

LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM



H. A. ROBERTS

INDIANS OF THE WESTERN PLAINS



**FREE SPEECH :: DEMOCRACY :: CONSTITUTION
RELIGIOUS FREEDOM :: QUESTIONS ANSWERED**

20 CENTS A COPY - WASHINGTON, D. C.



Religious Liberty Association

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

1. We believe in God, in the Bible as the word of God, and in the separation of church and state as taught by Jesus Christ.
2. We believe that the ten commandments are the law of God, and that they comprehend man's whole duty to God and man.
3. We believe that the religion of Jesus Christ is founded in the law of love of God, and needs no human power to support or enforce it. Love cannot be forced.
4. 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 obedience of all.
5. We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every individual to worship or not to worship, according to the dictates of his own conscience, provided that in the exercise of this right he respects the equal rights of others.
6. We believe that all religious legislation tends to unite church and state, is subversive of human rights, persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of both church and state.
7. We believe, therefore, that it is not within the province of civil government to legislate on religious questions.
8. We believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation, and oppose all movements tending to unite church and state, that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of civil and religious liberty.
9. We believe in the inalienable and constitutional right of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly, and petition.
10. We also believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

For further information regarding the principles of this association, address the Religious Liberty Association, Takoma Park, Washington, D. C. (secretary, C. S. Longacre; associates, H. H. Votaw and M. C. Taft), or any of the affiliated organizations given below:

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Atlantic Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, and Connecticut): Office, South Lancaster, Mass.; Sec., J. K. Jones.

Central States Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, Wyoming, Iowa, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota): Office, 4547 Calvert St., College View, Lincoln, Nebr.; Sec., J. F. Piper.

Columbia Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, West Virginia, Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland): Office, 507 Flower Ave., Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.; Sec., F. H. Robbins.

Lake States Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin): Office, Drawer C, Berrien Springs, Mich.; Sec., W. H. Holden.

North Pacific Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Alaska): Office, Box 598, Walla Walla, Wash.; Sec., E. K. Slade.

Pacific Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and Hawaii): Office, Box 146, Glendale, Calif.; Sec., W. M. Adams.

Southern Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Alabama, Mississippi, North

and South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee): Office, 4502 Brainerd Road, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Sec., S. A. Ruskjer.

Southwestern Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas): Office, 1019 North West 20th St., Oklahoma City, Okla.; Sec., R. L. Benton.

Affiliated Organizations Outside U. S. A.

Canadian Religious Liberty Association: Office, 209-212 Birks Bldg., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; Sec., M. N. Campbell.

Australasian Religious Liberty Association: Office, "Mizpah," Wahroonga, New South Wales, Australia; Sec., A. W. Anderson.

African Religious Liberty Association: Office, Grove Ave., Claremont, Cape Province, South Africa; Sec., J. I. Robison.

Central European Religious Liberty Association: Office, Regensburger-strasse 22, V. Berlin W. 50, Germany; Sec., H. F. Schuberth.

Northern European Religious Liberty Association: Office, 41 Hazel Gardens, Edgware, Middlesex, England; Sec., L. H. Christian.

Southern European Religious Liberty Association: Office, 39 Ave. de la Grande Armée, Paris 16, France; Sec., Dr. J. Nussbaum.

Philippine Island Religious Liberty Association: Office, Box 818, Manila, Philippine Islands; Sec., E. M. Adams.

LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

VOL. XXIX, No. 2, SECOND QUARTER, 1934

CHARLES L. LONGACRE, Editor

CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, Managing Editor

HEBER H. VOTAW, Associate Editor

CONTENTS

DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY ASSAILED	35
SOME POINTED QUESTIONS ANSWERED	37
THE STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE NETHERLANDS	38
A VIRGINIA CAVALIER COMMENTS ON SUMPTUARY LAWS	40
EUROPE'S CHAMPION OF DEMOCRACY	41
THE "CHRISTIAN STATEMAN'S" CHANGE OF BASE	42
WHAT IS LIBERTY?	43
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION	44
SCRIPTURE AND THE LORD'S DAY ALLIANCE	46
FREE SPEECH MUST BE MAINTAINED AT ANY PRICE	48
"A THREAT TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY"	51
WEST VIRGINIA SUNDAY BLUE LAW REVIVED	52
FREE PRESS ENDANGERED	54
SUNDAY OBSERVANCE IMPOSED UNDER PENALTY IN CALIFORNIA	58
"ABSURDITY" OF SUNDAY BLUE LAWS SHOWN UP	59
IDAHO SUNDAY BLUE LAWS INVOKED	61
A METHODIST COMPLIMENT	62
NEWS AND COMMENT	63
A GRATEFUL SUBSCRIBER	63
WHAT EMINENT MEN SAY	63
FARMERS OBJECT TO PAYING TITHE BY LAW	64
SPARKS FROM THE EDITOR'S ANVIL	64
THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER	Cover

Published Quarterly by the

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN., TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter May 1, 1906, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—One year, 35 cents; three years (or 3 subscriptions, 1 year), \$1.00; five or more copies, mailed by publishers to five addresses or to one address, postpaid, each 9 cents. No subscriptions for less than one year received. Remit by Post Office Money Order (payable at Washington, D. C., post office), Express Order, or Draft on New York. Cash should be sent in Registered Letter. When a change of address is desired, both old and new addresses must be given. No extra charge to foreign countries.



AFTER ELIHU VEDDER, ARTIST



**DEMOCRACY REQUIRES
IN ITS CITIZENS THE
HIGHEST MORAL AND IN-
TELLECTUAL STANDARDS**



Democracy and Liberty

Assailed

By

J. I. Robison

Secretary

*Religious Liberty Association
of South Africa*

THE thoughtful observer, as he looks out upon the political and religious world today, becomes deeply conscious of the fact that civil and religious liberty is in peril. There are decadent influences at work in every land that are permeating the social fabric and threatening to overthrow democracy and restore the absolutism of past centuries. A thirst for power is menacing our civilization built upon the democratic principle of freedom, which has made our age the greatest in the history of the world.

There are but few today who do not find fault with our democratic form of government. Democracy is on trial. Autocracy through dictatorship is threatening. Free-born peoples need to defend themselves against the insolent and turbulent minorities who would establish themselves in power and relentlessly put down all opposition.

Democracy Becomes Tiresome

Democracy is very often tiresome in its actual practice. Its uniformity and equality before the law become tedious. On the other hand, people are lured by a hero. A spectacular champion,

whether revolutionary or reactionary, finds a ready following, especially if he can promise relief from some real or imaginary abuses. This is one of the greatest menaces to freedom today. People

in a moment of hysteria are prepared to renounce their blood-bought freedom in favor of some unknown demagogue in whom they put implicit trust.

Democracy and freedom are twin brothers, and they stand or fall together. Of all forms of government, democracy is that which requires in a people the highest moral and intellectual standards. It grew out of the great reformatory movements of the sixteenth century, which resulted in a spiritual uplift of the masses and a general revival of learning. The World War, however, brought about a great lowering of the moral and intellectual standards, and therein lies an explanation of the dictatorships that have followed in its wake.

If democracy and freedom are to be saved, there must be a moral uplift of the masses, a return to higher ideals, and the exercise of individual will power over debasing influences. If a dictatorship works better than a ministry or a

parliament, as is often claimed, it is an acknowledgment of intellectual laziness and the moral decadence of our age.

Freedom Cost Centuries of Effort

It should be remembered that only after centuries of conflict did the oppressed masses gain from the privileged classes the freedom which is our cherished heritage today. A government "of the people, by the people, for the people" was the goal, while "liberty, equality, and fraternity" was the war cry. Autocracy made a determined stand, but the ideals of a state in which the power is exercised by all the people for the benefit of all, finally triumphed. Every man was at last granted the right to achieve his own aspiration to a larger and fuller life, and out of this freedom there grew into maturity the world's greatest era of intellectual proficiency, scientific advance, colonial development, and moral progress that mankind has ever seen. The feudal chains of slavery, serfdom, and special privilege were link by link broken, until religious, civil, and personal liberty became not a vague hope but a glorious reality in nearly every land.

These democratic ideals have often been assailed, but have as often triumphed. Probably the greatest assault against democracy was the World War. But the Allies in the war finally rallied their forces and led them on to victory under President Wilson's battle cry: "Make the world safe for democracy." Under this banner the victory was won, resulting in the dismemberment of ancient autocratic empires, the overthrow of a dozen dynasties, and the establishment of nu-

merous republics. One of the immediate fruits of the war was the rebirth of the great ideals of liberty. Even Russia, the most reactionary autocrat of prewar times, proclaimed complete religious liberty and personal freedom under the early Soviet rule. Suffrage was extended in nearly every country, not only to men, but to women, until more people were voting at the poles than ever before in human history.

Failure in the Hour of Triumph

But democracy in the hour of its triumph failed. Autocracy had been overthrown, but the spirit of democracy had not been inculcated into the hearts of the people. In fact, in the older democratic countries during the decades before the war, plutocracy had largely supplanted the rule of the people, and democratic ideals had lost their appeal. The economic and industrial revolution had made it possible for money barons to establish a commercial overlordship of the masses. Politicians and beneficiaries of special privilege were content

to laud democratic principles so long as the plutocrats were in the saddle and controlled the state.

Under such conditions democracy had little to offer the man in the street—the voter. And with what results? We find that in Russia, in Spain, in Poland, in Italy, and later in Germany and Austria, dictatorships were estab-

lished, ruling in the name of various political evangels, such as Fascism in Italy, Communism in Russia, and the Nazi régime in Germany.

During the last decade there has been,

(Continued on page 52)



C. S. PEARCE, ARTIST

"God created the soul of man free, and answerable to no one but the Creator."

Some Pointed Questions Answered

By the Editor



AT a recent hearing conducted before a joint Senate and House Committee of the Virginia Legislature on a bill proposing the repeal of certain sections of the Virginia Sunday blue laws, which forbid all recreation, business, and labor except works of necessity, there were more than a dozen clergymen present who wanted the old Sunday laws retained on the statute books. It was one of the most interesting and illuminating public hearings that the writer has attended upon this subject for many a day. Some very pointed questions were propounded by the members of the joint committees and by other members of the legislature, as well as by some of the clergymen. We shall set forth these questions and our answers to them:

Question No. 1.—"Does not the fourth commandment say, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy'?"

Answer.—Yes, but the fourth commandment refers to "the seventh day," and not the first day of the week. The first day of the week—Sunday—is never called the Sabbath in the Bible. There is no more holiness in Sunday than in Wednesday, nor is there any more divine authority to observe Sunday than Wednesday. But for the sake of the argument let us grant that Sunday is regarded by many as a holy day. Holiness cannot be legislated into people. A law that attempts to regulate a holy thing must of necessity be a religious law, and a religious law should never be placed upon the civil statute books and enforced under duress of the civil magistrate. The civil government should not prescribe religious duties.

Question No. 2.—"If an institution

proves to be a great spiritual uplift and blessing to those who observe it, like Sunday, why should it not be enforced by law?"

Answer.—The Lord's supper, the Lord's prayer, and baptism have proved to be great spiritual blessings to those who observe them, but that is no justification for enforcing these divine institutions by civil magistrates under the penal codes. Sabbath observance is a spiritual rite, the same

as the observance of the Lord's supper, and both are perverted when they are enforced by the policeman.

Question No. 3.—"Is not Sunday observance a moral obligation?"

Answer.—No. Sunday observance is not commanded in the moral law. And since it is not commanded by any moral precept, it is not a moral obligation. The Bible everywhere commands the observance of the seventh day of the week, which is Saturday. Many sincere people and good Christians do not observe Sunday, the first day of the week, but do observe the seventh day. Who dares to say that he who observes the seventh day in obedience to the moral law, is immoral, while he who observes Sunday in disobedience to the moral law, is moral? Anyway, the question is one between a man and his God. Religion cannot rightfully be prescribed by civil law.

Question No. 4.—"Is it not wrong to commercialize Sunday?"

Answer.—The Bible nowhere forbade the commercialization of Sunday, but it has forbidden the commercialization of the Sabbath day, which is not Sunday. The state as a secular power has no

(Continued on page 54)



A Delegation From the Netherlands Petitioning Their Sovereign, Philip II of Spain, to Respect Their Inherent Rights

The Struggle for RELIGIOUS FREEDOM in the NETHERLANDS

By J. H. Wierts

IN 1550 Charles V, king of Spain, issued a decree of extermination against all heretics within his realm. A like decree, in 1556, was issued by Philip II, with special emphasis on the destruction of all heretics in the Netherlands, and demanding that all government officials, from the highest to the lowest, carry out with all speed the provisions that all heretics be sought and apprehended, and their properties confiscated and added to the king's treasury. All male heretics that recanted were to be beheaded, all females to be buried alive. All heretics persisting in their heresies must be burned alive, male and female alike.

All high and low that knew of any heretics and did not report or apprehend them, or that sheltered, protected, or assisted them in any way whatsoever, were to be treated as heretics and suffer the same penalties.

Against this ordinance the Prince of Orange, William the First, protested, and instead of persecuting the heretics, he rather offered them protection within his own realm. Many of the persecuted left their homes and places of abode, and sought shelter in the realm of the prince, in the provinces of Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht.

This of course was an act of rebellion against his sovereign, and must

be settled by either submission or war. But what was the issue? What was at stake? Liberty! "*Liever dood als slaav*" (Rather dead than slave), came forth the slogan from the Prince of Orange, re-echoing through the Netherlands, and it did not cease until 1581, when that glorious independence was declared for the Netherlands. Liberty was assured.

During those years of struggle for freedom, Calvinists who had found an asylum in the Netherlands under the protection of the Prince of Orange had grown prosperous and numerous, in so much that by the year 1577 the government of the city of Mittelburg was in the hands of the Calvinistic Reformed Church. This church now became a real persecutor, demanding that the Waldenses, called Mennonites in the Netherlands, take the oath of allegiance, and take up arms against their common enemies, which conscientiously they could not do. Whereupon the city authorities closed the shops and places of business of the Mennonites, commanding them to vacate their homes and to leave the country. The persecuted appealed to the Prince of Orange for protection and freedom.

William's presentation of the case to the city authorities of Mittelburg reads as follows:

"Some citizens of your city have appealed to us for protection against your demands upon them. They say: You have demanded of them the oath of allegiance, and the taking up of arms, which conscientiously they cannot do, whereupon you have closed their shops and places of business and forbidden them to earn

a living for themselves and families, and have demanded of them either to comply with your demands or vacate their

homes and leave the country. Such has never been required of these people during all these years they have lived among us and have never in any way proved unfaithful. Did we not for this same cause of freedom take up arms against our king of Spain and withstand all his demands? And by the grace of God have now won that freedom. And would it not be unreasonable if we now would deny this privilege to these citizens, who at the risk of their own lives have helped to win this freedom, paying taxes and in every way helping in the support of the government during those many struggling years? You not only endanger the homes and lives of these people in your own city, but in the whole realm of Holland and Zeeland. Therefore, after careful consideration of their petition, in counsel with the governor and counselors of Zeeland, I petition you to let these people live among you in peace, open up their shops and places of business, and pursue their vocations as heretofore."—*Issued under His Excellency's name and seal in Mittelburg, January 26, 1577. Guil von Nassau.*

But the Prince's request was not heeded, and persecution rather increased. Whereupon the persecuted were driven to make another appeal for protection and freedom to the Prince of Orange. Whereupon he commanded those city officials to obey the law and to adhere to the letter of the ordinance of freedom in the following strong words:

"You are doing these citizens a great injustice in that you do not let them live in peace according to their own conscience in religious matters, because, the contents of our previous appeal to you had carefully been considered with our governors and counselors, wherein it was stated that the Mennonites are entitled to the same freedom of conscience in religious matters as others. But it seems you have paid no attention to our requests. Therefore, we feel ourselves constrained to inform you for the last time, and demand of you to

(Continued on
page 56)



Left, Prince of Orange, William the First,
often called "William the Silent"



Right, Maurice, Prince of Orange,
son of William the First

A Virginia Cavalier Comments on Sumptuary Laws

THE following able editorial, written by Thomas Lomax Hunter, a member of the Virginia Legislature and editor of the *Times-Dispatch*, of Richmond, Virginia, will be read with interest by the friends of religious liberty. It relates to the hearing on the repeal of the Virginia Sunday blue laws, conducted before the joint Senate and House Committees on Social and Moral Welfare, in the house of representatives of the Virginia Legislature. Representative Hunter was one of the speakers following the editor of the *LIBERTY* magazine. His editorial appeared in the *Times-Dispatch* of February 4, 1934, and is as follows:

"Addressing the Bar Association of New York, a former chief justice of the Court of Appeals of that State said: 'Today, according to the notion of many, if not most people, liberty is the right of part of the people to compel the other part to do what the first part thinks the latter ought to do for its own benefit.'

"Upon this conception of 'liberty' is founded all sumptuary, all restrictive legislation, all those statutes which have acquired the odious name of 'blue laws.'

"That the builders of this Republic knew the danger of such laws, and the tendency of democracies to create them under the pressure of organized and zealous minorities, is made abundantly manifest by their words of warning.

"George Washington, addressing the Baptists of Virginia, had this to say: 'Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen, is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience.'

"Under the colonial government the Baptists had suffered much persecution in Virginia; their churches, or meeting places, had been raided and their congregations dispersed by the constabulary, and their parsons had served terms in jail as contumacious and heretical persons. With such experiences fresh in their minds, the founders of America sat down with the determination of utterly divorcing church and state and setting free the conscience of man to worship according to its own dictates, or to worship not at all, if that pleased it better.

"James Madison, known to fame as the Father of the Constitution, wrote: 'Religion is not in the purview of human government. A connection between them is injurious to both.'

"Thomas Jefferson counted his statute of religious freedom among his chief accomplishments. He wrote these arresting words: 'Almighty God hath created the mind free; all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate by coercion on either, as was in His almighty power to do.'

"Not Washington, Madison, or Jefferson would have voted for a blue law, for blue laws are attempts to propagate religious observance by law.

"The wise words of the three great Virginians just quoted are sound and set forth the proper ideal of democratic government, which aims at governing the people as little as possible. Unhappily the great man of mankind is neither wise nor tolerant. Ignorance is easily imposed on. Professional sectarians soon found their opportunity.

"The sects which had suffered persecution during the British rule thrived and multiplied mightily when they were set free of that persecution. In a little while they grew to be the most numerous faction in the State. Then they yielded to that temptation which always besets zealots; they began to clamor that their religion be reflected in the law. It was history repeating itself. Puritanism fled from Europe to escape persecution, but no sooner found itself in power than it set up the cruel sort of persecution on its own account. Persecution begets persecutors.

"So long as sects are in the minority and find themselves at variance with the majority opinion, they are fervent advocates of freedom. On Tuesday night, before the House Committee on Social and Moral Welfare, the most eloquent and persuasive speech for freedom of Sunday was made by the Rev. Charles S. Longacre, of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. I suggested to him that if his faith became dominant in America, it might take a leaf out of the book of his present oppressors. He replied: 'I hope not.'

"One of the pro-blue law speakers, among

(Continued on page 58)

Europe's Champion of Democracy


PRESIDENT MASARYK, the chief executive of the Czech Republic, is a firm believer in democracy. In an interview published in the *New York Times Magazine* of November 12, 1933, President Masaryk says:

"There has been much talk of the inefficiency of democracy. However, democracy has not failed; rather, a number of men in authority have failed democracy. We must not forget that monarchies and dictatorships also have experienced difficulties, and even today are encountering them. Democracy makes provision for the concentration of power into a few hands in a time of crisis; even Hitler was elected by the German people. President Roosevelt also has dictatorial powers. Some men in authority may misuse their power; others do not. But that does not impair the fundamental value of democracy itself."

Masaryk does not believe that every custom official's son inherits the qualities to become a leader of a nation, nor that a national leader has inherent qualities in his blood which he transmits to his son that are destined to make him a great national leader. He asserts:

"There is no such thing as equality. People are different, and have not been endowed with similar abilities. It is not possible to translate into actuality at once the three slogans of the French Revolution. But we can practice one—fraternity. And that is basic for democracy. . . .

"Modern democracy is relatively new. It has its beginnings with the American and French Revolutions. It takes a long time for any form of government to develop: monarchism has had many thousand years to develop its organization. Democracy is not yet 200 years old. Education, political and general, of the people is the solution for the shortcomings of our present democracy."



(C) U. S. U., N. Y.

*Thomas G. Masaryk, President of the
Republic of Czechoslovakia*

The disintegration of the German Republic is no proof to the Czechoslovakian president that democracy will disappear. In his opinion, the German people were unprepared for democracy. He says:

"The Weimar Constitution was written on paper, but not on the soul of the German people."

He explained:

"Lessing, Goethe, Herder, and many others were German, but they certainly would not have been Hitlerites."

The establishment of democracy in the republics of Europe is a requisite for the establishment of peace in Europe, and, continued President Masaryk:

"A healthy Europe can be built only upon the firm foundations of free peoples, and not upon millions of dissatisfied subjects."

"In the Middle Ages there was a universal ideal, the Catholic Church, to which all mankind bowed. But that ideal was by no means exemplary in all its aspects. In its name and in the name of Jesus, an Inquisition was possible, and people were thrown to the flames for having independent opinions."

(Continued on page 63)

The "Christian Statesman's" Change of Base

By C. P. Bollman

IN LIBERTY for the fourth quarter of 1933, we raised the question, "Is there hope for the *Christian Statesman*?"

Giving full credit to statements made in an article in the November number of that periodical, written by Wm. Parsons, D. D., its associate editor, we must conclude that the official organ of the National Reform Association has changed, if not its base, at least its method of approach, and is no longer making the demands voiced by its editors and most prominent writers a half century ago.

In the *Christian Statesman* of November, 1933, Dr. Parsons attempts to wipe the slate clean of the many incriminating statements made years ago by editors and writers for the National Reform organ, saying:

"We are not concerned about the peculiar expressions of the National Reform leaders of fifty years ago. They had the right idea of the kingdom of God on earth. Perhaps they did not make as sharp a distinction as they should between the Sabbath as a religious institution which required rest and religious observance, and the civil rest day which requires only cessation of labor and business, that all may have the opportunity of religious worship and for rest and social, intellectual, and spiritual recreation. The explanation of this sharper distinction is that, as Lord Lytton puts it,

"A dwarf on a dead giant's shoulder sees more
Than the live giant's eyesight availed to explore."

But this mild disavowal of significant utterances that might be quoted from leading National Reform speakers of half a century ago, does not serve to save even the face of the National Re-

form organ. What has been officially written and widely printed as setting forth the objects of the National Reform Association, is on record and cannot at this later day be blotted out.

In 1898 the Christian Statesman Company issued a history and manual of their movement, prepared by David McAllister, D. D., LL. D., setting forth quite fully the principles and aims of the National Reform Association. We quote in full Article II of the Constitution of said society:

"The objects of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the family, the religious element in education, the oath, and public morality as affected by the liquor traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such amendment

(Continued on page 59)

THE STORY OF CAIN AND ABEL

CAIN and Abel were the first two boys born into the world. Cain was a farmer, and Abel a shepherd. "In the process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock." "And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect." "And it came to pass as they were in the field, that Cain rose up against his brother and slew him."



WHAT is liberty?" is often asked. Some people have gone so far as to claim that true liberty embraces the right to take from others the same liberty they claim for themselves.

It is evident that there must be somewhere a standard of right principles in order to define what one's liberties really are. There must be some way of knowing when a person is exercising his true liberty and when he is not.

The original law intended by the Creator to govern all relations of society is the law of love. This law answers every purpose and specification, and would, if carried out, make civil government unnecessary in the world. This law has ten points which embrace man's duty to his fellow men and to his Creator also. There has never been any other standard of right in existence.

What Is LIBERTY?

By
W. S. Ritchie

*Where is there a standard
of right principles?*

If this is not the true standard, then the world is without any way of deciding what is right or what is wrong, and thus has no way of defining the sphere of true liberty.

Confusion has always come into human affairs just as this great fundamental law has been disparaged and irreverenced. The present evils of society may be traced directly to the minimizing of the importance of this law by modern teachings.

One of the precepts of this law calls for the worship of the Creator in commemoration of His power in creating the earth. A particular day of the weekly cycle is specified; viz., the one on which He rested after His work was done, and which He sanctified and blessed as a day of worship.

It would appear that it is the very essence of true liberty that any one who wishes to comply with this command would have the right to do so without being in any way molested. And as this is really a law of liberty (James 1:25), any one who did not wish to honor the Creator by reverencing the day He appointed would also have the right, as far as man's authority is concerned, not to do so. He would be accountable to God alone for not complying with His command regarding honor to Himself. Since God's kingdom is based on the principle of love, He never compels any one to serve Him. He only, in love and forbearance, points out the inevitable result of disregarding the law of love; that it is unavoidable death, unless Christ's death is by faith counted as payment of the penalty. But this faith also is not forced on any one. What a perversion of the true concept of liberty

(Continued on page 60)

THE FIRST INTOLERANT MAN


BY R. L. ODOM

SPILLING the first blood on earth's fair land,
Dealing the first blow of a murderous hand,
Setting the pace for the bigoted band,
Was Cain, the Intolerant.

Taking the life of an own-blood brother,
Leaving his body for the dew to cover,
Crushing the heart of father and mother,
Was Cain, the Persecutor.

Producing no good, but only disaster,
Reaping infamy forever thereafter,
Earning a place in hell hereafter,
Was Cain, the Murderer.





FACSIMILE OF PART OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
FROM THE ORIGINAL IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The United States

CONSTITUTION

AN important fact in the creation of man is that God made him a free moral agent. The power of choice was his. He could do as he pleased. Of course there was the danger of sin; but without the power of choice inherent in the man himself, God could not be glorified in his service.

And this matter of freedom—liberty—has been the great prize of the ages; the prize that, down through the centuries, men have sought, and have sacrificed everything to win. It was allowed of God, but denied of man.

Liberty is of two kinds, one pertaining to a man's relation to his fellows, as between himself and them; the other pertaining to his relation to his God, as between himself and God. But the one carries with it the other. Religious liberty carries with it civil liberty. Nei-

By A. R. Bell

ther can stand without the other. The violation of the principles of either means, and can only mean, the violation of the principles of the great doctrine of human rights.

The word of Inspiration tells us that "God created man in His own image." The noblest document ever written on this question of liberty, outside of the realm of divine inspiration, sets forth the following:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Rights are not made. They do not come to men because of conditions or through circumstances. They are God given, and belong alike to all men.

Down through the centuries, however, the natural and inalienable rights of men have been more or less "dependent upon the will and caprice of rulers and governments who have arrogated to themselves supreme and irresponsible powers." The years had shown liberty as a thing practically in name only, and, as serving the true purpose of God, government among men a failure. It was at this time that a light blazed, a beacon burned, still bidding men to hope. Penned by man, but inspired of God, there was declared a manifesto that rejoiced the heart of mankind and astonished the world.

Never before in the history of the race had an organized society set forth the principles of its government as ordained of God. Never since sin entered the world had any nation, save America, proposed to build a superstructure in government upon the principles of the gospel.

The builders of this nation recognized the rights of men. They claimed, as man's first great right, liberty, and they claimed that right from God inalienable. Not alone for themselves did they claim this. Their scope included the race, reaching all men, and America became a beacon light to the oppressed of all lands, and millions flocked to her hospitable shores to enjoy, as had no other people before them, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We look back with pride upon those good men and true, "who pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor" that the principles embodied in those two immortal documents—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—might be the heritage of posterity.

Today we offer heartfelt gratitude to God for the benefits we enjoy under the Stars and Stripes. We thank God for liberty, civil and religious. We thank God for a country that recognizes the rights of conscience. We are proud of our country, proud of her history, proud of her exploits, proud of her institutions, proud of her traditions. We love our flag. We plight our troth to the principles for which our flag stands.


The revered President Coolidge said:

"Amid all the flash of conflicting interests, amid all the welter of partisan politics, every American can turn for solace and consolation to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States with the assurance and confidence that those two great charters of freedom and justice remain firm and unshaken. Whatever perils appear, whatever danger threatens, the nation remains secure in the knowledge that the ultimate application of the law of the land will provide an adequate defense and protection."

William McKinley said:

"We have lived under it [the Constitution] for one hundred twenty-five years in storm and in sunshine, in war within and war without, amid the passions of the people; and after one hundred twenty-five years that great instrument stands unclouded by a single lapse of principle. To us, my fellow citizens, young and old, the preservation of that Constitution is committed. It is a sacred document, and it is a sacred trust, given to us to see to it that it is preserved in all its virtue, and in all its vigor, to be passed along to the generations yet to come. Glorious Constitution! Glorious Union! Glorious flag!"—*Speech at San José, California, May 13, 1901.*

The
Spirit
of
America





"The foundation of God standeth sure."

IN a late issue of the *Lord's Day Leader*, organ of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, the president, Rev. J. H. Willey, says in a statement regarding the purposes of this organization: "It is not here to direct the young people to a devout and intelligent study of the word of God."

The purpose of the Alliance, as stated by President Willey, is to "preserve the first day of the week for rest, religious instruction, and the worship of God." As an indispensable requisite to the attainment of this purpose, the Alliance constantly agitates for the enactment and enforcement of legislation, local, State, and national, providing for a compulsory observance of Sunday as the weekly day of rest.

Viewing the character and aims of the Lord's Day Alliance in the light of Scripture, it is clear that the Alliance is not qualified to direct an intelligent study of the word of God for either young or old. Either it is very ignorant of that word, or it deliberately ignores the plainest statements made by Inspiration regarding the foundation of the Christian religion and the very definite purpose for which the Christian

SCRIPTURE

and the LORD'S

DAY

ALLIANCE

By

L. A. Smith

church is in the world.

In the first place, the Alliance is either ignorant of or ignores the fact that the Bible has nothing to say about Sunday, or the first day of the week, being the Sabbath or a holy day, or a day on which

anybody ought to abstain from work. This is not mere opinion or belief, but a fact any person can readily verify for himself, by an examination of every Scripture text which mentions the first day of the week. There are but nine of them in the whole Bible.

The Alliance through its spokesmen may say a thousand things about the value and necessity of the Christian Sabbath, which are all good and true; but as applied to Sunday, they lose all their force unless it can be shown that the Christian Sabbath is Sunday; and of that, as stated, there is not a particle of Scripture proof.

It would certainly be expected that in urging upon society the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, the Alliance would quote the highest authority on the subject of the Sabbath, which authority is, of course, the God of heaven. But it never does this, and for the best of reasons: there is nothing to quote.

It is all beside the mark to say, pointing to Sunday, that the Sabbath is an institution resting on divine authority, since there is nothing in Scripture to connect Sunday with the Sabbath. It is time, effort, and ammunition wasted, and worse than wasted, since it is in opposition to the only Sabbath ever instituted by God, which is the Sabbath of the decalogue, the seventh day, the memorial of creation.

Further evidence of ignorance or disregard of Scripture on the part of the Alliance, appears in the statement by President Willey that the Alliance "is not so much an organization of the church as it is the church itself fighting for the right to exist, and fighting for the opportunity to justify its existence." This simply cannot be true of the Christian church.

In Colossians 1:18, 24, it is specifically stated that Christ is the head of the church, and that the church is the body of Christ. It is therefore as absurd to say that the church—meaning the Christian church—is fighting for the right to exist, as it would be to say that Christ, who is God, is fighting for the right to exist.

The unity and oneness between God, Christ, and Christians, is made clear by many Scripture declarations. It is very definitely affirmed that God dwells in His church by His Spirit. Each one of the believers composing the church, we are told, is a temple of the Holy Ghost. 1 Cor. 6:19. "I in them, and Thou in Me," said Jesus in His prayer recorded in John 17. He who would overcome the true believers would first have to overcome God Himself.

Dr. Willey appears never to have read Matthew 28:18-20, which records the words of the risen Christ to His disciples, as He commissioned them to proclaim the gospel to the world: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations: . . . and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." If Christ, having all power in heaven

and in earth, is with His church, how can it be true that the church today is "fighting for the right to exist"?

And further, since Christ is with His church always, and has all power in heaven and in earth, what possible need is there for the church to be seeking governmental aid for the furtherance of her work? What more power could the church want, and what more could she possibly have, than "all power in heaven and in earth," which is assured to her by her divine Head without reference to the attitude or power of the state?

Of course, if President Willey has reference to some other church than the Christian church, his apprehensions may be well founded. It may be that such a church is "fighting for the right to exist," and needs all the help it can get from the state in the form of legislation and court protection. That, however, if it be true, is not a matter of concern to Christians.

And if the church feels the lack of power to enforce Sabbath observance on all classes of society and bring about the establishment of a Christian state, the explanation of such lack is to be found in the fact that the Christian church was never commissioned to do work of that nature. For the accomplishment of her divinely appointed task of proclaiming the gospel to all the world, the church is omnipotent; but for the task of converting civil governments and enforcing religious observances by the arm of the civil power, she is impotent so far as divine power is concerned, and hence must rely on the civil power for whatever is to be accomplished in that line.

President Willey and other spokesmen of the Alliance seem never to have noticed the fact that Christ left no example of working for the reform of civil government. Jesus of Nazareth, though living under a government notoriously corrupt, did not seek to oust any corrupt official from office, to overthrow any administration in city or state, nor

(Continued on page 62)

THE right of free speech and a free press which is at present trembling in the balance, was ably defended by United States Senator Arthur R. Robinson, of Indiana, in a speech which he made before the Senate, which is recorded in full in the *Congressional Record* of January 18, 1934. The latter part of his speech contains historical data concerning the early battle in behalf of press freedom, that we are confident the many readers of the LIBERTY magazine would like to preserve, and use when occasion presents itself. We quote:

"Controversy has been carried on during the last several months between the press, on the one hand, and the government, on the other, as represented by General Johnson. For the life of me, I have never been able to understand why there should have been any objection to the incorporation of a section in the proposed newspaper code reaffirming the constitutional right of free press and free speech. Yet everybody knows that the administration, for some cause or another, did not want it in there. Of course, it ought to be in; and the American people, I think, will demand that it be placed there.

"Mr. President, free speech in the United States must be preserved at any price. Otherwise our liberties are gone.

"For the past several weeks a controversy has been raging between the newspapers of the country and Gen. Hugh S. Johnson in which this question is seriously involved. The loquacious general has insisted that the Constitution is sufficient guaranty against executive usurpation, but the press has been equally insistent that a specific free-press reservation be incorporated in the proposed code.

"In the controversy that has arisen the American people are vitally concerned. If there is one right on which they have insisted throughout the years, and on which they will continue to insist, it is that of free speech, as guaranteed by the Constitution. Free speech is absolutely impossible without a free and untrammelled press. Because of this fact the people refuse to become excited so long as the press remains unmuzzled and content.

"But when the newspapers evidence concern, the people become justly alarmed, for they are aware that one of their most precious rights is seriously imperiled. That the Constitution itself is in danger there can be no doubt in unbiased minds. Evidence accumulates on all sides to substantiate this view. Executive dictatorship is well on the way, and State lines have well-nigh been obliterated. That the President now exercises too much power for the country's welfare is all too evident. That he is constantly reaching out for new and enlarged authority is also within the knowledge of everybody. Give him now the power to throttle the press, and his dictatorship is complete.

FREE SP

*Must Be Maintained
At Any Price*

Excerpts From Speech by U. S. Sena

"One may attribute to him the best of motives and still be seriously alarmed. It has been well said that:

"The law of nature is not that tyrants make tyranny, but that tyranny makes tyrants."

"Benevolent and kindly men have, in the history of the past, become the worst of despots.

"General Johnson says he has no intention of attempting to muzzle the press, but incidents connected with his own administration tend to controvert that statement, and whether he be well intentioned or not, the fact remains that he should not be given any semblance of such power.

"Radio facilities, controlled by the government, are now practically monopolized by administration propaganda, and it is the confident belief of many observers that all sorts of difficulties are placed in the way of those who would use the air to oppose administration policies.

"We want no such governmental control of the other news sources of the country. Otherwise free speech will have gone, the day of political prisoners will have returned, and liberty will have vanished. The Constitution will then have become a memory.

"Because of the seriousness of the situation, a section guaranteeing inviolability of the press in the proposed newspaper code becomes vastly important. Even such a section would not necessarily avail against pretended ne-

The Fin

United St

*Congress sho
specting an
religion, or
free exerci
bridging th
or of the p
of the peop*

Robinson



Endment

Constitution

no law re-
lishment of
biting the
reof; or a-
lom of speech
or the right



said a free-press clause was unnecessary.
“... Why, for instance, should it be
said that the liberty of the press shall
not be restrained, when no power is
given by which the restriction can be imposed?”
“Hamilton later became a great champion of
a free press.

cessities for martial law, suspension of constitu-
tional guaranties, and the possible development in
the minds of our rulers of the idea that they are
‘Heaven-sent.’ But for whatever it is worth, such
a reservation should be
insisted on, and the peo-
ple, whose liberties are at
stake, should be the most
outspoken of all in sav-
ing their rights which can
only be preserved by a
free press.

“Since the issue has
again been raised, it
might be profitable to
glance briefly at the past.

“Historical Survey of Press Freedom

“Freedom of speech
and of the press was not
guaranteed originally by
the Constitution. Charles
Cotesworth Pinckney in
the negotiations proposed
a free-press clause, but
to this suggestion Sher-
man said:

“‘It is unnecessary.
... The power of Con-
gress does not extend to
the press.’

“Pinckney explained in
the South Carolina House
of Representatives that
the Constitution did not
need a free-press clause,
although he himself al-
ways championed its in-
clusion.

“Alexander Hamilton

“Thomas Jefferson, fearing the tyranny of a
strong central government, especially under the
power that authorized Congress to pass all laws
‘necessary and proper’ to carry out other delegated
powers, fought for free speech and free press.
The battle was won, and the First Amendment
carries the guaranty of free speech and of free
press.

“Modern Parallel to Early Battle for Press Freedom

“The battle for a free-press guaranty has a
modern counterpart in the struggle between the
newspaper publishers and the NRA code author-
ities.

“The publishers insisted on a special section in
the code preserving the inviolability of free press,
while General Johnson charged criticism of pos-
sible abridgment of free press with being a
‘synthetic dead cat.’

“In a few speeches and interviews General
Johnson took occasion to discuss possible peril to
a free press because of the code. He said he re-
garded such a section—guaranteeing press freedom
—as ‘superfluous.’ As late as December 7, 1933,
before the National Association of Manufacturers
in New York, General Johnson said:

“‘As a matter of fact, there has been inserted
in every draft of the newspaper code that has been
submitted a special provision requested by the
newspaper publishers committee making special
reference to the inviolability of the freedom of
the press. We have regarded this as superfluous,
but the newspapers so eagerly asked for it that I
don’t know why it should be denied—it has about
as much meaning as “eeny meeny miney mo.”’

“Deputy Administrator Lindsay Rogers said the
newspaper publishers should have a clause guaran-
teeing a free press if they wanted it.

“Here in General Johnson’s reply is a curious
parallel to that given by Roger Sherman to Charles
Cotesworth Pinckney in the Constitutional Con-
vention.

“Minnesota vs. Near Case

“A few years ago an attempt was made to
gag a little paper up in Minnesota for publica-
tion of allegedly politically pernicious statements.
Through operation of the Minnesota ‘gag’ law an
attempt was made to suppress this paper.

“The case was carried to the United States
Supreme Court, and by a 5 to 4 decision the
Court upheld freedom of the press only insofar as
‘previous restraints’ were concerned.

“The Court said in effect in that case, by a
majority of one, ‘... that the main purpose of
the provisions of the First Amendment to the
Constitution was to “prevent all these ‘previous
restraints’” upon publications as had been prac-
ticed by other governments, and they do not pre-
vent the subsequent punishment of such as may
be deemed contrary to the public welfare.’

"History of Freedom of Press and Speech in the United States

"America's first newspaper, *Public Occurrences*, in 1690, was suppressed for not having a license. The first printer in Pennsylvania was forbidden to publish without a license.

"The fountainhead of free press in America is the famous Zenger case. In 1734 John Peter Zenger, publisher of the *New York Journal*, published two satirical songs, and the heavy hand of the law clamped down on him.

"After the grand jury refused to indict him, he was arrested by warrant of the council. His attorneys who came to his defense were disbarred. But one Andrew Hamilton, ablest advocate of the time, appeared for Zenger and obtained an acquittal. So effective was Hamilton's masterly speech that Zenger was not only acquitted, but there was established the principle that the jury could determine every question before it; that the law of England was not the law of New York. Thus the principle of press freedom was established in America before it was in England.

"The first appearance of the free-press ideal in constitutional form appeared in rhetorical Article XII of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, which said:

"The freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments."

"In 1798 the infamous sedition act was passed, and was roundly condemned by James Madison and Thomas Jefferson.

"Referring to press freedom, Madison said:

"And can the wisdom of this policy [press freedom] be doubted by any one who reflects that to the press alone, checkered as it is with abuses, the world is indebted for all the triumphs which have been gained by reason and humanity over error and oppression; who reflects that to the same beneficent source the United States owe much of the lights which conducted them to the rank of a free and independent nation, and which have improved their political system into a shape so auspicious to their happiness."

"Upon becoming President, Jefferson pardoned those held in jail for violations of the sedition act. This infamous legislation was never declared unconstitutional, and died of its own limitations in 1801.

"Modern Aspects of Press Freedom

"The *New York Times'* attack on the Tweed ring was another milestone in the battle for freedom of the press. By intimidation, threats, attempts to indict the publishers, attempts to buy stock, attempts to find a flaw in the property title, the enemies of the *Times* attempted to suppress the paper. But the newspaper won, and the Tweed ring was crushed in New York.

"Theodore Roosevelt figured in a brief flurry

against two of the country's newspapers—the *New York World* and the *Indianapolis News*. These papers criticized the President and other high officials in connection with the transfer of title of the Panama Canal from the French company to the United States. President Roosevelt tried to have the editor of the *News* removed from Indianapolis to Washington for trial, but the district judge refused to allow the transfer. An attempt to prosecute the *World* was equally unsuccessful.

"The old menace to the press, 'libel on government,' was invoked by the administration of Mayor William Hale Thompson of Chicago. The city administration sued the *Chicago Tribune* for a great sum for libeling the government. The *Tribune* won its case when the Supreme Court of Illinois held that a city cannot sue a newspaper for libel.

"Conclusion

"National emergencies are fraught with dangers, not the least of which is the possibility that some of those temporarily intrusted with power may feel called upon to 'rule or ruin.'

"If obsessed with such an idea, they are apt to stop at nothing to attain their ends. That such possibilities exist today there can be no doubt, and the American people should be on their guard. 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.'"

At the conclusion of his speech, Senator Robinson introduced a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate Commerce "to make an investigation of the control exercised by the Federal Radio Commission over persons broadcasting through licensed broadcasting stations, and the extent to which the freedom of speech of such persons has been restricted." Senator Robinson read evidence showing that "the radio facilities of this nation today are monopolized," and that there is "a radio censorship as rigid as the censorship practiced in any land ruled by an absolute dictator," and that "no one over those facilities will dare criticize the administration," according to the statements issued by the broadcasting management. All this restriction of free speech over the radio broadcasting facilities is done under the pretext "that any utterance on the radio that tends to disturb the public confidence in its President is a disservice to the people themselves and is hence inimical to the national welfare."

We agree with Senator Robinson that such a censorship of free speech is inimical to our constitutional liberties, and frequently precedes the establishment of despotic government upon the ruins of a republic. It is an issue in which the American people are more interested than any other.

C. S. L.



"A Threat to Religious Liberty"

UNDER the above caption an editorial from the *Chicago Tribune* of February 1, dealing with a bill in Congress which would give financial aid to the churches from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has the following to say:

"A bill has been introduced in Congress, known as the Ludlow Bill, to authorize loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to churches at 4-per-cent interest. It is argued in defense of this bill that unless some relief from the government is forthcoming, many churches will be obliged to close, and their property will be taken to meet their debts.

"These fears are not wholly unfounded, and, needless to say, the closing of churches would constitute an incalculable loss to communities and the nation, particularly if many communities should be deprived of all types of religious organizations. Nevertheless, the bill should be defeated. The separation of church and state in this country has been salutary for churches and state alike. Any tendency to break it down can only be regarded as a precedent for retrogression.

"The altogether heroic defense of religious freedom in Germany by Pastor Martin Niemöller could not have been required had the church and state been wholly independent. It was only because the churches in Germany were organized within the framework of the state and dependent upon it in considerable measure for their revenues, that it was easy for the state to abuse its powers. With the movement toward centralization gaining momentum in this country, it is impossible to be too zealous in defense of the freeman and his conscience."

We agree that the motive back of the above proposal to aid needy churches in their financial distress from public funds, is a laudable one. But the motive back of every endeavor on the part of the state in past ages to aid religion by legislative enactments and by financial

support was prompted by a desire to benefit the cause of religion and to preserve its institutions. Worthy motives are not always a justifiable reason for the extension of governmental aid. Every union of church and state in the past was inaugurated by legal precedents based on worthy motives and a desire to be helpful to religion. But in the end these proved to be boomerangs which struck back with baneful effect upon both the welfare of the state and the interests of religion.

The government funds belong to all the people. Sixty-five per cent of the people in the United States make no profession of religion, and it is no more justifiable to take their money to promote the cause of religion, than it would be to take the money of the church people to promote and preserve the institutions of infidelity.

It may be argued that this is only a loan of funds to the churches, and that all religious persuasions will have equal treatment. There are some things that are fundamentally wrong, and equality of treatment does not justify a wrong act. Suppose all religions in the world were agreed on the precise mode of baptism and the exact manner of observing the Lord's supper, that would not justify the civil government in backing up these institutions with legislative enactments and financial support to preserve them and make them more effective. It is fundamentally wrong for the civil government to intermeddle with religion and to give it legal and financial support in any degree. It establishes a dangerous legal precedent that is fraught with an inferno of troubles and perplexities. Let us profit from the experiences of the past, and keep the church and state completely and absolutely separate and independent of each other in the United States.

C. S. L.



A DANGER which threatens inalienable rights must be nipped in the bud.

West Virginia Sunday Blue Law Revived

THE *Sentinel* of Parkersburg, West Virginia, of January 15, gives an account of Sunday law prosecutions conducted by the prosecuting attorney, E. B. Pennybacker, of that city, resulting in the arrest of a number of respectable citizens engaged in the grocery business. The prosecuting attorney issued a statement that complaint had been made that certain grocery stores sold groceries on Sunday. "For any person to be found laboring at any trade or calling, or to employ any one for that purpose on Sunday, is a violation of the law," declared Mr. Pennybacker. "The employment of an orchestra," he further asserted, "would be a direct violation. The selling of merchandise is not only a violation of our State law, but is in conflict with the intent and purpose of the NRA. These practices must stop immediately or prosecution will follow."

The Federal NRA codes approved by the President governing the grocery business do not forbid selling groceries on Sunday, and to assert that such is their intent and purpose is contrary to fact. The Federal authorities which approved of these codes were expressly opposed to such a provision in the NRA code regulating the business of grocery stores, and eliminated the Sunday closing provision from the code.

The difficulty is that the local authorities are reading intents and purposes into these codes that are entirely unwarranted and contrary to the spirit and letter of the NRA codes. It is just such unauthorized assumptions that are bringing reproach upon the NRA program and defeating its objective.

It is just as illegal to operate an automobile for pay or for pleasure on Sunday in West Virginia, under its existing Sunday law, as it is to operate a grocery store. Why make fish out of one trade or calling and fowl out of another, when all are under the ban of the Sun-

day blue law? But Sunday laws and the advocates of such religious statutes have never been known to be blessed with an excessive amount of consistency. The only way to get rid of religious persecution is to get rid of religious laws. We, therefore, present the only remedy that will grant religious liberty to all citizens, and that is a repeal of these antiquated religious relics of a dead past.

C. S. L.

Democracy and Liberty Assailed

(Continued from page 36)

not only in these countries, but everywhere, a marked decline in respect for liberty and a definite curtailment of freedom itself. Few there are today who have the ardent devotion to "liberty, equality, and fraternity" that marked the liberals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Even in the great Republic of America a dictatorship, if not an actual fact, is threatening. The tyranny of the majority is beginning to be felt, and men everywhere are less tolerant of the views of others. People today are, as never before, swayed in masses. This mass psychology often causes them to forget principles and cherished rights, and impose by force the theories of an untried demagogue upon all objectors. Liberty is forgotten and tyranny holds sway.

Slaves to Ignorance

"Man is still the slave of his own passions and his own ignorance." The principles of liberty can never wholly triumph until men have victory over their evil passions and greed, and until the Spirit of the Founder of liberty dwells in their hearts. What the world needs today is a rebirth of the recognition of the equality of all men, and a renewed love for liberty, the seeds of which the Lord has planted in every heart. These are the God-given heritage of every race. In so far as these principles are destroyed, the seeds of despot-

ism are sown, which, when they come to fruitage, will reforge the chains of bondage and bring men again under the yoke of tyranny.

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." Lev. 25:10. It was a custom among the Hebrews that in the fiftieth, or jubilee, year all the slaves should be set at liberty and all the landed property should revert to the family of the original possessor. By this provision the inordinate love of property and power was admirably checked. There could be no landed nobility who would hold a peasant class in subjection, for in the fiftieth year all the land that had been sold during the jubilee period, reverted back to the original owners. Wealth was thus more equally distributed, and the plan tended to promote social equality, and in a large measure set right that which during the interval had gone wrong in the social and political economy of the nation.

The world needs a jubilee today. It is suffering because of the continued accumulation of wealth by one class and the poverty and degradation of another. The money barons are constantly grasping for more, seeking a monopoly each in his own line; while the poor, without land, without money, are in desperate straits, living from hand to mouth, and with nothing to look forward to but continued oppression, poverty, and despair.

Rebirth of Democracy Needed

These conditions breed revolution and invite despotism. Unless democracy can somehow right these injustices and arouse herself to a rebirth of the high ideals that led to her establishment, it seems that she is doomed to fall before the popular dictators who are willing to promise almost any social or economic reform in order to climb into power. We raise this note of warning, and point out the danger signals that indicate the failures of democracy, and the possibilities of a dictatorship even in the older democratic countries; but we wish to state emphatically that we have no con-

troversy with any men, nor any special political program to promote.

We do stand, however, uncompromisingly opposed to all political measures which would imperil or encroach upon the civil and religious liberties of men. We believe that God created the soul of man free, and answerable to no one but the Creator. In all things pertaining to our relationship to God and His law, we believe that every man should have the right to a free and untrammelled choice as to whom, when, and how he shall worship without let or hindrance. We believe in the principle set forth by the Saviour of men when He said: "If any man hear My words, and believe not, I judge him not." John 12:47.

Civil government, we believe, has been divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights and to rule in civil things. In this realm it is entitled to the respectful obedience of all. But there are certain inalienable rights, such as free press, free speech, peaceable assembly, and the right of petition, which we hold no government may lawfully withdraw or curtail. These are inherent rights which man, because he was created a free moral agent, with the power to choose his own destiny, must of necessity exercise. If and when these rights are withdrawn, man of necessity must fight against such restraints, because of his inborn love of liberty which God planted in his heart in the beginning.

It was on these fundamental principles of religious and civil liberty that democracy was established. They are God-given, and as long as they stand, we may look for and expect the approbation and blessing of the merciful Master upon our nation, and that peace and prosperity will be extended to all.



SOCIETY created government and not government society; therefore society should control government and not government society.

Free Press Endangered

THE American principle of the freedom of the press is endangered from many angles. This American principle of freedom was adopted in many countries for a time, but now, under dictatorship, the freedom of the press is denied.

Administrator Johnson of the NRA has taken a position that it is superfluous to recognize the freedom of the press in the publishers' and printers' NRA codes, because the Constitution guarantees such freedom.

But the American Society of Newspaper Editors has insisted that the code "shall contain a specific statement on behalf of the government, as one of the contracting parties, that the acceptance of a newspaper code is not intended, and shall not be construed, as abrogating or modifying the rights of free speech and the freedom of the press, as these are guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and the several States."

But General Johnson for a time refused to grant this request, and it made the editors and public uneasy and suspicious. When we observe how the press today is enslaved and tyrannized over in all foreign countries governed by dictators, we can sympathize with the editors of America, and we agree with them that the only safe and wise course to follow in this matter, so far as the NRA code is concerned, is to leave no possible room for future misunderstanding and future encroachment upon the freedom of the press by those who are intrusted with dictatorial and arbitrary powers.

On the other hand, the newspapers need to guard against their own enslavement of the freedom of the press. Many newspapers are selling out their press liberties to commercial interests for sordid profit. The press has largely become an institution for private gain, instead of a servant for the public interest. Big business interests and ad-

vertising patrons must not be offended. The press is too often a slave to these big commercial concerns, and refuses to print anything that is derogatory to its patrons. Thus the newspapers deny the freedom of the press to the public just as truly as if the government had put a ban upon its freedom.

The big business patrons of the press have virtually made the freedom of the press a myth, and it is a myth because the press has been blinded to justice and the public interest by holding the dollar before its eyes. C. S. L.



Some Pointed Questions Answered

(Continued from page 37)

more right to forbid the commercialization of the Sabbath day than it has to prevent the commercialization of other religious institutions and services. The priests of old were condemned by the Lord for commercializing the sin offerings. Some religions commercialize the prayers offered for sinners, but the state cannot rightfully interfere in these matters.

The state is supposed to encourage the spirit of public enterprise and commercialism. If it is wrong to take profit, then the state ought to forbid it on every day of the week. Only those who make a profession of religion are supposed voluntarily to abstain from doing business on the day which they regard as holy. The state cannot settle this question for any man. It is purely a question of conscience and religion. To prevent the commercialization of a day by civil law is to meddle with a religious question.

Question No. 5.—"If the Sunday law was repealed, would not business men compel their employees to work seven days each week?"

Answer.—No. There are now five States in the Union which have repealed all their Sunday laws, and business does not compel the employees to work seven

days a week in those States. California has had no Sunday law for over fifty years, and more people attend church in California on Sunday than in any other State in the Union, in proportion to its population. The District of Columbia has no Sunday observance law, and yet all government employees in the District are given Sunday off. There are hundreds of thousands who observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath in the United States, yet there is no civil law that compels them to observe their Sabbath day, nor does the absence of such a law compel them to work on that day. We have no law in America that gives any employer of labor the right to compel any man to work for him on any day of the week. If the Sunday observer has a conscience, there is no man or law that can compel him to go contrary to his conscience. Why should the Sunday observer have greater protection from the state than the Sabbatarian? All citizens should enjoy the equal protection of the laws of the land.

Question No. 6.—"Does good citizenship depend upon whether a man observes Sunday?"

Answer.—A person can be just as good a citizen of the state whether he observes Sunday or Saturday or no day at all. Some folks who make no profession of religion are better citizens than those who make a superfluous show of religion. A religious person ought to make the best citizen of the state, but it is not always so. At any rate, it is no business of the state to see that we are religious, but that we conduct ourselves as good citizens, irrespective of our religious persuasions.

Question No. 7.—"Are not the Christians in the majority in this country, and is not therefore this a Christian nation, and should not the minority be subject to the wishes of the majority regarding Sunday observance?"

Answer.—In religious matters the majority have no more right to force their religious observances and customs upon the minority than the minority

have to impose their religious views upon the majority. Majorities rule only in matters of civil policy. In religious matters the conscience of the individual is supreme, and the state or majority has no right to interfere. The church can control religious matters among its own members, and if a member does not care to abide by the religious requirements of the church, he can get out of the church; but if the state controls his religion for him, he cannot so easily flee from his country.

This is not a Christian nation in any sense. According to the latest statistics of the census report, 65 per cent of the inhabitants of the United States are nonchurch members, and make no profession of religion. From a legal viewpoint this is not a Christian nation. Our government does not have any religion. It is a secular power, without an established religion by law. All religions are supposed to stand on an equality before the bar of justice. Our government is neutral upon the question of religious faith, and protects all religions equally.

Question No. 8.—"Are not all our laws based upon the ten commandments, and should not the state enforce all of the decalogue?"

Answer.—No. The civil government cannot rightfully enforce any of the ten commandments as God's law and as divine requirements. How can the civil magistrate enforce God's commandment which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me"? The Bible makes it very plain that anything that a man thinks more of than he does of God, is a violation of that first commandment. How can the civil magistrate read a man's thoughts and judge his motives?

How can the magistrate enforce the second commandment, which is against the making and worshiping of images which are counterfeits of things in heaven? That is purely a religious matter, and is justified by many religions of this world.

How can the civil government punish

the taking of God's name in vain as divinely interpreted in the Scriptures? The Bible says that we take God's name in vain when we belie our religious profession, that we take Christ's name in vain when we misrepresent His life and His teachings. If we accede to the proposition that the United States government has the right to punish blasphemy against the Christian religion, then we are forced to admit that the Chinese government has a right to punish blasphemy against its state religion, which is paganism, and all Christians would be punished for saying a derogatory word against paganism. In China the preaching of the gospel against idol worship is blasphemy.

Sabbath observance as set forth by the fourth commandment cannot be enforced by the civil magistrate, for all citizens would not only be compelled to rest on the seventh day, but to keep it holy, which is an obligation that cannot under any circumstances be enforced by any man. Even God Himself does not attempt to enforce holiness. It cannot be done.

How can the civil magistrate make children honor their parents? You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. Honoring parents is a matter of the heart over which the magistrate has no control.

How can the magistrate enforce the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not kill," when Christ said that he that hateth his brother is a murderer? Who ever saw the sheriff hanging a man for murder who never did more than hate his brother?

How can the civil magistrate enforce God's commandment as such on adultery, when Christ said, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart"? The magistrate cannot read the hearts and motives of men.

How can the magistrate enforce the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not steal," when God says, "Ye have robbed Me . . . in tithes and offerings"?

We are guilty of theft when we do not give God the service due Him and by withholding what is His own.

The commandment of God says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." In God's sight we are false witnesses when we belie our profession of religion. We can lie without uttering a word—merely by a look. How can the magistrate read the heart in this matter?

How can he enforce the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet"? That is a matter of the heart. Again, if the magistrate should arrest anybody who did not love his neighbor as himself, he would have a tremendous task.

No; the ten commandments are exceeding broad, says the psalmist, yea, they are the end of all perfection, and reveal the righteousness of God; as such they cannot be enforced by the civil magistrate. For the law of God is spiritual and holy. No duty which we owe to God as such can rightfully be enforced by the civil magistrate. The civil government can enforce only civil duties and regulate those matters which pertain to man's relationship with man.

The first four commandments are duties which we owe exclusively to God and religion, and not to man. God only can punish offenses against God. The civil government can punish man for only the overt acts which are an infringement upon the rights of others. The civil government does this, irrespective of what the law of God demands and independent of it.



The Struggle for Religious Freedom in the Netherlands

(Continued from page 39)

make this affair public, informing all that you have no right whatsoever to interfere with another man's conscience. Therefore, we demand of you not to trouble these people any more, nor to hinder them in any way whatsoever from earning a livelihood for themselves and families. Take heed that you act in harmony with this our demands and requests."—*Written in Antwerpen, July 16, 1578, signed von Baudemont.*

This brought relief for the persecuted, at least for the time being. But in the year 1593, the so-called Reformed Church brought on another persecution against the Mennonites. And an appeal was made by them to Prince Moritz, son of Prince William of Orange. Prince Moritz's appeal to all state and city officials is as follows:

"We hope that you pay close attention to the words of the ordinance made by my father, Prince of Orange, and by the governors and counselors of the provinces of Holland and Zeeland, so that not only in the city of Middelburg, but in all the United Provinces, all government officials must adhere to the letter of that law, granting freedom of conscience in religious matters to all."—*Given in Graffen-Haag, March 4, 1593. Signed, Your very good friend, Mauritius von Nassau.*

It seems from the above that religious liberty and freedom of conscience in religious matters was fully granted and proclaimed by William the First, Prince of Orange, and the government of three provinces, namely, Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht, and by the time of Prince Moritz it had been proclaimed in all the seven provinces of North Netherlands.

The liberty gained in the provinces of North Netherlands was most noticeable because for centuries the Waldensians had suffered bitterly for their faith in most of the countries of Europe. There has been preserved, mostly in the form of personal letters written from prison dungeons, a somewhat complete record of the terrible sufferings endured by those who dared to disagree with the established ecclesiastical authorities. What they suffered upon the rack, in torture chambers, and at the stake is almost beyond the belief of people in this day of liberty and enlightenment. The piety of their lives was testified to by even their enemies. Reinerius, an Inquisitor, wrote:

"Among all sects which have ever been, there is none so dangerous to the Roman Church as the sect called Waldenses, because they are the most ancient, claiming their origin from apostolic times. They have penetrated into all lands, for there is no country or land where this sect is not to be found. They live most virtuous lives before the people, teaching the

right way concerning faith in God and the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed. Only that they teach against the teachings of the Roman Church and priesthood."

Not only in Catholic countries were these people made to suffer, but in Protestant lands at the hands of so-called Reformed Churches, they paid for their faith with their blood. America was blessed with some of the descendants of these hardy soldiers of the cross. At least one branch of the Mennonites, driven from Zurich in Switzerland, stopped in Alsace-Lorraine, only to find shortly that their enemies would give them no rest. From Alsace they went to Holland, and from Holland to America. As early as 1634 they had settled near Camden, New Jersey. In this group were two brothers who bore the name of Longacre, one an ancestor of the present editor of the *LIBERTY* magazine. A little prior to 1682 we find them in Pennsylvania, near the spot that was later to be so closely connected with the American Revolution, Valley Forge.

I had an opportunity to examine carefully a book containing over 1,400 pages, published in Ephrata, Pennsylvania, in 1749, in which is given a striking account of the activities of those who strove for liberty of conscience through centuries of tyranny and darkness. These pioneers of light were known by different group names. There were at least thirty-five of these. In some points of faith they differed from one another, but in the campaign for freedom to worship God without interference by either the church or the state, they were a unit. We of today owe a debt to them that can be discharged only by giving our all for the preservation of the boon which they bought at the cost of all that was most dear to them. No price was too great for them—material possessions, earthly comforts, families, life itself, were freely given.



THE new idea is always hated and persecuted by the old until the new becomes old.

Sunday Observance Imposed Under Penalty in California

THE Los Angeles *Herald* of January 19, says:

"Doors of Los Angeles barber shops must be closed to business on Sundays, or proprietors will be arrested for violating the California barbers' code under an order sent out today by Deputy City Attorney William Joos, of the prosecuting division of the city attorney's office.

"More than 200 Los Angeles barbers were summoned before Joos for asserted violation of the code, and they were informed they will face fines and jail sentences if they continue to offer shaves and hair cuts on Sunday."

Prosecuting Attorney Joos said:

"The city attorney's office has been co-operating with the State labor department in enforcement of the code. There have been scores of complaints that barber shops have been operating on Sunday in violation of the code."

The Los Angeles *Herald* further says:

"City Attorney Ray L. Chesebro has been acting in co-operation with the Master Barbers' Association in the matter."

Here we have a striking illustration of bureaucracy gone mad, and of official regulations not only circumscribing popular rights, but the orderly functions and prerogatives of the State legislature and the Federal Government. The people of California recently rejected a compulsory Sunday closing barber measure submitted to them on a State-wide popular referendum, by a majority of more than 750,000 votes. The legislature of California has repeatedly rejected Sunday closing barber bills and refused to enact them into law. Aside from this, the Federal NRA officials, in adopting the permanent barbers' code, eliminated the Sunday closing clause submitted by the Master Barbers' Association of America, and inserted one day of rest in seven in place of Sunday rest. The city prosecuting attorney of Los Angeles is following the dictates of the Master Barbers' Association instead of the Federal NRA codes or the State laws of California upon this subject.

How long will the people of California, the State legislators, and the Federal NRA officials allow a local

bureaucracy to encroach upon their prerogatives in so flagrant a fashion? The Federal NRA allows each barber to choose his own day of closing, but the regulations of the local dictators say all barber shops must close on Sunday.

C. S. L.



A Virginia Cavalier Comments on Sumptuary Laws

(Continued from page 40)

nine other reasons for opposing motion pictures on Sunday, set up the assertion that to permit this would be class legislation. Surely a naïve argument to come from the spokesman of a class in whose interest and at whose insistence all our blue laws have been made.

"The fight against Sunday motion pictures before the House Committee on Social and Moral Welfare was purely a parson fight. It is true that they brought some laymen to make it appear that opposition was not wholly clerical. They also mustered a goodly number of gallery rooters and cheer leaders, but in spite of very emphatic protests to the contrary, it is as clear as the nose on one's face that the fight is a contest waged by the parsons against weakening of their moral authority. . . .

"Sixty per cent of our population belong to no church, have no priest or bishop to make vocable their desires. They are not requested, in church, to send telegrams and write letters to their delegates or their senators. They have little legislative consideration because they are inarticulate. Yet it is these people who keep the world sweet and make it a place worth living in."

Mr. Hunter made the best speech at the hearing. It was replete with good-natured wit and humor, and clear-cut as a diamond on religious liberty and separation of church and state. Mr. Hunter declared he was not a member of any church, and was speaking for sixty per cent of the population who were non-church members. These sixty per cent of the population should not be compelled by the forty per cent of church members to act as if they were religious on Sunday when they are not, but should be allowed to follow the dictates of their own consciences as to the manner of spending their time on Sunday, so long as they do not disturb religious meetings.

C. S. L.

"Absurdity" of Sunday Blue Laws Shown Up

THE Sunday *Star* of Washington, D. C., January 21, carried an Associated Press report from Johnstown, Pennsylvania, as follows:

"A much perturbed and a little defiant citizenry tonight faced a Sunday without movies, sodas, or gasoline, as Mayor Eddie McCloskey prepared to show the people just how 'ridiculous' blue laws are anyway.

"Every business house got orders from policemen today to 'pull down your blinds tomorrow and keep them down; under an edict of the mayor that a blue law of 1794 will be enforced to the last letter.

"The mayor said he will back up the old law so well 'that the paid choir singers will not be permitted to appear in the churches.'

"It started when the city council told McCloskey to close Sunday shows. This incensed the fiery mayor, so he ordered everything shut up.

"The council wants to be ridiculous,' said McCloskey. 'I am going to show just how insane blue laws can be.'

The *Star* of January 22 says that the automobile drivers on Sunday "had to go out of town for gasoline," and that the news dealers "were threatened with stoppage of the sale and delivery of Sunday newspapers," and the "police were active about all news stands which remained open, and took the names of several boys who delivered Sunday newspapers."

The mayor of Johnstown is legally correct in the position he has taken upon this question of the enforcement of the Sunday blue laws of Pennsylvania, which prohibit all "worldly" and all "commercial" acts or business on Sunday. The present Sunday law of Pennsylvania does not permit anything on Sunday that is not strictly religious, nor does it allow any one to receive any commercial reward or remuneration for services rendered, whether those services are otherwise legitimate and honorable or not. If the law would forbid commercialism in illegitimate and disreputable matters only, certainly no one could object, but when it forbids commercialism of the day, and thus prohib-

its anybody's getting any reward for service rendered in a business that is perfectly legitimate and respectable in itself, simply because such service is rendered on Sunday, then the mayor of Johnstown is logical when he applies the restrictions on commercialism against commercialized choir singers on Sunday as well as paid singers at a public entertainment. The law now does not allow a singer at a paid entertainment to receive pay without being penalized under the Sunday law of 1794.

There are some people who are perfectly satisfied with the Sunday blue law of 1794 in Pennsylvania, if only those portions of the law are enforced which accord with their religious ideas, letting the rest of the provisions, which do not coincide with their opinions, remain dormant; but the mayor of Johnstown is evidently not of that type. He wants either the whole law enforced as it now stands upon the statute books, or none of it. No doubt the enforcement of the entire law is the quickest way of convincing the people of the State of Pennsylvania that this law is out of date, un-American, and that it ought to be repealed.

C. S. L.



The "Christian Statesman's" Change of Base

(Continued from page 42)

to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniably legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Just what these words mean may be judged by this, quoted from pages 36 and 37 of Dr. McAllister's book:

"What more ringing National Reform utterances were ever uttered than those of the president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in her annual address at the National Convention, held at Nashville, Tennessee? Miss Willard affirms in this address that the association over which she presides has 'one

vital, organic thought, one absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm. It is that CHRIST SHALL BE THIS WORLD'S KING—King of its courts, its camps, its commerce; King of its colleges and cloisters; King of its customs and constitutions; . . . Christ and His law, the true basis of government and the supreme authority in national as well as in individual life."

The Roman Pontiff claims to be Christ's representative upon earth, and to speak and act for Him. But Dr. Parsons would be slow to admit this claim on the part of the pope. However, to make Christ this world's King, as explained by the late Frances Willard, and as so heartily indorsed in the National Reform document from which we quote, would make absolutely necessary the setting up of some authority to speak for Christ, or else the recognition of the validity of the claim of the visible head of the Roman Church, that he is *Vicarius Filii Dei* (Vicegerent of the Son of God).

This present evil world is not Christ's kingdom, and can never become Christ's kingdom. The work of the gospel is to garner out of this fallen world "a people for His name." (See Acts 15:14.) When that work shall be finally accomplished, the wicked nations will be destroyed, as described in the second psalm. The world that now is will then be purified by fire, as graphically foretold in the third chapter of Second Peter, following which it will become the home of God's redeemed people, the seat of Christ's eternal kingdom.

The church of God is the whole body of His redeemed people, from Eden lost to Eden restored. Christ, the great head of the church, has never committed to His people the work of governing the world. Christ's commission to His church is not to go into politics, and try to govern the world in its sin-cursed condition, but is,

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:19, 20.

The gospel is spiritual, not political; its appeal is not to men *en masse*, but to the individual; its aim is not simply to improve the old life, but to give new life; in short, it says to every man, even as our Lord Himself said to the proud Pharisee, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." John 3:6, 7.

In effect, National Reform seeks to make men Christian by compelling outward conformity to certain forms; but instead of making Christians, their scheme at best can succeed only in making formalists, or, worse yet, conscious hypocrites.

C. P. B.



What Is Liberty?

(Continued from page 43)

it is for a man or a combination of men, even though they claim to be the true church of God, to insist that their liberty includes the taking away of another man's liberty to worship God as he chooses, compelling him to worship as they choose. Such was Cain's idea of liberty. He could not be content with his own liberty to worship God in his own way, but was angered at Abel for worshiping in the latter's way, which, as a matter of fact, was the way God had commanded. It is noticeable that Abel, who was worshiping God in the way He had commanded, did not try to force Cain to worship as he did, but that Cain, who was trying to worship God in a way He had not asked, was angered against Abel and rose up and slew him. "And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." 1 John 3:12.

It is no sign of sanctity or goodness when an assembly of men, no matter how great, rise up and claim that their liberty demands that other people worship as they do. This is not liberty, nor is it Christianity or godlike. It is a perversion of liberty that covers the

meaning of the word in a darkness that obscures the very light of life for the world. For unless God be known as a God of liberty and His law be known as a law of liberty, they are not known at all. His service will in this wrong understanding of His nature be obnoxious, and the world will wander in the night to the pitfalls of eternal ruin.



Idaho Sunday Blue Laws Invoked

EVERY now and then antiquated Sunday blue laws which still exist on the statute books of some States, are revived by zealots whose religious life consists of compliance with outward forms and a mania to ram their religious views down other people's throats. The editor, Mr. Burroughs, of the *Idaho Pioneer*, of Boise, sets forth the Idaho Sunday law crusade in the following interesting editorial:

"The prosecution (persecution) of the Boise grocers who have violated the State blue laws by selling groceries and such on Sunday again calls vehement attention to the inequalities and injustices of such ordinances. Sunday business of any kind is doubtless very wicked, but when the law permits the sale of 3.2 beer and prohibits the sale of a pound of butter, the law not only becomes very obnoxious, but is also very discriminatory.

"Cigars, tobacco, beer, candy, salacious magazines, root beer, ice cream, and a hundred other commodities are perfectly Christian, but a loaf of bread or a pound of coffee, if sold on Sunday, would send both buyer and seller to the bad place forever and a day.

"It is a fact that all of us are daily violating some of the laws and ordinances made and provided. I saw a very Christian minister jaywalking the other day, right in broad daylight, upon the streets of Boise. Such a violation of the laws and ordinances made and provided should be very severely dealt with. I saw another very Christian minister utterly and wickedly ignore a red light. These unholy things must stop—pronto.

"The grocers would have continued in the error of their ways had not some other grocers who do not sell anything on Sundays made a fuss about it. In like manner, those who do not jaywalk and those who do stop at the red lights should also complain to the powers that be, and there would be just about as much sense in it.

"The blue laws have been ignored for years, and the country would not go to the bowwows were they ignored forever. If a merchant wants to sell butter and eggs on Sunday, it's his foolishness and nobody's hurt or harmed.

"At that, viewing such petty persecution, one wonders why one little law violated is picked out by the long-haired chimney-pot-hatted reformers, and so many much more serious infractions allowed to run unnoticed. There are many laws not so 'blue' being ignored every day. We see dance hall profligating slopping over into every Sunday morning; we see juvenile drinking right under the noses of the 'reformers'; we see slot machines tinkling their merry tinkle in every hamlet in the State; we see our good ladies indulging in bridge games for profit or for prizes right inside the portals of the churches.

"But we cannot buy a loaf of bread or a pound of good Idaho butter on a Sunday morning. That's against the laws made and provided.

"And all of this implies no criticism upon the office of the prosecuting attorney. He can't help himself. When a complaint is made to him, it's his duty to put the prosecution over."

One of the nine grocers arrested and bound over for trial is a Seventh-day Adventist who regularly closes his store from sunset Friday evening until sunset Saturday evening in harmony with the Scriptural injunction. Why should he be prosecuted for operating his store on six days of the week which the civil law allows? Why must he observe Sunday and thus be deprived of one day's income to which all other civilians are entitled under the law? This is not civil prosecution, but religious persecution. We cannot have religious freedom in America for all men and all persuasions as long as these antiquated, un-American, religious laws remain upon the civil statute books. Let Idaho follow the example of her sister States, Oregon, Wyoming, California, Arizona, and Wisconsin, which have repealed all their Sunday laws. Only in this way can the church leaders be kept from carrying on a campaign of religious persecution.

C. S. L.



THE most hated thing in the world is an unpopular truth.

A Methodist Compliment

THE editor of the *LIBERTY* magazine receives many complimentary letters from public officials and ministers of various religious persuasions concerning the work the Religious Liberty Association is doing in defense of the American principles of government as conceived by the founding fathers. The following letter is from an ardent Methodist:

"MR. LONGACRE: Let me compliment you on your fine *LIBERTY*, First Quarter, 1934. It gives us up-to-the-minute information on a subject with which all liberty-loving Americans should be eternally on guard, so that our forefathers may not have lived and died in vain.

"We of California can thank those responsible from the bottom of our hearts that we have no hidden insidious 'blue' laws to catch us unawares. . . .

"I am a Methodist and not ashamed of it, and I know of no organization better fitted to carry on the principles of civil and religious freedom than yours. May you be able to 'carry on' for years to come. While we are all for peace, we have to be on our guard, and it is a continual warfare against selfishness and greed."



Scripture and the Lord's Day Alliance

(Continued from page 47)

did He give so much as a hint to His disciples to attempt work of that nature. He did use compulsion on two occasions, overturning a régime set up by corrupt men; but let it be noted that He did this to cleanse, not any part of civil government, but the house of God.

It seems also to have escaped the notice of President Willey that the apostolic church not only received no help from the state in any form, but was faced by the opposition of the civil power, the might of imperial Rome, the strongest despotism, possibly, that the world has ever known. And against all the power of Rome on the one hand, and the opposition of the Jews on the other hand, that church not only maintained its ground, but moved forward irresistibly in the work Christ had given her to do, sounding the gospel message

throughout the known world in a single generation of time.

The Alliance, President Willey says, is the only real "guardian and guaranty of the Sabbath day." What did the Sabbath institution do before the Alliance came into being? It must have rested on a very insecure foundation, according to his view. But the Scripture teaches that no institution of God is insecurely established. "The foundation of God standeth sure."

The Alliance would have people believe that without civil legislation to establish and enforce Sabbath rest, the Sabbath would be lost. The best answer to this idea is the fact, which seems to have escaped President Willey's notice, that today hundreds of thousands of Christians, scattered throughout the world and under every variety of circumstance, are observing the Sabbath of the decalogue, and reaping the benefits of such observance, notwithstanding the almost universal disregard of the day visible all around them.

The day which God calls "the Sabbath of the Lord," and "My holy day," the Creator's memorial established at the beginning of time, will continue, regardless of what men may do or may not do, because it rests on the foundation of that word which will stand though heaven and earth pass away.

Would it not be a great improvement if the representatives of the Lord's Day Alliance would become better acquainted with the word of God, so as to know what it affirms regarding the Christian Sabbath and the divine foundation on which the Christian church and Christian institutions rest; and then have faith in the power of the Almighty to take care of that which is His without calling for help from the state? God never started anything that He was not able to finish; and of the mission of His church to give the gospel invitation to mankind, it is written: "He will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth." Rom. 9:28.

News and Comment

THE people of Pennsylvania at the last election repealed the blue law which prohibited Sunday baseball and football. The vote in some cities and towns ranged from 5 to 1 to 22 to 1 in favor of Sunday recreation. More than 90 per cent of the cities and towns in the State voted in favor of this repeal of the antiquated Sunday blue law which the political preachers had kept on the statute books since 1794, when a committee of Presbyterian clergymen succeeded in having it enacted.

FIVE drivers of bakers' trucks who delivered bread to restaurants were arrested recently in Jersey City for delivering bread on Sunday in violation of the blue law of New Jersey, which prohibits all travel on Sunday of any kind, by train, automobile, bus, horseback, or on foot, except "going to or returning from any church or place of worship, within the distance of twenty miles."

They were found guilty before the first criminal court, but the judge suspended the sentence to circumvent an unjust law. The legislature should do its duty and repeal these Puritan religious laws, or give the people a chance to do so on a popular referendum.

A Grateful Subscriber

A VERY appreciative subscriber to the LIBERTY magazine renews his subscription for three years at \$1. He says:

"I hope to be able to read every number to the last of my days. I am now seventy-four years of age. I wish you great success with your magazine; it is as much needed now as ever in the past. Curtailing the freedom of the press and scrapping the Constitution, are things talked about. When tobacco and beer can be sold on Sunday and not the necessities of life, it seems that Sunday laws are for the real propagation of vice on that day, and not for the general welfare."

Perhaps some other friend of LIBERTY

wants to renew his subscription for three years for \$1, and keep informed on religious liberty issues.

Europe's Champion of Democracy

(Continued from page 41)

This experienced statesman of Europe is a thorough believer in the rule of the people as against dictators. He believes that civil and religious liberty is essential to good government, and that these rights and privileges cannot be attained under the rule of dictators. Dictators make a sham out of republics, and sacrifice the rights of religious minorities in favor of a state religion which dominates the consciences of all dissenters and non-conformists. More strength to the ideals of President Masaryk. C. S. L.

What Eminent Men Say

"You cannot legislate the human race into heaven. . . . The world can be made safe for moral decency only by education."—*Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst.*

"Our liberties are safe until the memories and experiences of the past are blotted out and the 'Mayflower' and its band of Pilgrims forgotten; and our public school system has fallen into decay and the nation into ignorance; until legislators have resigned their functions to ecclesiastical powers and their prerogatives to priests."—*Woodrow Wilson, "Public Papers," Vol. I, p. 62.*

"It is a good thing to demand liberty for ourselves and for those who agree with us, but it is a better thing and a rare thing to give liberty to others who do not agree with us."—*President Franklin D. Roosevelt, from a speech delivered over the radio from Warm Springs, Georgia, Nov. 22, 1933. Published in the New York Times, Nov. 23, 1933.*

"If you would build a bulwark against despotism, there are no ramparts like the breasts of free men."—*William E. Gladstone.*

Farmers Object to Paying Tithe by Law

TEN thousand farmers in England have revolted, and refuse to pay tithes to church officials who seek to collect them through government compulsion. These compulsory tithes were imposed on the farmers during the reign of Queen Anne, and amount to \$15,000,000 annually at the present time. The farmers call this a "sixteenth century graft."

The farmers in Kent and Suffolk Counties have organized armed companies equipped with sticks and guns, have dug trenches around their buildings, and have even placed electrified wires to protect their goods from the government collectors and preserve what they consider their rights. The clergymen, as they pass through the country, are hooted at by the farmers whose cattle are scheduled to be sold to pay the church stipend.

Religion and politics do not mix any better than oil and water. To try to mix them always causes trouble. As long as religion employs force, it must expect to be resisted and hooted at by the people.



Sparks From the Editor's Anvil

THE people are the masters and not the slaves of their government.

THE inalienable rights of man are God given, and not granted by governments.

A WISE statesman is one who possesses the gift of seeing into day after tomorrow.

THE primary function of civil government is to protect the rights of all men equally before the bar of justice.

THE government which breaks down constitutional barriers and safeguards, paves the way for its own overthrow.

No one but a usurper of arbitrary authority over the rights of mankind, ever attempts to muzzle the freedom of the press.

WHAT some reformers set up as moral standards for others to conform to are often merely self-opinionated prejudices and sentimental traditions.

WHENEVER governments are unjust and override constitutional guaranties of human rights, they turn the populace into nullificationists.

MAN must not strike back at the hand that feeds him, unless it is the hand of a tyrant that has reduced him to vassalage.

EVERY advance step toward truth is made in the face of tremendous opposition and the loss of many friends.

CONCENTRATION of power in the hands of a few means the destruction of the rights and liberties of the people.

A MAN who collects knowledge merely for a selfish purpose, as a miser hoards money, is a curse to the world.

HE who accepts every friendship the moment it is proffered, will have to fellowship many a lousy tramp.

If you have no house to move into, do not demolish the old one until you have built a new and better one.

HE who changes his opinions too readily is a flop, and he who never changes his opinions is a fool.

PERMANENT peace among men can be secured only through equality of rights and essential justice.

A RELIGION that cannot survive unless it is kept in a glass case is the religion of a tenderfoot.

THOSE who marry in haste and against good counsel have plenty to repent of at their leisure.

THE inalienable rights of man cease to exist only when he ceases to exist.

PUBLIC officials are the servants and not the sovereigns of the people.

THOSE who are afraid of truth, stuff their ears so it cannot enter.

EVERY MAN Is the MASTER of his own HEALTH

His enjoyment of life
depends largely upon
his enjoyment of
health,

for



Health Makes Life Worth Living



HEALTH MAKES LIFE WORTH LIVING

ISSUED MONTHLY
YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$1.00

REVIEW AND HERALD
Publishing Association
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.

It is with the realization of this vital truth that *Life and Health* has stood, since 1885, as a herald of right principles of living.

These principles, of preventive means and rational cure, are being practiced with increasing success by a long chain of sanitariums throughout the world, one of which is the Washington Sanitarium and Hospital at Takoma Park, D. C. Its able medical director, A. W. Truman, M. D., is editor of *Life and Health*.

Life and Health is a magazine of scientific accuracy, dealing with health problems common to every family, in plain, untechnical language.



WASHINGTON SANITARIUM AND HOSPITAL



© HORYDCZAK

HERE lies a soldier.

Unknown? Yes. Unnamed? Ah, no. So long as an American mother, wife, sister, sweetheart, who, during the trying days of the World War, saw her loved one march away to uphold the standards of his country, and return no more,—so long as these remember the name of the one whom they have lost—and when can they forget?—just so long will the soldier sleeping peacefully beneath this marble shaft have a name.

For he represents the thousands of brave American men and boys who answered the bugle call of their country, and are now lying under the white crosses that mark their graves on the bloodstained battlefields of Europe. It was from among these honored dead that a body was chosen, an unknown and unidentified American soldier, brought

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier

By
Ruth Conard

to the United States, and decorated with the medals of highest military distinction both of his own country and of the Allies. On November 11, 1921, he was laid to rest in the Arlington National Cemetery.

The site of the grave, on the hills of Virginia, just across the Potomac from Washington, D. C., and commanding a wonderful view of the capital of the nation, is yearly visited by thousands of American citizens and by delegations from foreign countries. And on Memorial Day, when the whole nation pauses to pay tribute to its heroes, numerous visitors, singly and in groups, come to place a wreath at the grave of the Unknown Soldier. And one wonders how many of these people, as they bow silently before the tomb, whisper the name of loved ones who made the supreme sacrifice "over there."