

# The Third Angel's Message

**(1893)** General Conference Daily Bulletin, Vol. 5 (1893)

January 27-March 26, 1893

## THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE - 1

A. T. Jones

As we begin our Bible study I think it would be well to spend this hour, at any rate, in considering what we came for, and how we are to come to get any good. I suppose that every one came expecting to hear things we never thought of before; and not only expecting to hear things we never thought of before, but expecting to learn things we never thought of before. It is very easy to hear things we never thought of before, but we do not always learn what we hear. But I suppose we have come expecting to learn things we never thought of before. It is simply saying we have come expecting the Lord to give

6

us new revelations of Himself, of His word, and of His way altogether. I have come for this.

This text is good advice for us all: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Mark 10:15. Thus we have come to learn of the kingdom of God, to receive things of the kingdom of God, things new and old, old things in a new way, and new things in a new way. Whosoever shall not receive it as a little child, shall not enter therein; cannot have it. Hence, we are all to come here and to sit down at the feet of Christ, looking to Him as our teacher, expecting to receive what He has to tell us, coming as a little child. Because, not only is this text here which speaks thus about those who

would receive the kingdom of God, but in Matthew it is put in such a way as to cover all the time after we receive the kingdom of God from the first. "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 18:1-3.

Now if any one should say that the other text refers to any who are receiving the kingdom of God for the first time and admit the truth that they can receive it only as a little child, confessing that they know nothing of it themselves and cannot bring themselves to a knowledge of it, this verse shows that it goes beyond that, and that the idea goes with it even after we have received the kingdom of God; for in order to be converted we are to be as a little child, receive the kingdom of God as a little child, allowing that we know nothing of ourselves, no wisdom of our own. It is not our own wisdom that can make it plain to us, can open the way by which we can understand it all right as it is. We must leave all our wisdom out in order to gain it and by being converted become as a little child. "Except ye be converted and become as a little child, ye shall not enter the kingdom of God." What kind of children are mentioned? Little children. Little children have not much pride of opinion of their own. Grown up ones are not so ready to learn. Then this is spoken as giving us a model and example as to how we are to come to the word of God to learn. There is another verse that tells us the same thing and perhaps in a more forcible manner. "And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know it." 1 Cor. 8:2. How many people does that cover? "Any man," all of us that have

come here. Any one then who has come here, will it refer to us as personally as that? Every one. Any one of us then who have come here, that thinks he knows anything, how much does that cover? Thinks he knows how much? Thinks he knows what? "Anything." Does that cover all things then? Yes sir. Then the text covers all people and all things that may be known. Then if any one of us thinks he knows anything, what does he know? How much does he know? He knows nothing yet as he ought to.

Well, then, we will all assent that that is true, shall we? Just set that down for yourself. If you came here thinking you knew something, you must decide you do not know that as you ought to

know it. Then shall we come to this study in that way? Shall we all come to this study tomorrow, next day, each time we come here, and just settle it in our minds that we do not know anything as we ought to know it? I do not care if it is the oldest minister in our ranks; he must come and say, "I do not know anything yet as I ought to know it; teach thou me." And we will learn. Every one that comes to this house that way will learn something every lesson he hears. And this includes that same oldest minister in the ranks. He will learn more than any of the rest of us, if he sits down like that. But how long a time does that text cover? How long will it remain there? Will we go beyond that time during this institute, think you? No sir. Very good then, we have that settled, for the whole institute, if we thought we knew anything.

There are some things we thought we knew pretty well. If there is one thing we thought we knew, just put it down, we don't know anything. We are always learning the most out of those texts that we already know best. Don't forget that. We are always learning the most out of the texts with which we are already the most familiar. Then don't you see that any

one who takes any text or thought, and studies upon it for a long time and thinks he has got all the thought out of it that is in it, he just shuts himself off there? When he says, "Now I know it," he shuts himself off from learning what is really in that text.

Brother Porter here in the lesson of the previous hour spoke to us of God's purpose in making known to us these things. What kind of purpose was that spoken of? An "eternal purpose." And the Scripture is God's expression to us of His thoughts in that eternal purpose. The Scripture is the expression of God's thoughts on that purpose, in carrying out and setting forth and making known that purpose. Well then, what kind of purpose is it? Eternal. How deep then are His thoughts? How far-reaching is that purpose? Eternal. How deep then are the thoughts expressed in the scriptures? Eternal. In how many expressions in the Scriptures and in how many scriptures is the thought of eternal depth? In

7

how many passages? *Every one*. Then it does take all the Scriptures that are written for the Lord to express to us what he wants to tell us, of His eternal purpose? Yes sir. Then how deep is the thought in each passage of Scripture and the words that are used to tell it? Eternal. Then just as soon as any man catches one of these thoughts and thinks, I know it now and have got it, how far short is he? How far short is he from having the thought that is really there, from having the thought that is in that passage? (Voices: As far as his mind is from God's mind). When he says, I have the truth; I have the thought, he has shut up his own mind from the wisdom of the knowledge of God, putting himself and his own mind in the place of God and His thoughts. The man that does that cannot learn any more. Don't you see, that at

that instant he shuts himself out forever from learning? And the man who does that, of course can learn nothing beyond himself, and of course will never have the knowledge of God.

The expressions of thought conveyed in the statements of the Scriptures are as eternal depths. Then what limit can we set to ourselves in the study of these? No limit at all. Then does not that present the splendid picture and the grand prospect that the eternal and the whole mind of God is wide open before us for us to study upon? Well then, let us not forget that that is the field of study upon which we are to enter.

We have been in it a good while, and let us be careful that we do not think we know something. Let us be sure that we have not been inveigled into the idea of thinking that we know something as we are to know it. Let us just settle it now by the word of God that we do not know that thing at all. There is knowledge in each line of thought for us to catch. And until all the depths and eternities are past we will never get to the place where we will have the right to think we know that thing and are done with it. Shall we? Well then, I am glad to know that we have such a subject as that to study upon, and such a length of time as that (eternity) in which to study it. Well then let us be *glad* to start with. That text is going to remain with us as long as we are in the world at least, and it won't go then; it will go in this shape of course; the Bible, the word of God as put

up in this shape, will go. No doubt these Bibles will be burned up just as any other book of paper and leather. But the word of God will not be burned up. That text in this shape (in print) will last as long as the world does, but after that it will still exist in this shape (the body). Then that text will still remain with us all the time, even eternally. "And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to

know." No, no man knows it. Are not you glad, brethren, are not you glad?

But we must not linger too long upon any one of these texts, for there are several texts we want to bring up tonight. Taking the thought we had a moment ago, we have come here expecting to learn many things that are new and many new things about what we have learned formerly. We have not come though, to learn anything but the truth. That is what we want. The only thing there is any power in, the only thing there is any good in, the only thing there is any sanctifying force in, is the truth, the truth as it is in Jesus of course, because there is no truth in any other way. Then coming with that purpose, to know only the truth, that is all we are to study, that is all we are to ask about. It is none of your business or mine whether a thing be old or new or who says it in this institute or whether it is for us to study or for any one else, is it? The thing for us to ask is, Is it true? If it be true, then take the Lord's word as He has given it to us, no difference by whom He says it, no difference in what way it comes, no difference if it comes in exactly the opposite way in which way we expected it to come-- and the probabilities are that it will, "for your ways are not my ways, saith the Lord." Then when we have a way fixed up, we may expect it to come another way.

The Lord will not allow any one to dictate to Him or to lay out plans for Him. We may take the Lord in that text, "O God, verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." But we can see Him. He will hide Himself; we cannot fix the ways in which He is going to do things always, but the best of it is we will let Him have His own way to do things, and we will be in a position to do it all the time. Then we will be perfectly safe. Then we will never need to have any anxieties, need never have any thing to do with the

management of it ourselves. He is all wise; everything goes straight with Him, and we simply keep ourselves ready to see Him do it at any time. And we have nothing to do but to enjoy ourselves in seeing Him do things. I have been greatly blessed in the study of the Bible and in watching the Lord do things. And when it is the darkest, the most mysterious, then it is the best study, because it takes us clear out of ourselves to see Him do it. If we could see just how it was coming out always it would not seem interesting. When it is the darkest, we can watch the more intently and with more interest, to see the Lord straighten it out.

So then we are to learn the truth only--no difference who speaks it. The Lord will speak it, of course, no difference by whom it is spoken or the way it comes. If we knew it before, thank God somebody else knows it now. If we did not know it before,

8

then thank the Lord we now know it. The only thing to ask is, Is it true? You all know those verses in 2 Thess. 2:9, 10: "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth. Any one who loves the truth and will receive the love of the truth, Satan will never have any chance to work in with all signs and lying wonders and all deceivableness of unrighteousness. No sir. Because Jesus has said it (John 8:32): "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Then every one who receives the love of the truth, this will make them free. Then the one in whom Satan is to work all signs and lying wonders, is he free? No, he is a fearful slave. As long as we have it settled in our minds that the only thing we shall ever seek or expect is the truth, and love it because it is the truth,

and take it because it is the truth, then we need not be uneasy about whether Satan is going to deceive us or not.

Notice the last half of the verse. The effect of the truth is to make us free. The first half is the best promise in the Bible, if we could measure promises. But we cannot do that because one is just as important as another. All are the thoughts of God, and His

thoughts are eternal. But this is an excellent promise, "Ye shall know the truth." That, it seems to me, is a most wonderful promise. "Ye shall know the truth." Think you know it? Wonder if you know it? Wonder whether such and such a thing is true? No sir. "Ye shall *know* the truth." That is the promise of Jesus Christ to you and to me, that when we trust in Him and follow Him, we shall know the truth. And as certain as we yield to Him and follow Him, He will take care that we know the truth, and we trust Him for it.

"Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed. And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." How are we to know the truth? Continue in His word, be His disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth. Then His word is the word of truth. "Ye shall know the truth." We want to stick to that promise. It seems to me that if that promise were the only one in the Bible it would be all we would need. "Ye shall know the truth." Because Christ has promised that, this is for you and for me, when we follow Him and when we yield to Him. And because this is so, it seems to me that we ought to be the gladdest people on the earth, for that promise given, "Ye shall know the truth."

There will be plenty of opportunities, assuredly--there have been some already, no doubt, in just the first lessons which have been given--some opportunities already for persons in the classes to say, Well, now, is that so? Probably some



opportunity has already been offered for some to say, "Well now, I do not know about that." There will be countless instances doubtless, before the six weeks are past, that the Lord has given us to study His word and ways, numberless times in which we will be called upon to say, Well now is that so? What is the promise? "Ye shall know the truth." Now the Lord does not want us to take things because some one says them. God does not want us to say when anyone says a thing, Well, that is so, because he says it. That is not the thing. We are to know it is true, because God says it. And I say that there is the promise, "Ye shall know." There will be the opportunity for the query to arise, Is that so? How about that. There is the query, but there is the promise with it. Do not forget it. Jesus has said to you every time that query arises, "Ye shall know the truth." Then, when that query arises from some thought in the lesson, what is the answer to you and me? What are we then to consider? What is the place for us to occupy just then? Here is some brother who will be speaking some day, and he will make a statement perhaps, reading a passage or two or three passages, and catch a thought there that is new to me, make an expression here that is new to me, and the query comes, Well now is that so? What is the answer to me? "Ye shall know the truth." Then what am I to do just then with that new thought, with that query? Am I now just to hold that query, that new thought, that which is to me a new thought? Am I not to hold that right before Christ, and ask Him the truth? Or wouldn't I better go to some of the brethren and ask, "What do you think about that? Brother A. says so and so. What do you think about that? That is new to me, and I kind of half doubt it." "Well, I doubt it too," says the other brother. Well then, of course it cannot be so; that settles it. It is not so. It is none of your business what I think about it.

I remember once in a camp meeting a brother read some scriptures right straight through--it was about all he did do; it was a Bible reading--but the thoughts he brought out in the Bible reading were new to a large number in the audience. About half a dozen came in a flock to me and asked, "Well, now, Brother Jones, what do you think about that?" I said, "It is none of your business what I think about it; what do you think about it yourself?" "Well, we do not know what to think about it," they replied. Then I said, "Find out." Suppose I had said I do not believe it. Then they would have

9

gone off and said, "I do not believe that, because Brother Jones said he did not." Suppose I had said it was so. They would have said, "That is so. Brother Jones says that is so." So I propose to tell you nothing about what I think. It is none of your business. You know for yourselves what is the truth. That is the position I propose to occupy in this institute. I expect to find some things coming out here that are new. I have never found a meeting yet where we have studied the Bible that the Lord did not give us something that was new, beautiful, grand, and glorious. But the place I propose to occupy is right upon that promise, "Ye shall know the truth." But I find people, and doubtless you have too, who seem to get upon the idea that the only sure way to know the truth is to raise all the objections they can and have them answered. But when I have raised and presented all the objections I know against a point and they are all answered, then am I sure what is truth? Am I sure of it? No, because there are objections I never thought of. Don't you see? On that line can I ever be sure that it is the truth until every objection that is possible is brought against it by every mind in the universe--can I be sure of it until then? When these are all answered would that make me sure it was so? If it would,

how can I live long enough to hear all the objections answered? Can we get at the truth in that way? Is there any possibility of getting at the truth by raising objections and having them answered? No sir. What is the use of starting on a road of which you will never reach the end--a wrong road of course? Better not start on it at all. Another word. Can there be any objections against the truth? Think of that closely. Well, when something is presented, are you and I to say, "I see an objection against that?" Is that the position we are to take? No; we are to ask whether it is the *truth*, and if it is, there is no objection, there can be no objection against it. Our objection is a fraud. Don't you see? The thing we are to ask is, Is it the truth?

And then another way the people have of getting at the truth is to hear both sides of it. You have heard that thing yourself. "That is one side," they say, "but now I want to hear the other side before I decide." What is one side of the truth? Well, here is one side of the truth, and there is the other side of the truth. Then where is the truth? You get on the either side of the truth and it is error. I have heard one side, and I want to hear another side of it! Then how can I tell what is the truth, anyhow? But suppose I have heard actual truth (and that is the need of it), and I am not satisfied until I hear the other side. What is the other side? Taking this one side to be the truth, what is the other side? Error. Then we can decide best what is truth by hearing a lot of lies, can we? "Well," says one, "I

have heard your side of it, and it looks to me as though it were true, but I want to hear the other side!" The truth is the word of God. Then he proposes by waiting to hear the other side, to know whether it is true or not by comparing it with a lot of lies and thus make a lot of lies a test of the truth.

We do not want to hear the other side. All we want is the

truth. Here is one side of the truth, and there is the other side of the truth. He hears both sides according to his own plan; then how does he arrive at the truth? In his own way. He has heard this and that. Where is the truth? He must find it out some way. Does he not compare one side with the other and weigh one against the other and strike the balance and judge where the truth is? Well, when he has done that, can he know he has the truth? Is he sure that is the truth? Is my mind, my judgment, my ability to weigh arguments and decide upon the truth--is that the infallible test of truth? Is a man's judgment, his faculties, the test of truth at all? When we want to test the truth so as to know it is the truth, the test must be an infallible one. Is not that so? It must be one that will never fail. To discern the truth and declare it, it must be one that will never miss under any circumstances amid ten thousand arguments and errors. The one by which we must test the truth must be such a one as will strike the truth among ten million diverse opinions, and strike it without fail in succession--every thought that may be raised among men. Is not that so? Man's mind we know is not the test of truth. It is only his own idea and the truth that he settles upon. "But your thoughts are not my thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, says the Lord."

Now brethren, in the time in which we are, there are two reasons why that thing could not be worked, even if it were correct. One is, that the truth of God is developing so rapidly that we have not time to hunt out all the objections and listen to the arguments on both sides, because we would be everlastingly behind while we were listening to a lot of arguments and objection. But we do not want to stand in that place when probation closes. The time is too short for that, and we would be left out when we get there. But there is the promise, "Ye shall know the truth."

Turn again to John 14:16, 17: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth." Spirit of what? Truth. Oh! Thank the Lord for the promise, "I will pray the Father." What is Christ doing tonight for us, who are here in

10

this institute? Praying the Father. He will send us the Comforter? The Spirit of truth. What is the position to occupy before we come to the class each day? Taking part in that prayer, that we may have the Spirit of truth, isn't it?

So then Jesus is praying, and by the way, as Jesus is doing it are not we in good company when we do it? Let us spend a good deal of time at it then during this institute. Let us spend a good deal of time in His company during this institute. What do you say? (Audience, "Amen.") I will pray the Father and He *will* give you-- He does not say I will pray the Father that He *may* do it, as though it was to be decided after He had prayed, but I will pray the Father and He *shall* give you. Of course His prayer is heard for He makes intercession for us. He presents our prayers according to the will of God. And so then He prayed and we pray that He may give us this Comforter, and He does. When we ask we know we receive, for He says so. If we ask anything according to His will, what then? He hears us. And this is the confidence we have in Him tonight. This is the confidence we have in Him that if we ask anything according to His will He hears us. Then if we have that confidence in the Lord, we can have a good time throughout this institute. Ask anything according to His will and He hears us. Then it is His will that we should have the Holy Spirit. Then we can go to Him every day, and every hour of the day, asking Him for that Spirit of truth and know that we shall receive it, know He hears us, and if we know He hears us, we know we have the petitions we desired

of Him.

Now put these things together. We ask anything according to His will, and He hears us. Every time we ask, He hears. Then when He hears, then what? We know we may have it? Shall have it? *Have* it. Then what are we to do? When we have asked according to His will we know He hears us. And we have what we ask for, then what are we to do? Let us thank Him for it. Then before we come to the institute each morning let us ask the Lord for the Holy Spirit according to His will, then when we have asked, yield wholly to the Lord, and thank Him that it is done, and come expecting Him to teach, and that He will teach the teacher, and through Him teach us.

"That I may abide with you." How long? Forever. Good. the Spirit of truth is able to take the truth and make known the truth at any moment amid ten thousand times ten thousand phases of error. How long? Forever. Isn't that good? Is not that a good promise that He shall give to us the Spirit of truth, and He will stay there forever? "Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you."

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you." What will He do? Guide you. He will do it; that is positive. When He comes, He will do that. Well, brethren, can't we trust Him, then? Let us put the three things together, "Ye shall know the truth;" "I will pray the Father," and He shall guide you." Then can't we trust Him? Can't we surrender everything to Him right off without a single hesitation about anything? "Ye shall know the truth." "The Father shall give you the Spirit of truth, and He will guide you." Then shall we not yield everything to Him and trust Him and expect Him to guide us in every study we have here?

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will shew you things to come." Will He? He will show us things to come. Good. Doesn't the Lord want us to see things that are coming before they overtake us? Hasn't He told us that the people who will now see what is coming upon us by what is being transacted before us, will trust no longer to human inventions, but will feel that the Holy Spirit must be recognized and received? How will we see what is coming upon us? By what is being transacted before us. Jesus will show us things to come. He does not want us to be taken by surprise in any of

these things. He wants us to know what is coming beforehand, to be fully armed, and not to be surprised and overtaken. "He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." And what is He? "I am the truth, and the Spirit of truth." He takes what is His and shows it to us. Then when the Spirit of truth takes only that which is the Lord's (and that is all He will ever show to us) He does not stand out independently and do great things of Himself, just as Jesus did not do that, but yielded everything that the Father might move and work in Him. So the Holy Spirit in His place does the same things as Jesus did exactly. He does not show of Himself, but finds what God told to Jesus and tells that to you and me. So He gives us the truth of God as it is in Jesus. He is the God of truth? "All things that the Father hath are mine. Therefore, said I, that he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you." Then we have the scripture, "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." There is the eternal purpose, and the depths of it. That is where we are to stand,

asking,

taking part in that prayer of Jesus every day, that we may have the spirit of truth here in our studies and all our work, guiding us into truth.

Note the following from Steps to Christ, pp. 105, 129, 130. "Never should the Bible be studied without prayer. Before opening its pages we should ask for the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, and it will be given. When Nathaniel came to Jesus, the Saviour exclaimed, 'Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.' Nathaniel said, 'Whence knowest thou me?' Jesus answered, 'Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee.' And Jesus will see us also in the secret places of prayer, if we will seek him for light, that we may know what is truth. Angels from the world of light will be with those who in humility of heart seek for divine guidance.

"The Holy Spirit exalts and glorifies the Saviour. It is his office to present Christ, the purity of his righteousness, and the great salvation that we have through him. Jesus says, 'He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.' The Spirit of truth is the only effectual teacher of divine truth. How must God esteem the human race, since he gave his Son to die for them and appoints his Spirit to be man's teacher and continual guide.

"God intends that even in this life the truths of his word shall be ever unfolding to his people. There is only one way in which this knowledge can be obtained. We call attention to an understanding of God's word only through the illumination of that Spirit by which the word was given. 'The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God'; 'for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.' And the



Saviour's promises to his followers was, 'When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth . . . for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.'

"God desires man to exercise his reasoning powers; and the study of the Bible will strengthen and elevate the mind as no other study can. Yet we are to beware of deifying reason, which is subject to the weakness and infirmity of humanity. If we would not have the Scriptures clouded to our understanding, so that the plainest truths shall not be comprehended, we must have the simplicity and faith of a little child, ready to learn and beseeching the aid of the Holy Spirit. A sense of the power and wisdom of God, and of our inability to comprehend his greatness, should inspire us with humility, and we would enter his presence, with holy awe. When we come to the Bible, reason must acknowledge an authority superior to itself, and heart and intellect must bow to the great I AM.

From this time forth as long as we live, when we read His word just as it is, let us never set up an "if" against it. Is there any "if" about it? Can there be any "if"? There is no "if" in it at all. It is just what it says. Thank God it is so, and let Him tell us what it means, and how it is to.

I read again from "Gospel Workers," p. 126:-

"God desires us to receive the truth upon its own merits--because it is truth. The Bible must not be interpreted to suit the ideas of men, however long they may have held these ideas to be true.

That means that I must not interpret the Bible to suit this man (speaker pointing to himself). It means you, too. "The spirit in which we come to the investigation of the Scriptures, will determine the character of the assistant at your side."  
*-Idem, p. 127.*

There is an important thing. We are coming in here every day for the investigation of the Scriptures. Now the word is, The spirit in which you come will determine the character of the assistant at your side.

"Angels from the world of light will be with those who in humility of heart seek for divine guidance. But if the Bible is opened with irreverence, with a feeling of self-sufficiency, if the heart is filled with prejudice, Satan is beside you, and he will set the plain statements of God's word in a perverted light." *Idem*.

Let us not have Satan for an assistant. Then let us be certain we join with Jesus in that prayer before we come--and remain in it while we stay. "We should study the Bible for ourselves. No man should be relied upon to think for us." That does not say we are not to be led by a man, if God is leading the man, or by a woman either, if God is leading the woman. You know too, that a certain man once would have done well to have consented to be led by an ass. But he proposed to be led by the Lord alone. He didn't propose to have anybody lead him, but he got into mischief. Let us not choose who shall lead us, except that God shall lead us.

A man was once talking against the Spirit of prophecy and telling how easy Seventh-day Adventists were deceived how deluded they were, that their teachers got up and told them certain things, and they just swallowed them down whole. I said to myself, that I wished he would try it, try to get things down there in that way. It is a fact that Seventh-day Adventists are hard to lead. I am glad of it in one way. I want every Seventh-day Adventist to be so hard to lead that nobody in the universe can lead him but Jesus Christ. Yes, sir. But oh, brethren, let us get where it will not be nearly so hard for Him to lead us. But I am glad they are so hard to lead that nobody can do it but Him. Let

us get into that place as soon as possible, and then let us just be led as easy as a lamb by Him, by the Lamb of God that He is. We must not become set in our ideas and think that no one should interfere with our opinions. When a point of doctrine that you do not understand comes to your attention, go to God on your knees, that you may understand what is true, and not be found as were the Jews, fighting against God. . . . It is impossible for any mind to comprehend all the richness and greatness of even one promise of God. One catches the glory of one point of view, and another the beauty and grace from another point, and the soul is filled with the heavenly light. If we saw all the glory, the spirit would faint. But we can bear far greater revelations from God's abundant promises than we now enjoy. It makes my heart sad to think how we lose sight of the fullness of blessing designed for us. We content ourselves with momentary flashes of spiritual illumination, when we might walk day after day in the light of his presence. . . . He whose office it is to bring all things to the remembrance of God's people and to guide them into all truth, may be with us in the investigation of his holy word. *-Idem, pp. 129-131.*

Oh, what a promise that is, that we shall know the truth! Then He gives us the Spirit of truth to guide into the truth. And that Spirit is such a perfect guide, such an infallible one that it will silence every other voice than that which comes from Him who is truth and life. Well, then, brethren, let us enter upon the study in this spirit and remain in this spirit, and God will teach us. And as it was said in the days of Job, and in the book, "Who teaches like him?"

## **THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE - 2**

A. T. Jones

I will take a text tonight that will last a week at least. It is a familiar statement to all, I think. It is as follows:

"The people who will now see what is soon to come upon us by what is being transacted before us, will no longer trust in human inventions, and will feel that the Holy Spirit must be recognized, received, presented before the people."

Tonight, to begin with and to lay the foundation for what is to come, we will look at the situation as it exists tonight before us in the United States government. And for this reason I shall relate the experiences of the hearing that took place lately in Washington; beginning with that, and simply state the facts as they are before us tonight, and then afterward we can find out the bearing of the facts that already exist.

When the first movement was made for religious legislation by Congress in the United States, you will remember that we began to circulate a petition, which was, in effect, a remonstrance against anything of the kind, containing these words:

To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States: 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 State, assured by the National Constitution as it now is, may

forever remain as our fathers established it. And the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, when that came up, this was likewise brought before Congress under this protest: 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.

The Breckinridge bill was protested against in the same way; the bill to stop the delivery of ice on Sunday, last year, in Congress, was protested against in the same way so that our protest in this respect has been against Congress touching the subject in any way at all. But it did do it, as we expected always, of course, that it would.

While we were circulating these petitions men would not believe that there was enough of importance in it to sign their names to the petitions, even

40

when they believed that the petition was all right in itself. Men would admit that that was all right. 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 that you are saying. No such thing as that will ever be done." 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. And the reasons they urge for the opening of the

Fair are precisely the same reasons that were given for closing it.

This movement for opening 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 the four days' hearing. Some of the reasons that were given upon which they asked that the Fair should be opened on Sunday, I will read:

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 the quiet may prevail." That is the same reason that the other folks want it shut on Sunday. They want the same thing.

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--so that they could 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 are of the opinion that more good will be accomplished

by permitting these people and all others who desire it, to visit the inside of the grounds than will follow from keeping them out. . . . 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 sanctify 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 religion over the whole Fair. 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 December 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 pandered to 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 Brother A. Moon, 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 can not 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.

Brother Moon immediately replied that he had seen these statements and had already taken the position that I spoke of in my letter. You will remember that about the same time I wrote an article which appeared in the *Sentinel* setting forth the same facts and taking the same position; saying that we



did not care a turn of the hand whether the Fair was opened or shut on Sunday but we did care more than could be told whether the subject should be dealt with at all by Congress. Therefore Brother 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 that movement. The Chairman of the Committee asked Brother Moon what our position was. He told the Committee what our position was and how many petitions there were there. Of course all the names that were gathered upon that first petition, nearly four hundred thousand, are just as good today as they were then, whenever any congressman chooses to call them up and present them. They are everlastingly against the whole thing. Therefore the Chairman, when Brother Moon told him what our position was and the reasons for it said to him: "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." Brother 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:--

52nd CONGRESS,

2D SESSION.

H. RES. 177.

In the House of Representatives, December 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.

Then that being understood that that 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, we proceeded upon that idea. The arrangement for the hearing was made. Brother Moon tells me that if the hearing could have been had before Christmas he is perfectly satisfied that we would have been heard; 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. I was informed that he had a dinner with Elliott F. Shepard in the meantime. Whether that had any effect upon his digestion or some other part of his make-up I do not know. At any rate that or something caused him to repudiate all that he had done and shut out the principle which he had embodied in that resolution and presented 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 taken 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 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 them, and that he had no intention to

speaking under the circumstances. But Mr. Durbin rather insisted that he should, that he had

42

five minutes to occupy if he chose. So he occupied them though in rather a perfunctory way.

Samuel P. Putnam was there for the same purpose, having several thousand of petitions in his pocket. He is president of the Free Thought Federation of America. He went to Mr. Durbin 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 was 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 get there long enough beforehand to find all that out. Brother Moon knew it, but I did not have a chance to talk with him. My train was late, and I arrived there in time, by hurrying, to get to the committee room as the argument was opened. So I did not have time to learn anything about the situation at all. After the hearing 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. I had written to Brother Moon that whatever arrangements they should make I would conform to when I got there. I supposed that was the arrangement. I told Mr. Thompson 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. It was to call in question the legislation, but that was the thing they had decided not to have discussed. I noticed immediately that they were

restless. The chairman was very restless. But I did not know what was the matter.

So I will take up the question right there now. It is true that the chairman made a statement in opening the hearing that I understand now, but did not then. He said:

"The meeting today 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.

Well, 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 were presented by others in a great deal stronger way than we should or could have stated them. My argument before the Committee is as follows:

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. 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: 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. I am a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. But I speak here today 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

43

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

This is shown 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 that 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 further 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 they went further 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 legislation shall be undone, and leave it 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 am going to follow this question a little further 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 December 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 today, and as that was distinctly shut <sup>44</sup>

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 formed the Constitution of the United States

and carried with him into that convention the principles which he had advocated in the 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 gentleman 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 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 December 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.

"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 Avenue and 33rd 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. H. Axrell, 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.

"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 the first three, resolutions were adopted in favor of Sunday closing of the World's Fair. At the last the resolution was defeated, the attendance, it is now claimed, being principally of Adventists. That was the reason of the gloom which pervaded the South Park Church 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.'

"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.

"And 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 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 --" The Chairman (Mr. Durborow): I don't want any more of such stuff as that. I do not see what bearing that 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 outvote 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 don'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. I think I had better give his speech right here. It is as follows:

#### **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. I notice in my territory that these church petitions are exceedingly 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 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. Cross: Very well, then; I will leave my sentence unfinished. I bow to the decision.

Another speech which most powerfully set forth this that the Committee refused to hear from me, 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. I will give his speech here also. So I read:

#### **SPEECH OF THOS. J. MORGAN**

After stating whom he represented and that he had received word "from 375 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

47

Germany also; and I, being a Social Democrat, being an Englishman, and associated intimately with the reform movement of 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 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 into 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 can not 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 German. 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.

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]. I want 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 Congressman 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, be 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 her stock.

What did the Church do? Did the Church 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. Hundred 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,

48

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. 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. Morgan: Well, of course my comprehensive faculties are not equal to grasp your way of managing these things. 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 (original document)].

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 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.

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 working men attribute the action of Congress in closing the World's Fair on Sunday to the activity and influence of the Protestant evangelical church, 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 willfully 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 working man 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 <sup>49</sup>

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 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 or 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.

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 modifications of the existing law.

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. 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 have no right to say to a gentleman walking along the street, You shall not go into that saloon. But if you give him five dollars you have the right to connect with it the condition that he shall not spend it in the saloon <sup>ii</sup>2 .

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. 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 Pepper said, "Today we are engaged in a theological discussion as to the observance of the first day of the <sup>50</sup>

week." So that they 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 Pittsburgh, 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 more often 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. 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 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."

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."

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

51

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 on 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 reasons 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 that 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 Senator 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.

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; but the questions that were asked brought all that out, until the time was consumed. 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 preserving 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 first speech that followed:

#### **OPENING REMARKS OF COL. E. 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 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

52

out from before the Committee when you stated that this was not the place to argue that question. Therefore we dismiss it without saying a single word.

Mr. T. A. Fernley, 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 the only possible ground upon which you can reconsider that question is its unconstitutionality. So that confirmed the position that he 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 they proposed to consider heavenly things, and they reined the Committee up before death and the

Judgment, stating that when they came to die it would be a consolation to them to know that they had acted right on the maintenance of the Sabbath.

Others would bring up and threaten the wrath of God upon the nation if it did not preserve the Sabbath. A man was there from Asia Minor, and he wanted the world's Fair closed on Sunday as a stimulus to missions, and if the World's Fair should be opened on Sunday it would be the greatest set-back to the missionary cause that ever could happen to it. And thus they would bring the Judgment before the Committee and the presence of death and threaten them with the wrath of God and the Judgment of God if they did not do so and so. In an editorial in the Review not long ago there was a quotation referring to this point, that these men would go to Congress, speak for God, and threaten these things if Congress did not do so and so. (See Review of Oct. 25, 1892) That has been done.

Here is an argument from a lawyer, a judge, Judge S. B. Davis, of Terre Haute, Ind., that was sent up there and distributed by the hundreds and lying in quantities on the table of the Committee, in which is said:

The Supreme Court of the United States says, 'This is a Christian nation,' and goes on from this to argue for national and State recognition of Sunday. Yes, 'this is a Christian nation.' That was the grand chief argument of all. This is a Christian nation; the Supreme Court of the United States has said so. If there are any of the brethren here who doubt whether the decision of the Supreme Court means anything, I wish they had been there and seen what it meant there.

What is the situation now as the legislation stands tonight? As it stood then? What is the situation since? Here is an article from the *Chicago Herald* of Jan. 14, 1893, that gives the situation, and so I read it here: 'It is anything but an

encouraging prospect which the friends of Sunday opening of the World's Fair have before them. . . . 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. . . . General Cogswell, who was counted upon till today, is now wavering. The Methodist Episcopal Church has brought some influence to bear upon him which he finds it difficult to resist. . . . 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 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.

I read here the closing statement of Rev. Joseph Cook in



his speech before the Committee:

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.

In whose hands is the government of the United States? The churches. Who owns Congress? The churches. Who is using it? As that gentleman from Ohio said: "We have been able by our strength to use Congress as we choose." The churches. These are the facts.

These are some of the things that are taking place before us. Now the study will be what is soon to come upon us from what is now taking place before us. When we see that, as the testimony has said, we will see the necessity, recognize the necessity, that the Holy Spirit shall be recognized, received, presented to the people. And that is where we are, brethren, as Brother Prescott has said. The only question is, Shall we seek God for the power of his Holy Spirit? The country is sold into the hands of a religious hierarchy, and that is sold into the hands of the devil.

### **THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE - 3**

A. T. Jones

I will take up the subject where we stopped last night and read just two sample statements of those we had in mind when the hour closed last night. Here is one:

"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 will 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 seared.'

"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." --*From the speech of C. B. Botsford, before the House Committee on the World's Exposition.*

Another one:-

"There is just one general reason, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I would like to give why 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 country 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 our laws, National and State, which subserve our liberties and our rights. Take the fifth commandment, take the sixth commandment against murder and protection to life, protection to person; it is based on that sixth commandment. Take the seventh commandment. 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.

"And therefore it is, dear friends, if we touch that fourth commandment, which lies at the very root of all the 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 the profanation of the Sabbath day. And therefore it is, dear friends, that we as a nation cannot afford

69

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.

"A heathen prince once visited Queen Victoria, and desired the Queen to give him the secret of the government's greatness. Queen Victoria sent for a Bible, and handing that to him said, There is the secret of the nation's greatness.' And the secret of our greatness as a nation is the Bible that is enthroned in all the laws on the line of the Sabbath. That is the foundation of our laws."--From the speech of Rev. F. A. McCarrel, before the House Committee on World's Fair, Jan. 11, 1893.

I read these simply as samples of the arguments that were presented to the Committee to persuade Congress to stand

fast in the position where the government has been placed.

Now brethren, you remember I took a text last night that was to last a week. Tonight I want to read another passage in the same line. It is this:

"Brethren and sisters, would that I might say something to awaken you to the importance of this time and the significance of the events that are now taking place about us. I point you to the aggressive movements now being made for the restriction of religious liberty."

That is what we want to study tonight. And as I, with the help of the Lord, shall bring before your minds things that *are*, I want you to be as anxious to receive and see these things as God is that we shall, in order that we may see and meet His mind in this respect.

There are doubtless people in this house who were here about three years ago when a subject was given me, which was, I think, "The Present Crisis." Those who were here will remember that in referring to our work at that time, which was petitioning Congress and remonstrating against all this legislation, I called attention to the fact that that was our work at that time. It was to circulate these petitions everywhere through all the land, that by this means we might waken the minds of the people of the United States against that matter, and to have their petitions go to Congress in such abundance that Congress might see what the principle is and that we might perhaps delay that legislation. The idea was that of getting the truth before the people by that means. And you will remember that I called attention to this thought: that that work

would continue only until Sunday had been adopted, until some Sunday law should be passed, and then all our petitioning would be past and our work in that direction would be stopped, because it would be of no use for us to

protest against Congress doing a thing which was already done.

Well, we are there now. We are now in the place that I referred to that night about three years ago. From the evidence that was given last night, it is clearly seen that the government of the United States is now in the hands of a hierarchy and no longer in the hands of the representatives of the people. Government as our forefathers established it, is gone, irretrievably gone now. Government of the people, by the people and for the people is gone. The authority of the government from the people, expressed in the Constitution, and the government to be conducted according to the Constitution is gone. The constitution has been overridden, and now it is ignored. It was ignored by the Committee the other day; in fact shut out entirely, and a hierarchy heard upon hierarchical positions giving hierarchical arguments only. When that is so--when the Constitution itself is shut out from before, and from the consideration of, a committee of Congress, whose only authority is the Constitution, and this other matter is received instead--then where has the government gone? Do you know? Where has it gone?

[Answers from the audience: "Into the hands of the churches."] Well, from the extracts I read last night, it is confessed that Congress dare not act according to their own view, according to the principles which they themselves hold, for fear of what the churches will do and that they dare not act in a way that fair minded men desire them to act, because of a fear of what the churches will do in creating more mischief and more trouble to the nation than if they acted the other way. That is precisely the reason that Judge Hammond gave in justifying his decision in an article which was printed afterward in the same paper in which his decision was

printed, that when churches demand legislation of that kind it was correct statesmanship to grant it, because Protestants were a fighting people and if they did not give them what they wanted, they would cause such trouble in the nation that the State would perish. That is the thought. What is that but just simply saying that the principles that actuate the professed Protestant churches of the United States are identical with the papal principles from beginning to end? And the reason which they gave for the legislation at the first is simply papal principles outright. That resolution which the churches sent up to Congress demanding this legislation, is as follows:

Resolved that we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other that we shall from this day 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.

Richard W. Thompson of Indiana, who was Secretary of the Navy under President Hayes's administration has well said: "To allow any church to

70

dictate beforehand what laws should or should not be passed is to deprive the people of authority of government which they ordained in their own hands and to transfer it to such church." And that is so. That has been done and from the words that they have spoken and the representations which we read last night, it stands as a literal fact before the world tonight that the government of the United States is no longer a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," as our fathers made it, but the *subjection* of the people by the churches and for the churches. The Church rules the government; she has it in her hands, and she is

holding it there, and she proposes to hold it there.

Now when that had been done, it was perfectly proper for us, or anybody else, and all the people, to demand that it should be undone. Having done it even for the reasons for which it was done, Congress could have undone it, could have opened its eyes and stepped back again precisely where it was before. Congress could have undone this thing and left it where they should have left it at the first, and then the churches would have had to make another effort to gain possession of the government. But instead of listening to that demand upon the only basis they have a right to consider any question--the basis of the Constitution--they shut out the Constitution and all argument upon the Constitution, openly refused to hear it, and played into the hands of the churches which had already secured this, and thus fixing indelibly in the legislation of the country that thing which has been done.

Then that is virtually the second step. When the first step was taken the next step could have been taken backward; that would have undone it. But instead of taking that step, what is being done is only to confirm what has been done, and then the thing never can go back.

Now what errand have we to Washington any more? What place have we in Washington any more with petitions or hearings protesting against religious legislation? None at all. We have no more such errands to Washington. There is no place for any of our petitions there any more. That is the situation as it is now.

Some have asked, "Well, suppose new legislation comes up; can't we send up a protest against that and go and ask a hearing upon that?" What would be the basis of our argument? What would be the basis of our protest? That it is unconstitutional? But the Constitution has been overridden in

this; and we would be met with the reply that it has been done already, and that this is constitutional. That has been declared. And when this is taken as constitutional, everything else follows. When I presented the idea that they might have been mistaken in the representations which were made to them, I was met with, "Your argument is not respectful to Congress."

Elder Fifield: Suppose another National Sunday bill comes before another committee, might not that committee listen to a constitutional argument?

Elder Jones: Well suppose they did; what would be the force of it? The Constitution has been overridden already. This thing is unconstitutional. Sunday legislation is all unconstitutional. But all that has been done. And what would be the force of any argument against any other Sunday bill; that is, on the ground of its unconstitutionality? Where is the force of it? There would be simply none at all.

So you can see that everything is gone, brethren. That is what I want you to think of; that the thing is gone. And the basis, the only basis which we ever had a right to go there upon--the Constitution--is taken from us. We had the right to go there upon that basis because the Constitution is God's idea in government. The principle of the government of the United States is God's idea for governments. And when we were holding up the Constitution and the principles of it as the idea of God, as we did every time, and as the right idea, that was the thing that we had to do. God had given that as an example to all the world and as a light to all the world, as the right ideas in government, and we had the right to appeal to it.

They wanted us to argue the other day against shutting the Fair on Sunday. You see we could not do that. And more



than that, we can't argue against it being shut on Sunday for the reason that Sunday is not the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, because to argue that way would be simply allowing and admitting that Congress had properly incorporated the fourth commandment into legislation and that if they would only recognize the *day* of the fourth commandment instead of Sunday, we would not have anything to say. But we have everything to say against that. That would be only to give away everything. Consequently we could not leave our position on the Constitution. But when they shut us out, they shut out the Constitution. I say always we are in splendid company, for in being shut out by that committee from any constitutional argument, we are in splendid company, for we are in the company of the Constitution of the United States, and in order to get rid of us they had to shut out the Constitution. That is the company in which we belong.

So the sum of the whole matter is, we have no more errands to Washington such as we have had. Of course whenever there come up other such questions, that will be a good place to put our principles before Congressmen, as we spread the truth before all

71

the people. But we have no more errands there with petitions or protests against religious legislation. That thing is gone. Well, in this work which is now past, what were we working against? Against something that was *done*, or against the *doing* of something? --Against the doing of something. Why did we protest against the doing of that thing? What did we say that the doing of that thing would be? --Forming a union of Church and State-- Making an image to the beast.

Now that thing *is* done, and there is no more protesting against the *doing* of it. But is all our work done now? Have

we nothing more to do in the world? Does all our work stop now, and we have nothing more to do in the world? No. Our work is *not* stopped. We have a work to do, but our work cannot be done in that way any more. Then what is our work? To warn against what is already done. But that which is done, is the making of the image of the beast. Then does not that bring us face to face with the third angel's message as it reads in words? Does not this bring you and me, and shut us up, to the third angel's message as it reads? There is no outlet but that, to speak the third angel's message as it reads in words against the thing that has been done. The third angel's message reads in words, "If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand." Then does not that show, in itself, that the image is there, and the mark is set up to be received?

I say again we cannot protest against the *doing* of the thing, because it has already been done. We cannot go to Congress and use constitutional arguments against religious legislation; we cannot protest against the making of the image to the beast. We cannot protest against the government recognizing the false Sabbath. That is set up, and it is put in place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment by the definite act of Congress itself. Then that action has put the government of the United States into the hands of the churches. It has established the mark of the beast as the Sabbath of the nation and for all the world, and it has done it in place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment in express words in the legislation.

What was the papacy? It was not simply the union of religion and the State; that was there in paganism. The papacy is the church ruling the State, the Church in possession of the State and the powers of the State and using them to enforce church decrees. It is a literal fact that

the government of the United States is now confirmed in the hands of the professed Protestant churches, and that they are using it to enforce a church decree above all other decrees. That is what they did it for. That is what they are now doing. Is that like the papacy? Does that look like the papacy? Yes sir. So I say again, we are therefore shut up to the third angel's message. The facts are before our faces and we are shut up to that as our only work.

If we are to have any connection at all with public affairs we have got to have it in some other way than that in which we have had hitherto, and the only way in which we can have any connection with them at all is just simply to warn people against receiving or admitting the rightfulness of the thing that is done.

We are shut up to that one thing and there is no other way out. Every man from this day forth who professes to work in the third angel's message can carry that message or give that message in no other way than in the words which that message speaks, "If any man worship the beast and his image."

But never before 1892 had one of us the right to say that and warn the people against the worship of the image, because the image was not yet made. We have told the people that it was coming and that when certain things came, the image would be made, and the warning then would be, Do not you worship it. That has been our message, but that is not our message any more. We cannot tell them that now. We cannot protest against the making of it; we cannot do that now. That thing is done. We are shut up therefore to this one thing. I say again, There is no way out but to preach the third angel's message as it reads: "If any man worship the beast and his image." But there is a word there that comes just before that: "The third angel followed

them, saying with a *loud voice*." What is that, then, but the loud cry of the third angel's message coming right in now. Does not that show us that when the time comes for the message to be given directly as it reads in words that the loud cry is right at that time? We have had enough before us in all these other things to show that, but is it not there in the words of the message itself, that when the message goes to the world in the words in which it is given, that is the loud cry? For it goes that way, with a loud voice.

Now another thought: How many of the nations of the earth besides this were there until this time that had no union of religion and the State? None. How many nations at all are there now that have it not? None. But a union of religion and the State, a union of Church and State, that is Satan's way of doing things. Paganism was Satan's way of doing things, and so was the papacy. And what is this now in our own nation? The image of the papacy.

Through what instrument did Satan make war against the church of God when Christ was born?

72

-Through paganism. Through what instrument did he make war against the church in the wilderness? Through the papacy. Through what instrument does he make war against the remnant? Through the image of the papacy? See Rev. 12. But until now the image was not made. Now it is made. Until now he did not have the government of the United States in his hands to wield against the truth of God. He has it now. How much then of the power of the world has Satan now in his hands to wield against the church and the Sabbath of God? He has it all. Hasn't he? Now you and I are pledged by years of profession to stand by the Sabbath of the Lord. We are pledged to that. But now opposed to this is every particle of power that this earth knows, with Satan the

chief to wield the power. Then are we not brought face to face with this fact: That as certainly as we maintain our allegiance to the Sabbath of the Lord we shall have to do it in the face of all the power that this earth knows? Then does it not follow that in order to do that we must have with us a power that is greater than all the power that this earth knows? Can a man, of *himself*, stand successfully against all the power of earth? No, sir. Well, then, are we not shut up to this, that we must have a power working for us that is greater than all the power of the earth put together? Is it not time then, that that angel *should* come down from heaven having great power? That angel coming down and adding his voice to the other makes the loud cry. We therefore just now, at the point where that angel *has* come down with great power, and we need not be afraid. Though all the power of the earth be against the Sabbath of the Lord and against us for standing by it, the power of God is given to every one who will be faithful to him.

Is not the message that the Saviour gave to his disciples precisely the message that is given to us? They were to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Here is our message. The everlasting gospel to preach "unto every nation, kindred, tongue and people." Rev. 14:6. It is the same thing. He said to them, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." Here Jesus Christ has a power *in the earth* that is greater than all the powers of earth. So if Jesus was only in the earth and was living on the earth, as He was once before, He would have more power than all the earth has besides anyway. "All power is given to me in heaven *and earth*: go ye *therefore*." Why go? Because He has the power.

Go ye therefore and teach all nations these things, and lo *I am with you*. Is He? Is He with us, brethren? Let us stop saying he *will be* with us. He does not say it. Let us stop

saying it; it is not faith at all. We say: "He says, 'I will be with you.'" And we ask Him to be with us, and then we wonder whether He is or not. He says, "Go ye; I *am* with you." Is He? Then thank Him that it is so. If you get into difficulties let Him help you out. It is Satan's office to present difficulties, to hedge up the way; but thank the Lord, when the Lord is with us, Satan cannot hedge up the way. He may put a Red Sea in front of us, and through we will go, for God can open the sea. The Lord *is* with us, and we want it a more personal thing than that He "will be," anyway. We want a power with us every moment, working with us, in us, and for us, and we want to be sure that it is so. How can we know it? He says so. Then let us say so, too.

There are two points that we have noticed thus far: One is that we are shut up to give the third angel's message as it reads; the other is that we are shut up to this one thing, that as certainly as we stand in our allegiance to the commandments of God, we have to do it in the face of all the power that this earth knows, with Satan using that power. And that shuts us up to this one thing, that we need therefore, in order to stand at all, in order to stand a minute, we need a power that is greater than all the power of this world put together. And the blessedness of it is, There He stands and says, "I *am* with you." Thank the Lord.

Now another thought, I think perhaps that will about fill the time for this evening, and these three points will be enough for tonight: Congress did take up the fourth commandment, did make it the basis and the reasons for that Sunday legislation. But it went further. It did not let that commandment stay there as it reads. It did not leave the commandment there as God gave it. It did not leave the commandment there as it is give in the Bible, and as it was

put into the *Record*. It did not leave it there for the World's Fair Directory to interpret, each man for himself as to what it means. Congress went beyond all that and interpreted the fourth commandment to mean "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday," as "the Christian Sabbath," "the Sabbath of the nation," and as that which should be observed and honored, for this nation and for the world, by shutting the Fair on Sunday. Then I ask, what is that but the government of the United States by a definite and decided act putting Sunday in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment?

Let us look back a little now. The mystery of iniquity was working in Paul's day. The apostasy began; the apostasy went on; the church adopted Sunday, but could she compel anybody to keep it? No. Could she bring any restrictions, any force,

73

to bear upon people who would keep the Sabbath of the Lord to compel them to put Sunday in the place of the Sabbath of the Lord, so long as the church stood alone? No. But she wanted to compel people to keep it instead of the Sabbath of the Lord. That apostate church wanted the Sunday sabbath kept instead of the

Sabbath of the Lord and that people should recognize and observe it instead of the Sabbath. She could not do it alone. What then did she do to accomplish her purpose? She took hold of earthly power. She seized the power of the State. How much power did that government represent in the world at that time? The Roman Empire was the world power then; so that Church then secured all the power of the world, and by that she compelled people to receive Sunday instead of the Sabbath of the Lord. Then was it not by that act that she succeeded in definitely putting the Sunday in the place of the

Sabbath of the Lord? But what was that but making void the law of God? She took the seal of His law, the heart of His law, that which reveals Him, the seal showing that He is what He is; she by force took that away and put her own sign in its stead. What was that but supplanting God in the minds of the people of the world? And it was by that act that she succeeded in her purpose of making void the law of God. That was the beast. That made the beast. We have preached all these years that the papacy has made void the law of God. And that is correct. Let us return now to our own time and the question that is before us. Have not the Protestant churches kept Sunday a long time? Have they not opposed the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord a long time? But they could not compel anybody to keep Sunday instead of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. In a measure, it is true, they could enforce the observance of Sunday in the States. But we know, and they have all confessed, that all efforts through State laws in this direction, we almost wholly nullified by the fact that the National Government was against it all, and we all know that one of the great reasons for their strenuous efforts to get the National Government committed to Sunday was to make the State laws effective. Then in order to make their purpose effective in exalting Sunday against the Sabbath of the Lord, these churches, professed Protestantism, had to seize the government of the United States, the power of this government, as the former apostasy seized the power of the Roman government. And now she has got it. And in the definite act by which she got it, she aimed at the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, to put it out of the way and to put the Sunday in its stead. Then have not these by this definite act also made void the law of God? When the other was done that made the beast! What is this? It is the



image. Is it not time, then, for the third angel's message to be given in its own words? "If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand."

Ah, and the Lord hath sent us a word just now, too. "It is time for thee, Lord, to work." Why? "Because they have made void thy law." Ps. 119:126. Then is not that word the prayer that God has put into our mouths at this time? Are you offering it? Are you living day by day and hour by hour in the presence of that terrible fact that it is time for God Himself to work, if His integrity is going to be maintained to all the world? It is a terrible fact; it is a fearful position. It brings us to the point of such consecration as not a soul of us ever dreamed of before; unto the place of such consecration, of such devotion, as will hold ourselves in the presence of God, with that fearful thought that "It is time for thee, Lord, to work, for they have made void thy law."

What is that but a confession, and a proper confession, too, "Lord what can we do? Here is all the power of the earth against us. What can we do against this great company?" Is not the prayer of Jehoshaphat our prayer now, "O our God, we have no might against this great company that cometh against us; neither know we what to do; but our eyes are upon thee." And they "stood before the Lord with their little ones, their wives, and their children."

"What does Joel tell us to do? "Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breast: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them: wherefore should they

say among the people, Where is their God?"

We stand pledged to the Lord and before the world that we depend upon God; that He loves His people; that He manifests Himself in behalf of those whose hearts are toward Him.

Brethren, there is that fearful word also that touches that very thought, that came to us from Australia. It is in the testimony entitled, "The Crisis Imminent." What does that say? "Something great and decisive is to take place, and that right early. If any delay, the character of God and His throne will be compromised." Brethren, by our careless, indifferent attitude, we are putting God's throne into jeopardy. Why cannot He work? God is ready. Are not God's workmen ready? But if there is any delay, "the character of God and His throne is jeopardized." Is it

74

possible that we are about to risk the honor of God's throne? Brethren, for the Lord's sake and for His throne's sake, let us get out of the way. Let us get out of the way. The only way to get out of the way of God is to flee to Him. That is the only way to get out of His way, and that is where He calls us now.

Here we stand. He has given us the prayer. O of all things when God has given us the prayer--how heartily and confidently can we present the prayer, and ourselves upon it. He has given us the prayer, He has told us the word; "It is time for thee, Lord, to work, for they have made void thy law."

Then another thing; If we need anything to cause us to be sure that that is all so, there is that word that was read last Sabbath, from that last word that came from Australia:

"Brethren and sisters, would that I might say something to awaken you to the importance of this time, the significance of the events that are now taking place about us. I point you to

the aggressive movements now being made for the restriction of religious liberty. God's memorial *has been* torn down, and in its place *a false sabbath stands before the world.*"

Not, is going to be torn down. But "has been" torn down. The testimony that came last winter--last year this time, said that a great move would be made "*to exalt* the false sabbath." What now? "God's memorial has been torn down, and in its place *a false sabbath stands* before the world."

How fast God's word is fulfilled these days! One mail brings a testimony that such and such things "will be"; the next mail comes:

"it is." One mail brings a word from the Lord that efforts are being made "to do" such and such things; the next mail brings words from the Lord, That thing "is done."

Brethren, should not we stand as minute men, ready to respond to God's word on the instant? There is no time, then, to lag for an instant. Brethren, let us seek God with all the heart. These testimonies that Brother Prescott read the past hour, bringing us face to face with this thought of calling upon God for His Holy Spirit--is not that the very evidence of all the work, of all the message, and everything else before us! Then is not the text applicable which I took last night:

The people who will now see what is soon to come upon us by what is being transacted before us, will no longer trust in human inventions, and will feel that the Holy Spirit must be recognized, received, presented before the people.

"God's memorial has been torn down, and in its place a false sabbath stands before the world; while the powers of darkness are stirring up the elements from beneath, the Lord God of heaven is sending power from above to meet the emergency by arousing his living agencies to exalt the law of

heaven. 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.*"

Now not "to set up" the false sabbath, but to honor the false sabbath which has been set up, and which stands before the world. Then this word came to us under date of August 30, 1882: After quoting the scripture from Rev. 3, it says this:

"Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.' The chosen people of God have lost their first love. Without this all their profession of faith will not save a soul from death. Suppose the attention should be turned away from every difference of opinion, and we should heed the counsel of the True Witness. When God's people humble the soul before Him, *individually seeking His Holy Spirit* with all the heart, there will be heard from human lips such a testimony as is represented in this Scripture--'After these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory.' There will be faces aglow with the love of God, there will be lips touched with holy fire saying, 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'

"

Brethren, let that be a word that will come from every lip in this house, at this institute, in this church, before this institute and conference shall close. Has not God made the way plain enough? Has not He made it plain enough in the events that are standing before our faces, and from which we cannot hide our eyes? Then let us open our eyes and our hearts and bid the Lord come in and take full possession and use

us just as He pleases.

#### THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE - 4

A. T. Jones

A question has been handed up.

Quest: Can the States logically refuse to fall into line with the Supreme Court decision, defining the national constitution in its relation to religion?

Elder Jones: No sir. As a matter of fact the States do not need to do it. The Supreme Court of the United States has fallen into line with the States. That is the way the thing has already been done. That is the mischief of it.

I begin the lesson tonight by reading Rev. 14:9. "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." I need not present any other evidence tonight to show that we are in the time when that verse is fulfilled than merely to refer to the points we mentioned last night. Three distinct points that were noticed last night shut us up to that one thing. Now that is the warning which we are to give to the world. And no man can give the third angel's message without giving it just exactly as it reads. But what is the consequence of disregarding the message in that verse? The unmingled wine of the wrath of God. Then what is the next thing that comes in that respect? I mean in the fulfillment of this prophecy, what is the next thing we are to look for? [Audience: "The wrath of God!"] Yes.

Now we have come to the loud cry, haven't we? That part of the prophecy is reached. We have come to the image of the beast; *that* part is reached; that prophecy is fulfilled. Now, of course, in the workings of the image of the beast there are many things to come in fulfillment of that, but all these

things--persecutions, deceiving miracles, etc.--are simply the consequence of what has been done: simply the speaking and acting of the image that is already made. We are not to look now for any great, wondrous, marked movement in legislation or government to fulfill that part of the prophecy, because the image is made. That is fulfilled. What comes

88

in the future in legislation and in the strifes and contentions and the rioting and warring, with the evil that will come, is simply the inevitable outcome and consequence of this. Then what next will there be in the line of this prophecy which is here before us? Rev. 14:9,10. [Audience: "The wrath of God."] Yes.

I might put the question in another way now, to make it a little plainer. Is there any piece of legislation, any special move of this government for which we are now to look as the fulfillment of this prophecy in connection with the making of the image of the beast? What have we been looking for all the time? We have been looking for legislation--some move to be made or something to be done in or by the government that would make the image of the beast. That was what our eyes were upon all the time. But now do we look for that any more? [Audience: "No sir."] Truth. Now then that having been done, isn't all that pertains to the image of the beast *in that?* and all that comes henceforth respecting the image of the beast and its work, is it anything more than the consequences of what is now here? Is not all that the image is to do, in the image when it is made to begin with? Then all that comes henceforth pertaining to the image of the beast being in that which is done, what great point in the words of the message stands next? [Audience: "The seven last plagues."] Yes. The next thing that follows the working of the image of the beast in that prophecy

is, The seven last plagues.

Now put the three things together. We *were* looking for the image of the beast, *then* the seven last plagues, and *then* the coming of the Lord. The image of the beast has come, hasn't it? The coming of the Lord is in the future, isn't it? But the seven last plagues are between them. Then what is the next great, marked thing in the history of this world and of mankind and of salvation? The seven last plagues. That being so, it becomes us to think very seriously *where* we are living, doesn't it? It becomes us also to think seriously *how* we are living.

Someone in the audience: Is it necessary to amend the Constitution?

Elder Jones: The Constitution, nothing! No, we have no Constitution any more. It is set aside. It is taken clear out of the way. We can't use it any more. What could an amendment do more than has been done? Don't you see they have put aside the Constitution? What could anybody want with an amendment?

But the thought which I want just now to get before you is that the next great and marked event in the history of this world and in the work of salvation, is what is spoken of here in the text. This shows it on the face of it. Look at it again. We are to give this warning to the world: "If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand." That is the warning we are to give. Well, in view of what is it that the warning is given? [Audience: "The wine of the wrath of God."] What is the wine of the wrath of God? [Audience: "The seven last plagues."] Rev. 15:1. Then doesn't it follow on the face of it, that the seven last plagues are the next thing after that warning? And that the warning will wind up with the seven last plagues? And we are now where that warning begins with a loud voice

in its very words. Then doesn't that which is now begun and the work which is now in our hands, end with the bringing of us face to face with the seven last plagues? [Audience: "Yes, sir."] When that work of warning is done, where will we be? [Audience: "At the pouring out of the plagues."]

Now are you satisfied that this is so? Are you satisfied that the seven last plagues is the next thing that comes after we give this warning to the world? [Audience: "Yes, sir."] Then as we go about to give that warning, isn't it in the nature of the case that we are to do it in view of the plagues that are to fall upon those to whom we speak of it? And that we must be faithful to that message ourselves, which we are giving, if we want to be shielded when the plagues do fall, of which that message speaks? But who will be shielded in that time? Those who have "the covering of the Almighty" drawn over them. And that covering of the Almighty is the covering that the prophet Isaiah spoke about, saying "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, *he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness*, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels." Isa. 61:10. That is the covering that God draws over His people, which shields every one from the wrath of God, now and forever. Have you that robe of righteousness?

Now another thing right there. We are living in view of another fearful fact, that is, if that message which we are now to give, is not received, it has attached to it the fearful consequences that the wine of the wrath of God will be received; so that when that message finishes, the wrath of God succeeds it. I say we are living in the presence of that fact. And the work which is to bring all face to face with that fact, as it is there recorded, is now begun. Therefore, *will not that give a power to the health reform that it has not yet had?*



When the health reform was given to the people of God, it was defined as that which is to fit the people for translation. That is the meaning of health reform. The leading thing, the

89

great thing, that God intends health reform to do, is to prepare His people for translation. But we have to go through the seven last plagues before we are translated, and if a man's blood is impure and full of gross material will he be able to pass through that time, when the air is sick with pestilence? Indeed he cannot.

That brings us face to face with some more solemn experiences doesn't it? And some more solemn truth. A great many solemn questions have already been presented to us. And brethren, there are a great many more that are still to come to us. We are in the most solemn time we ever saw. Let us consider it.

Now let us take the points that have already been presented in the different lessons that have been given, the searching thoughts and solemn experiences in our religious profession to which we have been brought face to face. I want to know now how on earth it is ever possible for any one of us to meet these experiences without Jesus Christ in the full? I would like to have somebody tell. [Audience: "We can't do it."] Of course we can't do it. Then brethren let us have Him come in in His fullness as quickly as possible. We need Him every moment, and each succeeding lesson brings to view more and more our need of Him.

Now as there are two other points that I want to present tonight, for the present purpose we will just sketch through what the further lesson of the plagues is.

When the first plague falls, it falls upon the men that "had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image" (Rev. 16:1,2)--the very people to whom the warning of

this message is given. Then the plagues follow each other in direct succession, unto the sixth, under which the evil spirits gather "the kings of the earth and of the whole world," to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. Rev. 16:14-16. This battle is fought when the Saviour comes, for "I saw the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies, gathered together to make war upon him that sat upon 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 worshipped his image." Rev. 19:11, 19, 20. And at that time the seventh angel pours out his vial in the air and there comes a great voice out of the temple of heaven from the throne saying, *It is done*. And there are voices, and thunderings, and lightnings; and there is a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth so mighty an earthquake and so great.

Every island flees away and the mountains are not found. The heavens depart as a scroll and every mountain and island are moved out of their places. Rev. 16:17, 18, 20; 6:14. And the beast and his image "the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth and destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. 2:8. And the remnant of the wicked world who went not up to the battle of Armageddon, "were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth." Rev. 19:21. The sword of him that sits upon the horse is the brightness of the Lord's coming.

Then the events that are directly and inseparably connected with the end of the world are the events that follow the work, to the doing of which we are now completely shut up. That is the living fact now.

Brethren, do you believe that the seven last plagues are

coming, just as certainly as the image of the beast has come" [Audience: "Yes, sir."] Honest now? [Audience: "Yes."] Now we looked for the image to the beast *to* come. It *has* come. Now what are we to look for? The seven last plagues. Do you believe that the end of the world is coming, with the seven last plagues, just as certainly as that the image to the beast is made? [Audience: "Yes."] Do you believe that the end of the world comes when that seventh plague comes? [Audience: "Yes."] Then brethren, these things mean something to us just now.

We will leave that point there now and take up another thought with reference to our government and what the consequences must be and can only be of what the government has now done; that is, the consequences to the government itself.

Let us begin with Acts 17:26, 27. Paul is calling the attention of the people to God and he says "And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the time before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." Then God made this nation of men to dwell on the earth, and He determined the bounds of the habitations of the people of this nation and how much space this nation should occupy. And He has given a portion of time to this nation. What did He do it for? The next verse reads: "*That they should seek the Lord*, if haply they might feel after him, though he be not far from every one of us!" If they might feel after Him and *haply* find him? --No, there is no *hap* about that. If they feel after Him, what then? They

would find Him. If anybody feels after Him, he will find Him. In the fourth chapter of Daniel we learn that God rules in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever He will. God's idea concerning the nations is that they shall seek Him. Well

then when a nation rejects the Lord what use has He for it?

None. But <sup>90</sup>

will He reject a nation as long as the nation will seek Him? No, sir. Will He cut off a nation, so long as there are any people there to seek the Lord? He will not. He didn't before the flood. Neither did He in Sodom and Gomorrah. If He could have found ten people that would seek the Lord in Sodom and Gomorrah He would not have destroyed those cities. But He couldn't find them.

When He made the promise to Abraham, He said to him, "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: *for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.*" Gen. 15:13-16. Had God established bounds to their habitation? Yes. What did He do it for? That they should seek the Lord. As long as there was any possibility of their seeking the Lord, they held the place where God put them. And the Lord would not give the land to Abraham, His friend, nor to Abraham's seed as long as there were people there who would seek the Lord. The Lord's people could not occupy, because the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full. But when the iniquity of the Amorites was full, there was no use for them any more.

When the Lord establishes a people on earth to seek the Lord and they will not seek Him, what then is the use of their staying any longer on the earth? To let them stay on earth after that was only to perpetuate iniquity for no possible use. So the Lord brought

His people in there at that time and drove out the Amorites.

He told His people not to do as the Amorites did lest the land spue them out as it had spued out the Amorites. But His people did the very thing He told them not to do. And the land did empty them out and He gave them into the hands of the king of Babylon.

He had established the kingdom of Babylon for a purpose; He set the bounds of their habitation. What was that for? It was that they should seek the Lord. Nebuchadnezzar sought the Lord in His day and He proclaimed the glory of the Lord, the honor of the Lord, and the existence of the Lord, to all the nations of the earth. You remember that proclamation He made in Daniel 4th chapter: "I thought it good to tell what the Most High hath done for me." And he told his experience. Let us read how far his proclamation reached:

"Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; peace be multiplied unto you. I thought it good to shew signs and wonders that the most high God hath wrought toward me. How great are his signs! and how mighty are his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation."

The Lord had said unto Nebuchadnezzar that He had given him all these lands round about and all the nations and that they should serve Him, and his sons and his son's son until the very time of his land came, and then what? Many nations shall serve themselves of him. God had determined the time before appointed as well as the bound of his habitation, so that when the time of his land came, many nations would serve themselves of Babylon.

Nebuchadnezzar's son succeeded him, then his grandson. Instead of Belshazzar seeking the Lord and honoring the Lord, he took the vessels of the house of the Lord and used them in his lascivious feasts, thus turning his back upon God

completely. Then what use did the Lord have for him or his nation any more? He had no more use. That same hour there came the fingers of a man's hand and wrote upon the wall in the presence of the king. And the meaning of the words that were written is this: "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it. Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting. Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians."

Thus the Lord brought up the Medes and Persians. Did they seek the Lord too?

God had called Cyrus by name before he came up there. Cyrus did not then know the Lord. The Lord said: "I have surnamed thee, thou hast not known me." But Cyrus found the Lord and proclaimed his name to all the nations. God's prophet in Babylon took the word of God to Cyrus, and then see what Cyrus did. First chapter of Ezra, first verse to the third:

"Now in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom and put it also in writing, saying, *Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven* hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? His God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel, (*he is the God*), which is in Jerusalem."

Cyrus found the Lord and proclaimed him to all the nations of the earth. It had been done even before Cyrus came in. Darius succeeded Belshazzar. We read in Daniel 6:26, 27 what Darius did: "I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel:

*for he is the living God, and steadfast forever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions."*

That is a splendid proclamation of God and his glory and his power. It sounds like the words of the prophet Daniel himself. Well, the Medes and Persians sought the Lord and found Him. But turn now to the 11th chapter of Daniel and there we read: "Also I [that is, the angel Gabriel] in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I

stood to confirm and to strengthen him. And now will I shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia. And a mighty king shall stand up, and shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. And when he shall stand up his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven."

That is Grecia. Now read in Daniel 10:20, "Then said he [Gabriel], Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come."

The angel would stay there as long as he could bear it, and when they had got so far along, that they would not seek the Lord, the angels would go, and when the angel went, Persia went too. And Grecia came. But what did the Lord establish Grecia for? That they might seek the Lord. Now read in the eighth chapter, verses 21-23:

And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall

stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. And in the latter time of their kingdom, *when the transgressors are come to the full*, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up."

So you see every time, it is because transgression has come to the full that a nation falls, and transgressors come to the full when they set themselves against the Lord. It is because the measure of their iniquity is filled at last that another kingdom comes. So you can see the philosophy of the whole matter is contained in that verse, that God establishes nations that they shall seek the Lord, and when they refuse to do it and turn their backs upon him, then the next thing is, that that nation leaves the world. There is nothing else for it.

The nation that followed Grecia was Rome. And Christ came in Rome's day, and the gospel of Christ was preached to Rome, although it was fearfully corrupt. And then that gospel of Christ