We believe in religious liberty, and hold that this God-given right is exercised at its best when there is separation between church and state.

We believe in civil government as divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights, and to rule in civil things; and that in this realm it is entitled to the respectful and willing obedience of all.

We believe in the individual's natural and inalienable right to freedom of conscience: to worship or not to worship; to profess, to practice, and to promulgate his religious beliefs, or to change them according to his conscience or opinions, holding that these are the essence of religious liberty; but that in the exercise of this right he should respect the equivalent right of others.

We believe that all legislation and other governmental acts which unite church and state are subversive of human rights, potentially persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of church and state; and therefore, that it is not within the province of human government to enact such legislation or perform such acts.

We believe it is our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent the enactment of legislation which tends to unite church and state, and to oppose every movement toward such union, that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty.

We believe that these liberties are embraced in the golden rule, which teaches that a man should do to others as he would have others do to him.
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OUR COVER PICTURE: There are some mighty important things going on in that building over there, son—things that concern the freedom of every American. You see, there are three branches of the American Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. The legislative makes the laws for our country. The executive—that's the part the President heads, you know—runs the country. The judicial is headed by the Supreme Court, and it settles arguments between States and between the Federal Government and the States. It protects the constitutional rights of individual citizens like you and me. Sometimes it tells a State that it can't make a certain law, just because of our rights. And it has even told the Federal Government to take another look at the Constitution. In fact, you might say that's freedom talking in that building over there. And, son, people listen. Yes, sir, they listen!

J. REYNOLDS
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Donald B. Haynes (left) and Don Yost have more than a reading interest in Liberty—they write for it.

from the editor’s desk

Two names familiar to long-time readers of LIBERTY appear in the magazine this month—Yost and Haynes. Don Yost (see editorial, page 28) is the son of the late Frank Yost, former editor of LIBERTY and associate secretary of the International Religious Liberty Association. Editor of a programming magazine for Christian youth, Don has his office just a few doors down the hall.

Donald B. Haynes (“How Bigoted Can a Man Get?” page 20) is the son of the late Carlyle B. Haynes, a prolific writer and defender of freedom, who served for years as head of the Seventh-day Adventist War Service Commission. Donald, a teacher and free-lance writer, lives in Takoma Park, Maryland.

Newell Jones and Jack Tucker (see guest editorial, page 6) collaborated on a series of editorials on American Freedom in the Evening Tribune of San Diego, California. LIBERTY reprints their “Free Election, Secret Ballot, Underlie Our Political System.”

In a past editorial LIBERTY pointed out that the question “Is America a Christian Nation?” can have three answers, depending upon whether the questioner alludes to its heritage, its practices, or its constitutional provisions. In the “Battle for Freedom” Dan Smoot, editor of the Dan Smoot Report, points out another sense in which America can be called Christian.


LETTERS

THANK YOU TO SOMEONE
Gentlemen:

Some years ago I was either a subscriber or at least on the mailing list of this magazine, and the receipt of the recent issue indicates, no doubt, that someone has been responsible for having this magazine sent to me or that it is being sent on a complimentary basis. If a subscription has been entered on my behalf by someone else, of course I deeply appreciate being restored to your mailing list; if not, I shall be pleased to enter a subscription and remit for same.

I am thoroughly in accord with the purpose of this excellent publication and shall read the copy sent me with great interest.—GEORGE P. WHITMAN, SR., Superior Court Judge, 807 Fulton County Court House, Atlanta 5, Georgia.

DISGUSTED WITH LIBERTY
Gentlemen:

Your disgusting political publication hiding under the guise of religious freedom is being sent regularly to me as well as all other local attorneys. I do not know who is responsible for this prostitution of our most sacred heritage, but I consider the practice even more subversive of human dignity than the “Communist” calling practices so prevalent in the ranks of one of our major parties a little over a decade ago.

If I continue to receive your magazines, I will store them in my office and sue you for the expense thereof.—WALTER R. ZACHARY, Chattanooga 2, Tennessee.

WHO DID IT?
Dear Sir:

From what source is my subscription paid—whom have I to thank for this magazine that says so well what cries to be said and what must be said? Am I the beneficiary of a subscription because I am employed in the field of public education? If so, I think it is most fitting, because education is the obvious instrumentality by which our heritage is passed on to emerging generations. Although there is a great clamor in public education about democratic living, democratic institutions, democratic process, et cetera, there not infrequently occurs a blurring of the focus placed by the framers of our Constitution upon the individual liberties of man to a kind of reverence for an enforced conformity to the preference of the group or majority.

You might be interested in knowing that although I have received several previous issues, I never took the time to really look at the magazine until this morning. I noticed on the cover the heading “Governors Speak Out for Religious Freedom” and I was curious to see whether Governor Nelson of Wisconsin would be included (he was, and in a characteristic, concise, lucid statement), and then I found the “articulate . . . courageous . . .” statements made by Attorney General Mosk of my own State of California. It was an instructive as well as gratifying experience to get the wisdom and the feeling of this man’s convictions, character, and intellect.

So thanks again to you and to whomever I am indebted for the subscription for this heretofore unappreciated gift.—SAMUEL F. MURRAY, Sacramento 19, California.
If you are getting LIBERTY without having subscribed, you are likely a professional man with an interest and an influence in the field of religious liberty. Thousands of gift subscriptions are paid for yearly by readers who value LIBERTY'S contents. Hundreds of letters begin: "Enclosed is $2.50. Please send LIBERTY to _______." All subscriptions to LIBERTY are paid.

ALERT TO RIGHTS

GENTLEMEN:

It is with deep humility that I attempt to thank you for the work you are doing in the field of religious liberty; reminding us of the great basic American precept of separation of church and state; regard and respect for minority groups; your campaign against bigotry; and generally reminding us of the things our founding fathers established in the days when men died for what we are prone to take as a matter of course, epitomized in the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution.

I was particularly grateful to you for the article printed on page 12 of your last issue (June, 1960) wherein the Attorney General of California, the Honorable Stanley Mosk, answered some very pertinent questions pertaining to present-day problems . . .

When my present term in the Nevada Legislature expires, January 1, 1961, I will have served eighteen years in that honorable body. In all that time I have been particularly alert to the rights of minority groups, and to all the tenets of the Bill of Rights.

I am running for re-election again this year, the Democratic candidate from Assembly District No. 1, Washoe County. If I have done well, and if the people have confidence that I have served them well, I may be re-elected. If so, I pledge myself to simply be a good American.—DON CRAWFORD, Assemblyman, Washoe District No. 1, Washoe County, Nevada.

BLANKET ENDORSEMENT

DEAR SIR:

A friend presented me with a copy of LIBERTY at my request.

I think it is the best publication of its kind I have studied. Firmly and wholeheartedly I support every single word in this magazine.

I am enclosing a money order for a year's subscription to LIBERTY: a Magazine of Religious Freedom. . . .—WILLIAM SELLARS MCDOUGLE, Washington 4, D.C.

ONE TO THE CONTRARY

DEAR SIR:

I notice that many letters have been published in your magazine commending it for the work it is doing toward defeating the blue laws in our States. I am going to write one to the contrary . . .

I must confess I don't agree at all with your conclusion that these laws are unconstitutional on the grounds that they restrict the freedom of certain religious groups. If that be true, then this Government has no right to legislate against religious groups in our land that practice polygamy.

Any government has the right to pass laws when they deem them to be good for the whole. I don't always agree with laws sometimes. I don't like it because they made liquor legal, but that doesn't make it unconstitutional.—C. J. MACKEY, Linton, North Dakota.

[See page 22.—ED.]

LIBERTY AND THE ELECTION

SIR:

I enjoy reading your most excellent and objective of all magazines on the market that deal with religious liberty. In one area, however, I find little comment in your recent issues: the question of whether a person who belongs to and believes in an organization that fundamentally opposes the principles of religious liberty should be elected to the highest position in the land—President of the United States. I am extremely interested in the stand that LIBERTY takes. What are your plans concerning this matter?—MAX G. PHILLIPS, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Mr. Nixon is a Quaker; Mr. Kennedy is a Catholic. The official stand of their churches on religious liberty is a matter of public record. Both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon have forthrightly stated their personal convictions on separation of church and state. Their voting records are available.

As to LIBERTY magazine, it is the voice of an organization that "advocates no political or economic theories." Thus LIBERTY takes no stand on political matters.

On November 7 the polls will be open. The registered voters on the staff of LIBERTY will be there. Each will undoubtedly vote his convictions. What are your plans concerning this matter?—EDITORS.

MAGAZINE-PREACHER-SERMON

DEAR MR. HEGSTAD:

The enclosed sermon * is sent to you so that you may see that your fine magazine, LIBERTY, is being read and used . . .

LIBERTY is a welcome magazine to my desk. Thank you for the good work you do.—ALBERT L. CARDWELL, Sherwood Baptist Church, Albany, Georgia.

* It was a good one, too!—R. R. H.

LONG MEMORY

DEAR SIRS:

I shall long remember your visit to Spartanburg, South Carolina, in July, 1959, just after the vote on the obsolete blue laws by the citizens of the city and county.

Your January-February issue of LIBERTY magazine was widely read in this section. Your publication of LIBERTY is making an excellent contribution to America's dream of religious liberty for all mankind. The tasks of the friends of freedom will never end so long as there is a single man whose conscience and moral response to his religious convictions are controlled by the iron hand of state authority.

Within the year since the July 14 vote on the blue laws, which took place in Spartanburg County, much of the . . . shouting . . . has died away. Many leading lawyers and legislators have expressed their desire for a better system . . .

Please find within a money order for $5.00 with which to extend my subscription to LIBERTY.—REV. W. Y. HENDER-SON, Spartanburg, South Carolina.
IF WE WERE to choose a single scene and symbol to illustrate political freedom in America it would be this:

The time: Election Day.

The place: A neighborhood polling place. It could be a private garage in your block; maybe the nearby school; maybe the fire station.

There would be an American flag in sight somewhere to give the place a special distinction on this day. There would be perhaps four or six of your friends, neighbors or acquaintances sitting at a table.

The key furnishings of the room would be some sort of private enclosures—some as simple as a curtained shelf; others as elaborate as a voting machine.

Enter John Q. and Jane Public.

They each receive a ballot and retire separately to the curtained voting booths. There, alone with their consciences, they mark their ballots; fold them; turn them in or drop them into the ballot box—their private judgment, if they so choose, known but to them alone.

To tens of millions of Americans, this scene is so familiar as to seem commonplace.

But to 10 times 10 millions, and more, elsewhere in the world, this little drama of the free election and the secret ballot is unknown.

Many of them have never known an authority other than one imposed on them. The idea of having a voice in choosing their leaders is inconceiv-
The clue to our little drama of the free election and the secret ballot rings out like the clear notes of a prelude in the opening words of the Constitution:

"We, the people of the United States . . . ."

Ours is a nation of laws, and the determination of those governing rules rests primarily in the hands of the people.

We vest this power in the hands of an elected Congress and a Chief Executive.

In this enormous grant of power over our lives and fortunes, Americans have deemed it important that the process be conducted in freedom and in secrecy.

This is an ideal concept. Perhaps we fall short of its complete realization in practice—as often happens in the gap between man's vision and his reach.

But the right to free elections and a personal secret ballot is deeply etched in the foundations of America's political freedom.

We burnish it and keep it intact for succeeding generations by going to the polls on election days and voting, and by resisting encroachments on this basic freedom.—Evening Tribune, San Diego, California.
WHATEVER LIES AHEAD for religious liberty in this land, its direction should be determined by the ideals laid down by our founders. Most of us believe that religious liberty derives from these words in the Federal Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But clearly, religious liberty cannot derive from these words, because these words grant nothing and define nothing. They merely restrict the powers of Congress. They do not tell us what religious liberty truly is.

Today we no longer know what true religious liberty is, because we are each born into a going world with well-established customs and institutions. We learn to follow them without question or thought. They determine that we take a man at face value without first making inquiry about his religion. We sit beside him at football games and serve with him in the Army, but never do we discuss religion with him. Only cranks and crackpots do this. Our religion is a segregated and private matter, about which we do not even argue with members of our own segregated religious community. It belongs to the world of silence. It is never publicly considered in our deliberations as citizens. We act as though there were no such thing as religion at all. What we practice is religious tolerance and religious silence. This is a far cry from the way things were in the nation's beginnings. Washington and Jefferson and Patrick Henry and the rest were not simply mouthing phrases when they spoke of Providence and the sure hand of God. They had learned some lessons we have completely forgotten.

We have forgotten that this nation was founded in 1776 with the issuing of the Declaration of Independence, and that the United States was already a great and recognized world power, with ambassadors in foreign lands, when the Constitution was adopted thirteen years later. We have forgotten what lies beneath the Constitution to give spiritual life to this nation. We have forgotten that this nation is based not upon the Constitution but upon the solid foundation of natural rights.

Today we hear of religious liberty, but we do not understand. We see the framework of our institutions, but we do not perceive the essence beneath. We no longer know or accept religious liberty as a natural human right and a natural human need.

It was at Jamestown and Plymouth and other original colonies that our forefathers learned about natural rights. Each of these colonies was planted in the wilderness. Each was responsible for its own success or failure. Each began with the same raw material. Each was a venture maintained and established by the voluntary cooperation of its individual members. The degree of success achieved depended upon the degree of cooperation attained. This is the way God made the wilderness. The relationship of the settlers with the God who had
made the wilderness and placed man within it was clearly recognized and openly expressed. Everything God had provided became a tool for the success of man.

Self-evident Truths

Our forefathers perceived in the relationship between the wilderness God had made and the man God had put in the wilderness, certain self-evident truths. They perceived that God had made man with certain basic wants, or needs, and concluded therefore that the God who had made man with these needs had meant for them to be satisfied. They perceived that it is man's right to satisfy these needs, because he could not do otherwise. They perceived that man can only gain a sense of fulfillment when this right is honored, and that he therefore must have the liberty to satisfy the needs God put in him. The protection of this right is justice and liberty because of man's very nature. No one should be allowed to take away this right. Our founders reasoned as simply as that.

As an example of a basic need implanted by God, every man has a desire to improve himself. God gave him that desire. The first man in the wilderness wanted things that were not available in the wilderness, like houses and streets and plumbing. But he could perceive at once that one man standing alone could never acquire such things.

To get these things his heart desired, he found it necessary to cooperate with other men; for two could accomplish what one could not. God planned the world so that men would be required to cooperate. In the cooperative effort that is possible under government our founders found the best fulfillment for the desire of their hearts.

But our founders had lived under governments that ruthless men gained control of the machinery of government. They knew from experience that the wonderful promise inherent in government can be easily nullified. So they sought to solve this problem for all time by declaring it to be the purpose of American Government to preserve and protect all attributes and relationships, or rights, that man first received at the hands of God. God was at the center of their thinking. They held that it was for man's own best interest and happiness to honor the purposes of God, as these purposes are evident in the nature of men. In their Declaration of Independence no Catholic found reason to differ with a Protestant, nor a Protestant with a Jew.

To be a good citizen today, a man must have this concept of God-given needs and rights. He must understand further that if he denies another's God-given rights he denies God. Such thoughts were expressed by men of all religious persuasions in the early days, and no Catholic or Protestant or Jew took offense. Their convictions did not constitute religious tolerance and religious silence, but rather religious liberty.

Goal, Not Creed

Religious liberty, as our founders practiced it, could only bind, not divide. It offered a goal and not a creed. And so it still must be today. An American, whether he be Catholic priest, Jewish rabbi, or Protestant clergyman, because he is an American, is dedicated to the proposition that the nation is imperfect when the God-given rights of men are not all honored. And he is equally dedicated to the proposition that in his own time he can make it a bit more perfect by seeing to it that fewer God-given rights are denied. The seed for this nation's greatness is unquestionably planted in the soil of religion. Unless we are again led to know our goal and direction, and to express openly our belief in
the creating God who made the goal possible, we shall continue to practice things that are not religious at all. Because of our policy of religious silence and tolerance, today when we think of problems and seek to solve them, God never figures in our reasoning. We have lost sight of the Guide He gave us to discover His laws and advance His kingdom. We have forgotten the attributes and relationships that are the rights of men.

How, then, can we rediscover what constitutes proper government and true religious liberty? The answer is to be found in the example of our forefathers.

The writers of the Constitution made no definition of God. They merely accepted the fact that God exists. They prescribed no rituals. They merely resolved to honor and respect the basic needs that God established in man, and the relationships of government stemming from these. In this resolve there is still a substance to be found that is common to all religions. It presents a field and a goal for religious thinking and expression, which can bring religious liberty back to the land. If we make this our resolve, the veil of religious silence can be safely lifted. It is a worth-while project that should be soon undertaken.

FOCUS ON FREEDOM

IS THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN POLITICS?

No, says Richard Cardinal Cushing:

"I can't conceive of the Catholic Church entering into politics save in cases where the Church was being deprived of its right to exist and function. . . . I don't see where we [the Catholic Church] would have a right to foist a law on people who don't go along with our thinking."—RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING, Archbishop of Boston, as reported in Religious News Service, July 19, 1960.

No, says National Catholic Magazine:

"Despite the conviction of non-Catholics that the Church and its clergy mix in politics, little if any of the political is heard from the Catholic pulpit, and priests stand aloof from politics."—JEROME G. KERWIN, "Why This Fear of the Church?" The Sign, National Catholic Magazine, July, 1960, p. 15.

No, says Catholic newspaper:

"Any attempt to set up a clerical state in which the interests of the Church would be protected and given priority against non-Catholic minorities would tend dangerously in the direction of . . . totalitarianism."—AUXILIARY BISHOP THOMAS J. RILEY in his "Theology for Everyman" column, The Pilot, archdiocesan news weekly.

Yes, say citizens of a commonwealth under the American flag:

"Because the Puerto Rican Legislature rejected a Roman Catholic Church-sponsored effort to introduce religious instruction into the public schools of the island, the two bishops of Puerto Rico have publicly indorsed the formation of a Catholic political organization known as the Christian Action Party. Despite Governor Louis Munoz's criticism of the bishops' action as an error that can have 'grave consequences on the tranquillity of life in this country,' by order of Bishops Davis of San Juan and McManns of Ponce, the letter of indorsement was read in Catholic churches throughout the island. Priests and Catholic papers have urged Puerto Ricans to join the new party."—Associated Religious Press news dispatch.

Verdict (check one):

☐ The Catholic Church is in politics.

☐ The Catholic Church is not in politics.
The BATTLE for FREEDOM*

GOVERNMENT RECEIVES ITS JUST POWERS FROM US, THE GOVERNED

DAN SMOOT
Editor, The Dan Smoot Report
Dallas, Texas

The BEGINNINGS of America were Christian—and I don’t mean simply that Pilgrims were Christians fleeing from persecution. The ideal of the American revolution was a product of Christian thought. Hence the essence of Americanism is Christian.

Read the Declaration of Independence. There is the essence of Americanism; and the essence of the Declaration is a Christian assumption:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are . . . endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights. . . .”

* Excerpt from an address at directors’ meeting, Christian Freedom Foundation, April, 1959.

There were no arguments or committee meetings or panel discussions about it. Simply, we proclaim these things as truth because we know them to be truth.

What things?

God created man and endowed him with all his rights. Man is not beholden to government for anything, because government gave him nothing. Government can give man nothing except what it has taken away from him. Government has nothing to give but power. This power is dangerous and always potentially evil; yet it is necessary for the maintenance of order and individual liberty in a civilized society. Therefore we will form a government and give it the minimum of power necessary; but, to keep this arrangement in proper focus, we here go on record before all the world that the power we delegate to government is ours to take back if government becomes tyrannical. We derive no rights or power from government.

It is vice versa.

Government derives its just powers from us, the governed. We want it clearly understood, moreover, that the grant of power we make to government is very limited. Even though we must delegate to government enough power to protect all of us from one another and from possible foreign enemies, we have certain rights that we are not willing to surrender or modify for any purpose whatever. We call these rights inalienable because God, our Creator, endowed us with them. We consider them sacred.

That is the meaning of the American Declaration of Independence.

After winning the independence they had declared, and after writing a Constitution to make the necessary grant of limited power to a central government, the founding fathers worried about that matter of their sacred rights. In the first section of their Constitution, where they granted power to the new government, they started off by saying, “All legislative powers herein granted.”

They meant that the government should have no powers except those specifically listed in the Constitution. But was this sufficiently clear and emphatic? Perhaps not. The founding fathers decided to make certainty doubly certain. They wrote a Bill of Rights, not asking the government for any rights but specifically listing certain God-given rights, and telling government that it must not, could not, tamper with them.

Congress shall make no law abridging these specific sacred rights of ours.

That is the meaning of the American Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The Christian concept of the equality of men (also written into the Declaration of Independence: “All men are created equal”) is not tainted with materialism.

The Christian concept of equality is spiritual. It has nothing to do with my income or my health or my
environment. It simply gives me—a little, imperfect man born in sin—an individual, personal relationship with God, a relationship equal to that of any other man on earth. In short, Christianity exalts individualism, stressing the importance and the exclusive dependence on God and self of the human individual.

Could the founding fathers have founded a nation on the assumption of God-given rights if they had left God out? Of course not. Neither can their heirs maintain that nation if they leave God out. The conflict of our time is the clash of these two opposite ideologies—individualism versus collectivism. The great battle for freedom is primarily a battle for the minds and souls of men. It can be won only if free men are aflame with a faith greater than that of their enemies.

**QUANTA CURA**

and the **SYLLABUS** of ERRORS

TWO PRONOUNCEMENTS OF A CENTURY AGO LIE BEHIND MANY OF THE QUESTIONS ASKED CATHOLIC CANDIDATES FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

WALTER C. UTT

**V**ARIOUS DIFFICULTIES, real and imaginary, face Catholic candidates for office in the United States. One was created by a pontiff who has been dead for eighty years. Before his campaign is very old, the candidate is likely to be asked whether he subscribes to the encyclical *Quanta Cura* and the Syllabus of Errors, both released by Pope Pius IX on December 8, 1864. He may profess ignorance of these documents, as did Al Smith in 1928, offer one of the explanations commonly advanced by spokesmen of his church, or declare that nothing takes precedence over a candidate's oath of office, as Senator Kennedy has done.

Why should pronouncements made almost a century ago be cause for current concern? In answer one may say that non-Catholics took the 1864 documents as a "dra- stic and authoritative reminder that the Papacy was as medieval as ever in its attitude to modern society and civilisation and uncompromisingly hostile to the ideas which commanded the assent of the most civilised sections of mankind." Furthermore, when in 1870 the declaration of papal infallibility was approved by the Vatican Council, thus "regularizing" the encyclical and syllabus retroactively, Catholics found it difficult to claim that the pronouncements were merely personal views of a pope and without dogmatic value.

The 1860's

To understand why a pope would take positions fraught with embarrassment for his followers in other times and places, the situation in the 1860's must be taken into consideration. Pius IX (1846-1878) was losing his battle to preserve the temporal power of the Papacy. At the beginning of his reign patriots had considered him liberal, and hoped he might lead in the
unifying of the Italian states into a single nation. Any such ideas vanished in 1848, when Pius was driven from Rome and a revolutionary republic established under Mazzini and Garibaldi. Restored by the French Army the next year, the pope stood firmly for the status quo. Except for a short time in 1867, French troops remained in Rome from 1849 to 1870 to protect the papal government from Italian nationalists and anticlericals.

In 1859 Sardinia, aided by France, succeeded in forming the Kingdom of Italy under Victor Emmanuel II. Napoleon III permitted Sardinia to despoil the pope of two thirds of his territory in central Italy, leaving him only the area around Rome, the Patrimony of Peter. Italy would accept no permanent capital but Rome; only French power stood in the way. Yet the French emperor was distrusted by Vatican circles and by French Catholics for his previous help to the Italians. Pius IX feared that his temporal power would end soon, and he resented the pretensions of the modern national states.

Within the church a liberal Catholic movement had arisen in France and Germany and was spreading. A leading spokesman was the Frenchman Montalembert. He advocated a free church in a free state as best for the church in the long run. To separate church and state might lose government support, but it would free the church from government interference. Doctrine would not be affected, the liberals said, and the church would be better able to face the problems of modern society and the industrial age. The pope and his conservative supporters, the ultramontanes, emphatically rejected such ideas as dangerous, and in each country the battle went on within the church. The pope feared that any revolutionary and modern concepts absorbed by the liberals would prove to be injurious to the church. His advisers, particularly the able Cardinal Antonelli, thought mostly in terms of "keeping the lid on."

"Deliramentum"

The idea of cataloging the social and political errors of the modern age had been germinating for some time at Rome. As early as 1832 Gregory XVI in his Mirari Vos had condemned a list of practices, such as separating church and state, as "deliramentum." Also labeled erroneous were ideas that no preference should be shown any particular form of worship; that it is right for individuals to form their personal judgments about religion; that each man's conscience is his sole and all-sufficing guide; and that it is lawful for every man to publish his own views, whatever they may be.

In 1849 Bishop Pecci (later Leo XIII) urged publication of a list of errors and was seconded by the ultramontanes in their struggle against the liberals. Committees culled previous papal pronouncements and lists used by bishops. Contents of their compilation became known prematurely and the liberal Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans protested that the time was not opportune to take such a step. Release was postponed and the list reworked until the number of errors reached eighty.

It is said that issuance of the encyclical and the syllabus was precipitated by remarks made at Catholic congresses at Malines, Belgium, in 1863 and 1864 by Montalembert and Dupanloup respectively. They urged that the church would be stronger in a modern society if not tied to a political power. These sentiments deeply offended the pope. Furthermore, at this time France was attempting to get Italy to promise that papal territories would be respected when French troops withdrew from Rome. The Vatican put no reliance on the word of the Italian government and felt that Napoleon III was betraying the church. The pope was a man of strong feelings, but not always capable of sound judgment. In his irritation at the French emperor and the Catholic liberals he loosed his "lightning" at the end of 1864.

Quanta Cura was a general condemnation, the Syllabus of Errors an enumeration. It has been claimed that the "lightning" was aimed at certain Sardinian liberals who advocated separation of church and state, but no such limitation was stated or understood. Reactions of Catholic governments were almost without exception hostile. France especially was annoyed, which was intended. The liberals, who had already been rebuked more or less privately by the pope, now took a shattering salvo, which was also intended. Their position was shot from under them, many of the "errors" listed being positions they had advocated. Their discomfiture was completed at the Council in 1870, when almost all of them had to give in and accept papal infallibility.

Turn to page 32

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER
The right of the individual to follow the dictates of his own conscience with regard to his religious convictions is, without question, the most precious and most basic of all human rights. It is the basis for all other freedoms enjoyed by man and the source from which he draws the strength to defend and perpetuate those freedoms. The society that denies its citizens the right of religious freedom does, by the same act, sow the seeds of its own destruction.

Luther H. Hodges
Former Governor of the State of North Carolina

Religious liberty is perhaps the most cherished of our treasures in the American heritage. It has been said that we here in America have the right to be religious as we see fit or irreligious if we so choose. We have noted in the past few years a new emphasis on spiritual values in pronouncements from our top leaders. There are common denominators in almost every denominational precept, and if we as a people adhere to these, we shall certainly be building our nation and our personal lives upon a bedrock foundation rather than the shifting sands of baseless concepts.

Mark O. Hatfield
Governor of the State of Oregon

Of the freedoms which 15 million Californians enjoy, they are blessed with none so important to their daily lives as that of religious freedom. Upon it our entire concept of freedom is based, for it is within the principles and teachings of Christ that we live. The charge to protect this freedom against those who would destroy was never so important as it is today in a world in which doctrines are rampant that would erase the privilege and right.

Edmund G. Brown
Governor of the State of California

LIBERTY, 1960
Religious freedom is a fundamental element in the American concept of individual liberty. Except as we maintain and give fuller meaning to the concept of religious freedom, we cannot hope to remain secure in the other fundamental rights we hold to be vital.

The form and expression of the concept of religious freedom represents the highest order of development of the individual mind and spirit of each of us. Without the freedom to pursue this faith, there can be no full realization of the other freedoms we hold to be essential in the development of individual personalities.

Herschel C. Loveless
Governor of the State of Iowa

God made each of us an individual, and it is logical that He intended each of us to have the liberty of worshipping as we choose. Religious liberty is essential to self respect.

The Founding Fathers of our Republic were careful to recognize this right, just as our Nation has proclaimed on every coin the abiding trust of the American people in the universal Supreme Being. Infringement or suppression of the full exercise of religious liberty is thus completely contrary to American concepts of right and justice. Also it is a brazen attempt to confound the Creator's Divine Plan.

Harold W. Handley
Governor of the State of Indiana

Americans have many freedoms and privileges. One of the most important of our liberties is the freedom to worship in the church of our choice. This indeed is one of the foundation stones for our nation today, and must be preserved if we are to continue to enjoy freedom from slavery of the mind and body.

Michael V. DiSalle
Governor of the State of Ohio
M aryland's tradition of religious liberty is as old as the State itself, stretching back as it does for more than 300 years. It was in St. Mary's City, then the capital, in 1649 that a little band of freemen in Lord Baltimore's Province met and approved the Act Concerning Religion, which later was called the Act of Religious Toleration. This law granting freedom of conscience to the colonists stated that "no person or persons whatsoever within this province . . . shall from henceforth be in any wise troubled, molested or discommoded for or in respect to his or her religion, nor in the free exercises thereof." There was an even earlier profession of belief in religious toleration, for Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore and founder of the colony, warned the Catholic and Protestant settlers as they were departing to settle in the New World that they were not to give offense to one another in matters of religion. In the very first paragraph of his charter he wrote: "His Lordship requires his said Governor and Commissioners (who were Catholics) that in their voyage to Maryland they be very careful to preserve Unity and peace among all the passengers on board, and that they suffer no scandal nor offense to be given to any of the Protestants . . . that . . . they cause all acts of Roman Catholic Religion to be done as privately as may be, and that they instruct all the Roman Catholics to be silent upon all occasions of discourse concerning matters of religion; and that the said Governor and Commissioners treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as justice will permit." These instructions and the Religious Toleration Act were the foundation upon which Maryland built a strong tradition of religious freedom and toleration of the beliefs of others. The people of Maryland cherish this noble tradition.

J. Millard Tawes
Governor of the State of Maryland

D o you know your State flag? Do you know how it looks, what it stands for, the history it represents?

Chances are excellent that very few residents of any State in the nation could pick out their own State flag from a collection of the fifty banners—unless theirs is one of the twenty-one that displays its own name. Yet the story told by the fifty State flags is the story of America. Many emblems were born in battle, carried by militiamen long before their official adoption. In fact, the Nevada standard displays the words "Battle Born," significant of that State's admission to the Union during the throes of the Civil War.

New Jersey's banner went through the Revolutionary War and was proudly displayed at Cornwallis' Yorktown surrender. The North Dakota flag saw action at the head of the First North Dakota Infantry in no less than thirty-seven engagements during the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection. Manila, Paete, Tarbon Bridge, Morong, and King's Bluff are names linked with its history.

The Michigan and Wisconsin banners both originated during the Civil War. The Wolverine State emblem was unfurled for the first time at the laying of the cornerstone of the monument in the Soldiers' National Cemetery, Gettysburg, on July 4, 1865.

The California flag was born in the "Bear Flag Revolt" of settlers against the Mexican Government at the Cosumnes River in 1846. During this uprising, which led to the formation of the nation's thirty-first State, the ancestor of the present California banner first replaced the Mexican standard at the pueblo of Sonoma.

* Courtesy of State Mutual Life Assurance Company of America.

L I B E R T Y, 1960
Arizona’s colorful flag, showing the rays of the setting sun, was first flown by the battleship Arizona. Ironically, the battleship was sunk at Pearl Harbor in 1941 by the nation whose flag bears the rising sun.

Other State flags have been designed and selected through contests conducted by various patriotic organizations. The standard of the forty-ninth State, completely different from all others, was drawn in 1927 by Benny Benson, a thirteen-year-old orphan schoolboy of the Jesse Lee Mission Home at Seward, Alaska. His design was chosen as the winner among 142 contestants in a public-school contest conducted by the American Legion. He wrote: "The blue field is for the Alaska sky and the forget-me-not, an Alaskan flower. The North Star is for the future State of Alaska, the most northerly of the Union. The Dipper is for the Great Bear—symbolizing strength."

The Indiana, Illinois, Washington, and Wyoming State flags resulted from contests held within each State by the Daughters of the American Revolution. Washington’s banner, incidentally, is the only one of the fifty with a green background. The bison, or buffalo, once monarch of the Great Plains, still reigns supreme on the Wyoming flag. Appropriately, its design was submitted by a woman from Buffalo, Wyoming.

The flag of our newest State—Hawaii—displays the British Union Jack on its upper corner, out of consideration for Captain Vancouver who, during his voyage around the world in 1794, gave King Kamehameha a British flag. Kamehameha supposedly ceded the Hawaiian Islands (then named the Sandwich Islands) to Great Britain, and he used the British ensign upon occasion, even though no action was ever taken by Britain on the cession. The eight white, red, and blue stripes of the present Hawaiian flag represent the major islands of the group.

Several flags might claim the distinction of being the oldest among the fifty. There is no question, however, that the Lone Star Banner of Texas is the senior official flag. It was formally adopted by the State in 1839 and has remained unchanged ever since. The Maryland emblem, though officially made that State’s emblem as recently as 1904, is nevertheless one of the oldest flags still in use in the world. It bears the arms of the Calvert and Crossland families. Calvert was the family name of the Lords of Baltimore who founded Maryland, while Crossland was the family name of the mother of the first Lord Baltimore.

The Rhode Island standard is also replete with old traditions. Its anchor was first used as a Colony symbol on a seal adopted in 1647. The motto “Hope” was added in 1664 when the government was reorganized under a charter from King Charles II. The Louisiana flag, though not adopted by that State until 1912, has been in use since the War of 1812. It is the tenth banner to fly over Louisiana soil. Oklahoma claims the record in the latter respect, however, as the Oklahoma flag is the fourteenth which the State has seen.

Dates displayed by the Delaware and North Carolina emblems have special historical significance. December 7, 1787, was the day on which Delaware ratified the Federal Constitution, becoming the first State to do so.

The uppermost date on the North Carolina banner refers to the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence from England, adopted at a meeting of the citizens of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, on May 20, 1775.

Much historical controversy has occurred because no contemporary draft of this document has ever been discovered. The lower date commemorates the Halifax Resolves, which empowered delegates from North Carolina "to concur with the delegates of the other Colonies in declaring Independency . . . ."

A former President of the United States described the national ensign as symbolic of the qualities of a great people. "The flag," said Woodrow Wilson, "is the embodiment, not of sentiment, but of history. It represents the experiences made by men and women, the experiences of those who do and live under that flag."

The same can truly be said of the fifty State flags, for each one stands for a fundamental portion of America’s vibrant history.
In the following text the States are arranged in the order in which they were admitted to the Union. The date after the name of each State refers to the official adoption of its present flag. The 51st flag is, of course, that of the District of Columbia. It appears at the end of the text.

DELAWARE—1913—"December 7, 1787" on this flag is the day on which Delaware ratified the Federal Constitution. Because it was the first State to do so, it is given the first position in such national events as presidential inaugurations.

PENNSYLVANIA—1907—The Keystone State's coat of arms, carried by its flag, shows a sailing ship, a plow and three sheaves of grain over the motto, "Virtue, Liberty and Independence." The emblem on the flag dates from the latter part of the 18th century.

NEW JERSEY—1896—The buff background of this banner was derived from the buff facings on the Revolutionary War uniforms of the New Jersey Continental Regiments, specified by orders from General Washington. The flag was displayed at the surrender of Cornwallis' army at Yorktown.

GEORGIA—1956—The Georgia flag, one of the newest of all, combines the Battle Flag of the Confederacy and the State seal. Its thirteen stars correspond in number to the States recognized by the Confederate States Congress.

CONNECTICUT—1897—The three grape vines displayed on the State seal which decorates the Connecticut flag represent the three original settlements of the Nutmeg State—Hartford, Windsor and Wethersfield.

 MASSACHUSETTS—1915—With an Indian warrior on one side and a green pine tree (not shown) on a blue shield on the other, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has one of the few State flags with two distinctly different sides. The Latin motto is translated, "With the sword she seeks peace under liberty."

MARYLAND—1904—One of the oldest flags in the world, the Maryland standard bears the arms of the Calvert and Crossland families. Calvert was the family name of the Lords of Baltimore who founded the State, while Crossland was the family of the mother of the first Lord Baltimore.

SOUTH CAROLINA—1861—The Palmetto State adopted its banner when it withdrew from the Union in 1861. It is the second oldest unchanged official State flag in existence.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—1931—This flag, first adopted in 1909, carried the Granite State's seal; in use since 1784. The seal was redrawn and the flag with the new seal approved in 1931.

VIRGINIA—1930—The flag adopted by Virginia in 1930 has been essentially unchanged since 1831 when it was first raised by Governor John Floyd at the head of a militia force called to quell the Nat Turner insurrection in Southampton County.

NEW YORK—1901—The Great Seal of New York, which decorates its banner, has changed little since its original design in 1777, though there have existed at least six slightly modified official versions since that date.

NORTH CAROLINA—1885—Because of its two dates, this flag carries special interest. The uppermost refers to the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, while the lower commemorates the Halifax Resolves which empowered delegates from North Carolina "to concur with the delegates of the other Colonies in declaring Independence. . . . "

RHODE ISLAND—1897—The anchor was first used as a Colony symbol of the official seal adopted in 1647, and the motto "Hope" was added in 1664 when the government was organized under a charter from King Charles II.

VERMONT—1923—The 14th State in the Union, Vermont has had three State banners since 1803. The first two were originally patterned after the national emblem with alternating red and white stripes. The present flag carries the State's coat of arms.

KENTUCKY—1918—Though authorized in 1918, an actual Blue Grass State banner was not made until some ten years later by an art teacher in the Frankfort schools. The lower portion of the seal is encircled by goldenrod, the State flower.

TENNESSEE—1905—Tennessee's three stars denote the fact that it was the third State to enter the Union after the first thirteen colonies. They also represent the three political divisions of the State which were organized at different times in its history.
OHIO—1902—Ohio is the only State with a pennant-shaped flag, or " burgee," as it is correctly called. The Buckeye banner was originally designed to fly over the Ohio building at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York, in 1901.

LOUISIANA—1912—The Louisiana flag with its group of pelicans has been used since the War of 1812, though not officially adopted until 100 years later. At least ten different flags have flown over the territory.

INDIANA—1917—A prize-winning design in a D.A.R. contest, the Indiana flag was adopted as part of the State's Centennial celebration. The outer circle of thirteen stars represents the original States; the inner semi-circle of five stars, the next five States admitted to the Union. Indiana was the nineteenth State.

MISSISSIPPI—1894—The Mississippi banner is one of six State flags that use only the red, white and blue of the national emblem. Its thirteen stars stand for the original States of the Union.

ILLINOIS—1915—The Illinois flag was the winning design selected from 35 entries submitted in a contest by various D.A.R. chapters within the State.

ALABAMA—1895—The Cross of St. Andrew appears on Alabama's present flag. An earlier version carried a cotton plant in flower with a rattlesnake at its roots about to spring into action. Beneath the plant were the Latin words, "Noli Me Tangere"—"Don't Tread on Me."

MAINE—1909—The Maine flag is unusual in at least one respect. Though not shown in this illustration, a fringe for the flag to be two and one-half inches wide was prescribed by law. "Dirigo" means "I direct."

MISSOURI—1913—A flag, of the design finally adopted, was made and submitted to the State legislature in 1909, but failed to get immediate approval. Although this first flag was destroyed in a fire at the capitol in 1911, its features were accepted two years later.

ARKANSAS—1913—The three blue stars below the name "Arkansas" represent the three nations, Spain, France and the United States, to whom Arkansas has successively belonged.

MICHIGAN—1911—The first official flag of Michigan, similar to the present emblem, was adopted in 1865 and unfurled for the first time at the laying of the cornerstone of the monument in the Soldiers' National Cemetery, Gettysburg, on July 4, 1865.

FLORIDA—1900—The State seal in the center of Florida's banner pictures a cocoa tree, a steamboat, and an Indian maiden scattering flowers. The seal was adopted in 1868.

TENNESSEE—1939—The Lone Star banner is the oldest of the official State flags, adopted in the first half of the 19th century and unchanged since then.

IOWA—1921—"Our Liberties We Prize and Our Rights We Will Maintain," reads the motto on Iowa's flag, an adaptation of a design made during the First World War for use by State regiments.

WISCONSIN—1913—The Wisconsin legislature in 1863 adopted a State flag with the Badger State coat of arms on one side and the U.S. coat of arms on the other. After the Civil War the Wisconsin National Guard used a different flag, and the legislature in 1887 inadvertently repealed the 1863 law. The present standard was made official 26 years later.

CALIFORNIA—1911—The Californian flag was born from the "Bear Flag Revolt" of settlers against the Mexican government at the Cosumnes River in 1846. The early flag, similar to its modern cousin, first replaced the Mexican standard at the pueblo of Sonoma.

MINNESOTA—1957—Minnesota boasts the newest design of all the State flags. The 1893 version was discarded because its bulk and two separate sides (each of a different color) made it liable to wind damage and too expensive to manufacture.

OREGON—1925—Oregon is another of those few States whose banners have a different design on each side. Not shown here is the reverse side with its Oregon beaver, symbol of the fur trade which opened the great northwest. 1859 is the year Oregon came into the Union.

KANSAS—1927—The flower on Kansas' flag is a sunflower. The motto, "Ad Astra Per Aspera," means "To the stars through difficulties." The scene is representative of early Kansas history.
WEST VIRGINIA—1929—Typifying the independent spirit that was responsible for forging the State from the chaos of the Civil War, the West Virginia flag carries the motto "Montani Semper Liberi," which means "Mountaineers always freemen."

NEVADA—1929—Showing its name in an unusual design around a star, Nevada's banner displays two sprays of sagebrush. "Battle Born" refers to the State's entry to the Union during the Civil War.

NEBRASKA—1925—The date on the flag of the Cornhusker State, March 1, 1867, is the date Nebraska was admitted to the Union. The motto on its seal is "Equality Before Law."

COLORADO—1911—The present flag of Colorado does not conform exactly to the State laws which authorize it. The law stipulated a "C" of smaller size than that actually in use. "C" stands, not only for Colorado, but also for Centennial State, its nickname due to its admission to the Union in 1876.

NORTH DAKOTA—1911—Of unknown origin, this banner was carried through thirty-seven engagements by the First North Dakota Infantry during the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection.

SOUTH DAKOTA—1909—South Dakota's nickname can be read from its flag, which carries the State seal on its reverse side. Design of this flag was started by a Black Hills pioneer, a member of Teddy Roosevelt's "Rough Riders."

MONTANA—1905—The State seal carried by the Montana flag shows mining equipment, a gold pan and a plow, while the background shows the mountains from which the State derives its name. "Oro y Plata" refers to the gold and silver found in the State.

WASHINGTON—1923—The only State flag with a green background, Washington's flag was designed by that State's organization eight years before its official adoption.

IDAHO—1927—State law forbids all military organizations within the Idaho boundaries from carrying any flag except the national and State banners. The flag shows the State coat of arms.

WYOMING—1917—Once monarch of the Great Plains, the bison or buffalo still reigns supreme on the Wyoming banner. The flag design was the result of a D.A.R. contest, and, appropriately enough, was submitted by a woman from Buffalo, Wyoming.

How BIGOTED Can a Man Get And Still Be Legal?

DONALD F. HAYNES

SOUND STIMULATING? Let's make the question even more so by inserting a few other words of equal uncleanness in the question and asking it again. How intolerant can a man get and still be legal? How prejudiced? How discriminatory?

First off, let's see what we are talking about when we use these words:

Bigotry—state of one obstinately or intolerantly devoted to his own church, party, belief, or opinion. Legal—lawful.

Discrimination—quality of distinguishing between or against.

Intolerance—incapacity to endure.

Prejudice—preconceived judgment or opinion.

Notice that in not one of these definitions is there any suggestion of an overt act. They are all concerned with how a man thinks or refuses to think. So they are all quite legal, for there is no law in the United States
against thinking. They run afoul of the law when the thinking, straight or otherwise, starts the tongue chattering maliciously, the legs running, or the fists flying; when the bigotry or prejudice or discrimination hurts people in general or one person in particular; or the government, and thereby breaks the laws, but not the laws against bigotry or prejudice or discrimination, for there are none, at least not in the Constitution. The word is not even mentioned there once. They are rather those laws that are enacted to protect people from violence, slander, et cetera.

A bigot violates the law when he implements his bigotry and breaks the laws that society establishes to protect people.

How bigoted can one get, then, and still be legal? Quite bigoted. In fact, all-the-way bigoted. This is because law, American law that is, does not attempt to deal with a man's thoughts or beliefs. In America thought is not contraband. There is no bounty on thinking. A man's thinking gets him into trouble with the law only when it produces actions contrary to the law. The law does not deal with thinking but with overt acts, with what a man does.

Under the American system every man is free to think, to decide, to choose for himself, even to be a bigot. He does not have to give account to any man, to the courts, or to the Government for what he thinks. Only to God.

For example, it is quite legal for one to think against Kennedy because he is a Catholic, just as it is legal, too, for one to think against Nixon because he is a Quaker, or against Humphrey because he is from Minnesota, or against Symington because he talks about a missile gap, or against Rockefeller because he is wealthy.

This November citizens will go into the voting booth (at least they should) and vote for some candidate for President. In that voting booth they will be free to line up their prejudices, pass them in grand array before their mind, and on this or some other basis make a decision.

But no one will be free to throw a rock through the front or back window of the home of any of these candidates, or any other men, in implementing his prejudice.

If discrimination and prejudice per se are wrong, and not only in their implementation, then we are all wrong. And we should be restrained by law if necessary when we discriminate against cauliflower and choose instead to eat bananas; when we discriminate against the bleachers and choose instead to sit in the grandstand; when we discriminate against every female or male, except one among the world's one billion odd of each gender, and then step to the altar and marry that one.

To say that we must abolish bigotry, discrimination, intolerance, or prejudice by law is at once both futile and dangerous. It becomes futile when we remind ourselves that we are all quite intolerant of roaches, insomnia, and war. But if we should enact a law abolishing them, this in itself would not, could not, really abolish them. These things and many, many others like them, or worse, spring from filth, degeneration, and the very nature of man.

It becomes dangerous in that having passed such a law, many of us would consider the matter closed. Acting on the assumption that there never could be another roach, sleepless night, or war, we would call in or off all pesticides, sleeping pills, doctors, and armaments, and thus give them carte blanche to do their worst.

No, bigotry cannot be abolished by law. Only by a change in the nature of man. And this is a change that does not lie within the purview of earthly governments to make. Governments that legislate against it have only taken a step toward despotic thought control.

Until changed by the Spirit of God and brought into harmony with a higher and holier law, man must continue his bigoted way. And bigotry must continue to be as legal as it is ugly.
FEW MONTHS AGO Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania signed a bill hiking the fine for Sunday-law violation from $4 to $100 for the first offense and $200 for the second. Explained the governor: "There has been growing dissatisfaction in the disturbance of Sunday observance. . . . I am signing the bill because I think it represents the will of the majority of our people that Sunday be observed as a day of rest." (No mention was made of the rights of the minority.)

Of course the governor's signature didn't settle the matter, because the State Assembly, in its role as conscience for all citizens, had to decide which activities desecrate the Lord's day and which do not. After months of debate they have now decided to revive the old law, first enacted in 1794, and permit Sunday golf, tennis, shooting at inanimate targets, picnicking, swimming, and perhaps bowling. These activities though forbidden were widely practiced.

The majority wants it this way, says the governor. How William Penn would groan at such carryings-on in his Sylvania, haven of dissenters! The doughty Quaker spent a good share of his earthly existence bucking the will of the majority, asserting his own and others' rights to believe or disbelieve how and what they jolly well pleased. Penn himself, no less, was arrested after his return to England for riding horseback on a business errand on Sunday, and as a matter of principle, chose to go to jail rather than to pay the fine.

If unchecked majority rule is to reign from now on, then certain constitutional guarantees we have long taken for granted are well on their way down the drain. The Bill of Rights presupposes a dissenting minority, and states that in certain areas—among them religious faith and practice—the majority has no power over the minority. In sundry colonies it was the will of the majority that consigned to Gehenna and to the whipping post Catholic priests, Quakers, witches, users of profanity, nonbaptizers of infants, nonchurch attenders, those who shoot squirrels on Sunday, and all other types of profane and wicked persons. Presumably, most Americans no longer favor this type of majority domination.

At least a few voices have been raised against this would-be regression to the saintly barbarism of early Colonial days. State Senator Joseph J. Yosko called Pennsylvania's Sunday law "obsolete, ridiculous, unenforceable, and a mockery to justice." And last year State Senator Clyde L. Miller of Utah observed that his State Sunday bill, if made into law, would make it impossible to buy baby food on Sunday while allowing the baby's father to run out for beer. Utah's Gov. George Dewey Clyde finally vetoed the bill because of possible economic and moral issues involved, such as the fact that it would force some minority groups to work only five days a week while competitors worked six. (See Liberty, Fourth Quarter, 1959, pp. 5-7.) The State senate voted 13 to 12 to override the veto, failing by four votes of the necessary two thirds. And now the United States Supreme Court has decided to take another look at blue laws.

Why the widespread resurrection of long-dormant Sunday laws? The revival of interest in religion, the Communist threat, the crime problem, the craze for conformity, and other factors apparently have their influence. One of the chief arguments is, in essence: "Ours is a Christian nation, but threatened by Communism without and secularism and moral rot within. To sur-
It's one thing to invite men aboard the "blue-law bandwagon"; quite another to grind them under the "Lord's Day steam roller."

... vive we must get back to God. To get back to God we must go to church Sunday. To get everybody out to church Sunday we must close down the competition."

As a Lord's Day Alliance poster says, "Our family worships together since our merchants close on Sunday."

The inference seems to be that as long as a store here or there is open, people prefer the store. And the presence in society of a minority of nonconformist Mordecais at the gate seems to be most obnoxious, Bill of Rights or no.

Before we turn back the clock three hundred years and get further enmeshed in religious legislation, we would do well to take a second glance at some of the implications of this kind of law:

First, Sunday laws are frightfully inconsistent with and repugnant to the genius of Americanism with its dedication to the Four Freedoms. Most Americans, both Protestant and Catholic, hope that the freedom they enjoy may be extended to other parts of the world. Can they, then, heedless of minority customs and beliefs in their own country, afford to run the Lord's day steam roller over all who have not the same veneration for the day as they?

It is no less than amazing how Americans who humbly pride themselves on being spiritual heirs of Roger Williams can so easily hop aboard the blue-law bandwagon. Do they not know that one of the offenses for which Williams was to be punished in Massachusetts was (as reported in Governor Winthrop's journal) that he "had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the Sabbath, nor any other [religious] offense"? Have they not heard that in 1647 the General Assembly, swayed by Williams' influence, adopted a law that closed with the words: "All men may walk as their consciences persuade them, without molestation—every one in the name of his God"? Are they not aware that Rhode Island knew no Sunday law till 1679, when enough Puritans had moved into the colony to overrule Williams?

Second, most Americans, Christian and non-Christian alike, deplore anti-Semitism, at least in other countries. But what can so effectively hobble the Orthodox Jews' social, commercial, and religious life in this country as a rigorously enforced Sunday law? In Nebraska the Jews recently mobilized to kill a threatening Sunday law sponsored by Protestants. In New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts the battle lines between Jew and Gentile have been rather sharply drawn over Sunday sales of kosher foods, among other issues. In Atlantic City citizens held a meeting, led by Finkle, Fiore, Councilman Isaac Goldberg, and Abe Roth, to inaugurate the raising of $10,000 to combat a Sunday-law bill.

In addition, Sunday laws have repeatedly proved to be discriminatory and arbitrary. It is safe to say that they are innately so. In New Jersey a Sunday law prohibiting the sale of home and office furniture, appliances, clothing, and building materials was slapped on all but...
three counties. These were excluded in order to protect resort trade, until Judge Everett M. Scherer of the Superior Court ruled the law invalid. "The [law's] effect," he said, "is to make criminal certain acts to be performed on Sunday by citizens of 18 counties, while granting immunity for the same acts to the citizens of Atlantic, Cape May, and Ocean counties." More recently a local-option type of Sunday law has been enacted in the State.

A bill introduced in Pennsylvania would prohibit selling meat, groceries, and produce. Stores employing fewer than three persons, or members of the owners' immediate families, would be exempt. Well wrote the psalmist, of children, "Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them," because among other things he could operate a pretty good-sized store on Sunday without running afoul of the sheriff, whereas his barren neighbor could not.

Under present Connecticut law you may sell "bakery products, fresh agricultural and horticultural products, newspapers and magazines, drugs, antiques, motor vehicles or repair equipment, eggs and gasoline." Selling antiques somehow does not desecrate the "Sabbath," but don't you get caught selling undergraded furniture! More Sunday laws would further glut our courts, already swamped with cases ranging from overparking to murder. They would make criminals of law-abiding citizens who happen to be religious nonconformists. They would put men of the cloth into the position of Pharisees, who followed the Nazarene and His disciples around to see if they toed the line in the matter of their Sabbath laws and traditions.

Sunday laws, supposedly designed to increase the righteousness that exal'teth a nation, are actually self-defeating. How much righteousness is added when a man respects the "Christian Sabbath" only in order to stay out of jail?

Finally, what has happened to "equal protection of laws" if Jew and freethinker, Buddhist and Catholic, General Six-Principle Baptist and Episcopalian alike must give account to the governments of the several States for the personal use made of the day on which Christ rose from the dead?

Blue-law sponsors, aware of traditional opposition toward church-state amalgamation, have often disguised Sunday bills as social, not religious, legislation. "Ought not every man to have one day in seven free?" they ask. Of course, but why must that day be Sunday? Why not simply one day in seven, letting each man choose his day? This would definitely remove the religious onus from the bills. A one-day-in-seven law is a social law. But, of course, this would not fill the pew on Sunday, so the Sunday-law spokesmen will have none of it. The day must be Sunday and no other, they say, so the issue remains a religious one.

"We will not work on Sunday," says a Lord's Day Leader sermon, "whether it be as a clerk in a store or putting in a new lawn about our home. This is a special day. We will not do our shopping or scrub the kitchen floor on this day. Why? Because making this day like the other six denies our relationship to God, and reduces our life to a routine materialistic pointlessness." 10

This is fine, provided the Sundaykeeper does not go to the law to coerce those who have already refrained on Saturday, the day before, from putting in new lawns about their homes, and from scrubbing their kitchen floors, in order not to reduce their lives to a routine materialistic pointlessness. It is fine, provided the Sundaykeeper refrain from forcing the agnostic—who perhaps wants to reduce his life to materialistic pointlessness—to abstain from putting in a new lawn around his house, et cetera.

It would be hard to improve upon Benjamin Franklin's familiar observation to Dr. Price: "When religion is good, it will take care of itself; when it is not able to take care of itself, and God does not see fit to take care of it, so that it has to appeal to the civil power for support, it is evidence to my mind that its cause is a bad one."

REFERENCES

5 Ibid., May 21, 1959.
8 Ibid., April 21, 1959.
9 Ibid., March 9, 1959.

I have always believed that the First Amendment is the keystone of our Government, that the freedoms it guarantees provide the best insurance against destruction of all freedom.

—Justice Hugo L. Black, in Dennis et al. v. United States, 341 U.S. 494 (1951)

The right to profess a heresy of any character on any theme, is an essential element of a liberal society. The liberal stands ready to defend the honest heretic, no matter what his views, against any attempt to curb him. It is enough that the heretic pays the price of unpopularity which he cannot avoid. In some respects each of us is a heretic, but a liberal society can impose no official orthodoxy of belief, disagreement with which entails loss of liberty or life.

7. Principles of Relationship Between Religions and Public Education

a. Aspects of Religion. Discussion of the relation of religions and public education may be clarified by distinguishing on the one hand certain aspects of religion which ought to be reserved to the home and church, and on the other hand those aspects which may be dealt with appropriately in the public school.

Characteristic elements of religion include (1) worship and commitment to God as He is understood in one’s particular religious heritage, (2) beliefs and the idea structure of the particular faith, and (3) an ethical code.

Religion expressed in terms of commitment and inculcation of beliefs and idea structure is essentially sectarian, doctrinal, dogmatic, or ecclesiastical. Religion so conceived is primarily the province of homes and churches separately and together, where it may be affirmed in terms rich with historic meaning and in claims of faith that quicken and challenge. The teaching for commitment to sectarian and ecclesiastical concepts, proselyting, recruitment for church membership, specific instruction in dogma, doctrine, ritual—these are not the function of public schools, but of the church, the home, and voluntary agencies. The public schools observing the limits of their assigned task appropriately cooperate in a reasonable arranging of school schedules and programs, to permit parents and churches to meet their respective responsibilities for specifically religious instruction.

Expressing one’s religion through ethical conduct is a functional outworking of one’s belief and commitment. In these terms religion is functional and not sectarian.

b. Desired Behavior. There is substantial agreement upon what kind of individual and group behavior is wanted. The same behavioral goals for pupils may be sought by school and church, and interpreted differently by each. For example, both school and church seek to develop pupils who are committed to the practice of brotherhood. The school teaches the practice of brotherhood as a part of the democratic ideal. The church teaches brotherly love as a response to the command of God to love one’s neighbor. Church and school may and should interpret their behavioral goals in ways which reveal common elements, and thus strengthen the appeal to the pupil.

But church and school must each be free to interpret its own role with integrity. Whereas the church’s ultimate concern goes beyond strengthening democracy, the school’s primary concern is limited to the tasks assigned by modern society. The public school is out of character when it becomes involved in defending or rejecting the theological claims of religious groups.

Again, persons of different commitments may agree on what is desirable conduct while disagreeing on the developing acceptable ethical judgments and conduct is the joint concern of home, church, public school and community. Each should reinforce the other in helping the pupil develop the kind of behavior which most Americans consider necessary to the development of a free society.

Wide-spread usage and the significant content of such terms as "ethical character" and "moral and spiritual values" suggest that there is some common ground, not only among religious people who are convinced that the highest quality of personality emerges only when vital religious faith is at the center, but also between religious people and those who deny the presuppositions of religion. Churches in the main support the common stress upon the importance of "moral and spiritual values." Agreement on importance is helpful. George Washington saw reason to say long ago, "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports... And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

[Liberty continues publication of the major portion of the study document prepared by the Committee on Religion and Public Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Part one dealt with six convictions that influenced the study group’s thinking—Differences and Agreements; the Child, Education, a Shared Responsibility; Tax-Supported Schools; Other Schools; Separation of Church and State. A seventh conviction is now discussed.—Ed.]
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sanctions for that conduct. The secular humanist may practice brotherhood as an expression of a purely human value, while the committed Christian practices brotherly love because the prior love of Christ calls it forth.

c. **Factual Information.** In a pluralistic society the school has a significant and interpretive function to perform regarding the nature of such a society. Where germane to subject matter, it should provide factual information, about religious movements that have influenced the development of our free institutions. It should foster good intergroup relations by seeking to help pupils appreciate the kind of diversity that exists within our culture. The school should encourage in the child a spirit of free inquiry. It is not the public school's task directly to try to secure a specific religious commitment.

d. **Sanctions Are Important.** In teaching and advocating values which religious persons see as outcomes of religious faith, the school should (1) be aware of the multiple sanctions for these values accepted in our society; (2) recognize that religious persons see these values in ways which allow for the addition of sanctions of religious faith. The school should not teach that the values alone are important, and that the question of sanctions is unimportant. Rather, pupils should be encouraged to adopt for themselves those values and sanctions which provide maximum meaning.

In many public schools there is an attempt to maintain a strict silence not only in regard to the different claims of particular faiths, but also concerning question of whether or not God exists. This silence is often mistaken for neutrality, or even for objectivity. The practical effect may be to give support to the charge by some that religious questions have no importance and that religion itself does not count. On those occasions when silence should be maintained, the silence should be interpreted as a recognition that questions about the nature of God are beyond the province of the public schools, and pupils should be referred to their homes and churches. A mistaken interpretation of separation of church and state may result in attacks upon religious freedom, since intelligent understanding of the issues involved is avoided. When pupils receive the impression (however mistaken it may be) that this avoidance comes out of the deliberate or militant desires of their teachers, they find themselves in the position of having to affirm or deny a sectarian secularism, which could be in effect a new type of "established religion."

Fairness in a pluralistic society requires an entirely different attitude in the classroom. The practical implications of a pluralistic society prohibit public schools from inculcating belief in God, and they require that a child be encouraged to explore religious questions and to seek for religious understanding. The child should be acquainted with the fact that the majority of our people have believed in God and that our greatest men were often men of deep faith. He should ask why our governments, local, state and national, have professed belief in God and acted upon it. He should be encouraged to seek after and appropriate for himself values and sanctions providing maximum meaning, and be brought to see the need for commitment to the highest source of good that he can discover. It must be made clear that the sanctions of faith, its consequences and institutional expressions—cardinal articles of faith for the believer—are left to the teaching and nurturing ministries of home and church where properly they belong, and where they can be transmitted and interpreted most effectively. Differences between the affirmations of members of particular faiths emphasize a point upon which they all agree, that religious beliefs are important. This children in public schools may learn.

In all of this, freedom of belief must be preserved. The rights of minorities, however small, must always be a matter for solicitous concern. Although the school is under obligation to reflect faithfully the life and culture of a total community overwhelmingly committed to the preservation of American democracy based on the theistic faith, it must respect the personal and civil rights of the child or family of unpopular religious or political views so long as they do not clash with public morality. The school sustains the basic views that our democratic institutions should be upheld, respected, served, defended and improved. The school should not pursue any trend toward a non-religious view of life. Attempts to dominate public schools by a sectarian view of life are also to be avoided. Each child must be protected from embarrassment because of his faith or lack of it. No preference, overt or implied, of one religious group over another should be tolerated.

e. **Public Schools Are for All.** The schools exist for all the people, Protestants, Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Jews, unbelievers and all others. Churches must avoid pressure upon the school to do what it cannot do. Parents and churches must go on from there, nurturing and teaching separately and together as their own understanding of God requires. If the public schools can declare their identity of purpose with the governments which created them and with the people who support them, they have done enough. More should not be expected.

f. **Obligations of Teachers.** Christian teachers may have temptations to make of the school a church and of the classroom an evangelistic hall. The more complete the commitment of the teacher, the more powerful his temptation, because of the evangelistic and missionary nature of the Christian faith. But the teacher must remember that the public school is not the proper place for attempts to win converts to his faith, or any faith, however commonly held. That must be done within the church, home, and community. In the public school classroom, the teacher has obligations to all the parents and taxpayers for the defined and limited purposes of public education.

*(To be continued)*
"Baltimore (AP).—Baltimore residents may cut their lawns with a power mower on Sundays if it's quiet and they don't have to push it much.

"That was the gist of a two-page opinion by the attorney general's office after Magistrate Milton Saul asked if use of power mowers and the labor that goes with it violated the Sunday laws.

"The opinion said a magistrate would have to determine the facts in each particular case, deciding if the mower made 'loud and unseemly noises' and if the pushing was hard enough to constitute bodily labor."

The foregoing dispatch raises some interesting questions while posing what would seem to be well-nigh insuperable problems for even "will-lawndered" magistrates. I came to this conclusion last Sunday afternoon when with one ear cocked toward Baltimore I fired up my two and three-quarter Briggs-Stratton and had a go at our back forty—forty feet. (I never mow in the mornings for fear of awakening dozing congregations. I am guided in this partly by the golden rule and partly by the feeling that a preacher should bear his own responsibility for keeping his audience awake.)

Take that phrase "loud and unseemly noises," for example. I once knew a fragile damsel of ancient vintage to whom the sound of a dropped stitch reverberated like a thunderclap. She habitually wore clothing of subdued shades, for even colors were to her "loud." A current acquaintance, on the other hand, wears checkered neckties and strains the endurance of would-be communicants, even with his hearing aid turned up high.

Now, it is probable that even magistrates have varying sensitivities to noise. A mower with a gentle purr might be a cacophony to one, while the throaty roar of a wide-open three-horsepower motor would sound like a symphony of hummingbird wings to another—which might mean that a Bureau-of-Sound Standards will have to be set up for magistrates confronted with the challenge of justice for all operators of lawn mowers. Those magistrates who wear hearing aids, if not disqualified immediately, will have to settle on a standard setting—though this will have to be varied, depending on the altitude of the yard, for sound travels faster in a thinner atmosphere than at ground level. A mower permissible from a noise standpoint at sea level might produce quite a sonic boom in an alpine meadow.

This brings up another question: "Does the speed at which a mower is pushed have anything to do with the sound?" All schoolboys know that a jet pushed through the sound barrier "packs quite a wallop." Anyway, none of my neighbors pushes his mower faster than a fox trot, so we will lay this fear to rest, though the conscientious magistrate will want to be informed on the matter.

Speaking of my fox-trotting neighbor reminds me that I have a waltz-time mower just up the block. One might conclude that the fox trotter undoubtedly expends "bodily labor" while the waltz-time mower likely does not. But such is not necessarily the case; the conscientious magistrate will not be content with snap judgments.

Take Mrs. G, the fox trotter, for instance. She just kind of leans on her mower—when one totes 230 top-heavy pounds, that is all it takes to mow a lawn. But scrawny Mr. H has to fling his 135 pounds at the mower with gay abandon to guillotine his crab grass.
Does this mean that leaner citizens will be penalized for their leanness by the attorney general’s ruling? What an encouragement that would be to the unpatriotically corpulent!

Now Mrs. G sometimes gets her husband to leave off his Sunday round of golf to mow the lawn, which brings me back to the subject of “loud and unseemly noises,” which Mr. G makes whenever this happens. He generally aims these at his wife, but some get by. Though not of the same metallic quality as those produced by the mower, they nevertheless appear to be produced by internal combustion, and thus may come within the purview of the heretofore-mentioned conscientious magistrate. And everyone knows that crab grass cuts louder than clover. (This problem may not fit in this paragraph, but you know how crab grass is.)

I now tackle the matter of the contour of the lawn, which under the Maryland attorney general’s ruling may become important for more than drainage. In our back yard there is one spot where the bulldozer operator covered over a stump instead of uprooting it. I usually mow this spot while I am still fresh. In determining whether bodily labor is involved, will the qualified magistrate henceforth have to consider not only the mower operator’s contour but also that of his lawn?

Actually, I wouldn’t be surprised if this whole issue turns out to be a plot engineered by the self-propelled mower people. They’ve been trying to take all bodily labor out of mowing for some time now. Or again, the electric-mower people could be behind this—their mowers are silent except when the cord gets cut in half, at which time “loud and unseemly noises” come from somewhere behind the handle.

To be sure, I cannot claim to give an unbiased opinion on this Sunday mowing matter, for not only do I rest on Saturday but I have a freedom-biased ear as well. Just a moment ago, for example, my mower choke jammed and the engine died. Its agony sounded to me for all the world like the “unseemly” death rattle of strangled freedom.

To me, application of the attorney general’s ruling would appear to serve but one good purpose—unless, of course, an anticrab-grass rider could be written into the law, in which case it would serve two—and that is to demonstrate the futility of applying blue laws to green grass.

R. R. H.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION REAFFIRMS POSITION ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

THREE EMPHATIC RESOLUTIONS, dealing with personal liberties, public education, and national elections, have come out of the recent American Baptist Convention. They stem from the Baptist conviction that religious liberty is more than a social expediency to adjust religious differences; it is rather the doctrine of those who believe that man’s relationship with God is a personal matter not subject to human legislation or administration.

Viewing religion’s role in the rise of nationalism overseas, the convention warns new countries against the establishment of a state religion or the emergence of a church-state relationship where “either the church or state can use the other for its advantage.” The personal rights of citizens may be trampled upon and minority groups denied basic religious freedoms as young nations struggle for internal unity. “We view with apprehension any denial of the free exercise of conscience,” the report continues.

On the matter of elections the convention has drawn a fine line—and we believe correctly—between the basic democratic right of any citizen to seek public office and the right of citizenship to evaluate his qualifications for that office. No barrier as to “race, creed, color or sex” should inhibit the quest for public office. But, the resolution says, “A man’s religious belief influences his views on public affairs.” Therefore “it is not only our right, but our duty to determine how various candidates stand on all issues of American life.”

The third item, the most strongly worded of all, urges “all Baptists to resist encroachment upon tax funds” by sectarian or private interests. Not only are all forms of financial aid by government to such groups condemned, but the Baptists urge a positive program involving “a continuing inquiry into the preservation and development of a strong system of public school education, and urge the study of, and action in opposition to, forces that may make this preservation difficult.”

These forthright declarations are in harmony with the precious and practical philosophy of the separation of church and state. We believe with the American Baptist Convention that the healthiest climate for the development of a new nation is one in which each individual has the right “to exercise freedom of conscience and to promote and practice his religion.” We also believe that in the choice of candidates for office, the electorate must evaluate more than personality or political experience, and must study “the public statements and voting records of the various candidates.”

And we join wholeheartedly in the staunch stand of this convention against attempts by sectarians to secure public funds for “free text books, salaries of teachers, and purchase, building or repair of property of private and parochial schools.” We do not deny the right of religious bodies and other groups to operate their own schools, but we firmly believe that these schools must not look to public funds for their support.

DON YOST

No man must feel that his religion is tolerated. His constitutional “right of conscience” should be indefeasible and beyond the control or interference of men.

—Kaplan v. Independent School District of Virginia
UNITED STATES

STRATEGY BASED ON CATHOLIC VOTE

U.S. News and World Report for August carried confirmation of a long-time Protestant claim: There is a Roman Catholic vote in America. Source of the report? Backers of Senator John F. Kennedy. According to U.S. News, the report was prepared during the 1956 preconvention campaign, was used then, and was used during the recent convention activities in Los Angeles, California.

The U.S. News story indicates there are 14 pivotal Catholic States with 261 electoral votes where Democratic elections are won or lost. These 14 States are also considered "Democratic" States. Since 1940 these States have played key roles in each Democratic Presidential victory or defeat. Thus:

"—In 1940, 13 of these States with 240 electoral votes went Democratic, *without which the Democrats would have lost the election* (emphasis theirs).

"—In 1944, 12 of these States with 221 electoral votes went Democratic, *without which the Democrats would have lost the election* (emphasis theirs).

"—In 1948, 8 of these States with 125 electoral votes went Democratic, *without which the Democrats would have lost the election* (emphasis theirs).

"—In 1952 none of these States went Democratic. All 261 of their electoral votes went to Eisenhower, thus making possible the first Republican victory in 24 years."

U.S. News makes clear that contrary to Catholic-voiced emphasis there is a Catholic vote to which an appeal can be made. Kennedy forces in the United States will make a direct appeal to the real Catholic vote in these 14 key States in their effort to win the Presidency.

BIBLE STORYLAND RIDES CANCELED

Cucamonga, California.—Protestant church leaders' objections have caused promoters of the proposed Bible Storyland amusement park to drop plans for three "rides" that were considered most offensive.

Abandoned were the "Garden of Eden," "Ride to Heaven," and "Dante's Inferno."
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AMISH LEADERS PLEAD FOR SCHOOLS

Columbus, Ohio.—Fourteen Ohio Amish leaders have asked the State to permit the sect to operate its schools without interference by educative authorities. Anything else, said an attorney for the Amish, would be an unconstitutional infringement of religious freedom.

Headed by Amish Bishop Neil Hershberger of Burton, the group defended their school system before a committee of the legislature and suggested that Ohio follow Pennsylvania's example in administering tests which they said would show Amish children's education is equal to that of public school children.

"We believe in education that will teach the children to lead moral, Christian, God-fearing lives," Bishop Hershberger told the committee. "We will not ask subsidies or handouts from government," he added. "We help our neighbors when we can."

Attorney Joseph H. Dush of Willard maintained that the law for revoking schools' charters lacks "the usual rights and protections" guaranteed Americans and involves the question of religious freedom.

The Amish school problem began nearly ten years ago when isolated prosecutions were started against Amish parents on charges of violating a State compulsory school attendance law by sending their children to private schools with standards below State requirements.

The serious-faced Amish may want to operate their schools without State interference, but they have recently become reconciled to polio shots. Here the family of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Stoltzfus watch as their 8-year-old son Jonathon gets his Salk shot from Dr. Paul W. Herr, Quarryville, Pennsylvania. Father Leroy looks on while mamma waits with Rachel, 6, and Daniel, 7.
AUSTRIA

CZECHS PUBLISH ANTIRELIGION SERIES

Vienna.—Government publishers in Communist Czechoslovakia have begun printing a whole series of antireligious books intended to "help freethinkers and atheists in their campaigns."

According to Prague Radio, first of the series was a book by Heinrich Fuchs entitled "Is the Bible True?" which "illustrates the antiprogressive attitude of the churches by extensively analyzing Biblical documents."

The second book, Prague Radio reported, was one by Soviet writer Ivan Lendman entitled "The Origin of Christianity." It said this work "deals with church crimes in the early centuries of Christianity."

BURMA

BUDDHISM FEARED AS STATE RELIGION

Rangoon.—Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Moslems in Burma have expressed strong fears that the proposed establishment of Buddhism as the state religion would cause serious discrimination to members of other faiths.

The Protestant Christian Council declared that a state religion is "diametrically opposed to the modern democratic ideal of separation between religion and the state." It pointed out that the founders of the union (of Burma) and authors of the constitution "ensured that each individual citizen should have an equal standing and an equal share in all state interests and activities, and that religion is a matter of private individuals and religious bodies, not that of the state."

The Protestant group stressed that adequate clarifications have not been given in the proposal about safeguarding and upholding the fundamental rights and freedoms of non-Buddhist citizens as guaranteed by the existing constitution. It said further that such action may lead to a "retrogade step" against national unity.

Promotion of Buddhism, the Christian Council added, can be better served and achieved by the efforts and on the responsibility of religious bodies rather than by the state.

Archbishops Victor Bazin of Rangoon and John Joseph U Win of Mandalay in their joint statement said that while the Catholic Church is not "hostile" to the idea of establishing a state religion, they fear that policies such as preferential selection of political candidates on the basis of knowledge of Buddhism, as indicated in a Commission questionnaire, would discriminate against members of other faiths. They also felt that the same person should not be the Minister of Education and of Religious Affairs.

The All Burma Burmese Moslem Youth League announced it objected to the entire concept of Buddhism as the state religion. At a mass meeting, Moslems of the town of Pegu adopted a resolution opposing the move.

CANADA

MAGISTRATE ACQUITS RELIGIOUS "NUISANCE"

Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan.—A magistrate has ruled that shouts of "Praise the Lord" and "Amen" during services are not offenses under the law.

He acquitted Dave Van Ness of Erwood, Saskatchewan, who was charged with disturbing a religious service in the Apostolic church.

Mr. Van Ness, the father of eight children, brought his whole family to court for the hearing and before testifying in his own defense, insisted on leading the court in prayer. On several occasions he had to be restrained from quoting lengthy passages of Scripture.

Pastor Maurice Fuller testified that at times during church services when members were called on to recount their Christian experiences, Mr. Van Ness would monopolize the floor. He said the governing body of the church had already ruled that Mr. Van Ness could not speak during services or take part in church activities.

Undaunted by the ban, Mr. Van Ness at a subsequent service began to shout "Praise the Lord" and "Amen." The pastor abandoned the service.

The magistrate said the defendant was "a religious fanatic" and agreed he could be a nuisance to other members of the church, but declared he was not a law-breaker.

GERMANY

PROTESTANTS PROTEST MAP

Nuremberg.—Evangelical authorities in Nuremberg have asked the municipal government to halt the sale of a new city map, which they say is a gross discrimination against the predominantly Protestant population of Nuremberg.

The map, while identifying all Roman Catholic churches and chapels in the city and giving their full names, does not show the Evangelical churches at all, or at best only identifies a few with a small cross mark.

GREECE

GREEK EVANGELIST SENTENCED

Neapolis, Crete.—A Protestant evangelist was sentenced by the Court of Neapolis to five months imprisonment and a fine of 3,000 drachmas ($50) on a charge of proselytising. He is Michael Markogamvrakis, 55, head
of the Greek Free Evangelical church in Heraklion.

The evangelist appealed the decision to a higher court.

He was charged with distributing Evangelical pamphlets free to Orthodox people. Traveling throughout the island of Crete, preaching the gospel and selling Bibles and books, he has organized three Free Evangelical congregations—at Manofaccio, Neapolis, and Heraklion.

IRELAND

INCREASED RELIGIOUS HARMONY SEEN

Washington, D.C.—Irish Ambassador John J. Hearne said in a farewell interview that he is returning to Ireland convinced that it will someday become a united country because old religious animosities between Catholics and Protestants are dying down.

Predominantly Protestant Ulster in northern Ireland has remained a part of the United Kingdom, sending representatives to the British Parliament in London, while the rest of the island has constituted the independent Republic of Eire.

"The clause on religion in our constitution says that Catholicism is the religion of the majority of the Irish people but that all religions are free and independent and none are state-endowed," Mr. Hearne said. "Now nothing could be clearer than that."

The 66-year-old ambassador, one of the most respected members of the diplomatic corps in Washington, is retiring to private life after more than a decade as Eire’s envoy to the United States.

Noting that the old bitterness between Ireland and England had all but melted away in the course of his adult lifetime, Mr. Hearne said he felt the religious issue between the two countries was "a fictitious issue, lashed into a flame by those with other purposes to serve."

ITALY

JEWS, ADVENTISTS GET CONCESSION

Rome.—Public Education Minister Giuseppe Medici has instructed school superintendents throughout Italy to permit Jewish applicants for teaching posts in the public schools to take their oral examinations on days other than Saturday.

The same ruling, he said, will apply also to prospective teachers belonging to the Seventh-day Adventists.

In a previous decree, issued in 1956, the Ministry of Public Instruction had stipulated that no written examinations should be held on Saturdays, "so that candidates professing religions which sanctify Saturday may practice their cult."

ORAL EXAMINATIONS WILL CONTINUE TO BE HELD ON SATURDAYS, BUT CANDIDATES MAY REQUEST THAT THEIR ORAL TESTS BE CHANGED TO ANOTHER DAY IF RELIGIOUS CONSIDERATIONS ARE INVOLVED.

TURKEY

BIBLE BANNED

Ankara.—The new Turkish Government has banned the distribution of the Jehovah's Witnesses' American translation of the Bible.

In a message to the U.S. Secretary of State protesting the decree, the society said that the action was "shocking to the hearts of those who believe in freedom of religion so much spoken of by the nations of the western world."

The society said it had also appealed to Melih Esenbel, Turkish ambassador in Washington, D.C., urging him to investigate "this latest action of the Turkish Government."
1885

MESSAGES FROM MARS.—An Italian astronomer declares that the planet Mars is peopled by intelligent beings who are trying to attract attention from dwellers on this planet. He is now engaged in making experiments with a view to discovering what the messages mean.

1910

PLANE NONSENSE.—Rear Admiral R. D. Evans declares that "for naval purposes no type of flying machine has as yet shown its usefulness." Airships would be riddled with shot before they could get near enough to a battleship to do any damage. According to the Admiral, flying machines may be useful for observation purposes.

1925

COSMIC DRAWL.—The first verse of Genesis has been amended by Harry Emerson Fosdick, leading apostle of evolution and modernism. In an article entitled "Evolution and Religion," which appeared in the Ladies' Home Journal for September, Mr. Fosdick proposed the following rewording: "In the beginning, an indwelling purposeful Power, the Creative Spirit of the Living God, unfolded by slow gradation across measureless ages this immense developing cosmos and on the earth slowly bringing forth life crowned in the possibilities of men, made the heavens and the earth." The psalmist's "He spake and it was done," will evidently have to be understood in terms of a cosmic drawl—a drawl that would enable all the slow-talkers who have ever lived to complete three-score-and-ten-year-long monologues one after the other before the Creator finished one syllable.

1950

UNIVERSAL UNITY.—Prayers for the conversion of the world to Roman Catholicism will mark the annual Chair of Unity Octave. Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle urged prayers and works of charity "to the end that sincere and fervent followers of our Lord may find their way back to that abode of peace and strength which is to be found only in the universal unity of the true fold of Jesus Christ." He pointed out that Pope Pius XII had made reunion of all Christians a major objective of the Holy Year.

The Glorious 50

From page 20

UTAH—1913—The State flag of Utah was presented to the battleship Utah the year before its official adoption. Its two dates commemorate the year in which the Mormon pioneers entered Salt Lake Valley, 1847, and the year that Utah became a State, 1896.

OKLAHOMA—1925—The present Oklahoma flag with its buckskin Indian war shield, peace pipe and olive branch, is the fourteenth emblem to fly over Oklahoma soil.

NEW MEXICO—1925—The ancient sun symbol of a forgotten southwestern Indian tribe gives the New Mexico flag a striking appearance. Its colors are the red and yellow of old Spain.

ARIZONA—1917—Arizona took its flag from one originally flown by the battleship Arizona, sunk at Pearl Harbor in 1941. Ironically, the banner shows the rays of the setting sun, while the Arizona was sunk by a nation whose flag represents the rising sun.

ALASKA—1927—Resulting from a public-school contest conducted by the American Legion, the Alaska flag was designed by a 13-year-old orphan boy. He described the North Star in his design as standing "for the future State of Alaska."

HAWAII—1898—The Hawaiian flag, though not adopted as its Territorial flag until the annexation in 1898, was originally designed for King Kamehameha I in 1816. The stripes stand for the eight major islands, while the British Union Jack is included as a reminder of Captain Vancouver, who on his voyage around the world in 1794 gave Kamehameha a British flag.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—1938—Until this flag was adopted, the District of Columbia had no official flag other than carried by the District Militia.

Quanta Cura and the Syllabus of Errors

From page 13

The List of Errors

It is not necessary here to enumerate each point of the two documents. In general terms, Quanta Cura dis-
cussed sixteen errors. It was primarily interested in refuting the idea of the all-powerful state that could interfere with such aspects of society as the church and education.

The syllabus had eighty errors in ten sections. Some of these would not be germane in a country without a church-state connection, but a number deal directly with concepts important to a country with religious freedom. The two documents were not completely parallel, and there was overlapping.

Important propositions include such "errors" as superiority of state over church (No. 54), exclusion of church control over public schools (Nos. 45, 47), separation of church and state (No. 55), undesirability of temporal power (Nos. 75, 76), exclusion of the church from politics (No. 62). Most important may be the "errors" that say that Catholicism might not be the sole religion (No. 77), that newcomers might be allowed to practice their own religion in a Catholic state (No. 78), and that religious liberty and freedom of thought and expression might be permitted (No. 79).

Most famous was No. 80, a "catchall" that sounded the most extreme to critics of the time: "The Roman pontiff can and should reconcile himself and reach agreement with progress, liberalism and recent departures in civil society." 5

Though it was understandable that the pope might strike out at his foes in this fashion, still something had to be done to ameliorate the effects. Bishop Dupanloup gallantly essayed this task, insisting that the syllabus was "a statement of 'an ideal Christian society' which was intended to warn against the abuses of modern liberalism rather than start a feud with the entire world." With alacrity and relief, 636 bishops subscribed to this viewpoint. The pontiff himself, a little taken aback by the furor, wrote Dupanloup that he had indeed found the "true meaning" of the encyclical. 6

No later pope ever denied this position, and it is the usual one taken by apologists. Neither, however, was the strict interpretation ever denied. The ultramontanes angrily called Dupanloup's pamphlet "anti-Syllabus," and accused him of "violating the teaching of the Holy See so far as to make it mean what it really condemns." A French church paper complained: "The Encyclical would have united all Catholics; the Bishop of Orleans has made everything doubtful." 7

**Touchstone of the Time**

Years later, in 1903, the German Cardinal-Archbishop Fischer wrote:

The Syllabus of Errors is a touchstone of our time, by which we can decide what agrees with Catholic truth and what contradicts it. It is to be regretted that recently some Catholic writers have ventured, in order to sustain their opinions, to lessen or set aside the force and authority of this important document. 8

How can these conflicting viewpoints both stand? The explanation sometimes offered is the difference between thesis and hypothesis. Thesis is the church-state relationship as the church wants it; hypothesis is as it actually obtains in dealings with various governments. Both views, then, are right to a degree. Thesis would approach the "confessional" state, of which Spain is the closest example today; hypothesis might entail acceptance of a minority situation, as in the United States. If not supremacy, then at least freedom.

Other explanations offered include the claim that the syllabus is in such condensed form that to understand it properly, the various papal allocations from which it was drawn must be consulted. It is also pointed out that the errors are stated in negative form and that it is not accurate or fair to turn them about (which is naturally the first thing a reader would do) and assume the converse to be the Catholic position, at least not without some modification.

The effort to dissociate the more general encyclical from the syllabus does not seem reasonable either. Both were issued simultaneously with a covering letter from Cardinal Antonelli indicating they were to be considered as supplementing each other.

No later pope directly or indirectly disavowed the syllabus and encyclical. Elaborations of some points have been made. Leo XIII in his *Immortale Dei* of 1885 finds no form of government bad or good of itself, therefore democracy may be desirable in certain circumstances. The state, however, must acknowledge the "true religion." He condemns the kind of freedom where the state allows the individual private judgment in religion, but (and this is the saving clause for the church in many parts of the world) circumstances may require toleration of error so that a greater good may be achieved or a great evil prevented. 9

**Official Versus American View**

Much is made these days of the distinction between the "official" view of the Vatican, defined as favoring the European confessional state, and the "American" view, which purports to find religious pluralism bearable if not desirable. Under the latter view, Catholics can, of course, accept church-state relationships as found in the United States. The writings of Father John Courtney Murray are frequently used to illustrate the "American" view. This present-day Dupanloup holds that the confessional state is an "irrelevancy" under American conditions. Anticlericalism does not inspire our separation of church and state; the limited state is not a menace to the church; the church has prospered more here than under some Catholic states of the old type; nor is it necessary or desirable to use state power against heretics. 10

Yet Cardinal Ottaviani claims the "official" view is "unchangeable," and leaves little room for accommodation to time and place. In 1953 Pius XII, a great ad-
mimer of Pius IX, seemed to concur: "What is not in accord with truth [Roman Catholicism] has objectively no right to existence, propagation, or action. . . . [If Catholics do not] prevent it . . . by means of coercive power," it is only because a superior good may be threatened.

Fuel was added to the fire in May, 1960, when L' Osservatore Romano, Vatican City newspaper, in what many American Catholics took to be an indirect slap at Presidential Candidate Kennedy's "Declaration of Independence," reasserted the hierarchy's "duty and the right to guide, direct and correct" the faithful in the political field, just as in other aspects of life. Entitled "Punti Fermi ("Firm Points")," the article stated that the hierarchy "alone . . . has the right to decide whether, in a given social and political situation, there is any involvement or compromise of religious and moral principles." When politics "touches the altar," the article declared, bishops have the right to speak and to expect the faithful to show a "dutiful discipline."

"The Catholic can never overlook the teaching and the instruction of the Church," said the Vatican paper. "In every field of his life he must base his private and public behavior on the guidance and instructions of the hierarchy."

The article was not signed, but Vatican sources described it as "authoritative." To distinguish the article from its own editorial opinions, Osservatore published it in a special make-up usually reserved for statements from the Holy See. Though aimed at the political situation in Italy, "Punti Fermi" lays down principles that may be applied to all Catholics everywhere.

The circumstances under which Pius IX acted in 1864 may seem irrelevant to twentieth-century America, but in view of "Punti Fermi" and conditions prevailing in such Catholic states as Spain and Colombia, the old question about the encyclical and the syllabus has current point and immediacy. American political candidates of the Catholic faith may then reasonably be asked to state their position in this debate. Until the debate is resolved, Quanta Cura and the Syllabus of Errors must continue to play a part in American church-state relationships.
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