING.

When, in the Senate, an amendment to the sundry civil bill, appropriating five million dollars for the World's Fair, was offered, Mr. Quay, of Pennsylvania, moved to insert a Sunday-closing provision in language and manner worthy of note, and to be remembered as the real initial step in the general enforcement of religion by the Government of the United States, in pursuance of the decision of the Supreme Court that this is a religious and a Christian Nation.

The *Congressional Record* of July 10, 1892, page 6614, reads thus:—

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 enclosed in brackets.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The part indicated will be read.

The secretary read as follows:—

"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."

The discussion which followed upon this amendment deserves well to rank among the debates in the great religious councils of the fourth century. It was even more significant than they. Its result is fraught with even greater peril, as it marks the culmination of added centuries of error, and also because, that, amid the greater opportunities to know and do the right, the wrong was deliberately chosen. The debate was opened by Senator Manderson, of Nebraska. In the *Congressional Record*, of July 12, pp. 6694, 6695, 6701, appears the following:—

MR. MANDERSON.—The language of this amendment is that the Exposition shall be closed on the "Sabbath-day." I submit that if the senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet that idea. The Sabbath-day is not Sunday.

The word "Sabbath-day" simply means that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the words "Exposition on the Sabbath-day," and insert "mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

MR. QUAY.—I will accept the modification so far as it changes the phraseology of the amendment

proposed by me in regard to designating the day of the week on which the Exposition shall be closed.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole.

MR. HARRIS.—Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—It will be again reported.

THE CHIEF CLERK.—On page 122, line 13, after the word "act" it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting:—

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the first day of the week commonly called Sunday."

As a final amendment to Mr. Quay's amendment, Mr. Gray, of Delaware, offered the following, which was accepted by Mr. Quay:—

And it is hereby declared that all appropriations herein made for, or pertaining to, the World's Columbian Exposition, are made under the condition that the said Exposition shall not be open to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and if the said appropriations be accepted by the corporation of the State of Illinois, known as the World's Columbian Exposition, upon that condition, it shall be, and is hereby made, the duty of the World's Columbian Commission, created by the act of Congress of April 25, 1890, to make such rules or modification of the rules of said corporation, as shall require the closing of the Exposition on the said first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

#### THIS BECAME A LAW.

This was adopted by the Senate, on July 14; and by the House on July 19; and received the signature of the President of the United States on August 5, and thus became a law.

This is the first finished enactment of religion by the Congress of the United States in the history of the Government.

#### THIS ENACTMENT RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION.

In his "Sabbath for Man," page 194, speaking of Sabbath laws, Mr. Crafts says:—

At first thought they would seem to be religious laws.

True enough, and so they are; first impressions are usually correct. So was this legislation on the part of Congress touching the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, religious legislation. Men who were there and took part in it recognized the whole proceedings as religious. Reporting to the *New York Independent*, of July 28, 1892, the chaplain of the Senate said:—

During this debate you might have imagined yourself in a general council or assembly or synod or conference, so pronounced was one senator after another.

Senator Hawley said:—

Everybody knows what the foundation is. It is founded in religious belief.—*Congressional Record, July 12, 1892.*

And Senator Peffer said of it:—

To-day we are engaged in a theological discussion concerning the observance of the first day of the week.—*Id.*

Closing his speech Senator Colquitt, a National Reformer, thus betrayed a consciousness of the fact that such proceedings and such speeches as he and others had made were out of place in the halls of a civil government:—

But I shall continue this no further, Mr. President, for it may to some sound like cant, like preaching, as though we were undertaking to clothe ourselves in overrighteous habiliments and pretend to be better than other men.—*Congressional Record, Fifty-second Congress, page 6755.*

#### SECURED UNDER RELIGIOUS PRESSURE.

This legislation was not secured from Congress without the use of political and boycotting measures on the part of

\*From this point onward this article is condensed from "Facts for the Times."

the so-called Protestant "evangelical churches." To many of their petitions asking for this legislation was attached the following threat:—

*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 to the World's Fair except on conditions named in these resolutions.—*Congressional Record, May 25, 1892, page 5144.*

Many churches by vote declared that they would stay away from the Fair if it were not closed on Sunday. Many churches and church papers went so far as to declare their intention to do what they could to persuade exhibitors to withhold their exhibits if the Fair were not closed on Sunday, thus resorting to boycotting methods to compass their ends. And these threats of loss of votes and patronage were not without their weight upon those congressmen who cared more for position than principle.

In the Senate, Senators Hawley, of Connecticut, and Hiscock, of New York, were the most prominent advocates of the measure. Senator Hiscock said:—

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 not stand here hesitating or quibbling about it. . . . I would not leave it uncertain whether the Government might engage in business or not upon the Sabbath-day.—*Congressional Record, July 13, 1892, page 6755.*

Senator Hawley said:—

There is no use in endeavoring to escape responsibility. If the Senate to-day decides that it will not close that Exposition on Sunday, the Exposition will be opened on that day, and you will have offended more than 40,000,000 people—seriously and solemnly offended them. No wise statesman or monarch of modern times, no satrap of Rome, would have thought it wise to fly in the face of a profound conviction of the people he governed, no matter if he thought it a profound error. *It is not wise statesmanship to do it.* . . . Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it, if they deny that this is in the true sense of the word a religious Nation, 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? How would you deny that from the foundation of the country, through every fibre of their being, this people has been a religious people? 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.—*Congressional Record, July 12, 1892, page 6700, and July 13, page 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.

**THE CHURCHES FEEL THEIR POWER.**

By Congress and congressmen thus yielding, these churches knew the State had become the servant of the Church. Rev. J. D. Sands, of the Seventh United Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Pa., in a sermon preached July 17, 1892, said:—

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 \$5 000,000 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.

Rev. H. H. George, D. D., said, in a speech in Paterson, N. J., August 7, 1892, these words:—

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

And in a meeting held in Lansing, Mich., Dec. 9, 1892, the same speaker again said:—

We can hold Congress in our hands, and wield this country just as we please.

And the *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 1, 1892, thus joyfully exclaimed:—

The forty millions in the Christian homes of the land, the ruling majority when they assert themselves, have won at least one great moral victory in each of the recent sessions of Congress. The Sabbath-closing victory with which the quarter century closes, shows the way to others that will make the nineteenth go out in glory eight years hence. For 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.

This Church control over the Government, over which these men here boast, is a most certain evidence that—

**CHURCH AND STATE ARE UNITED IN THE UNITED STATES.**

National Reformers have themselves admitted that this sort of Church domination is a union of Church and State, as note the following words of Rev. J. M. Foster in the *Christian Statesman*, of Aug. 29, 1889:—

A union of Church and State exists where the Church usurps control over the State, as on the Romish theory, or where the State assumes to establish and control the Church, as in England.

The union of Church and State now in existence in the United States is of the Romish kind,—a veritable image to the Papacy.

**Chicago Correspondence.**

**The United States Against the Columbian Exposition.**

SOME months ago it was said in the SENTINEL, that the United States courts might, before the year was passed, be compelled to state their position more definitely upon the points raised, and indirectly determined by Justice Brewer's opinion in the decision of the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity of New York vs. the United States, in the United States Supreme Court, decided Feb. 29, 1892. It was said that it might be that this would be brought about through the question of State rights, as to whether Congress has any jurisdiction within the municipality of Chicago by which it may enforce the Sunday-closing proviso attached to the World's Fair appropriation, or lay any penalty for its non-observance. It is possible that the time has already come which was looked forward to in those statements previously made, for suit has been commenced for the Government, looking to the permanent enforcement of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair by decree of the United States Court. The action has been brought for the United States by Thos. E. Milchrist, United States District Attorney for the northern district of Illinois, in the United States Circuit Court.

Mr. Milchrist sets forth in his bill that he acts in this behalf by the authority of

the United States and brings the bill of complaint against the World's Columbian Exposition, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois. After narrating the inception of the plan for the holding of the World's Fair and the determination of Chicago as the site upon which it was to be held, the act of Congress providing for the holding of such an international exhibition in the city of Chicago is cited. The congressional history of the different appropriations made by Congress in behalf of the Fair is then set forth together with the passage of the Sunday-closing proviso attached to the appropriation of the five million souvenir half dollars, and the claim is made that the proviso attached not only to that but to all other appropriations made by Congress in behalf of the Exposition. The action of the Local Directory and of the National Commission, in the acceptance of the appropriation, of souvenir coins, is then referred to and the language of the resolutions passed by each body, respectively, respecting the closing of the Fair on Sunday, as embodied in the rules governing the World's Fair management, and the question of the abiding force of that Sunday-closing regulation treated at length, as follows:—

Your orators further aver that the said rule, as modified, providing for the closing of the Exposition and the gates thereof on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is now in force; that, by virtue of the several acts of Congress heretofore set out and referred to, and by virtue of the acts of the said commission and the said corporation, neither the said Exposition nor the gates thereof can lawfully be opened upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and that neither the said corporation nor the said commission, acting together or severally, have legal power or authority to change or abrogate the said rule last aforesaid, as modified, or to open the said Exposition or the gates thereof on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

Your orators further aver that after the acceptance of the said appropriations by the said corporation as aforesaid the Secretary of the Treasury delivered to said corporation 3,858,240 of said coins.

Your orators further represent that the said corporation and the officers thereof, and the said defendants, Harlow N. Higinbotham, D. H. Burnham, Col. Edmond Rice, George R. Davis, and Horace Tucker design and intend to open the said Exposition and the gates thereof for the admission of the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and on each Sunday during the remainder of the period during which the said Exposition is to be held; that in pursuance of such design and intention the Board of Directors of the said corporation, defendants herein, heretofore, to-wit: on the 16th day of May, 1892, passed and accepted the following resolution, to-wit:—

"The Exposition shall be open for the admission of visitors until the 30th day of October, 1893, on each day of the week, subject, however, to the following regulations for the management and conduct of the Exposition Sunday: On each and every Sunday the operation of the machinery in Machinery Hall shall be suspended as far as practicable. Exhibitors and employes shall be relieved from duty, except so far as their presence is essential and necessary for the protection of property and the public peace, but all employes whose services are required Sunday shall be given one day of rest during each week. Religious services may be held in Choral and Music Halls at such hours as may be designated and named by the Council of Administration, and said council shall have authority to arrange for such services. The fee of admission on all days of the week is hereby fixed at fifty (50) cents for adults and twenty-five (25) cents for children between the ages of 6 and 12 years."

And your orators further show unto your honors that the said corporation and the officers thereof, and the said other defendants, have given out to the public that the said Exposition and the gates thereof will be open on Sunday, the 28th day of May, A. D. 1893, to the public; and your orators aver that they have good cause to believe, and verily believe, that, unless the said defendants are restrained by the order of this honorable court from opening the said Exposition and the gates thereof to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and each Sunday during the continuance of said Exposition, the said defendants

will open the same in accordance with their design and intentions so to do as aforesaid.

#### CHARGES OF CONSPIRACY.

Your orators further aver that the said World's Columbian Exposition, corporation as aforesaid, and the said Harlow N. Higinbotham, D. H. Burnham, Col. Edmond Rice, George R. Davis, and Horace Tucker are conspiring and confederating together, and are assuming to be in possession and control of the said Exposition and grounds, and have usurped and are attempting to usurp an unlawful authority over the same, and assume to have the right to open and control the said gates and said grounds for the admission of the public thereto on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, during the continuance of the said Exposition and that by reason of such unlawful claim and assumption, claim an authority to open said gates and grounds to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, by virtue of the said resolution and rule so passed by the Board of Directors of the said corporation as aforesaid, notwithstanding the fact that the said unlawful assumption and the attempt and purpose as aforesaid to open the said grounds and Exposition on Sunday are in direct contravention of the terms of the said act of Congress, and notwithstanding that the said contemplated acts in opening the said gates as aforesaid are and will be, as your orators aver, of great injury and a grievous prejudice to the common public good and to the welfare of the people of the United States.

In consideration whereof, and inasmuch as your orators can only have adequate relief in the premises in this honorable court, where matters of this nature are properly cognizable and relievable, your orators pray that this honorable court may order, adjudge, and decree that the said World's Columbian Exposition, Harlow N. Higinbotham, D. H. Burnham, Col. Edmond Rice, George R. Davis, and Horace Tucker, and each and all persons acting for or on their behalf or under their direction, be enjoined and prohibited from further agreeing, conspiring, and acting together or severally to carry out the said last mentioned rule and regulation as adopted by the said corporation as aforesaid, and that all and each of them be enjoined and prohibited from opening the said Exposition and the said grounds and the gates thereof to the public on the 28th day of May, A. D. 1893, which is the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and on all other Sundays during the continuance of the said Exposition; and that the said defendants, and each of them, and each and all persons acting for or on their behalf, be commanded by the order and mandate of this honorable court to close the said Exposition, grounds and the gates thereof to the public on the said 28th day of May, 1893, and each Sunday thereafter during the continuance of the said Exposition.

To the end, therefore, that the said defendants may, if they can show why your orators should not have the relief hereby prayed, and may, according to their best and utmost knowledge, remembrance, information, and belief, full, true, direct, and perfect answer make, but not under oath, answer under oath being hereby specially waived, to each and all matters and things in the said bill contained as fully and particularly as if the same were here repeated and they were specially interrogated thereto severally; and that the said defendants and each of them may be required to stand to perform and abide by all further orders and decrees which to your honors shall seem meet; and your orators, as in duty bound, will ever pray, etc.

THOMAS F. MILCHRIST.

United States Attorney and Solicitor for Complainants.

The gist of this bill is the averment on the part of the Government of a conspiracy by the World's Columbian Exposition corporation to contravene an act of Congress and a law of the United States.

This bill was filed on Saturday, the 27th of May and the hearing upon it continued to the following Wednesday. It is understood that the case will be heard by three judges. The two judges of the United States Circuit Court sitting Chief Justice Fuller of the United States Supreme Court in consultation.\* The decision of the court in this matter will, therefore, under such circumstance partake of the reflected authority of the United States Supreme Court. In the meantime, according to the latest resolution of the Local Directory with which the National Commission

failed to disagree, and in obedience to the injunction issuing from Judge Stein's Court forbidding the World's Fair authorities from closing the public park in which the Exposition is situated to the people on Sundays, the Exposition will be open every Sunday, at least until an adverse decision is had in this case in the United States Court. Corporation Counsel, Edwin Walker, who is attorney for the World's Fair, has given notice that he will need certainly two weeks for the preparation of his side of the case and consequently there will be at least two more Sundays in which the World's Fair, both the grounds and the buildings, will be open to the public, except so far as individual exhibitors and States see fit to close their buildings and cover their exhibits.

W. H. M.

Chicago, May 29.

#### The Superior Court of Cook County Defends the People's Rights.

JUDGE STEIN of the Superior Court of Cook County has granted a temporary injunction restraining the authorities of the World's Fair from closing Jackson Park, in which the Fair is situated, to the people on Sundays. This case was brought by Ex-Congressman William E. Mason, as counsel for C. W. Clingman, a resident and tax-payer in the city of Chicago, and stock-holder in the World's Fair corporation, and others. After setting forth the necessary facts and technical legal matter, Mr. Mason represents—

That the said premises occupied by the said Exposition are described in the Act of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, and adopted by the people, entitled, "An Act to provide for the location and maintenance of a park for the towns of South Chicago, Hyde Park and Lake. Approved February 24, 1869," as public lands, and the South Park Commissioners by the terms of the original act hold title to said premises as follows: "Which said land and premises when acquired by the said Commissioners as provided by this act, shall be held, managed and controlled by them and their successors as a public park for the recreation, health and benefit of the public, and free to all persons forever," and "subject to such rules and regulations as shall from time to time be adopted by such Commissioners or their representatives for the well ordering and regulation of the same."

Your orators further represent that they are informed that the said South Park Commissioners have attempted to make a pretended lease of said public property to the said World's Columbian Exposition, a corporation, etc., but your orators charge that neither the said Park Commissioners nor the said World's Exposition Company have any right or authority to make any rule or regulation contrary to the original Act under, and by virtue of which, the people purchased and became possessed of the said premises, and that the people, or the public in general, upon the purchase of the said premises in question became possessed of the same with the right to free access "forever" to the premises in question; and that while the said law creating the said South Park Commissioners permits them to make rules for the regulation of the same, such rules must be consistent with the act creating the said Board, and permitting the purchase of the said premises which provides that the said premises shall be open as a public park "to all persons forever," and that, neither the Legislature of the State of Illinois, nor the Congress of the United States, nor any authority short of a vote of the people themselves, can have power or right to change or modify the right of the people to use and occupy said premises for "health" and "recreation" "forever."

Your orators further show unto your Honor that they are informed and believe, and therefore charge the fact to be that the said Directors of the said Exposition, pretending to be guided by an Act of Congress of the United States, have decided to open a part of the premises in question, and to close a part, to wit: that part of the premises occupied by certain buildings which contain exhibits of great interest to the people, and of great benefit to the stockholders of said Exposition, by reason of their attractiveness to the patrons of the said Exposition, and that the said pretense of the said Di-

rectors of the said Exposition is, that they are bound by the Act of Congress to close the said part of the said premises on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; but your orators show unto your Honor that the said Act of Congress is wholly unconstitutional and void, the first section of the Constitution of the United States providing as follows, to wit: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And your orators represent that the said Act of Congress, under which the said Directors of the said Exposition pretend to act, attempts to establish the said first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship as against the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, which is used by a part of the complainants to this bill as a day of rest and worship; and is an attempt of Congress to make a law "respecting an establishment of religion," and "prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Your orators further represent that the said Act of Congress, which the said Commissioners pretend to be operating under, provides that it shall in no way interfere with the laws of the State of Illinois.

Your orators further represent that the constitution of the State of Illinois, Article 8, Section 3, is as follows, to wit: "That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their consciences; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship."

And your orators further represent that the said Act of Congress which attempts to close the said Fair, or Exposition, on the first day of the week, commonly known as Sunday, is giving a "preference" to those "religious establishments" which rest and worship on the first day of the week commonly known as Sunday, to the prejudice of those "religious establishments" which worship on the seventh day of the week, commonly known as Saturday, as directed and commanded in Holy Writ. And while your orators, who worship on Saturday or Sabbath, can not conscientiously attend the said Exposition upon the Sabbath day, commonly called Saturday, they have not sought to interfere with the conscience of other people who desire to visit the said Exposition on the Sabbath day, commonly called Saturday, and charge that any attempt to prevent them from visiting the said Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is an abridgment of their constitutional right and is an attempt to illegally prefer or to give preference to other modes of worship against their mode of worship, and is therefore unconstitutional and void.

In the course of his opinion in this case granting the temporary injunction asked for, Judge Stein said:—

In the first place it is contended that Congress, having sole and supreme jurisdiction, has enacted a law that the Fair shall be closed Sundays. Even if it were true (which it is not) that Congress had sole or supreme jurisdiction in the matter in hand, still in the first act of Congress concerning the Exposition and creating the Board of National Commissioners (approved April 25, 1890) it is provided that "nothing in this act shall be so construed as to override or interfere with the laws of any State." Nor is it true that Congress has passed a law requiring the Fair to be closed Sunday. On the contrary, it has carefully refrained from doing so, probably for the reason that it knew it had no power.

What it did do was by the act approved Aug. 5, 1892, to make certain appropriations, including the \$2,500,000. "upon the condition that the said Exposition shall not be opened to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and if the said appropriation be accepted by . . . the World's Columbian Exposition upon that condition it shall be and hereby is made the duty of the World's Columbian Commission . . . to make such rules . . . as shall require the closing of the Exposition . . . Sunday." It was only by the acceptance of this condition by the Exposition Board of Directors that the clause forbidding Sunday opening became operative. In effect Congress offered them a certain sum of money, provided they would do a certain thing. They accepted the proposition and thereby entered into a contract with Congress.

As it takes two both to make a contract and to change it after it is made, and Congress had seen fit on its part, without the concurrence of the second party to the contract, to withhold one-fifth of the lump sum appropriated, there was there-

\* Chief Justice Fuller did not sit in this case as was expected, for the reason that he is a stockholder in the corporation. Judges Grosscup, Wood, and Jenkins heard the case.

fore such a breach of contract, on the part of the Government, as to relieve the directors from their obligations, entered into in the acceptance of the proviso attached to the contract for the appropriation required in the act of Congress.

An intervening petition opposing the granting of the injunction, and in favor of Sunday closing, was filed in this case by an attorney for the American Sabbath Union; referring to the argument of this attorney the Judge said:—

"This is a Christian Nation," says the intervening petitioner, and "Christianity," says his counsel, "is a part of the law of the land," and, therefore, the injunction should not be granted. In the "Bill of Rights," being article 2 of the constitution of Illinois, the people of the State have declared: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be guaranteed; and no preference shall be given by law to any denomination or mode of worship." There is a well-known Christian sect, the adherents of which believe that Saturday and not Sunday is the proper and rightful day of rest and worship; and even among those who regard Sunday as the proper day there is serious differences of opinion as to the manner in which it should be kept. In this as in other countries there are millions of professing Christians who see no wrong in taking recreation on Sunday. Even if Christianity be imbedded in the law—which is not free from legal doubt—yet it by no means follows that the Christian religion, as practiced by large numbers of its devout believers, requires the Fair to be closed Sunday.

It is next objected that for the court to grant the injunction asked for would be a violation of the law of the State, because section 317 of our criminal code provides that "whoever disturbs the peace and good order of society by labor or any amusement or diversion Sunday shall be fined not to exceed \$25." It is assumed by the intervening petitioner and his counsel that keeping the Fair open Sundays will result in a disturbance of the peace. As a citizen, the Court, with many others, is of the opinion that under the conditions known to prevail in this community the opening of the Fair Sundays, instead of disturbing, will directly and powerfully conduce to "the peace and good order," and, one may safely add, to the education and elevation "of society."

In regard to the plea that Jackson Park, in which the Exposition is located, is a public park dedicated to the people, and that the usufruct of this public ground is in them forever, Judge Stein said:—

By the act of the legislature providing for the location and maintenance of the South Park, the commissioners are to hold and manage the park grounds, "subject to such rules and regulations as shall from time to time be adopted by them or their representatives for the well-ordering and regulation of the same." Under this provision the commissioners may make such rules and regulations as are reasonable and proper to effect the purposes for which the park system was established. It does not appear that the "agreement" to close the park was entered into in pursuance of any rule or regulation made by the commissioners, or that any rule was made by them regulating the admission to the park Sunday or any other day. Upon the showing now made, and even regarding the "agreement" as a rule, the Court is not in a position to determine whether it is a reasonable exercise of the powers conferred upon the commissioners. It devolves upon those who claim that the exclusion of the public Sundays was rightful to show the reasonableness of the action taken in that regard. This not having been done the complainant is entitled, on the face of his bill, to a preliminary injunction as prayed for.

The temporary injunction being thus granted, Wednesday, the 7th of June, was set for a final hearing on the motion for a perpetual injunction. W. H. M.

Chicago, May 29.

ANY religion which is not of sufficient value in itself to pay men for professing it, is not worth professing, much less is it worth supporting by the State. In genuine Christianity there is a virtue and a value which make it worth more to him who possesses it than all the world can afford. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

### Protestants Keeping Sunday Holy.

[Apropos of that which we have repeatedly said relative to the only authority for Sunday observance, is the following article from the *Kansas City Catholic*, of Feb. 9, 1893. We give the article entire. The reader will observe that the scripture quotations are from the Douay version, which, however, in these texts, does not differ materially from the King James.]

THE agitation for and against "the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday," brings the strange—in fact, wild—inconsistency of the Protestants in keeping Sunday holy under a flood of light. In an article in the *Mid-Continent* some weeks ago, entitled, "The Change of Day Question," the position taken in defense of Protestants observing Sunday as a holy day is more than ordinarily ludicrous. In reply to a question put to it by a correspondent as to why Protestants have changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, and as to why they do not keep Saturday the Sabbath day, and keep it holy, the *Mid-Continent* says:—

The difficulty which our correspondent has upon the subject is the same that others have experienced, viz: in expecting to find in the Scriptures a legislative injunction in favor of a particular day.

If there be no "particular day" set apart, why decree that either Sunday or Saturday, or any other "particular day" be observed?

This is among the most extraordinary assertions that we have seen, even in defense of Protestantism, and that is pursuing the possibility of assertion to its limit. That book so much abused by Protestants that their inconsistencies and contradictions over it have destroyed all firm belief in it among the masses in even their own "membership," the Bible—"the Scriptures" spoken of in the above—has this "legislative injunction" in it, commanding, under pain of punishment here and hereafter, "a particular day," and that day Saturday for "the Sabbath." Let us quote the Scriptures:—

And the Lord spoke all these words. . . . REMEMBER that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. . . . The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; thou shalt do no work on it; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. FOR [because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh day; THEREFORE, the Lord blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it. Exodus 20.

God here tells them to "remember," what had always been a command from the beginning, and refers them back to the creation of the world for the original command and its cause. The "injunction" being to "keep holy the Sabbath day," being "the seventh day" of the week as time was measured from the beginning by man. This is repeated, again and again in chapters 23:10, 11, 12; 31:13-17; 34:21; 35:1-3; Lev. 23:3-8. And in memory of the injunction, the command, given to Adam at the beginning, because God "rested on the seventh day," Saturday, and commanded that "particular day" to be kept holy—to prevent their ever forgetting the day of the week—they were made to set every seventh year apart as the Sabbath year, so as to indelibly inculcate and commemorate the day among the Jews, so that they could not forget that the seventh day of the week, Saturday, was "the Sabbath." (See Lev. 25:4; Num. 19:4.) If the editor of the *Mid-Continent* had never seen a Bible, this refreshing statement would be excusable. But in the sects,

in men who claim that all religion is within the leaves of this very Bible of which all the foregoing string of testimonies are a part, this is a stretch of desperation so foolish that we did not think that even a bad case would drive any one to it.

### THE DIVINE COMMAND TO KEEP SATURDAY.

The *Mid-Continent* continues:—

A divine precept did not lay the foundation of the Sabbath at the beginning of the world's history. No one, if challenged could have pointed in the first twenty-five hundred years of the world's career to a single divine command ordaining the Sabbath.

When the Lord spoke on Mount Sinai, the Bible tells us that he told all mankind that in the very first hour of the world's career, he did give a "divine command ordaining the Sabbath," and in now attempting to explain away the Sabbath, we hope (with all due reverence to the name of God, even in battling with the marvelous squirming of the sects) that these sectaries will not claim that God was untruthful on Mount Sinai. But if some good Presbyterian will loan this Presbyterian editor a copy of the Bible, besides the statement given from God on Sinai, and the other testimonies we have given from the Scriptures, the first two chapters in the Bible will contradict him.

### THE DAY THAT ADAM OBSERVED.

The *Mid-Continent* continues:—

Did Adam observe the seventh or the first day of the week? The record shows that man's first full day on earth was the Sabbath. His Sabbath was not on Saturday, but on the day commonly called Sunday. It was on the *first day* of the week.

As it is not possible that the editor of the *Mid-Continent* never saw and read a Bible, he evidently wishes to cover over an irreparable blunder by a foolish misstatement. The first two chapters of the Bible tell him:—

And God . . . said: let us make man to our image and likeness. . . . And God created man to his own image; to the image of God he created them. . . . And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Gen. 1:25-28.

And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done. And he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. Gen. 2:1-3.

Adam was created on the sixth day, and the "seventh day" was "blessed" and "sanctified" for him, and he was commanded to keep the seventh day the "Sabbath day," which is as distinct a command to not keep the first day or any other day but the seventh day, Saturday.

And to render plain and make the day unmistakable through all time the Jewish posterity of Adam divided all time into weeks and kept the seventh day of each week, Saturday, as God commanded Adam, and as God again commanded Moses, and as the Jews were reminded and continuously commanded in the Bible ever since. And too, as far as a command and its capital enforcement could make the command imperishable, the Sabbath-breaker, the man who does not both keep Saturday as the Sabbath and keep Saturday "holy," is commanded by the Bible to be punished with death. Num. 15:32-36.

The Catholic Church abrogated "the Sabbath" and made the change of day from Saturday to Sunday by virtue of the power conferred upon her by Christ when he said: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth." Matt. 28:18. "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth,

shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." Matt. 18:18. Here is the warrant and commission given the apostles and their successors the bishops and pastors of the Church. He received *all power in heaven and on earth*, and he gave that power to the apostles and their successors, and "sent" them "*as the Father sent him*" (John 20:21), to bind and loose upon earth, and anything that the Church shall bind or loose upon earth shall be bound or loosed also in heaven. By the power of Jesus Christ her Founder, the Catholic Church, in the plenitude of her infallible power, abrogated Saturday, the Sabbath of the old law, and substituted Sunday in its place, and commanded Sunday to be kept holy in the manner that she commands. We see, then, that not only do all who keep Sunday acknowledge the infallibility of the Catholic Church whether they wish to do so or not; but that to observe it in any other manner than the manner in which she commands, if it be observed at all, and yet claim that it is a religious observance, is insensate.

#### OUR SAVIOUR AND "THE SABBATH."

The most astonishing statement, probably, that we have seen about keeping Sunday instead of Saturday as the "Sabbath day," is the following in the *Mid-Continent*:—

The change of day—so-called—was effected in the same way that the Sabbath was originally established, viz, by divine example.

After stating that God did not establish the Sabbath on any particular day, he here contradicts himself and acknowledges that God did establish the Sabbath day; but let that pass. He here states that God, by divine example, made a change of day from Saturday to Sunday. The first manifestation of God to man was after he had created Adam, and "he rested on the seventh day," and sanctified it. And if there be any further dispute by Protestants as to what day "the seventh day" was from the beginning of man on the earth, the only manifestation of God in the flesh was the Word Incarnate, and let his divine example be both the test of the "particular day" kept as "the Sabbath" from the beginning of man in the world, and of the validity and binding force of the command to keep Saturday the "particular day." We must ask some Bible Christian to loan this apparently anti-Bible, or at least Bibleless editor of the *Mid-Continent* a copy, as he speaks as if he had never seen the Bible. Matthew tells us, as follows, that our Saviour kept the Sabbath day on Saturday, and that he kept Saturday—and not Sunday—holy:—

And he came to Nazareth, where he was brought up; and he went into the synagogue, according to his custom on the Sabbath day; and he rose up and read. . . . And he found the place where it is written: The spirit of the Lord is upon me; wherefore he has anointed me to preach the gospel. Luke 4:16-18.

And our Saviour kept Saturday, the seventh day of the week, during all his life on earth as the Sabbath day, and preached the gospel to the people, and in his divine preaching never spoke of any change of day, but, on the direct contrary, his divine example always was to keep Saturday, the seventh and last day of the week, the Sabbath day.

The divine example of his whole life is for Saturday, the last day of the week, as the Sabbath day. In Matt. 21:12, 13,

when he drove the buyers out of the temple where Saturday the Sabbath day was enshrined. In Matt. 23, when he told his disciples to obey the Jewish lawgivers, who made them observe Saturday, the Sabbath day. In Luke 6, where he defended the gathering of corn on the Sabbath day, which he would not have had need to do if Saturday was not the Sabbath and a holy day. In other places in the same chapter we find the same divine example. And in John 7:7-16; 7:10, 14, 22, 23, 37, we find the same divine example.

The Catholic Church, of its own infallible authority, created Sunday a holiday to take the place of the Sabbath of the old law, and as Catholics are bound to obey the commands of the Church equally with the commands given on Sinai, Catholics must observe Sunday. But what in the world do Protestants mean by observing Sunday?

#### Australia.

FROM this country we are watching with deep interest the movements in the United States in the formation of the union of the Church and the State, and we are amazed at the frantic efforts of the Church to get control of civil power. But we are forcibly reminded that that spirit is not confined to America. The same movements are on foot in Australia. In forming the constitutions of the colonies, and in later legislation these governments have granted to the people considerable religious liberty. In some things they have gone beyond toleration and have recognized the people's rights. These acts seemed at one time to please all, but lately a certain class of religionists feel that the governments are too secular; that they do not attend as much to the religious needs of the citizens as they should,

This feeling is manifested chiefly by the organization of various societies for the promotion of religion by the State. In the Colony of Victoria the principal denominations have recently formed an organization called, "The Council of Churches." The object of this organization is to "afford an opportunity for consultation and co-operation on matters affecting the religious, moral and social interests of the community." It will be the duty of this counsel to watch the legislation of Parliament; to study every bill to be presented, and when the clergy decide that a bill is not what they think is best for the people, they are to oppose it personally and through their churches, and secure its defeat if possible. On the other hand they are to do all in their power to secure the passage of such measures as they think are proper. This organization can easily make itself felt by working through the great mass of voters who are connected with the churches.

Associated with the "Council of Churches" organization, and working under its supervision are two other organizations known as "the Lord's Day Observance Society" and the "National Scripture Education League." The mission of the Lord's Day Observance Society, as its name indicates, is to secure a better observance of what it is pleased to call the Lord's day, namely the first day of the week. The course this society has so far adopted has been to inflict the severe penalties of the law upon those who perform ordinary labor on Sunday. It

will be understood by the reader that in this country these religious organizations are not compelled to lose any time securing the enactment of laws to enforce religious dogmas. They find everything ready to hand. Church and State are united although some acts of liberty or toleration have been passed by Parliament. But these go for nothing when the constitution orders otherwise.

The National Scripture Education League has recently been organized for the purpose of securing scriptural instruction in the public schools. Some years ago the Victorian Government passed an Education act excluding the Bible and all religious instruction from the State or public schools. The churches have decided that this was a very wicked piece of legislation and that it must be undone. Hence the Scripture Education League.

Other colonies followed Victoria in excluding the Bible from the schools, and the churches in other colonies have followed the Victorian churches in the formation of special societies to secure religious legislation. In South Australia there is at present a religio-political war over the Bible-in-the-public-schools question. The Leaguers have traveled over the colony giving lectures, organizing, and securing petitions for scriptural instruction in the government schools. The general elections are to be held in a short time, and every candidate must pledge himself to work for the introduction of the Bible into the schools or be opposed by the great mass of religionists. Some of the editors and members of Parliament are vigorously defending the present system. We see plainly that the issue is right upon us, and that the churches are certain to deprive the citizens of Australia of what religious liberty the governments have seen fit to grant them. We feel the force of the following statement written some months since:—

Now, just now, is our time to work in foreign countries. As America, the land of religious liberty, shall unite with the Papacy in forcing the consciences of men to honor the false Sabbath, the people of every country on the globe will be led to follow her example.

The dark clouds are rising around us and our liberties will ere long be gone. But we take refuge in God who says, "I, even I, am He that comforteth you: who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?"

A. G. DANIELLS.

Sydney, Australia.

#### The Presbyterians and the President.

MAY 19, the President and Mrs. Cleveland gave a reception to the delegates of the Presbyterian General Assembly, wives, and friends, to the number of 2,500. After the formal introduction of the guests, Rev. Dr. Craig, Moderator of the Assembly, addressed the President as follows:—

You know somewhat of the Presbyterian Church. Many of these gentlemen who are here had precisely the same general experience that you had, perchance—reared amid the same plain living and the high thinking of that wonderful nursery of strong men. We have common experiences which make us, though we may never have come together before, to be, as it were, friends, because we know the things which have, perchance, made us to be worthy of the esteem of our fellow-men, and made you, sir, worthy to rule, with the confidence of your fellow-citizens gathered close around about you, the mightiest Nation of the world. Let me, sir, congratulate you upon the fact that sturdy Presbyterians hedge you round about and that the sturdiest Presbyterian of us all is at your side, a

holy benediction to keep you straight to the faith of your ancestors, which is not only the great assurance of success, but it is the highway to the immediate presence of the living God. I am not much inclined to the common saying, "You must be obedient unto your wives." I never was yet enabled to do that, as I have been officiating around the holy altar. But, sir, you are entitled not only to give us instruction from your high place, but order; now I have this little chance to give you an instruction, I tell you, be obedient to her.

I have but one word more to say, sir, and this gives me more pleasure than most men who are addressing you in these days. I am afraid of late hours. You ought to be refreshed when you talk with a man who represents 2,500, people who do not want a single office. [Applause.]

In conclusion Dr. Craig invited the President to visit the Assembly; after which Mr. Cleveland responded in these words:—

I assure you it affords me much personal gratification to meet on this occasion the representatives of that great religious denomination which has done so much to make our people better and happier, and which is associated with so many tender and pleasing incidents of individual experience. The thought is also in my mind that in the light of my public duties and responsibilities there is a propriety in extending to you a welcome to this home of the Nation's chief executive. We still profess to be Christian people. This means that no public officer of high or low degree should be unmindful of the restraints of religious sentiments. It means that the religious teachings of our people should lead them to exact from those who make and execute their laws a recognition of these restraints. It means that the rules which a popular religious sense approves should underlie the performance of every public duty; and it means that those who assume to be religious teachers in this land, where the people rule, are related in responsibility to those in public station.

You, therefore will, I hope, permit me to say that though you do well to insist upon the conscientious discharge of official obligations, and though you ought never to shrink from the exposure of official shortcomings, the contribution you owe toward accomplishing good government will not be fully made unless you teach the people by precept and example that they will find their safety and welfare in enforcing upon their public servants the observance of the mandates of Christianity and morality. There ought to be inspiration in the thought that our country's destiny is in our hands, and it ought to dignify our Americanism to feel and know that those who teach and those who govern and those in every walk of citizenship have a share in our preservation as a Christian people and in the guaranty this affords of grand national achievements.

Nine days after uttering these sentiments the President went yachting on Sunday, and now the Presbyterians think him very inconsistent.

#### The Remedy for Sabbath Violation.

In the *Michigan Christian Advocate*, of May 13, in an article entitled, "Sunday Papers," Rev. Wm. Fawcett, D.D., of Chicago, says:—

The Sunday newspaper violates the law of God and the law of the State, and to the extent of its influence is a promoter of lawlessness.

Granting that Sunday were the Sabbath of the law of God, and that the State had a law enforcing its observance, Mr. Fawcett's statement that law is violated, would be true. But does Mr. Fawcett approve of the State's making a law to enforce the observance of a command of God which pertains only to the individual and his God, even if that individual exercises his God-given right to choose to disobey that command? Is this the remedy which Christ put into the hands of his Church? Did he say, "Render to Cæsar the things which are God's"?

Has Mr. Fawcett overlooked the teachings of Christ in the New Testament on this point? As a professed minister of the gospel does he think the commands of God must be bolstered up by human laws? Is he reflecting on the judgment of God

by implying that his law is inefficient for the purpose designed, and hence must fall back on civil power for support? Does he not know there can be no real obedience where there is no freedom of choice? Does he not know that God in his infinite wisdom saw that compulsory observance was no observance, to the end for which observance is desired? Does he not see that God purposely avoided making the very kind of a law in reference to man's loyalty to him, which the State makes—a compulsory law—because of the injustice of it? That God does not announce punishment for violation of his law simply in order to enforce his law, but because it is a necessary consequence of sin, and not an arbitrary result; and in order that in his infinite love and mercy, he might give the creatures of his image an opportunity to avoid the direful consequences?

Mr. Fawcett says truly that the land is full of Sabbath violation, but he fails to discern and point out the only effectual remedy. If he will read the following from another column of the same paper in which his own article appeared, he may possibly discover what the true remedy is:

Faithfully preaching the gospel is by far the most successful way to combat error. Get the truth into the conscience if you would expel heresy from the head. Satan goes walking around among the churches with a chip on his shoulder, and is never so happy as when he can induce some over-zealous, inexperienced or pugnacious theologian to turn aside from preaching Christ and him crucified, and devote his attention to knocking the chip off his Satanic Majesty's shoulder. Brethren in the ministry, if you wish to worry the devil, pay no attention to that chip, but instead, go right on faithfully preaching the Word.

This has the right ring to it. If the Church sees iniquity in the land let it preach Christ; for "neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. If the ministers, and others zealous for religious laws, would stop spending their time and energies tampering with the chip on the devil's shoulder, and devote themselves to the promulgation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, good would come out of it, for there is power in that gospel to remedy the evil abroad in the land; but there is not anywhere else. For the Church to use any other means than this, especially to use civil authority as an enforcing power, is to acknowledge its own weakness and the lack of that power which is in the gospel. Then instead of turning to Christ, who is that power, and pointing the people who are in error, to him, they prefer to entrust the matter to human agency, and only augment the evil already begun.

The way to annihilate error is to let the truth shine. We do not enter a dark room with a body of men and attempt to carry the darkness out by force, but we simply take in the humble candle and let the light shine, and darkness is nowhere present.

W. E. HOWELL.

#### THE MEDICAL MISSIONARY.

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D., Editor.

A twenty-four page monthly journal, devoted to the various phases of medical missionary and benevolent work. It contains each month also articles of general interest on mission fields, and items of missionary intelligence. Each number is illustrated.

Published by the S. D. A. Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association.

Price 25 cents per year.

Address Medical Missionary,  
Battle Creek, Mich.

#### Methodists and the Fair.

MAY 29, a special committee reported at the Methodist ministers' meeting at 150 Fifth Avenue, this city, in favor of resolutions requesting all members of the Methodist Church to stay away from Chicago during the Fair. It had been expected that such resolutions would be adopted, but three ministers in turn spoke in opposition until 12.30 o'clock, when the meeting ended according to rule.

A Methodist ministers' meeting in Boston the same day adopted this:—

*Resolved*, First, that we respectfully request all our societies and agents to promptly withdraw their exhibits from the Fair: second, that we request all our people to keep away from the Fair. The Church of God must have no connection with dishonesty, anarchy, and godlessness.

The same day at the noon service for business men in the Broomfield Street Church the Rev. Mr. Dunnett, the Canadian evangelist arraigned the Methodists for their aggressive attitude on the World's Fair Sunday opening. He said:—

I have been informed of the withdrawal by the great body of Methodists of their patronage of the World's Fair because of the opening of its gates on Sunday. Yet the morning papers tell of 200,000 who passed through the gateway, and not a single one was compelled to go, but went voluntarily. I want to ask the churches of Boston why they do not get excited and arise in their strength and withdraw their patronage from the street car companies and the railroads, who cause thousands of men to work on the Sabbath who are hungering for the bread of life and can not get time to attend a church for the pressing daily needs of little ones. I am waiting for a resolution for the closing of the theatres and rum holes.

It is a popular thing now to attack the World's Fair, but it would be unpopular to stop the street cars that on a Sunday carry Christians to their churches and to the beaches.

As I look over this audience, I see some faces that are vexed, but you can hurl all the resolutions you will and I will sympathize with the man who has to work on Sunday, and whose perchance Christian employer says, "Work or leave."

I tell you there is enough work for you right here in your own city, and to let Chicago alone. In the name of God, my friends, as you hope to stand before the great tribunal of God, quit this sham. It is a farce. The world knows it and laughs at you.

It is significant also that Bishop Samuel Fallows, it was said, was present and took part in the religious services in the grounds the first Sunday that the Fair was open. It is evident that the "Christian boycott" is not unanimous.

Or the Sunday opening of the World's Fair the Silver Creek, Neb., *Times* says:—

We trust the agitation will not end here. Let it go on until the American people are so aroused that they will wipe from the statute books every Sunday law from Maine to California. Let these people be given to understand that while they are free to preach and pray, an appeal to the civil power by way of supplementing their legitimate religious work, will not be tolerated.

The agitation will not end here; it will increase more and more. But it will not result as the *Times* wishes; on the contrary it will result as foretold by Hon. Richard M. Johnson, in 1829, namely, *future measures of the Government will be still more strongly marked by the same influence*; other laws of like character will be demanded and passed, and a religious hierarchy will see to it that they are enforced. The Sunday-closing law did not fail because of the protest of the people, or because of any just appreciation of the real principle involved, but because of the financial necessity for an open Fair. Few even now discern the real issue involved.



NEW YORK, JUNE 8. 1893.

*Do not fail to read in connection with the article on the Union of Church and State in the United States, beginning on the first page, the article on page 181, entitled, "Protestants Keeping Sunday Holy." It throws much light on the subject, showing, as it does, that to keep Sunday is to do homage to the Papacy. Because of the special value of these articles, we have printed quite a number of extra copies of this issue and will supply them at the rate of \$1.00 per hundred. You can get nothing better for the same money for genuine missionary work.*

THAT the manhood of Henry County, Tenn., is becoming aroused, and juries refuse longer to be the mere puppets of the prosecuting attorney, is evident from the fact that two more Adventists, charged with nuisance by working on Sunday, have just been acquitted there. It is said that Judge Swiggart is opposed to the persecution. Out of twelve indictments found six months ago for Sunday work, the State's attorney has not secured a single conviction, yet he is said to be determined to pursue the matter further, and other indictments have probably been returned by the present grand jury.

THE *Mail and Express* says that "the administration is on the side of those who oppose the opening of the gates of the Chicago Exposition on the Sabbath, while it is inclined to sympathize with the other side." This must be the reason the President went yachting on Sunday instead of ordering out the army to close the Fair gates in obedience to the modest(?) request of Mr. Crafts and the Boston preachers.

THE claim that different police conditions exist on Sunday than on other days, and that the public peace may be disturbed on that day by things that do not disturb on other days, received a serious setback in Chicago, on the 29th ult. In granting the temporary injunction prayed for by one of the stockholders, forbidding the closing of the Fair gates on Sunday, Judge Stein overruled the plea that "to open the Fair would be a violation of the law of the State by disturbing the peace on Sunday," remarking that the petitioner had made no showing that there was a disturbing of the peace, or that the disturbance, if any, was worse on Sunday than on any other day. This principle consistently adhered to by the courts would render null and void every Sunday

law in America. It is refreshing to find a judge who can grasp the thought that a mere annoyance of somebody's religious prejudices is not a disturbance of the peace, and is not cognizable by civil courts.

BUCKLE, in his "History of Civilization," defines the functions of civil government thus: "To maintain order, to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and to adapt certain precautions respecting the public health, are the only services which any government can render to the interests of civilization."

THE evening *World* of this city, remarks that "Attorney-General Olney goes out of his way to aid and encourage the various sectarian trusts which seek to make Sunday a closed day in America. He would be much more fittingly employed in getting into the way to block the more material trusts which rob labor for monopoly's enrichment."

ATTORNEY-GENERAL OLNEY is quoted as personally favoring Sunday opening; but "his personal views," says the *Mail and Express*, "have nothing to do with the matter." Then how does it happen that the personal views and religious opinions of the Sunday people have so much to do with public affairs that they must be crystallized into laws for the government of the whole people?

A GENERAL mass meeting of the Massachusetts Sunday Protective league was held on Sunday evening, the 21st ult., in Boston, to organize another and more formal protest against the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday.

A telegram was sent to the President, concluding in these significant words: "We suggest proclamation that opening will not be allowed except on mandate of Federal Court."

After the telegram had been adopted Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, secretary of the league, went to the table where the reporters sat, hard at work on Sunday, and distributed typewritten copies of the telegram, saying as he did so, that he hoped they would give the meeting all the space they could in Monday's papers. One reporter suggested that the story would have to be written on Sunday, but Rev. Mr. Crafts replied that he wanted the readers of the papers to know all about the meeting.

Just so! It makes all the difference in the world, it seems, who works on Sunday and who they work for; if it is for Mr. Crafts and his Sunday-closing scheme, it is all right; otherwise, it is all wrong.

ANOTHER Seventh-day Adventist—the elder of the Millington church—was arrested, May 30, in Kent County, Md., for practical dissent from the established reli-

gion of that State. Other arrests are threatened. As usual only Adventists are disturbed, though the law is openly violated by others. The true reason was stated recently by a Sunday keeper, in these words: "We would not notice your Sunday work so much if you did not keep Saturday." The Adventists' real offense is keeping another day.

WHEN the Author of Christianity sent forth his disciples to proclaim the truths of his kingdom, he said, "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." But if we can make ourselves believe that certain persons, now living, are his servants, we must conclude that this statement has been reversed, for they now act more like wolves in the midst of sheep. The "Rev." H. H. George, Sunday-law champion, said last fall at Paterson, N. J., that the clause in the World's Fair Appropriation Bill, closing the Exhibition on Sunday, "can not be repealed. . . . We mean to maintain it at the point of the bayonet." And now, that the time has come that the Fair has been opened on Sunday, in spite of governmental interference, the following from the "hub" of this "Christian Nation" is in exact accord with this wolfish spirit:—

BOSTON, May 19.—At a full meeting of the First United Presbyterian Church last night the pastor was authorized to send the following telegram to President Cleveland:—

"The First United Presbyterian Church of Boston, distrusting both directory and commissioners, appeals to you to suppress Chicago nullification with Jacksonian firmness and to guard the gates next Sabbath with the troops if necessary."

How far are such men from the Jesuitical idea that "the end justifies the means"?

THE June *Arena* is a mammoth number. It is probably the largest magazine ever published as a monthly issue of a review, containing one hundred and sixty-four pages, of which one hundred and forty-four are in the body of the magazine and twenty pages of carefully written book reviews by such well-known critics as Rev. W. H. Thomas, D.D., of Chicago, Helen Campbell, Hattie C. Flower, Hamlin Garland, and the editor of the *Arena*. Among the leading papers in this notable anniversary issue are: *Insanity and Genius*, by Arthur McDonald; *The Liberal Churches and Scepticism*, by Rev. Marion D. Shutter, D.D.; *Arsenic versus Cholera*, by R. B. Leach, M. D., is interesting and timely; *Women Wage-earners in the West*, by Helen Campbell; *Does the Country Demand the Free Coinage of Silver*, by A. C. Fisk; *Save the American Home*, a striking economic paper, by I. E. Dean; *Islam, Past and Present*, by Prof. F. W. Sanders, one of the most scholarly religious essays of recent times, and should be read by all interested in obtaining a correct idea of what Mohammedanism is; *Union for Practical Progress*, by the Editor, a strong plea for the union of progressive and reformative impulses for educational and practical work. Mr. Flower also contributes a striking paper, entitled, *Parisian Fashionable Folly versus American Common Sense*, which deals with the dress reform movement now being so vigorously pushed by the National Council of Women of America, handsomely illustrated.

#### AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year,	- - -	90c
"	25 to 99 " " " "	- - -	80c
"	100 to 249 " " " "	- - -	75c
"	250 to 499 " " " "	- - -	70c
"	500 to 999 " " " "	- - -	65c
"	1000 or more " " " "	- - -	60c

To foreign countries in Postal Union, - - - 5 shillings  
Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
43 Bond Street, New York City.