

Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of the American Sentinel

INTRODUCTION

Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of New York City, is field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, an organization formed for the purpose of promoting Sunday observance and influencing legislation in its behalf. Prof. A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner are editors of the *American Sentinel*, a journal opposed to all legislation on religious questions, or any legislation tending toward a union of religion with the State. As Mr. Crafts is engaged in advocating and pleading for legislation in behalf of the Sunday-Sabbath, a religious institution, the *American Sentinel* has thought it proper and wholly within its sphere to criticise the work and methods of Mr. Crafts and his associates, and to cease not to present before the public the objects and logical outcome of their work.

Under date of March 3, 1889, Mr. Crafts challenged Prof. Jones to a public debate, in Kalamazoo, Michigan, on the basis of the American Sabbath Union's petition for a National Sunday-Rest law. The challenge was accepted, but it was afterward agreed by both parties to hold the debate in Chicago, June 12, 13, 14. Owing to Mr. Crafts' failure to fulfill his engagement, the discussion did not come off, and it was so published in a second edition of the *American Sentinel* of June 19, 1889. Objection was taken by Mr. Crafts to the article in the *American*

iv

Sentinel which stated this fact, and to other articles in the same issue; and in the *Colorado Springs Republic* of June 28, 1889, there appeared an article over Mr. Crafts' signature, sworn to before a Notary Public, which article contained charges against Prof. A. T. Jones and Dr. E. J. Waggoner, of "wholesale slanders and falsehoods" and "willful and malicious slanders."

The charges were addressed to the churches of which the editors of the *Sentinel* are members; and both of them being members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Oakland, Cal., that church was placed under obligation to investigate the matter. Accordingly a committee was appointed for that purpose, and arrangements were made with the complainant for a public hearing of the case. This public hearing took place in the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Oakland, Cal., August 13, 1889. In order to insure an impartial report of the meeting, a competent reporter, in no way connected

with the *Sentinel* or its editors, was employed. Mr. Crafts was given all the time he asked, for the presentation and support of his charges. Professor Jones replied in person in his own behalf; and Dr. Waggoner, being in the East, and a copy of the complaint having been sent to him, forwarded his reply by mail. The following pages contain:—

1. The original charges and specifications of Mr. Crafts.
2. The replies of Prof. Jones and Dr. Waggoner.
3. The findings and recommendations of the committee of investigation.

To all of this matter a careful perusal is invited, in the interests of truth and justice.

PUBLISHERS.

THE CHARGES

To the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of which Prof. A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner are members:—

I hereby submit to you, for consideration and action, the following sworn statement, showing that the above-named editors have gone far beyond the true liberties of public discussion and the freedom of the press, into wholesale slander and falsehood, for which they might properly be called to answer either in civil or church courts. My lecture engagements for many months to come make it inconvenient for me to prosecute in person, and in this case it is unnecessary, as the proof is mostly in documents. As a simple, I have carefully examined the last issue of the paper edited by the parties named—that of June 19th, 1889—and find that it averages seven falsehoods per square foot, sixty-seven in twenty-four short columns, that is, about three per column. There is no reason to suppose that this issue is more fertile in falsehood than preceding issues, nor that future issues will have a shorter crop unless the Seventh-day Adventist Churches refuse to allow even such popular leaders to remain in "good standing" without reform in this matter. The slanders and falsehoods in the issue named are, in part, as follows:—

1. SLANDERS.

1. *The false charges of alleged breach of contract, etc., in connection with my challenge of Prof. Jones to debate the Sunday-rest Petition.* (1) On page 168 it is said, "The challenge and propositions originally

made by Mr. Crafts were not subject in any sense to the consent of others." (2) In same article, it is said, "In the challenge of Mr. Crafts there was no intimation that he was under the control of the Chicago ministers." (3) In same, the dependence of the debate in Chicago upon the consent of others is called "an after-consideration." (4) Title of same, "Mr. Crafts' Back Down." (5) In same, "backing squarely out of the discussion." (6) In same, "failing to live up to one's obligations," etc. (7-10) The charge of cowardice, insultingly made, and the thrice-repeated charge of falsehood, bring up the list of willful and malicious slanders in this one short column to ten, to say nothing of several coarse epithets.

The above statements I declare, on oath, are willful and malicious slanders. In such case Prof. Jones is bound to prove his statements by the original letters. They will show that my first challenge for a debate at Kalamazoo was *subject to the approval of the ministers of that city*. This is stated in my original challenge to Prof. Jones,¹¹ and also in my letter to Rev. W. A. Waterman of Kalamazoo, who would testify by letter to this effect, if requested. Before the ministers of Kalamazoo replied,

6

Prof. Jones wished the place changed to Chicago, to which I consented *subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association*, as is shown by several of my letters to Prof. Jones²¹⁰, and by others, to Rev. C. E. Mandeville, D.D., of Chicago, who would so testify if requested. The Illinois Sabbath Association declined to approve and arrange the debate on the ground that Prof. Jones had shown himself a trickster at the Washington hearing, and that his obscure sect were not worthy of so much attention.³¹¹ This decision was not, however, considered final by me—only a postponement—and while it canceled the June dates, Prof. Jones was assured in *my last communication to him* (let him show it), in its very last sentence, that I was still trying to arrange the debate. As late as June 9th, at Milwaukee, I told Rev. Mr. Corliss, pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist Church at Battle Creek, that I was hoping to have the debate in California, or at Battle Creek. Two days before, I said the same to another citizen of the same place, whom I met in Chicago. At the time the slanderous article appeared, I had *not given up the debate*, nor deviated a hair's breadth from the conditions of the challenge.

Self-respect, of course, prevents me from entertaining, for a moment longer, the idea of a debate with one who has so fully proved himself incapable of fair dealing.

It cannot be pleaded, in extenuation, in this case, that the slanderous charges quoted from Prof. Jones were made thoughtlessly; for they were first made in an abusive private letter; ⁴² sent by him to me, in responding to which I reminded him of the conditions of the challenge, long before the article was printed.

2. *The false charge that I and other leading promoters of the Sunday-rest petition have been guilty of the treason of a "false count."* (11) On page 162, last column, it is charged that we "counted those members who were opposed to the bill as favoring it." This is a false and malicious assumption, without proof. The votes of the churches and labor organizations have been stated, in nearly all cases, "unanimous;" in others the exact vote "for" and "against" is recorded on the petition. (12) In the same column there is a quotation so abridged as to make it the ground of a willful misrepresentation, as can be seen by comparing it with the full record in the *Congressional Record* of January 17, 1889. (13, 14) In the same column and the one following, it is twice stated that "only 407 persons actually signed the petition," conveying the impression to the readers that this is a statement in regard to the whole petition,—some have so quoted it into other papers,—whereas it was true only of one special lot of petitions, chiefly those endorsed by national bodies, such as the General Assemblies of the Presbyterians and of the Knights of Labor, which were attested, in each case, by the signatures of

7

the presiding officer and clerk only, after which were added a few signatures of such eminent men as General Fisk, President Seelye, and Joseph Cook, who belong to the Nation rather than any one State. The whole list of the individual names, according to Mrs. Bateham's careful estimate, if arranged in a single column would have measured a mile at the beginning of the last Congress. Professor Jones saw this immense list festooned on the church walls at the Washington Convention. (15-28) On pages 162-5 there is an unlucky thirteen of malicious slanders, each a specific allegation that the same petitioners were counted twice or more. The figures and facts

given in the paper itself are proof enough that these allegations are falsehoods. Anyone can see by a few moments' work in adding up the figures given in the paper, that if the churches and the W. C. T. U. and the workingmen had been counted over and over again, as alleged, the total would have been nearer forty than "fourteen millions." When a General Assembly has endorsed the petition, the subsequent action of synods, presbyteries, and churches of the same order, are counted only as amens, not as new petitioners; and so in case of the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor and the local assemblies, and in other similar cases. (29, 30) Twice on page 163, it is implied that some fraud was perpetrated, because the whole membership of churches petitioning was given, not those above "twenty-one" only; but the records quoted show that there was no attempt to deceive. It is impossible to tell how many in a denomination are under twenty-one, and so the whole number is given. It has never been stated by me that the petitions had fourteen million *signatures* (in an article in *Our Day* "ten million names" are spoken of, but the last word if there through a mistake of the proofreader), nor even "representative endorsements" of fourteen millions above twenty-one. The "twenty-one years" in the petition is used with reference to individual signers as the working shows. (31) On page 165, first column, it is stated that "Mr. Crafts and his associate Sunday reformers went to Sunday-schools and secured the names of children to their petition,"—another malicious slander, the definite proof of which you should demand. (32) On page 168 another absurd slander as to a proposed false count by the W. C. T. U., is added. (33) These premises, on which is based the slanderous charge that our last year of Sabbath Reform work was "a year of trickery and fraud," having been disproved, the conclusion also takes its place in the list of slanders. (34) A minor but not unimportant misstatement is the attempt to make the heading of an article by me in *Our Day*, "A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform," equivalent to a confession that the year named was such a "year of trickery and fraud." Apply this philological sophistry to General Grant's last strategic year before Richmond, and see how false it is.

I challenge Professor Jones or Mr. Waggoner to produce before you a single authentic statement made by my authority, or by that of Mrs. Bateham, or by any other person entitled to be called one of our "associates" in the management of the petition, to substantiate this serious slander, the reiterated charge of a "false count," with "repeaters" and attempts to deceive. The largest petition ever presented to be government needs no exaggeration.

No frantic misstatements can hide the facts that this unparalleled petition, in which labor organizations and churches of all creeds have united, has been endorsed by deliberate vote by so many of the labor organizations that it may fairly be said to voice the wishes of workingmen; that it has been endorsed by so many evangelical churches and conventions that it may fairly be said to voice the wishes of all such churches; that it has been endorsed by the American head of the Catholic Church, and so will not be opposed by any of its loyal members. Promiscuous petitions of unclassified names such as your people are sending to Congress, are far less valuable than our classified petitions, which show just who and what the petitioners are, in part by the name of the organizations which act by vote, and in other cases by the prefix "Mr." Or "Mrs." Or "Miss," with the limit "twenty-one years of age or more," and the "Occupation."

3. *Other slanders in the paper referred to.* (35-37) The charge of falsehood, made twice against me in the article on the challenge, already referred to, is made three other times in the paper on pages 163, 164.

There are, then, thirty-seven distinct slanders in the twenty-four short columns of this one issue, many of them slanders that have been printed repeatedly, some of them in book form,—slanders that have been copied from this paper into others,—slanders that make their perpetrators liable for heavy damages in civil courts, and surely ought not to be ignored in church courts.

I put into a second classification minor slanders and falsehoods, some of which would be of slight importance if they stood alone, but which help to show that the accused editors are not only guilty of slander, but also of

II. CRIMINAL INACCURACY.

4. *The false claim that I am urging the National Sunday Law as "Religious Legislation."* (38-40) On page 163 I am quoted as saying, "A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land, except on the basis of religious legislation." The last word should be "obligation," as correctly quoted on page 161; but even there it is made to mean "law," whereas it is a distinct reference, not to law, but to its "basis" in the public conscience. This is only saying what is true also

9

of the basis of our laws against adultery. The absurd but malicious inference from the above that I favor "a law compelling people to observe the first day of the week religiously," is almost worthy to be classed with the gross slanders before mentioned. The same may be said of (41-46) five statements in the sermon on pages 165-6, which the editors endorse as a "candid statement of facts,"—namely, that "there is a direct though concealed purpose in this movement to accomplish a practical union of Church and State;" and that the enactment of the Blair Sunday bill would compel Seventh-day Adventists to go to church on Sunday, which is reiterated, in substance, three times. (47-49) Three falsehoods are associated with the quotation about the "Puritan Sabbath," on the first page of the paper. This quotation is given in one place in the paper as mine, but in another it only "seems to be credited to Mr. Crafts." Even this is a manifest falsehood, as it "seems" clearly to be the comment of some reporter unfriendly to the Christian Sabbath, and certainly is not published approvingly by the editor of the *Lutheran Observer*, nor is the preceding misrepresentation of Mrs. Bateham. (50-55) On pages 163-4, there are five misstatements as to the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, most of which anyone can detect by examining the bill as given in the Senate report of hearing upon it. The statement that the counter-petition circulated by Professor Jones does not "confound" the Sunday-Rest bill with any other, is sufficiently answered by the one word "Amendment" in the petition, which clearly refers to the Blair Amendment (though it misrepresents it). This "Amendment" is mixed with the Sunday-Rest bill to dupe the enemies of the so-called "religious amendment" into opposition to the proposed Sunday law. (56-59) I am grossly

misquoted in four places, pages 164 and 168, the editors taking the long-hand reports of incompetent and sometimes unfriendly reporters, and quoting them, as no intelligent man can be innocent in doing, as *what I said*, not as *what I was reported to have said*. Even if that last form had been used, it would not have excused the misquotations. Fair disputants do not quote irresponsible abstracts of an opponent's views, without ascertaining their accuracy.

The misreport of my address at Vineland is taken as authority for the misstatement that I have advocated the Blair Sunday-Rest bill. The January document, referred to elsewhere, in its "Extra" will show that neither the American Sabbath Union nor the Woman's Christian Temperance Union champion the bill, but ask for radical changes, some of which Senator Blair has consented to make, especially in the two slight references to "religious observance." The only Sunday-Rest bill I have ever advocated is the unwritten one described at large in the following petition, which, it will be seen, would allow seventh-day people the liberty to do, as "private work" on Sunday, al-

10

most anything except to open a shop, which would be forbidden only because it would "interfere with the general rest:"—

"To the United States Senate:—

"The undersigned, adult residents of the United States twenty-one years of age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the Nation's Mail and Military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of religion and works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who observe another day as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship. (Duplicate to the House.)"

(60-67) On pages 161, 164, 165, 168, there are seven more misstatements, one that I always speak contemptuously of minorities; another that I falsified in saying the W. C. T. U. was not the originator of the petition, its "head"—it is glory enough that the W. C. T. U. is its heart and hand; another that I had to "plead" with P. M. Arthur to get him to favor the Sunday-rest movement, whereas he said at our first private interview, that "if

he had the power, he would stop every wheel on Sunday;" another, like to the last, that I had to "plead" with the workingmen, engineers, and Knights, to endorse our movement, whereas the discussion, two hours in one case, and one hour in the other, was wholly on practical adjustments of the movement, which their applause approved at its first mention; another, that in quoting Prof. Jones' "admissions" of the very principle on which we base the civil Sunday, we are making him "plead" for Sunday law.

The January document of the American Sabbath Union (23 Park Row, New York), which any one can have for the asking, publishes, without comment, the "admissions of those who oppose the Sunday-rest bill as an infringement of liberty," showing that not only Dr. Lewis, of the Seventh-day Baptists, but also the infidel Wolff and the two Seventh-day Adventists, Mr. Haskell and Prof. Jones, "gave their case away," the latter not by admitting that government has the right to make Sunday laws, but by admitting the premises which any logical mind can see leads straight to that conclusion. One of the passages in which Prof. Jones admitted the very principle on which we base our justification of Sunday laws is as follows: "If in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments he invades the rights of his neighbor, then the civil government says that is unlawful. Why? Because it is irreligious, or because it is immoral? Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only." In that admission that government may legislate in regard to the first four commandments when it is necessary to prevent persons from uncivil invasion of the rights of their neighbors, there is a base large

11

enough to build such a Sunday-rest law as is asked for in our petition.

Other manifest misrepresentations are, the illogical accusation of insincerity against Dr. Herrick Johnson on page 165, and another illogical accusation against the National Reform Association, on page 167, and references to me, in two places, as connected with the last mentioned society, though I am not, in order to associate the origin of the petition with the movement to put "God" into the Constitution and so prove the proposed Sunday law "religious legislation." There are several

other minor inaccuracies. If I am notified by the proper officers that these charges are to be investigated officially by you, the churches addressed, I will, if desired, send a copy of the paper with the sixty-seven falsehoods marked and numbered.

It is almost, if not quite, an immorality worthy of church discipline, that in this same paper these editors oppose the Sunday closing of saloons, except where there is prohibition for all days, notwithstanding the fact that Scotland proves that Sunday closing reduces the consumption of liquor one-fourth, that is, to give one-fourth prohibition, a quarter loaf of unpoisoned bread; while Cincinnati, when saloons are open on Sunday, has one-third of its crime on that day, but during Sunday closing gives the police almost nothing to do.

To sum up, these editors have put into one issue of their paper sixty-seven false statements, thirty-seven of them gross slanders, bolstered up by thirty petty slanders.

To correct sixty-seven slanders per week in this paper, besides the numerous similar misstatements, less venomous, in the Seventh-day Baptist organ, edited by Dr. Lewis, and the numerous reiterations of the same falsehoods in the organs of the liquor traffic and of infidelity, would make life a useless mosquito battle, and leave no time for more important work; therefore do not expect me to reply to the replies that this affidavit may call out.

Minor points in this list of falsehoods the editors accused may be able to explain, but the paper itself, and my original challenge to Prof. Jones, and the *Congressional Record* furnish absolutely conclusive proof of willful and malicious slanders numerous enough to warrant all readers in declining to believe anything that may be hereafter said or written by these editors, and also to warrant the churches to which they belong, in refusing to keep them any longer in their membership without repentance and reform. The Seventh-day Adventist Churches are themselves on trial. We must hold them responsible, if, after this exposure, they still allow such slanders published in their behalf.

W. F. Crafts.

Cahon City, Colo., June 26, 1889.

Rev. W. F. Crafts appeared before me, and swore that the above statement is true.
MOSES T. HALK, *Notary Public*.

THE DEFENSE
PROFESSOR A. T. JONES' REPLY.

In reply to Mr. Crafts' accusations I would say: The editors of the *American Sentinel* are now infallible; we may have said some things in which we are mistaken; but from the evidence we have had, we supposed we were stating the exact truth. Whenever it may be shown that we have not stated the truth, we are ready and willing to make the correction.

The question is, then, between us and Dr. Crafts, as to whether we are justified in making the statements to which he objects.

First, the statement in regard to Mr. Crafts' challenge to debate. He calls for the original letters. I have them all. He says: "They will show that my first challenge for debate at Kalamazoo *was subject to the approval of the ministers of that city*. This is stated in my original challenge to Prof. Jones."

The italics are Mr. Crafts'. This is not only what he says; but he has taken a *positive oath* "that the above statement is true." He does not make even the usual qualification of an oath, that it is true to the best of his knowledge and belief. He swears without qualification that his statement is true.

Here is the original letter to me in which the challenge was made (see *fac-simile* on opposite page):—

PROF. A. T. JONES: I expect to be in Michigan to speak somewhere—the place is under advisement—on evening of June 3rd. I would be glad to have a kindly debate, not in the interest of personal victory for either of us, but of truth, at Kalamazoo or some other large town quite near to your headquarters, that your people as well as mine may be well represented in the audience, or better still, let it be at the capital to which people may more readily come from all parts of the State. If you agree, I think I could get Lansing pastors to secure a hall and advertise the meeting or convention.

The subject of the debate to be the enclosed Sunday Rest Petition which is the form in which most, of this petitioners have put this case. That is, the debate is substantially the same as that at Washington, only "before the Committee of the whole."

Yours for the Truth, WILBUR F. CRAFTS.

Resolved, that the following petitions ought to prevail.
[FOR A NATIONAL LAW.] SIGN BOTH. [FOR A NATIONAL LAW.]
Basis of debate. FOR A SUNDAY REST BILL.

To the United States Senate:

The undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill, forbidding, in the Nation's Mail and Military service, and in inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of religion and works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who observe another day as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.

FOR A SUNDAY REST BILL.

To the House of Representatives of the U.S:

The undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill, forbidding, in the Nation's Mail and Military service, and in inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of religion and works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who observe another day as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.

16

There stands the original challenge of Mr. Crafts. It shows that no such statement or condition was made, as that the debate was subject to the approval of anybody; and as for the ministers of Kalamazoo, they are not even mentioned. The only ministers that are referred to are "the Lansing pastors," he thought he could get the Lansing pastors "to secure a hall and advertise the meeting or convention." That is all. There is no such statement as that the debate was subject to the approval of the Lansing pastors; and I repeat, as for the Kalamazoo ministers, they are not even mentioned in the letter. Mr. Crafts may say the he meant it so, or that he intended to say so; but that is not the question. He says that we "might properly be called to answer either in civil or church courts," and we are ready to answer in either civil or church courts. But he must bear in mind that when he comes into either a civil or church court, the question will not turn upon what he meant, or what he intended to say, but upon what he said. The above letter shows what he *said*. He swears that that challenge will show that a debate at Kalamazoo was "subject to the approval of the ministers of that city." The challenge shows nothing of the kind. Mr. Crafts has sworn that the challenge says what it does not say.

Further: Even though the challenge had actually said that the debate was subject to the approval of the Lansing pastors, still it would be a false oath,

because he swears that it was subject to the approval of the ministers of Kalamazoo. But the challenge does not even say of the Lansing pastors what Mr. Crafts swears it says of the ministers of Kalamazoo. Therefore it is demonstrated that on this point his oath is not true in any sense. Mr. Crafts has made a most serious mistake. I am sorry that it is so; but there is no escape.

He may plead that he made this condition in a letter written to Rev. W. A. Waterman of Kalamazoo. But how was I to know that? And even though it were true, what matters it to me, what he wrote to Mr. Waterman? That is not the question. The question is upon what he wrote to me. He swears that he wrote to me what he did *not* write to me. That is all there is to that point.

17

For your better information, I will present the whole correspondence precisely as it occurred. My answer to Mr. Crafts challenge was as follows:—

BATTLE CREEK, Mich., March 18, 1889.

Dr. W. F. Crafts, New York City—

DEAR SIR: Yours of March 6 was received several days ago; but as I am to attend some general meetings under the direction of our General Conference Committee the coming spring and summer, and as that committee is now in session here, I had to await their arrangement of dates for the meetings which I am to attend, before I could make answer. These dates have been now arranged, and I can say I gladly accept your proffer to debate.

Your choice of Kalamazoo as the place is perfectly satisfactory, as that would be much handier for me and for our people generally than would any other.

You said nothing in your letter about how long the debate should be; you only mentioned your expectation to speak somewhere in Michigan the evening of June 3. Did you expect the debate to begin the 4th of June, and continue—how long? Surely you would not expect to confine the debate to one evening, and have it take the place of your expected address. Such an arrangement could not do the subject justice.

I will deny the proposition which you inclosed, while you affirm it. And when I shall have done that, then I request you to deny the one which I herewith inclose, while I affirm it. You can have as much time in your affirmative as you choose, though I think there should not be less than two days, with two sessions

each day, of two or two and a half hours each. I could be content with an equal amount of time on my affirmative; yet in no case will I be arbitrary.

I am authorized to say to you that you are welcome to the free use of our church building in Battle Creek as long as you want to debate, at any time. This building will seat 3,500 people; and this city has about 12,000 inhabitants. I extend to you a cordial invitation to visit us at Battle Creek while you shall be in this State.

Awaiting your reply, I am, yours, etc.,

ALONZO T. JONES.

The counter proposition referred to in the foregoing is as follows:—

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 Lord's day, or any other ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption

18

of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

Before I received from Mr. Crafts any answer to my acceptance of his challenge, I was called to Chicago, and wrote from there the following letter:—

CHICAGO, Ill., April 8, 1889.

Dr. W. F. Crafts, New York City—

DEAR SIR: It has been quite strongly impressed upon my mind the last few days that the city of Chicago would be a much better place in every respect for the debate which you proposed to me when you suggested Kalamazoo. I am now in Chicago, and shall be until April 10. I find that the report has reached here that such a debate has been proposed; and there is a strong desire expressed, and quite widely too, that the debate

might be held here. As you suggested in your letter to me that this debate was to be before the committee of the whole, Chicago would be far more appropriate upon this consideration than any other place, it seems to me, in the Union.

The question of the Sunday law has been agitated largely in Chicago; mass meetings have been lately held; the leading ministers of Chicago are in favor of it; and it is certain that a larger audience could be gathered here than perhaps any other place. And the papers here would extend the notice of it all over the country, and the influence of the discussion, if it were held in this city, would be felt over the greater part of the Union. Halls of sufficient size to hold as large a crowd as might be gathered can be had at not much expense comparatively, and we might say at a very little expense, as it is thought that collections taken in the audience would very nearly, if not fully, meet the expense of whatever hall might be secured.

I therefore sincerely ask your favorable consideration of the proposition which I here make to hold the debate in Chicago.

I see by the *Pearl of Days*, of March 29, that you are to be in Wisconsin June 11. If you are to be in Michigan June 3, it would be apparently directly in the line of your appointments to hold the debate in Chicago between the 3rd and the 11th.

Hoping that this may receive your favorable consideration, and awaiting your reply, I remain,

Yours respectfully, ALONZO T. JONES.

Of this step Mr. Crafts states in his affidavit: "Before the ministers of Kalamazoo replied, Prof. Jones wished the place changed to Chicago, to which I consented, *subject to the ap-*

19

proval of the Illinois Sabbath Association, as is shown by several of my letters to Prof. Jones." The italics are his own.

Here is his letter:—

[FAC-SIMILE.—PRINTED TEXT ON PAGE 19.]

21

4-6-'89

PROF. JONES—*Dear Sir:* I will transfer debate to Chicago for Friday evening, June 7th, as the reasons you give are good ones. Please see Rev. Dr. Mandeville, Pres. of Illinois Sabbath Association, and see if that organization will join you in arranging for the meeting. Music Hall is the proper place. To

make sure of expenses let ten cents be taken at the door, announced as "A collection of 10 cents each at the door, to pay expenses." The advertising should be thoroughly and impartially done, announcing the subject and the debaters, giving the whole petition, which I will sustain and you oppose. You can quote your petition if you choose, not in advertising, of course, but as a part of your negative argument, but I have only one night unengaged—the one named—until later in the season. I hope we may have the debate over again at some other point, with two nights or more for it. For the 7th, let us begin at 8 sharp, and speak 45 minutes each, with 15 each for rejoinders. I appoint Dr. Mandeville to represent me in the arrangements as far as debate is concerned. The expenses I leave for you and his Society to arrange, and divide surplus, if any, beyond my usual \$10 for traveling expense.

W. F. CRAFTS.

In that letter there is no such statement as that either the debate or the change was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association. The letter says: "I will transfer debate to Chicago." He does not say he would transfer the debate subject to the approval of the Illinois Association, no, anything of the kind; but that he would transfer debate to Chicago, and that "as the reasons you give are good ones." The words are plain, and without qualification.

Then, of the Illinois Association he says: "Please see Rev. Dr. Mandeville, president of the Illinois Sabbath Association, and see if that organization will join you *in arranging for the meeting.*" I was not to ask Dr. Mandeville if that organization would approve of the debate. I was not to ask whether that organization would consent to have such a meeting; but to see if that organization would join me "in arranging for the meeting." And the only thing I ever gathered from Mr. Crafts' letter on this point was that if that organization would not join in making arrangements he would name another party.

Again, Dr. Crafts may say that he meant that the debate was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association; and again I say, The question is not what he meant, but what he said. He makes oath that this letter shows that the change of the debate to Chicago was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association. The letter does not show it. He has sworn that the letter will show what it does not show. Mr. Crafts has made a mistake. I am sorry. It is too bad; but I cannot help it.

Having now positively proved by his own letters, that in these

two points he has made a false oath, and having thus clearly impeached his testimony; I might here drop the whole subject, and, upon every principles of law and justice, count myself clear; being fully justified by the legal maxim, "*Falsus inn uno, falsus in omnibus*—false in one point, false in all." But I am willing to waive all this, to be more than strictly just, and, as far as time will permit, to notice all the other points to which he has made oath.

As Mr. Crafts appointed only one evening, June 7, for the debate, and as I had told him in my letter accepting his challenge, that one evening's debate would not at all do justice to the subject, I did not go to see Dr. Mandeville, but wrote the following letter to Mr. Crafts:—

CHICAGO, Ill., April 9, 1889.

Dr. W. F. Crafts, New York City—

DEAR SIR: Your letter I received last night. As you have but this one night—June 7—unengaged, and as you hope we may have the debate over again at some other point with more time, would it not be far better under all the circumstances to put the time over until you can have all the time that is needed.

Allow me to suggest points which make it seem to me ever so much better to do so: First, no other place would be as fit as Chicago for having it another and longer time, especially after having had it in Chicago only one night. through the thorough advertising recommended by you, and which I heartily endorse, it is certain that ministers upon both sides would want to come from many miles on all sides of Chicago, but who would not think it would pay to come for only one night. Upon these considerations alone it seems to me that it would be only abusing, if not throwing away, the very best opportunity that can possibly be had.

But aside from all this, it would be impossible for either you or me to do any sort of justice to the subject, or the people who would come to hear it, by talking virtually only forty-five minutes each upon it; because the following fifteen minutes on either side could not be employed in anything else than the briefest rejoinders to thoughts suggested by the foregoing speech of the other. This would certainly be very unsatisfactory to the people, because it would awaken a multitude of questions, of new thoughts etc., which they would have no opportunity of hearing further discussed or explained.

Besides these considerations, which seem to me to make it almost imperative that it should be more than one night in this

23

place, there is a personal consideration with me which I submit to your candor; I have an appointment in Williamsport, Penn., June 4-11, at the State meeting of the Seventh-day Adventist Conference of Pennsylvania. It would hardly pay me to leave in the midst of that meeting, and be at the expense of going all the way to Chicago, simply for an hour's talk; and then either neglect the balance of the meeting in Pennsylvania, or else be at the expense of going back there. besides, for me to leave that meeting would be a disappointment to hundreds of people. I am sure that you will admit that it will hardly be just to make that journey under the circumstances for only one hour's talk in Chicago.

What I would suggest is this: Fix upon a later date; secure Central Music Hall, as you suggested; thoroughly and impartially advertise, as you propose; and let the debate continue five nights or six, beginning Monday evening; take a collection at the door to pay expenses. Five nights will give plenty of time for an affirmative on each side of the question, and certainly will be much more just to the cause of each disputant, and very much more satisfactory to the public. If this were done, undoubtedly excursion rates could be secured over the roads centering in Chicago, and people would be there from all parts of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and perhaps from greater distances. This would be strictly in conformity with your original proposition to have the discussion before the committee of the whole.

I think, dear sir, that you will admit the justice of this proposition and these suggestions as a whole. I make no choice, or even suggestion [*sic.*], as to what date it should be. If it can be five nights or more, every appointment and arrangement that I should otherwise have in view will be made to conform to that, and that take precedence of everything.

I would leave the suggestion of the date wholly with you to arrange according to your own convenience. If we could have a sufficient number of nights to do justice to the subject and to the public, I would not hesitate at all to accept the date of June 7, and would break up the appointment in Pennsylvania or

anywhere else that would conflict with it. It is not any particular date that I ask for; I only ask for a sufficient time to do justice both to the subject and to the people, whenever the date may be, and the choosing of the date I leave wholly with you.

I am, yours respectfully, ALONZO T. JONES.

26 College Place, Chicago, Ill.

In reply, I received the following letter (*fac-simile* on page 24 and printed text on page 27):—

27

FIELD SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
74 E. 90th Street, N. Y., 4-12-'89

PROF. JONES: I happen to have open June 12, 13, 14, all I can spare at any time. I can come to Chicago then for the debate, on several conditions: 1. My expenses from Minneapolis and return, and locals in Chicago. 2. Both of us to agree not to linger after 14th to speak on Sabbath, lest the attendance be weakened, or speeches be made with no chance to reply. 3. The debate to be under joint control of your committee and Illinois Sabbath Association, Rev. Dr. Mandeville, President, Chicago. 4. The debate to be *one* continuous debate for the three nights. Myself, as affirmative, to speak an hour the first night, and you to follow with half an hour of your reply, "to be continued in our next." You to have first hour second night and myself closing half hour. The third night each to speak twice; opening addresses 30 minutes each, to be followed by rejoinders of 15 minutes each—the order to be determined by lot, that is, who shall open, &c.

Your petition I should not consent to debate separately, as it relates to National Reform, with which I am not connected, and to Blair amendment, which, as Field Secretary, I have no right to work upon. I shall, however, refer to that petition, and you can, of course, use it in your argument as far as you consider it pertinent.

Yours, W. F. CRAFTS.

Please see Dr. Mandeville, and show him this letter, and see what he says about it. As to money, above expenses of hall and advertising, if any, I should be willing to have it given to your denomination and Illinois Sabbath Association equally, or more appropriately, devoted half and half to your literature and to

ours, or better yet, to the printing of stenographic reports of the debate. I should insist on a competent stenographer taking down every word, to prevent misreporting from going uncorrected. These dates have already been refused to a S. S. Assembly that would have paid \$50 for two or three addresses, and may be wanted any hour. Please hasten a final decision.

W. F. C.

This is the last letter I received from Dr. Crafts before he declared the debate off. And as with the others, so with this; there is no such statement as that the debate was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association or any other party. The third condition is: "The debate to be under the joint control of your committee and Illinois Sabbath Association." Not that these committees were to decide, or either of them, whether there was to be any debate or not, nor whether the debate depended upon their approval, or the approval of either of them; and it is certain that neither I nor my representatives ever supposed for a moment that these committees were to decide whether the debate should take place or not. Further, Mr. Crafts asked me in his letter to "please see Dr. Mandeville, and show him this letter, and see what he says about it." We shall come presently to the place where Dr. Mandeville is shown the letter, and we shall see what he said about it.

As Dr. Crafts requested me to hasten a final decision, I replied by the following telegram:—

28

Dr. W. F. Crafts, 74 E. 90th St. N. Y.—

Propositions accepted. Arrangements going on.

A. T. JONES.

As I was to leave Chicago that same evening for Minneapolis, I appointed Elders R. M. Kilgore and Geo. B. Starr, of Chicago, to act with the Illinois Sabbath Association in making arrangements. They visited Dr. Mandeville, and made an appointment for another meeting. The further proceedings are shown in the following communication to Dr. Mandeville, and his reply:—

CHICAGO, Ill., April 19, 1889.

Rev. C. E. Mandeville, 394 West Adams St., Chicago, Ill.—

DEAR SIR: Since returning from my talk with you yesterday, at Mr. Moody's Tabernacle, in reference to the proposed discussion between Rev. Crafts and Professor Jones, I find that we have an appointment for Saturday evening, which I knew of then, but for the time entirely forgot it, which makes it

impossible for either Elder Kilgore or myself to call at your house Saturday night.

Could you not therefore inform us by mail what the mind of your committee is?

We prefer Central Music Hall, as I told you, and will agree to bear one-half of all expenses not covered by collections; but if your people decide on Farwell Hall, we will acquiesce in it; although a large amount of advertising should be done, which, we fell, would go out with a better tone to it if Central Music Hall should be the place of the meetings.

We anticipate a large attendance of our people, and others whom we know to be interested in the subject. you will know best what the interest will be on your side of the question; but we should judge it would be very good.

It seems to us that a liberal sum should be appropriated for advertising. We will furnish one-half of the amount decided upon, and will meet with two persons selected by your committee to decide on the nature and manner in which the advertising shall be done.

If you will write us after your meeting with the committee, so that we can get it by Saturday night, or the first thing Monday morning, we will inform the Central Music Hall folks accordingly.

Yours respectfully, GEO. B. STARR,
Secretary Illinois Press Committee.

26 and 27 College Place.

29

894 W. ADAMS ST. CHICAGO, Ill., April 20, 1889.

GEO. B. STARR, Esq., *26 College Place, Chicago, Ill.*—*Dear Sir:*
The Executive Committee of our Association met yesterday and took under advisement the matter of the proposed public debate. After carefully considering the question in all its bearing, we came to the conclusion indicated in the inclosed resolution.

Very sincerely yours, C. E. MANDEVILLE.

WHEREAS, The proposition to hold a public debate between Rev. W. F. Crafts and Prof. Jones on the petition are a Sabbath Rest Bill has been referred to the Illinois Sabbath Association; therefore,

Resolved, That as the time of this Association is fully occupied with its own work, they do not deem it advisable to spend either time or money in any discussion which, in their judgment, will in no way conduce to the better observance of the Sabbath.

31

Here we are brought to another point in Dr. Crafts' list of charges. He says that—

The Illinois Sabbath Association declined to approve and arrange the debate, on the ground that Professor Jones had shown himself a trickster at the Washington hearing, and that his obscure sect were not worthy of so much attention.

Mr. Crafts has positively sworn, and without qualification, that this is true. but the foregoing resolution of that Association, declared by Dr. Mandeville over his own signature to be the conclusion to which that Association came, gives as the sole reason, that in their judgment a debate would "in no way conduce to the better observance of the Sabbath."

It may be that the Illinois Association gave to Dr. Crafts the statements which he has sworn are true. If they did, then the foregoing resolution, and signature of Dr. Mandeville, show such statement to be clearly false, and Dr. Crafts' oath that it is true does not help the matter a particle. More than this: From his experience in crossing the continent, and especially from the result at the mass meeting in the Congregational Church in this city last week, I am persuaded that Mr. Crafts himself will now agree that the reasons given him by the Illinois Association were mistaken ones. Because when in Oakland, the city of churches, the Brooklyn of the West, at a largely advertised Sunday-law mass meeting, when not half of our people of this city were present, there were yet enough of us to out-vote the Sunday-law petitioners, it would fairly seem that we are not such an obscure sect as the Illinois Association would have him believe.

Another point comes in right here which strongly confirms the fact that the debate was not considered as subject to the approval of either the ministers of Kalamazoo or those of Chicago. The *Christian Statesman* of April 18, 1889, contained an announcement of Mr. Crafts' appointments for the month of May, June, and part of July, in which is found the following:—

June and a part of July is to be devoted to the Central States (from Ohio to Kansas), June 2 being engaged for East Saginaw, Mich., June 3 for a debate with the champion of the Seventh-day Adventists at some place in Michigan.

And the California *Christian Advocate* of April 17, announced that—

32

Mr. Crafts is to debate with Professor Jones of the Seventh-day Adventists, in Michigan, and will probably arrange to meet some of their leaders in California also.

Manifestly this statement could have come originally from no other person than from Mr. Crafts himself; and its being printed in the California paper dated a day before the Philadelphia paper, shows that it was an announcement made by him to different parts of the same time, yet this also completely fails to make any provision for the approval of the Kalamazoo ministers or anybody else.

As soon as I learned of the action of the Illinois Sunday Association, I wrote to Mr. Crafts as follows:—

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., April 24, 1889.

Dr. W. F. Crafts, New York City—

I have just read letters and resolution from Chicago, showing that Dr. Mandeville and the Illinois Sabbath Association refuse to have any part in the arrangements for our debate that it to be in that city.

I do not see, however, that this should in any way hinder the progress of the arrangements, nor tend to conflict with our own plans. If they do not want to have any part in the matter, let us go ahead and complete arrangements, and carry the discussion through ourselves, as we have conducted it so far.

I am satisfied that the collection will more than pay expenses; and let the proceeds above expenses be divided between your National Association and ours.

I see by the *Christian Statesman* of late date that they have learned that the debate is to be, and have announced it. It is too late to drop the matter; besides, I repeat, I do not think the action of the Illinois Association should affect the progress of the matter between you and me. We can advertise just as thoroughly without them as with them. It will be their loss, not yours.

I insist, therefore, that we go ahead according to the suggestions made by you and accepted by me, regardless of the action of Dr. Mandeville and the Illinois Association.

My brethren in Chicago will do all in their power to make the thing a success, and I assure you they can be trusted to work impartially in all the advertising and other arrangements that may be engaged in. They can attend to the local arrangements—

securing Music Hall, advertising, etc., according to directions from you and me.

If you can get some of your friends in Chicago to act for you with them, of course that will be more satisfactory.

I send to them a copy of this letter, and say to them that I expect them to be ready to go ahead, as though the Illinois Association had not refused.

33

Please let me know your mind at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly, ALONZO T. JONES.

Ottawa, Kansas, by the time your letter reached me.

I next received from Dr. Crafts the following by postal card, written two days before my letter:—

NEW YORK, 4-26

Illinois Sabbath Association do not consent to debate & so there will of course be no debate at Chicago on dates named, and it is too late to arrange for any other place at present. A new call for addresses had made it necessary for me to use those dates in the line of my original plan of tour, and so the whole matter will have to rest for the present as I leave home tomorrow, and shall in few days leave on a winding way for the West.

W. F. CRAFTS.

34

Before I had time to reply, I received also, by postal card, the following:—

I have hit upon another plan for having the debate in Chicago in the Autumn, on the same general plan as I wrote—of which I will write you when it is arranged, if others concur in it. Probably it will be a month before I can arrange it, when in vicinity of Chicago in person.

W. F. CRAFTS.

En route, 2-25-'89. Address always, 74 E. 90, N. Y.

To these I replied in a letter, which Mr. Crafts has sworn "is an abusive private letter." Here is a *verbatim* copy of this "abusive letter:"—

35

OTTAWA, KANSAS, May 3, 1889

Dr. W. F. Crafts, New York City—

DEAR SIR: Your card of April 25th received at this place yesterday. I was about to answer your other card anyhow.

Your plan of having the debate in Chicago in the autumn is satisfactory if it shall be made definite and carried out.

You speak in your card of writing to me about it "when it is arranged, *if others concur in it.*" I fail to see what the concurrence or non-concurrence of others can have to do with it. I was not challenged by any others than yourself to debate; I had no others in view to debate with when I accepted your challenge. The challenge has come from yourself; the proposition, the division of time, and all other suggestions in regard to the debate, have come from you, and have been accepted by me. And the announcement has been made by you in the East that it was to be. *The Christian Statesman* and *The Herald of Reform* have announced it; and I count it wholly an inadequate reason for your declaring the debate off, as already arranged for Chicago, June 12, 13, 14, that the Illinois Sunday Association declined to have any part in it.

The obtaining of the hall, advertising, and other local arrangements for the discussion, were not wholly dependent upon Dr. Mandeville, and the executive committee of which he is chairman; there are other people in Chicago besides these, who certainly could attend to that just as well as they. And, I repeat, their declining is no valid excuse at all for your setting aside your own challenge, your own propositions, and your own appointment of dates, which I had accepted without qualification.

Yet all this I am willing to pass by if you will within a reasonable time appoint a date to which you will certainly stand.

I care nothing for the concurrence or non-concurrence of others; but unless some date is definitely settled, as above suggested, I shall hold you to the date already fixed, and hold you alone responsible for the failure of the debate to come off upon the date specified, June 12, 13, 14.

It certainly is an unusual thing for a challenger to declare a meeting off simply because certain third parties decline to have anything to do with making arrangements. Such proceeding is too much like trifling, too much like child's play, for me to look upon it with much favor.

I hope you may soon be able to fix a definite time, whenever it may be; but I cannot promise now to accept whatever date

you might name, because certain important arrangements have been made for my work in the fall, which would, in a certain measure, have to be conformed to; but this will not be much of an interference, because we can surely fix upon a date without much difficulty.

Hoping to hear a favorable report from you soon, I remain,
Very respectfully yours, etc.,
ALONZO T. JONES.

36

Now I am willing to submit to any civil or church court to decide whether this is an abusive letter or not.

In answer to that letter I received from Dr. Crafts, by postal card, the following:—

37

5-8-'89.

I do not like the tone or wording of your letter. I have never accepted challenge except on condition, in the first case, that Kalamazoo pastors would arrange in my behalf. When you wished a change, that Illinois Association, in whose field you wished to have it, would see that my interests were fairly attended to. By referring to my letters you will see that I have kept to my agreement. I cannot allow you to arrange the debate, now are there others in Chicago to whom it would be proper for me to turn. I am doing all that I can to arrange for the debate.

W. F. CRAFTS.

Field Secretary American Sabbath Union.

There is a point here worthy of particular notice. In the second sentence he says, "I have never accepted challenge except on condition," etc. In this he deftly turns the whole case around, makes himself the challenged party, and, of course, in that event makes me the challenging party. This opened the way for him to decline the challenge, as I found announced by Dr. Nelson when I reached this place. But it is just about as unusual a thing for a man to decline his own challenge, as it is for the challenging party to declare a meeting off because certain third parties will not help make arrangements.

It is true that on that card he said he was doing all that he could to arrange for the debate; but as I had told him plainly in my last letter, that unless some date to which he would stand was soon definitely settled, I would hold him to the date already fixed; and would hold him alone responsible for the failure of the debate to come off at the time specified, as there was then more than a month before that time should come, and as I have received no

communication from him since, I yet hold him alone responsible for the failure of the debate to come off at the time appointed by himself—June 12, 13, 14. I further hold that the failure was without valid excuse on his part, and that the record fully sustains me in so holding.

38

Mr. Crafts further says that as late as June 9, at Milwaukee, he told Rev. Mr. Corliss, pastor of the S. D. Adventist Church at Battle Creek, that he was "hoping to have the debate in California, or at Battle Creek." He says also that, "two days before" he said the same thing to somebody else whom he "met in Chicago." But what was all that to me? He did not say anything of that kind to me, neither at that time, nor up to this time. Mr. Corliss was not acting for me. Whether I could debate or not did not depend upon the concurrence of somebody else. My acceptance of Mr. Crafts' challenge was not subject to the approval of Mr. Corliss or some unnamed, and perhaps unknown person, whom Mr. Crafts happened to meet in Chicago. I was conducting my part of the controversy myself, and supposed Mr. Crafts was capable of doing the same thing for himself.

This closes that part of my reply which relates to the debate. Although it is clearly demonstrated by every count that he has sworn to things which are not in any sense true, yet I do not accuse him of "willful and malicious" false swearing; nothing of the kind. I only say that Dr. Crafts, failing to keep copies of his letters, forgot what he had written, and then swore to what he had not written. Then Doctor has made a very serious mistake. He ought to be more careful of his letters, and much more careful of his oath.

One other statement only I will notice. Mr. Crafts says that at the hearing before the Senate Committee on the Sunday law. I "gave my case away" "by admitting the premises which any logical mind can see leads straight to the conclusion that the government may make such a Sunday-rest law as is asked for" in their petition. Mr. Crafts has positively sworn that this is true. In reply I submit a portion of an open letter, which I wrote to the Secretary of the American Sunday-law Union as soon as I received the monthly document in which this statement was originally made. In this case, it may be addressed to Mr. Crafts as well as to Dr. Knowles, to the field secretary as well as to the other secretary.

The following is the extract:—

"DEAR SIR: In the monthly documents of the American Sunday Association, edited by yourself, you have chosen to

39

charge me with insincerity; and you have also done your best to make it appear that I 'admit all that the friends of the Sunday-

rest law generally claim—the right of the government to make Sunday laws for the public good.'

"You have garbled extracts from the report of my speech before the Senate Committee on the Sunday law, and then have italicized certain words and sentences in one passage to try to make it appear that I admit the right of the government to make Sunday laws for the public good.

"You have quoted from my speech the following words in the following way:—

"Whenever any civil government attempts to enforce anything in regard to any one of the first four commandments, it invades the prerogatives of God, and is to be disobeyed (I do not say resisted, but disobeyed). . . . The State, in its legislation, can never legislate properly in regard to any man's religious faith, or in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue; *but if in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments he invades the rights of his neighbor, then the civil government says that is unlawful. Why? Because it is irreligious, or because it is immoral? Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only.* [Italics ours.—ED.]

"It is in the italicizing of these words that your effort is made to make me admit what I continually and consistently denied before the committee, and do deny everywhere else. You have inserted in the above quotation three periods, indicating that a portion has been left out; and you know full well, sir, that in the portion which is there left out, is the following:—

"*Senator Blair*.—You oppose all the Sunday laws of the country, then?

"*Mr. Jones*—Yes, sir.

"*Senator Blair*—You are against all Sunday laws?

"*Mr. Jones*—Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed.

"*Senator Blair*—State and national alike?

"*Mr. Jones*—State and national, sir.

"Not only were these words there, but in that portion which you have printed following the italicized words, you yourself have printed my plain denial of the right of any nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of a thousand to compel the thou-

sandth man to rest on the day on which the majority rest, in the following form:—

"*Senator Blair*—The majority has a right to rule in what pertains to the regulation of society; and if Cesar regulates society, then the majority has a right in this country to say what shall be rendered unto Cesar.

"*Mr. Jones*—If nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of every thousand in the United States kept the seventh day, that is, Saturday, and I deemed it my choice and right to keep Sunday, I would insist on it, and they would have no right to compel me to rest on Saturday.

"*Senator Blair*—In other words, you take the ground that for the good of society, *irrespective of the religious aspect of the question*, society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath, if it disturbs others?

"*Mr. Jones*—No, sir.

"*Senator Blair*—You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath.

"That last expression of mine, saying 'No, sir,' is in accord, and was intended when spoken to be in accord, with Senator Blair's inquiring statement whether society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath. My answer there means, and when it was spoken it was intended to mean, that society *may not* do so. As to its disturbing others, I had just before proved that the common occupations of men who choose to work on Sunday or any other day do not disturb and cannot disturb the rest of the majority who choose to rest that day.

"Again: A little further along you print another passage in which are the following words:—

"*Senator Blair*—You would abolish any Sabbath in human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?

"*Mr. Jones*—Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.

'Now, sir, I should like for you in a monthly document, or by some other means, to show how by any fair means, or by any sincere purpose, you can, even by the use of italics, make me in that speech admit the right of the government to make Sunday laws for the public good. You know, sir, that in that speech I distinctly stated that any human laws for the enforcement of the

Sabbath, instead of being 'for the good of society, are for the ruin of society.'

41

"Again: You know (for you printed it in one of your documents) that Senator Blair said to me: 'You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath.' You know that in another place he said again to me: 'You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or nation either.'

"Now, sir, I repeat, you have charged me with insincerity. Anyone making such a charge as that ought to be sincere. Will you, therefore, explain upon what principle it is that you claim to be sincere in this thing, when in the face of these positive and explicit statements to the contrary, and Senator's Blair's confirmation of them to that effect, you can deliberately attempt to force into my words a meaning that was never there, that was never intended to be there and that never can by any honest means be put there?

"More than this: It can hardly be thought that Senator Blair will very highly appreciate the compliment that you have paid to his logical discernment, when, in the face of his repeated statement that I was logical all the way through, you force into my words a meaning that could have no other effect than to make me illogical all the way through.

"I have no objection to your printing my words as they were spoken; but I do object to your forcing into them a meaning directly contrary to that which the words themselves convey, and which they were intended to convey; and I further object to your so garbling my statements as to make it possible for you to force into them a meaning that they never can honestly be made to bear.

"In that speech also I said that if an idol-worshiper in this country should attempt to offer a human sacrifice, the government should protect the life of its subject from the exercise of that man's religion; that he has the right to worship any idol that he chooses, but that he has not the right to commit murder in the worship of his idol, and the State forbids the murder without any reference at all to the question as to whether that man is religious or whether he worships or not, with no reference to the commandment which forbids idol-

worship, and with no thought whatever of forbidding his idolatry. I stated also that if anybody claiming apostolic example should practice commu-

42

nity of property, and in carrying out that practice should take your property or mine without our consent, the State would forbid the theft without any reference at all to the man's religious opinions, and with no thought of forbidding the practice of community of property. You know that it was with direct reference to these words that I used the words which you have italicized. I there distinctly denied that the State can ever of right legislate in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue. But if any man, in the exercise of his rights under the first four commandments, and in this case, under the fourth commandment, should invade the right of his neighbor, as I have expressed it, by endangering his life, his liberty, or his property, or attack his character, or invade his rights in any way, the government has the right to prohibit it, because of the incivility; but with never any question as to whether the man is religious or irreligious, and with never a purpose or a thought of forbidding the free exercise of any man's right to work on any day, or all days as he chooses."

This is precisely what every State in this Union already does by statutes which punish disturbances of religious worship or religious meetings, or peaceable assemblies of any sort. But there is a vast difference between such statutes as these and the ones which you desire shall be enacted. These are strictly civil statutes, prohibiting incivility, and are far from anything like the enforcement of religious observances. The Sunday-law workers complain of the disturbance of their worship on Sunday. If they are sincere in this, why don't they enforce the laws already on the statute books prohibiting disturbance of worship? California, for instance, prohibits disturbance of worship, under penalty of five hundred dollars' fine and six months in jail. But instead of having such legitimate laws enforced, you propose to prohibit the disturbance of your worship on Sunday by compelling everybody to keep Sunday. Upon this same principle you would have the State forbid the offering of human sacrifices by an idol-worshiper, by compelling him to keep the second commandment. In short, the principle is that you would have the State prohibit incivility by compelling everybody to be religious. And you are so enraptured with this distorted view, that you have chosen in your sincerity and by *ital-*

43

ics to force me to sanction the wicked principle. But it will not work. I say always, if your worship is disturbed on Sunday or at any other time, let the State punish the person or persons who create the disturbance. Let the State punish them by such strictly legitimate statutes as the States already have on this subject. But let the State never attempt to prohibit disturbance of worship by trying to compel men to worship, nor attempt to prohibit incivility by enforcing religious observances. This is just what I had in view, and is precisely what I meant, in the words which you have italicized.

All this is further shown in the argument which I made, in that, immediately following the words which you have italicized, I proved that Sunday work does not disturb the rest or the worship of those who keep Sunday. And the conclusion of that is, therefore, that there is no basis for Sunday laws on that ground. This I prove by the fact that the people who make this the ground of their demand for Sunday laws, do not recognize for an instant that work on Saturday disturbs the rest or the worship of the people who keep Saturday. I there showed that if your work on Saturday does not disturb my rest or my worship, my work on Sunday cannot disturb your rest or your worship. I made this argument not only on this principle, but from actual experience. I know, from an experience of fifteen years, that other people's work on Saturday does not disturb either my rest or my worship on that day. There are Seventh-day Adventists in every State and Territory of this nation, in Canada, nearly every country of Europe, the Sandwich Islands, Australia, South America, China, South Africa, and other places. They all rest every Saturday; they all keep it as the Sabbath unto the Lord. But no person has ever yet heard of a Seventh-day Adventist who ever complained that his rest on the Sabbath was disturbed by other men's work. Not only is this so, but the Seventh-day Adventists have organized churches in the great majority of the States and Territories of this Union. These churches are found in country places, in villages, in towns, and in cities. They meet for worship every Saturday; and although, as everybody knows, Saturday is the busiest day in the week, in the midst of such busy cities as Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Kansas City, these churches of Seventh-

day Adventists assembly for worship; and no person has ever yet heard of any Seventh-day Adventists making a complaint that their worship was disturbed by the work, the business, or the traffic that is carried on by other people on that day. The fact is, our worship is *not* disturbed by these things.

Now, sir, if all the labor, the business, and the traffic that is done on Saturday, the day which is acknowledged by all to be the busiest day of the

week,—if all this, in such cities as I have named, does not disturb our rest or our worship, will you please explain how it is that your rest and your worship are disturbed on Sunday, when there is not one-thousandth part as much labor, or business, or traffic done on that day as is done on Saturday?

This, dear sir, is only an additional argument, but one which rests on the living experience of thousands of people every seventh day, conclusively showing that your whole theory and claim for Sunday laws break down utterly at every point.

Just one observation I would make in closing: If such is the case with Dr. Crafts' unqualified oath, with what confidence can the people receive his unsupported word? And if he is so reckless of a solemn, deliberate oath, how careful is he apt to be of common running statements?

ALONZO T. JONES.

DR. E. J. WAGGONER'S REPLY.

To the Committee—

GENTLEMEN: In response to yours inclosing affidavit of W. F. Crafts, published in the *Daily Republic* of June 28, 1889, wherein he professes to show that A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner, editors of the *American Sentinel*, have been guilty of willful and malicious slander and falsehood, in their opposition to the work of the American Sunday Union, of which Mr. Crafts is one of the chief representatives, I return the following statement—

These charges of slander and falsehood were made in the most positive manner, and were sworn to before a notary public, and therefore deserve serious consideration. If the charges are true, we might, as Mr. Crafts, properly be called to

45

answer either in civil or church courts. So far as I am concerned, I am only sorry that Mr. Crafts' lecture engagements make it inconvenient for him to prosecute in person; for in that case it would have been necessary for him to endeavor to bring some positive proofs of his assertions. But whenever he may arraign us, we will cheerfully come and answer to the charges.

In what follows I shall make special reference only to that portion of the charges which relates to me personally, or to articles that I myself wrote. The field of investigation is not very extensive, since Mr. Crafts' entire charge is based upon one number of the *American Sentinel*, viz., a supplementary number, of June 19, 1889, in which he says that he finds sixty-seven falsehoods [*sic.*]. In taking up this matter, I shall deal with it more definitely than Mr. Crafts has, and therefore my reply will necessarily require a little more space.

The first thing that I notice that what is found in the following:

The false charge that I and other leading promoters of the Sunday-rest petition have been guilty of the treason of a "false count." (11) On page 162, last column, it is charged that we "counted those members who were opposed to the bill as favoring it." This is a false and malicious assumption, without proof. The votes of the churches and labor organizations have been stated, in nearly all cases, "unanimous;" in others the exact vote "for" and "against" is recorded on the petition.

The figures that appear in parentheses in the article of Mr. Crafts, are his enumeration of the falsehoods which he professes to find in the *Sentinel*. I begin with number 11, because the preceding numbers refer to matter which is answered in another place. The reader who is unacquainted with the question at issue could not possibly get any idea of it from the paragraph just quoted. The statement concerning the counting of those who were opposed to the bill as favoring it, appeared in an article entitled "Whose Image and Superscription is This?" which deals with the petitions which were presented to Congress for a National Sunday law. I present here, from the article referred to, not only the few words which Mr. Crafts quotes, but also the connection:—

The petition for a Sunday law, to which it is claimed that upwards of fourteen million signatures have been obtained, reads thus:—

46

"The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the Government's mails, military service, and inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia, and Territories, all Sunday work, traffic, etc."

That is plain enough to be understood by anybody. If that had been circulated in a legitimate manner, for individuals signatures, no complaint could have been made. But right on the face of the sheet which contained the petition, provision was deliberately made for fraud. Immediately below the petition was the following note:—

"When a labor organization or church, or any other society, indorses the petition BY VOTE, let the 'name' of the organization be signed, with the attesting signatures of the presiding officer and clerk or secretary, with place and date, and in the margin, under 'number of petitioners,' indicate the numbers in the organization petitioning."

This meant that at any meeting of any church or society, a vote could be taken on the petition. If a majority of the members present voted in favor of it, the presiding officer and the clerk would sign their names, and set down the number of members in the entire church or society. Now it must be evident to the most zealous partisans that such a plan could not by any possibility secure an individual expression of opinion. In the first place, it allowed a part to speak for the whole, and in the second place it coerced those members who were opposed to the bill, as favoring it. In many cases a minority would speak for the whole.

The statement which is made, and which we here reiterate, is that in the petitions circulated by the organization of which Mr. Crafts is field secretary, there was direct provision made for fraud. Then: The petition declares on its face that those who sign it are adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more. Immediately following on the same page is the instruction above quoted, to labor organizations, churches, and other societies, as to how to indorse the petition by vote. The instructions are that when any body indorses the petition by vote, the presiding officer and clerk are to sign the petition, and indicate in the margin the number in the organization petitioning. Mark this: The instruction is not simply to give the number of members present when the vote was taken, but to give the number of members in the organization. Now, it might be *possible* that at the meeting of some churches at which

47

a vote indorsing the petition might be taken, there would be none but adult members present, although this would be improbable in the majority of instances; for everybody knows that there are very few churches in the United States that do not contain some members under twenty-one years of age. Now, according to the instructions given in the petition, all the members in the organization are to be counted as favoring it. And when that petition is sent to Congress, it attests that every member is twenty-one years of age. We say that when such a thing is done, it is fraud, and the petition provides for just such fraud.

Moreover, the minority in many cases would speak for the entire body. Thus, 200 members would be a very common representation of a church of 500 members, at any ordinary meeting,—an evening prayer meeting, for instance, or a Sunday evening service. Now if the petitions were presented and voted upon, the whole 500 members would, according to the instruction in the petition, be counted as favoring it, and so, even if the vote were unanimous, 200 people would be counted as 500. If Mr. Crafts had quoted my article instead of simply referring to it, his statement that this "is a false

and malicious assumption without proof" would have had no weight; for the proof appeared in the portion of the article which I have already quoted, and still more appears and will be given in answer to his next charge, which is as follows:—

(12) In the same column there is a quotation so abridged as to make it the ground of a willful misrepresentation, as can be seen by comparing it with the full record in the *Congressional Record* of January 17, 1889.

The quotation to which he refers, and which he says is such an abridgment as to make it a willful misrepresentation, is as follows. I give it with the paragraph which preceded it in the article, and the one following it:—

On Wednesday, January 16, the first of these petitions was presented to Congress. After senators from several States, including Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Indiana, had presented petitions from churches, labor unions, Women's Christian Temperance Unions, etc., from their respective States, Mr. Blair arose and said:—

"I present petitions of several bodies, praying for the passage
48
of a Sunday-rest law. Of the petitions, the following analysis is submitted by those who desire their presentation:—

Petitions from National Bodies.

CONTENTS.

1 .	I n d i v i d u a l
signatures	407
2. Representative signatures by indorsements of bodies and meetings:	
14,174,337	
Total	
.14,174,744	

"Analysis of the latter:—

"First indorsement is that of the American Sabbath Union, which was officially constituted by official action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Home Missionary Society of the Baptist Church, the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (North and South), and the Synod of the Reformed Church, five denominations, whose membership together is 5,977,693. Of the membership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the indorsement of

whose international convention stands second, at least 20,000 citizens of the United States. Of the Knights of Labor, the indorsement of whose international convention stands third, at least 219,000 citizens of the United States. The Presbyterian General Assembly, North, whose action stands next, had at the time of the indorsement 722,071 members. The convention of Christian Workers, whose indorsement is next, had 450 present when the unanimous vote of indorsement was taken. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which comes next, had 185,521 at the time of the vote. The Roman Catholics, for whom Cardinal Gibbons speaks, number 7,200,000."

Now what do we learn from this? Several things, namely: That out of 14,174,744 alleged petitioners for the Sunday law, only 407 persons actually signed the petition. That in order to produce a greater effect, the petitions were presented first by States and Territories, and then in bulk. In that way the strength of the petitions which had already been duplicated, was duplicated again.

There is no other way of showing that this is not a misrepresentation, than by quoting the complete report as it appeared in the *Congressional Record* of January 17, 1889. Here it is:—

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The President *pro tempore* presented a petition of 148 citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Callom—I present a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, department of Sabbath Observance, praying for the passage of the law prohibiting the running

49

of interstate Sunday trains, Sunday mails, and military drills on the Sabbath. The petition is signed by 100 ministers of Chicago and vicinity in the State of Illinois. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Collom—I also present several bundles of petitions that I hold in my hand on the same subject, signed, one of them, by 1,766 another by 7,727, another by 1,000, and the fourth by

2,498 citizens of Illinois praying for the same legislation. I move the reference of the petitions to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Cameron presented numerous petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law prohibiting needless Sunday work in the government's mail, military service, and interstate commerce; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Faulkner presented a petition of 2,591 citizens of West Virginia, praying, for the passage of the national Sunday-rest law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Payne presented a petition of citizens of Ohio, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law, prohibiting needless Sunday work in the government's mail, military service, and interstate commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Hale—I present a petition of the same kind, in favor of the passage of a national Sunday-rest law from labor organizations, churches, and other bodies in the State of Maine. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Sherman—I present a petition signed by 4,745 citizens of Ohio praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law, prohibiting needless Sunday work in the government's mail and military service, and interstate commerce. I also present a similar petition signed by 2,710 citizens of Ohio. I move the reference of the petitions to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Platt—I present a similar petition, which is said to contain 497 individual signatures and representative indorsements of churches and other bodies in the State of Connecticut. On an examination of the names I find that some mistake has been made, and that they are the names of citizens of South Carolina; but I trust the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Butler] will have no objection to my presenting the petition.

Mr. Butler—None in the world, Mr. President. I am very glad to see it come from that source.

The President pro tempore—The petition will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

50

Mr. Farwell presented numerous petitions of citizens of Illinois, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Stockbridge presented a petition of 379 citizens of Michigan, praying for the passage of a national law prohibiting Sunday mail trains and military drills on the Sabbath; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Hiscock—I present a petition collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, department of Sabbath Observance, signed by 3,147 citizens of New York, and a petition of 627 citizens of New York of like character. I move the reference of the petitions to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Voorhees—I present a petition said to contain 6,755 individual signatures and combined representative indorsements collected in Indiana by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, department of Sabbath observance, the Illinois Sabbath Association, the American Sabbath Union, etc., praying for a national Sunday-rest law against needless Sunday work in the government mail and military service and interstate commerce. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. George—I present a similar petition to the one just presented, containing 673 individual signatures collected in the State of Mississippi. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Saulsbury—I present a similar petition said to contain 338 individual signatures of citizens of Delaware, which is move be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Frye—I present a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, remonstrating against the running of

interstate Sunday trains, etc., signed by 115 citizens of the State of Maine. I move the reference of the memorial to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Hoar presented a petition of 3,144 citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of a national law prohibiting Sunday work, military service, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Spencer—I present a petition said to contain 953 signatures of residents of the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law, against needless Sunday work in the government's mail and military service and interstate commerce. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

51

Mr. Dawes—I present the petition of 211 citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the same object. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Regan—I present petitions collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law against needless Sunday work, government mails and military service, and interstate commerce, signed by 565 citizens of the State of Texas. I move the reference of the petitions to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Sawyer presented a petition of 2,552 citizens of Wisconsin, and a petition of 263 citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of a national Sunday law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Allison—I present two petitions, one containing 2,458 individual signatures, and the other containing 3,716 individual signatures, all signed by people in Iowa, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law, etc. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Wilson, of Iowa—I present a petition signed by 3,220 citizens of Iowa, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law, and a similar petition signed by residents of Page County, Iowa. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Chandler—I present a petition in favor of a national Sunday-rest law, approved by the New Hampshire Sunday-school Association in convention, with the signatures affixed of J. M. Williams, president, and John G. Lane, secretary; also by Alden Youngman and numerous other citizens of South Merrimac, N.H.; also by Rev. W. H. Alden and numerous other citizens of New Hampshire; which I move be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Riddleberger—I present a petition of citizens of Virginia, containing 1,851 individual signatures, in favor of a national Sunday-rest law. I take it for granted it is the same as the other Senators here have presented, because of the red covering; and I present it recognizing the right of petition; but in presenting it I want to state, what other Senators have not done, my unqualified opposition to any such legislation. I should like for the ladies who send these petitions here to understand that the first thing they would have to do in the way of legislation would be to change market day. For instance, if we mill our cattle in Washington, in order to give them beef on Tuesday we must transport it on Sunday. I should like to know how the Senators from the West would represent that constituents if they

52

were to stop the cattle trains over Sunday at Cumberland, at Wheeling, or somewhere else *en route*. I ask that the petition may be referred.

The President pro tempore—The petition will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Mitchell—I present a similar petition of 355 citizens of Oregon. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Hawley—I present a petition signed by members of the South Congregational Church of Middletown, Conn., and

other citizens, entitled "A petition to Congress against Sunday work." I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Hoar presented a petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of what is known as the Sunday-rest bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Blair—I present petitions of several bodies, praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law. Of the petitions the following analysis is submitted by those who desire their presentation:

Petitions from National Bodies.

CONTENTS.

1 .	Individual
signatures.	407
2. Representative signatures by indorsements of bodies and meetings:	
14,174,337	
Total.	
.14,174,744	

"Analysis of the latter:

First indorsement is that of the American Sabbath Union, which was officially constituted by official action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Home Missionary Society of the Baptist Church, the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (North and South), and the Synod of the Reformed Church, five denominations whose membership together is 5,977,693. Of the membership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the indorsement of whose international convention stands second, at least 20,000 citizens of the United States. The Presbyterian General Assembly, North, whose action stands next, had at the time of the indorsement 722,071 members. The convention of Christian Workers, whose indorsement is next, had 450 present when the unanimous vote of indorsement was taken. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which comes next, had 185,521 at the time of the vote. The Roman Catholics, for whom Cardinal Gibbons speaks, number 7,200,000.

Deducting for those who are twice or thrice represented, these petitions represent thirteen and a half million petitioners.

At a low estimate there are on the other petitions presented, besides a multitude who are twice or thrice represented, at least enough to make the total on the 13th of December, 1888, a full fourteen millions.

What I present is the petition of the National Sabbath Union of the United States by Elliott F. Shepard, president, and J. H. Knowles, secretary. Their prayer is very brief:

The undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding, in the nations' mail and military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of religion and works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who observe another day as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.

The next is the petition in like words of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and so throughout, in accordance with the analysis which I first read. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Blair—I have here a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Jersey with 6,000 members, of Indiana 2,500 members, of Massachusetts 6,000, of Delaware 800, of Illinois 9,000, of Iowa 6,000, of Pennsylvania 6,000, of Dakota 1,000, and the National nearly 200,000, praying Congress to instruct the Postmaster-General to make no further contracts which shall include the carriage of the mails on the first day of the week, and to provide that hereafter no mail matter shall be collected or distributed on that day of the week by railroad trains, and to forbid military drills, musters, and parades of United States cadets, soldiers, and marines on the first day of the week in times of peace, as interfering not only with the soldier's right to the day of rest, but also with his rights of conscience.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Blair—I present also the petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Department of Sabbath Observance, the Illinois Sabbath Association, the American Sabbath Union, etc., 492 signatures. This is, however, the petition of that body in the State of New Hampshire. I move

that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Blair—I present a like petition of 43 citizens of Washington Territory, collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and also the petition of 100 citizens or residents of the District of Columbia, collected by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for both of which I ask a like reference.

54

The President pro tempore—The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Evarts presented a petition of citizens of New York, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law prohibiting needless Sunday work in the government's mail, military service, and interstate commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Palmer presented a petition of citizens of Michigan, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law prohibiting needless Sunday work in the government's mail, military service, and interstate commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Nineteen States and two Territories.

From this lengthy quotation what appears?—Simply that is the article referred to in the *Sentinel*, the subject was correctly represented, and the substance of the whole matter was given. This is sufficient to answer that charge.

But Mr. Crafts proceeds, and says:—

(13, 14) In the same column and the one following, it is twice stated that 'only 407 persons actually signed the petition,' conveying the impression to the readers that this is a statement in regard to the whole petition,—some have so quoted it into other papers,—whereas it was true only of one special lot of petitions, chiefly those endorsed by national bodies, such as the General Assemblies of the Presbyterians and of the Knights of Labor, which were attested, in each case, by the signatures of the presiding officer and clerk only, after which were added a few signatures of such eminent men as General Fisk, President Seelye, and Joseph Cook, who belong to the Nation rather than any one State. The whole list of the individual names,

according to Mrs. Bateham's careful estimate, if arranged in a single column would have measured a mile at the beginning of the last Congress. Professor Jones saw this immense list festooned on the church walls at the Washington Convention.

Mr. Crafts feels injured because the impression has been conveyed that only 407 persons actually signed the petition, whereas he says that it is true of only one certain lot of signatures, chiefly those indorsed by national bodies, etc. In this statement Mr. Crafts has made the matter appear even worse than we did. Let us examine it. The statement concerning the 407 persons *was* made with reference to the entire petition, as will be seen from the quotation from the *Congressional Record*.

At any rate, it is a statement concerning the petition to which it is claimed there are over fourteen million signatures. Now

55

there has never been a claim made that there were more than this number of petitioners for a Sunday law; but Mr. Crafts says there was another lot of petitions beside this general summary that was presented by Mr. Blair in which the 407 petitioners are referred to. That is admitting the very thing with which we charged them and which appears from the *Congressional Record*, namely, that besides presenting the whole number in bulk, they presented them also as smaller organizations, and as individuals. We have never denied that more than 407 individual signatures were obtained, but the point is that these individual signatures were also included in the representative lists. Thus Mrs. Crafts himself helps to establish our charge of fraud.

He says concerning the petitions: "Prof. Jones saw this immense list festooned on the church walls at the Washington Convention." This is true. Moreover, he and others also saw this immense list somewhere else, viz., in the Capitol building in Washington, where they could examine it more closely than when it hung on the church walls; and what they saw there, appears in the following statement:—

I did see the festoon of "petitions" in the Foundry M. E. Church, at Washington, D. C. I afterward saw them in bundles in the room of the Committee on Education and Labor. And I say that I saw space after space, some of them apparently more than a foot in length, filled with names all of which were written by the same hand. That is to say, there would be a space of say a foot, filled with names all written with the same hand; then there would be a space following, longer or shorter, as the case might be, all written with the same hand, but a different hand from the one preceding or following. I did not take the time to

go over all of the bundles, because there were bags full of them; but thus it was with all that I saw.

ALONZO T. JONES.

Mr. Crafts proceeds, and notices the charge made in the article, to the effect that the same petitions were counted twice or more. Out of this charge he makes thirteen slanders, which he lumps together. we quote from him:—

(15-28) On pages 162-5 there is an unlucky thirteen of malicious slanders, each a specific allegation that the same petitioners were counted twice or more. The figures and facts given in the paper itself are proof enough that these allegations are falsehoods. Anyone can see by a few moments' work in

56

adding up the figures given in the paper, that if the churches and the W. C. T. U. and the workingmen had been counted over and over again, as alleged, the total would have been nearer forty than 'fourteen millions.'"

If there is anything unfortunate about this, it is for Mr. Crafts, and not for me. I quote again from the article to which Mr. Crafts objects that it may be seen just how the charge was made. I begin immediately after the quotation from the *Congressional Record*, and requite a paragraph which has already been used, in order to get the connection:—

Now what do we learn from this? Several things, namely: That out of 14,174,744 alleged petitioners for the Sunday law, only 407 persons actually signed the petition. That in order to produce a greater effect, the petitions were presented first by States and Territories, and then in bulk. In that way the strength of the petitions which had already been duplicated, was duplicated again.

But this is not all. We find that the entire membership of the Methodist, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian Churches in the United States is taken to help make up the 14,174,744 alleged petitioners. This was done because the annual convention of those bodies indorsed the petition. A vote by a few hundred people was thus swelled into nearly seven million. Not only so, but by the wording of the petition, every member of those churches was certified to as being "21 years of age or more." Of course everybody recognizes that as another fraud.

Still further: The entire membership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Knights of Labor, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, is counted on the strength of a vote taken by a few members of those bodies, in

convention assembled. Of course the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union could, on general principles, be counted as favoring the bill; but as they are Christian women, they of course belong to some one of the churches previously reported. The same is true largely of the Knights of Labor, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Not only were they represented as favoring the bill, although but few of them had ever heard of it, and many were opposed, but they were represented three times, as we have already seen.

Let the reader compare this with the quotation from the *Congressional Record*, and he will see that I have stated simply the fact. The same individuals were presented several times over. It is true that no claim has been made specifically for more than the fourteen millions of petitioners, but the evidence is conclusive that at the same time that that alleged

57

fourteen-million-signature petition was presented to Congress, organizations and individuals included in that list were also presented separately, and some of them several times over, in such a way as to try to make it appear that the petition had been indorsed by many more than the fourteen millions. The fraud, however, is so transparent that a simple presentation of it is sufficient to make it fully manifest.

Mr. Crafts proceeds as follows:—

(29-30) Twice on page 163, it is implied that some fraud was perpetrated, because the whole membership of churches petitioning was given, not those above "21" only; but the records quoted show that there was no attempt to deceive. It is impossible to tell how many in a denomination are under 21, and so the whole number is given.

Exactly; that is just what we have said, that the whole number in any denomination was given, whether 21 years of age or less, and all were counted as "21 years of age or more." He says it is impossible to tell how many in a denomination are under 21 years of age; but it would not be impossible to tell how many over 21 years of age had indorsed the petition, if only actual indorsers were counted. What difference does it make how many in any denomination are under 21 years of age? Why is it necessary to try to ascertain? The petition has nothing to do with such, and they do not need to appear. Neither does it make any difference how many in any denomination are over 21 years of age. All that straight-forward dealing would require would be to find how many over 21 years of age had signed the petition, and if no fraud had been perpetrated, that fact would be shown on the face of

the petition. Mr. Crafts is entitled to my thanks for this admission of the truthfulness of our charge of fraud. This admission is the more valuable because it is made in answer to my charge, and in an attempt to prove us guilty of slander in making the charge.

Again I quote from Mr. Crafts:—

On page 165, first column, it is stated that "Mr. Crafts and his associate Sunday reformers went to Sunday-schools and secured the names of children to their petition,"—another malicious slander, the definite proof of which you should demand.

In this, Mr. Crafts appears to give a quotation from the *Sentinel*, but it is not an exact quotation. To show that it is not,

58

we give the matter just as it stands on page 165 of the *Sentinel*. It is from an article entitled "Fitly Designated," based upon Mr. Crafts' article in *Our Day*, entitled "A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform." After having stated that this indicated a year of trickery and fraud, we said:—

That this is indeed so must be evident to any one who has read the *Sentinel's* exposure of the methods of Mr. Crafts and his associate Sunday reformers. They started out with deceit, and with exhortation to deceive, when they requested all public conventions to indorse the Sunday petition by vote, and then to duplicate the strength of the petition as far as possible by securing the individual signatures of the assembly. Then, by securing a few representative indorsements, they counted in whole denominations, thousands of members of which had never heard of the petition. A letter from Cardinal Gibbons stating simply that he personally favored the movement, was forthwith counted as the signatures of 7,200,000 Catholics. Not content with counting in the entire membership of the various religious organizations as well being twenty-one years of age or more, they went to Sunday-schools, and secured the names of the children to their petition, which stated that each signer is twenty-one years of age or more.

It will be seen that this does not say, or even necessarily imply, that Mr. Crafts went personally to Sunday-schools and secured the names of children to his petition, although we admit that it implicates him. We had no positive assurance that Mr. Crafts himself had done so. All that the article says is that such things were done by those working with Mr. Crafts for a Sunday law.

Mr. Crafts proceeds and says:—

A minor but not unimportant misstatement is the attempt to make the heading of an article by me in *Our Day*, "A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform," equivalent to a confession that the year named was such a "year of trickery and fraud." Apply this philological sophistry to General Grant's last strategic year before Richmond, and see how false it is.

This is equivalent to a confession that the year named was a year of trickery in the Sunday-law movement. In my article I said:—

The leading article in *Our Day* for April is an address by Rev. W. F. Crafts, at Mr. Cook's Monday lecture, March 25, and is entitled, "A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform." This is a most appropriate heading for a summary of the work of the

59

American Sabbath Union during the year 1888. It shows that Mr. Crafts appreciates the situation. A strategem is defined by Webster as "a trick by which some advantage is to be obtained. An artifice." Strategic means, "pertaining to strategy, effected by artifice. Therefore, since, according to Mr. Crafts, the year 1888 has been a strategic year in the Sunday work, it has been a year of trickery and fraud.

Mr. Crafts says, "Apply this philological sophistry to General Grant's last strategic year before Richmond, and see how false it is." And this is all he has to say! A most damaging comparison it is that he makes. We never yet knew of any one who professed to conduct war on Christian principles. It is generally understood that strategy—and by this is meant attempts to deceive the enemy—is always allowable in war. No one claims that it is Christian-like. War cannot be conducted on Christian principles. It is opposed to every principle of Christianity. The golden rule laid down by Christ is to do unto others as you would have them do to you; but in war each side continually tries to do to the other side the very thing which they do *not* wish done to themselves. Gen. Sherman, in reply to a charge that he was not sufficiently careful of the property of the enemy in his famous march through Georgia, replied in his blunt way, that "war is hell," and that the worse it is made the more successful it is. Let it be noted that the only reply Mr. Crafts makes to the conclusion that the year of Sunday-law work, which he calls "a strategic year," was a year of trickery and fraud, is to compare it to strategy in war. Are we to understand from this comparison that the Sunday-law movement in which Mr. Crafts is engaged, is as un-Christian as is war? It seems so, and the facts already brought out corroborate this conclusion.

Next, Mr. Crafts makes the following challenge:—

I challenge Prof. Jones or Mr. Waggoner to produce before you a single authentic statement made by my authority, or by that of Mrs. Bateham, or by any other person entitled to be called one of our "associates" in the management of the petition, to substantiate this serious slander, the reiterated charge of a "false count," with "repeaters" and attempts to deceive. The largest petition ever presented to be government needs no exaggeration.

60

We accept this challenge, and herewith present the proof. The so-called American Sabbath Union, of which Mr. Crafts is field secretary, publishes *Monthly Documents* pertaining to its work. In the *Monthly Document* for December, 1888, on the last page, second paragraph, we find the following official statement:—

We ask every religious paper to publish our petition, and every church and preachers' meeting and religious conference or convention to indorse the petition by resolution, and also, as far as possible, by individual signatures, *which duplicate its strength*. The Catholic Church has indorsed the petition through a letter of its Cardinal, and most of the Protestant churches by resolutions of their supreme councils; but these indorsements are strengthened by the confirming votes and signatures of local churches.

Here we have not only the official indorsement of the fraudulent methods of obtaining signatures to the petition, but a deliberate official request that those fraudulent methods be adopted. Mr. Crafts, it is true, says in a previous portion of this article, that "when a general assembly has indorsed the petition, the single action of synods, presbyteries, and churches of the same order are counted only as amens, not as new petitioners." We should call them pretty hearty "amens." Notice how hearty they are designed to be. The quotation says that these individual signatures to the petition *duplicate its strength*. Now if a man indorses a petition, he does not *duplicate* the strength of that petition by saying *amen* afterwards. If a man casts a vote for an officer, he does not *duplicate the strength* of that vote by afterward publicly proclaiming how he voted. He can duplicate the strength of his vote only by voting twice; and so the strength of the petition is duplicated only when the number of petitioners is duplicated; and this is what the official document of the American Sabbath Union calls for,—not by getting twice as many persons to sign the petition, but by counting the same persons twice.

In further proof we call attention to Mr. Crafts' admission already quoted, that because it was impossible to tell how many in a denomination were under twenty-one years of age, they counted the whole number as over twenty-one years of age. He says that "the largest petition ever presented to a government needs no exaggeration." Certainly the Sunday-law peti-

61

tion needs none, for it is already well supplied; but it does stand sadly in need of some substantiation.

Again Mr. Crafts says:—

No frantic misstatements can hide the facts that this unparalleled petition, in which labor organizations and churches of all creeds have united, has been endorsed by deliberate vote by so many of the labor organizations that it may fairly be said to voice the wishes of workingmen; that it has been endorsed by so many evangelical churches and conventions that it may fairly be said to voice the wishes of all such churches; that it has been endorsed by the American head of the Catholic Church, and so will not be opposed by any of its loyal members.

I have somewhat to offer on this point also. I have had a number of statements from workingmen and from representatives of labor organizations, who emphatically repudiate the Sunday-law movement; but the following statement from *Ideas of Reform*, of January 1, 1889, a paper published at Broken Bow, Nebraska, and wholly devoted to the interests of the workingmen, is sufficient to show that the petition does not fairly voice the wishes of the workingmen. From an editorial in the issue of the date above noted, we take the following:—

Fourteen million people have petitioned Congress, asking for the enforcement of a Sunday law. This is evidently preliminary to an attempt to unite the Church and State. A halt should be called at once. Religion by faith in God, is good; and no Christian, under our Constitution, is deprived of the privilege of observing Sunday as strictly as he desires. Religion, by law, by force, without conversion, is bad, and contrary to the principles of good government. . . . The United States Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Our petitioners would in substance say: "Do away with the Constitution, and give us a law that we may imprison or fine every one whom we have been unable to convert to our faith,

and who does not give tribute to our support." Now, if this clamor for a Sunday law, coupled with the Blair Educational Bill—which advocates the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools—is not an attempt to unite the Church and State, neither was the act of Constantine in making Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman empire. It is hardly time to allow 14,000,000 people to dictate how 60,000,000 people shall worship, in a free country like ours.

Now as to the indorsement by the Catholic Church. "The American head of the Catholic Church" indorsed the petition

62

in the following letter, which was first published in the January (1889) number of *Our Day*, edited by Joseph Cook:—

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
408 NORTH CHARLES STREET, BALTIMORE,
DECEMBER 4, 1888.

Rev. W. F. Crafts—

REV. DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge your esteemed favor of the 1st inst., in reference to the proposed passage of a law by Congress "against Sunday work in the government's mail and military service," etc.

I am most happy to add my name to those of millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by legitimate legislation. As the late Plenary Council of Baltimore has declared, the due observance of the Lord's day contributes immeasurably to the restriction of vice and immorality, and to the promotion of peace, religion, and social order and cannot fail to draw upon the nation the blessing and protection of an overruling Providence. If benevolence to the beasts of burden directed one day's rest in every week under the old law, surely humanity to man ought to dictate the same measure of rest under the new law.

Your obedient servant in Christ, JAMES CARDINAL
GIBBONS,

Archbishop of Baltimore.

On the strength of this letter, seven million two hundred thousand Roman Catholics were counted as favoring the Sunday petition, as will be

seen by reference to the quotations already made from the *Congressional Record*; and Mr. Crafts himself says, in the article under review, that because of this indorsement, the movement will not be opposed by any of its (the Catholic Church) loyal members. This shows what?—That Mr. Crafts is willing to have indorsements secured to the Sunday-law petition in the same way that sheep are driven into a pen. Get one to start, and all the rest will follow blindly, and they will follow the leader as readily into the greatest danger as they will into the sheepfold. So Mr. Crafts is pleased with the thought that loyal members of the Catholic Church will indorse the petition because Cardinal Gibbons did, without any individual choice, or even any thought in the matter. This thing alone is sufficient to show that he does not care whether or not peo-

63

le are individually or collectively in favor of his movement, provided they can by some means be counted as favoring it. All he wants is that it shall succeed.

But did the Cardinal indorse the petition in behalf of his church? We will let the Cardinal himself reply, as he does in the following letter written in reply to a question asked him by Mr. D. E. Lindsay, of Baltimore:—

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
408 NORTH CHARLES ST., BALTIMORE, MD.,
FEB. 27, 1889.

MY DEAR SIR—

In reply to your favor dated Feb. 25, 1889, duly received, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons desires me to write to you, that whatsoever countenance His Eminence has given to the "Sunday law" referred to in your favor, as he had not the authority, so he had not the intention, of binding the archbishops, the bishops, or the Catholic laity of the United States. His Eminence bids me say to you that he was moved to write a letter favoring the passage of the bill, mainly from a consideration of the rest and recreation which would result to our poor, over-worked fellow-citizens, and of the facility which it would then afford them of observing the *Sunday* in a religious and decorous way.

It is incorrect to assume that His Eminence, in the alleged words of Senator Blair set forth in your favor, "signed the bill, thus pledging 7,200,000 Catholics as indorsing the bill."

I have the honor to remain, with much respect, yours faithfully,
J. P. DONAHUE, *Chancellor*,
To D. E. Lindsey, Esp., 708 Rayner Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

This shows that loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church does not demand that its members should indorse the petition simply because Cardinal Gibbons did. In this, Mr. Gibbons is more American than is Mr. Crafts. Representative indorsement has not yet been recognized as an American institution.

Mr. Crafts says:—

Promiscuous petitions of unclassified names, such as your people are sending to Congress, are far less valuable than our classified petitions, which show just who and what the petitioners are, in part by the name of the organizations which not by vote, and in other cases by the prefix, "Mr." Or "Mrs." Or "Miss," with the limit "21 years of age or more," and the "occupation."

It is true that individual signatures signed by the hand of the person whose name appears, will not count up so fast, nor make

64

so imposing an array, as petitions presented by whole organizations in bulk, included in which are children, who by the petition are certified to be "21 years of age or more;" but they certainly are more valuable in the eyes of those who regard truth. Josh Billings said that he would rather know less than to know so many things that were not so. We would rather have fewer indorsers to our petition than to have so many petitioners who never signed the petition, and who never even heard of it.

Under the head of "Criminal Inaccuracy" Mr. Crafts says:—

The false claim that I am urging the national Sunday Law as "Religious Legislation." (38-40) On page 163 I am quoted as saying, "A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land, except on the basis of religious legislation." The last word should be "obligation," as correctly quoted on page 161, but even there it is made to mean "law," whereas it is a distinct reference, not to law, but to its "basis," in the public conscience.

Here it will be seen that Mr. Crafts makes two charges of slander and willful misrepresentation on the strength of what he admits is a typographical error. He admits that the quotation is correctly made in the same paper, thus showing that there was no intention to deceive. We will quote what Mr. Crafts did say, and the comment, so that the reader may

judge for himself what it does mean. At the close of the speech which he delivered before the General Assembly [*sic.*] of the Knights of Labor, and which appeared in the *Journal of United Labor*, November 29, 1888, the following question was asked him, as appears in the same report:—

"Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion, by having the workmen of an establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient, not all resting on any one day?"

This was a fair question, and the plan suggested affords a perfect solution of the question, if the claim so often made be true, that the sole object of a Sunday law is the securing to workingmen of the right to rest on one day in seven, in accordance with the requirements of nature. But notice Mr. Crafts' answer:—

"A weekly day of rest has never been secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out."

65

What could prove more plainly that the law which is desired is a law to compel all the people in the land to observe the first day of the week, not as a holiday, but as a day of religious rest?

The point that was made on this quotation was that if a religious institution is legislated upon, such legislation is religious legislation. It can be nothing else.

Again Mr. Crafts comes to the charge, and says:—

The absurd but malicious inference from the above that I favor "a law compelling people to observe the first day of the week religiously," is almost worthy to be classed with the gross slanders before mentioned.

In his anxiety to make out a case, he makes a charge of slander because we quoted his own words, and another charge from the *inference* that may be drawn therefrom. He says that the inference that a law is desired compelling people to observe the first day of the week religiously is "absurd and malicious." He has sworn to this statement, but has offered no documents in proof. Now let us examine a few points. As to the religious observance of the day, I quote from a speech made by Mrs. Bateham before the Washington convention last December, and reported in the *Lutheran Observer* of December 21, 1888. Referring to the petitioners for a Sunday law, she said; "They are praying that the government will pass a law that will compel the people to observe the first day of the week."

I also quote from the same report in the same paper the following statement made in that convention:—

The bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, which day shall be occupied only by worship. No amusement or recreation should be indulged in, no mail handled or railroads run except under the pressing necessity, with a fine of from \$10 to \$4,000 as the penalty for non-observance of the law.

As I said in my article, it is not specifically stated who spoke these words, but they appear in the *Observer's* report, and seem to have been spoken by Mr. Crafts, because in the paragraphs before them extracts are made from a speech by Mr. Crafts. But Mr. Crafts says of this report, and of this statement:—

66

Even this is a manifest falsehood, as it "seems" clearly to be the comment of some reporter unfriendly to the Christian Sabbath, and certainly is not published approvingly by the editor of the *Lutheran Observer*, nor is the preceding misrepresentation of Mrs. Bateham.

Mark: Mr. Crafts swear to every statement which he makes in the article under consideration. Therefore he swears that these statements which we have quoted were not made in the convention, and that they *certainly* were not published approvingly by the editor of the *Lutheran Observer*. Does he know this? and has he the statement of the editor of the *Lutheran Observer* to that effect? The editor of the *Lutheran Observer* was present at that convention as one of the officers, and made a speech in the convention. He is still one of the officers of the American Sabbath Union. Now is it not strange that an officer of the Association would allow a false statement concerning the convention to go into his own paper, and make no denial of it? If it was not published with the approval of the editor, why was it not so stated in that same paper? If Mr. Crafts *knows* that that report is a misrepresentation, and that it was not approved by the editor of the *Lutheran Observer*, he must have a statement to that effect from the editor himself. Certainly he could not know in any other way; but if the question has been raised, and Dr. Conrad, the editor of the paper, has been appealed to, to state whether or not he approved of it, and has made the statement to Mr. Crafts, why was not the statement published in the paper? In other words, if a statement in the paper has been challenged, and has been repudiated by the editor, why was the repudiation made to a private person, and not to the public who are interested, so that the paper could stand in a proper light? The questions

answer themselves. Mr. Crafts never had any such statement from Dr. Conrad. The quotations which we have made appear in a report from one on the ground who was favorable to the convention. Not only so, but they appear in the *leading editorial*, showing that if they were not written by Dr. Conrad himself, they have his indorsement as true statements. The correspondent's report appears on another page of the same paper.

Having disposed of this matter, we will make a few more quotations to show that the movement in which Mr. Crafts is

67

engaged is a movement to secure a law to compel people to observe the first day of the week religiously. The *Pearl of Days* is a department of the New York *Mail and Express*, and is the "Official Organ of the American Sabbath Union." It is edited by the Rev. J. H. Knowles, general secretary and editor of publications of the above-mentioned Association. In the issue of May 31, 1889, we find the following editorial statement:—

It is worthy of note that in the discussion of the Sunday question by the secular press, the divine principles underlying the question are often incidentally concealed. This may be unintentional; nevertheless the lesson taught us is most suggestive. We see from this fact that Sunday, considered only in its economical relations, can never be wholly divested of its moral basis.

Again I quote from the *Pearl of Days* of January 25, 1889, from the full report of a speech made by Col. Elliott F. Shepard, editor of the *Mail and Express*, upon his election to the presidency of the American Sabbath Union. Speaking of the petition and its indorses, and the work the Union has to do in interesting everybody in the Sunday movement, he said:—

You have to say yes or no—whether you will stand by the decalogue, whether you will stand by the Lord God Almighty, or whether you will turn your back upon him. The work, therefore, of this society is only just begun. We would not put this work on mere human reasoning, for all that can be overthrown by human reason; we rest it wholly on the divine commandment.

Again, in the *Pearl of Days* of January 18, 1889, the editor gives a brief history of the present Sunday-law agitation, and especially of the origin of the American Sabbath Union. Speaking of the representatives that were appointed by the religious bodies for the purpose of forming such an organization, he said:—

The fifty representatives thus appointed were invited to express their views concerning the propriety of forming a

national Sabbath organization whose only object should be to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.

And then he goes on to show how the organization was completed.

The Blair bill itself states upon the face of it that its object is to "promote" or "protect" the "observance of the first day of the week as a day of religious worship."

68

In his anxiety to make out a big case against the editors of the *American Sentinel*, Mr. Crafts takes a contributed article,—a sermon that was preached by a Baptist minister,—and adds five to his count of slanders, on the strength of that. The article is a good one, and we would like to present it; but inasmuch as it is general in its nature, making no mention whatever of Mr. Crafts, but dealing only with the general principles of Sunday legislation, and since Mr. Crafts makes no particular mention of it, we pass it by without comment.

I quote again from Mr. Crafts. He says:—

On pages 163-4, there are five misstatements as to the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, most of which anyone can detect by examining the bill as given in the Senate report of hearing upon it.

Surely "here's richness!" On two pages which he has already gone through from top to bottom, and from bottom to top, piling up alleged slanders in lots of from two to a dozen, he now finds "five misstatements as to the Blair Sunday-rest bill *most of which* anyone can detect by examining the bill." "Most of which," when stated concerning five, means three, or at the most, four. We will give Mr. Crafts the benefit of the largest number. So, then, on those pages, according to Mr. Crafts, there are five misstatements, four of which can be detected by one who reads the matter concerning which the statements are made. What about the other? That, of course, must be excluded. If that cannot be detected by one who reads the statements, how did Mr. Crafts find it out?

Further, if there are even four misstatements concerning the bill, which anyone can detect by reading the bill, why did not Mr. Crafts specify those misstatements for the benefit of those who have neither the article in question nor the bill to which reference is made? Does he think a thing can be proved by a bare assertion, even if that assertion is sworn to? Is there a court in the United States that would accept as proof an assertion made by a witness even under oath, if he could not substantiate his assertion? For instance, Mr. Doe charges Mr. Roe with having slandered him, and determines to prosecute him in court. So he comes into the court, and is duly

sworn, and under oath says, "Mr. Roe lied about me," and then stops. The judge would ask him to proceed to state where and

69

when Mr. Roe lied, and to give the exact language that was used; and not only so but to demonstrate to the jury that that language was false. If he could not do this, his assertion, even though sworn to, would amount to nothing in court, and he would go from the court-room under the odium of having sworn to a statement which he could not prove. He certainly must stand convicted of rashness, to say the least.

In another place Mr. Crafts says that he has been grossly misquoted in four places, for which he adds four to his list of alleged slanders; but he does not tell his readers what those four misquotations are, nor does he tell them what he is represented as saying, or what he really did say. Therefore his charges amount to nothing. We do not find any misquotations in the pages referred to, therefore we can say nothing more concerning them.

Concerning his statement that "neither the American Sabbath Union nor the Woman's Christian Temperance Union champion the bill," viz., the Blair Sunday-rest bill, we present the following: At the hearing before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Senator Blair, after reading the bill, said, "We will proceed in just such order as the friends of the bill may desire." (See page 2 of the "Hearing.") Immediately following this statement, Mr. Crafts arose and said, "I have been requested by the various societies petitioning for the passage of such a law as Senator Blair's bill is, in the main, to take charge of the hearing in their behalf." Then Mr. Crafts proceeded to make a speech, in the course of which he said, "What we ask is that Congress (and here I state the whole proposition in brief) shall as far as the national jurisdiction extends, first among the employes of the government, and then in the wider domain of interstate commerce, prohibit all needless Sunday work." But this is exactly what the Blair Sunday-rest bill called for.

When Mr. Crafts had finished his first speech, he introduced Mrs. J. C. Bateham, the Superintendent of the Sabbath Observance department of the W. C. T. U., who said, "Honored Chairman and Senators, as representing our great body, I had the honor of presenting to you last winter a petition from nearly two millions of people, asking that Congress forbid needless government work and interstate commerce on the

70

Christian Sabbath. You graciously granted us a hearing, and your honored Chairman afterwards introduced a bill into the Senate covering our requests." (See pages 21, 22.) Here is direct reference to the Blair bill, by a leading official of the W. C. T. U., who says that it covers the request of that association.

Still further: On page 41 we read the following statement by Mr. Crafts: "We shall now grant to an opponent of the bill, a representative of the Seventh-day Baptists, Rev. A. H. Lewis, D.D., the time which he asks." Mark this: Mr. Crafts appeared before the Senate Committee, convened for the special purpose of considering the Sunday-rest bill, as a leader of the friends of that bill. He introduced the speakers in favor of it, and when he saw fit, he very graciously gave an opponent of the bill an opportunity to speak; and yet he says that "neither the W. C. T. U. nor the American Sabbath Union championed the bill."

Still further: At the convention of the American Sabbath Union, held in March, 1888, a committee was appointed to suggest some improvements in the bill. Among the members of that committee were the president and general secretary of the American Sabbath Union. They considered the bill, and brought in a report containing the original bill and also the bill with such modifications as they desired to have. Every one of these modifications offered by the committee tended to make the bill stronger than it was originally presented; so that while it is technically true that the Sabbath Union did not indorse the Blair Sunday-rest bill, it is also true that the only reason why they did not do so was because it was not strong enough to suit them.

I have before me on one sheet the report of that committee. It is too long for insertion in this article, but copies can be secured by those who wish them.

I think I have now noticed quite fully all the specific assertions made by Mr. Crafts, so far as they concern me. I am sorry he stated in his article that he need not be expected to answer to the replies that his affidavit might call out. In this he shows his wisdom; but he would have shown still more wisdom if he had not replied in the first place, for it has been demonstrated that not a single one of his assertions to which he has sworn can be substantiated.

He calls on the church of which the editors of the *American Sentinel* are members, to refuse to keep them any longer in membership. He has arraigned us before the public, and says that we might properly be called to account in civil court, but that his lecture engagements for many months to come make it inconvenient for him to prosecute in person. I am sorry that he is so busy. But I will say this: That such crimes as he charges us with do not become outlawed in a few months; conviction can be had many months after they are committed; and if at any time within the present year he can arrange his lecture engagements so as to prosecute us, we will guarantee that he shall be paid as much for his time as he would get were he lecturing,

providing he succeeds in securing a conviction. If he will do this, we will consider it as an equivalent for the debate which didn't come off, and will say no more about that matter. E. J. WAGGONER.

¹ See original letter, pages 13, 14, 15.

² Original letter, pages 19, 20.

³ The real reason, pages 29, 30.

⁴ See letter, page 35.