

*Conf.*

# LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

*The Complete Separation of  
the Church and the  
State*

*The Emancipation of Religion  
from the Dogmatism of  
Modern Science*



Baron von Steuben, the German officer who placed his  
all on the altar of Liberty, that America might  
be free. (See note in Editorial Department.)

Published Quarterly

Price, 10 cents

Washington, D. C.

# Religious Liberty Association

## DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Scriptural Basis: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." "The powers that be are ordained of God."

1. The Bible is the Word of God, and Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world.
2. The ten commandments are the foundation of all morality, and comprehend the whole duty of man, both to God and man.
3. The religion of Jesus Christ, being founded in the love of God, needs no human power to support or enforce it. Love can not be forced.
4. 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 that right he does not interfere with the equal rights of others.
5. Civil government is of divine origin, designed for the protection of men in the enjoyment of their natural rights. It is ordained to rule in civil things, and in this realm is entitled to the respectful obedience of all.
6. The civil power is not authorized to enter the realm of religion, enacting legislation to define or to enforce any religious dogma, ritual, or observance. Coercion in matters of religion always means persecution.
7. All religious legislation on the part of the state, and all movements tending to unite church and state, are subversive of human rights, persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of both church and state.
8. It is proper, therefore, for all to protest against, and use every laudable and legitimate means to prevent, religious legislation, or the union of church and state, in order that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty.
9. The warfare of modern science and modern theology upon the Word of God is a warfare upon the liberties of men, which are defined and guaranteed by that Word.
10. The liquor traffic is a curse to the home, to society, and to the nation, and a menace to civil order, and should be prohibited by law.

For further information regarding the principles of this association, address the Religious Liberty Association, Takoma Park, Washington, D. C. (secretary, K. C. Russell; corresponding secretary, C. M. Snow), or any of the affiliated organizations given below:—

## AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

**Atlantic Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island): Office, South Lancaster, Mass.; secretary, S. B. Horton.

**Canadian Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, and Newfoundland): Office, 173 Second Ave., Ottawa, Ontario.

**Central States Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, and Wyoming): Office, College View, Neb.

**Columbia Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland): Office, —; secretary, W. A. Hennig, Takoma Park, D. C.

**Lake Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin): Office, 213-215 Dean Building, 113 S. Lafayette St., South Bend, Ind.; secretary, Allen Moon.

**Northern Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota): Office, 2718 Third Ave., S., Minneapolis, Minn.

**North Pacific Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska): Office, Walla Walla, Wash., Box 429; secretary, A. J. Breed.

**Pacific Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in California, Nevada, Utah, and Arizona): Office, Mountain View, Cal.; secretary, J. O. Corliss.

**Southeastern Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina): Office, 75 Ashby St., Atlanta, Ga.; secretary, Charles Thompson.

**Southern Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Mississippi): Office, 85-87 Arcade Building, Nashville, Tenn.; secretary, C. P. Bollman.

**Southwestern Religious Liberty Association** (affiliated organizations in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico): Office, Keene, Tex.

## FOREIGN OFFICES

**Australia:** Office, "Elsnath," Burwood St., Burwood, N. S. W., Australia; secretary, L. A. Hoopes.

**Great Britain:** Office, Stanborough Park, Watford, Herts, England; secretary, W. T. Bartlett.



IN THE GOSPEL OF THE PROMISED MESSIAH IS MAN'S ONLY  
ASSURANCE OF TRUE LIBERTY

# Contents

\*\*\*

FRONTISPIECE	PAGE
The Annunciation to the Shepherds . . . . .	2
<b>EDITORIAL</b>	
The Sin of the Ages . . . . .	5
Profaning Holy Things . . . . .	6
The President at Mass . . . . .	6
Hard to Learn . . . . .	7
The "Padlock Bill" Passes . . . . .	8
Religion by Bonus . . . . .	8
Who Was Disturbed . . . . .	9
The Bible and the Public School . . . . .	10
What Will Be the End of Earthly Governments? . . . . .	10
The Impossible . . . . .	11
National Religion and Individual Religion . . . . .	12
Mixing Religion and Politics . . . . .	13
The Idaho Sunday Law . . . . .	13
What Would Jesus Do? . . . . .	17
A Centennial . . . . .	18
A Resume of Significant Events for the Year 1910 . . . . .	20
<b>CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES</b>	
Tinkering the Constitution . . . . .	21
A World Movement With Much in It . . . . .	24
Putting God's Name in the National Constitution . . . . .	30
America's Liberties in Jeopardy . . . . .	31
Union Labor and the Civil Rest Day . . . . .	35
The Sabbath and the Civil Power . . . . .	37
The Laymen's Movement . . . . .	38
Religious Liberty — Retrospective . . . . .	40
Back to the Night (poetry) . . . . .	43
<b>TEMPERANCE</b>	
An Abstinence Testimony in a Strange Place . . . . .	44
America's Enormous Liquor Traffic . . . . .	45
<b>ILLUSTRATIONS</b>	
State Capitol Building, Idaho . . . . .	14
Delegates to World's Conference on Christian Citizenship . . . . .	24, 25
Chambers-Wylie Memorial Church, Philadelphia . . . . .	27
Leaders of the National Reform Association . . . . .	29
Cardinal Gibbons in Thanksgiving Mass Parade . . . . .	33
St. Patrick's Church, Washington . . . . .	34
The Thin End of the Wedge (cartoon) . . . . .	41

# LIBERTY

*Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto  
all the inhabitants thereof. Lev. 25:10.*

VOL. VI

FIRST QUARTER, 1911

NO. 1

## *Editorial*

MAN must be free in religion, or he has no freedom that is worthy of the name.

IT is in the interests of true religion that we protest against our legislators prescribing it.

WHEREVER the state seeks to dictate in religion, it obtrudes itself between man and God, and interferes with the prerogatives of both.

CONGRESS should never enter the domain of religion, either to forbid or to enforce it. In either act sacrilege is committed and the dearest rights of man are trampled in the dust. Religion is a matter of conviction, not of compulsion.

IN the temporalities it is proper to yield to the state in its requirements; but if in religion also we look to the state for guidance and direction, we are accepting in the place of God a human master, who has no power to deal in the things of eternity.

THE article in this issue entitled "Tinkering the Constitution" ought to be read by every lover of American institutions. It is a faithful warning as well as a revelation.

IF religion is of God, Congress can neither prescribe nor proscribe it without acting upon the assumption that God has abdicated his throne that Congress might occupy it in his place.

TO all eternity it will remain true that the Creator rested on a certain day and hallowed it. That became God's rest day. His rest day is therefore unchanging and unchangeable; and civil laws to enforce another day as a sabbath are a seeming effort of the human to make the Deity himself appear to be attempting the impossible.

THE clericals in the Spanish senate are opposing the bill for secular education. The proposition in Spain at the present time is to have a system of education in which the instruction given in the differ-

ent schools shall be in the hands of lay teachers rather than in the hands of priests and nuns. The Church is opposing this, just as she is the American public-school system based upon the same principle.

---

THIS magazine is sent out only on pre-paid orders. Any one receiving this journal who has not personally subscribed for it, may know, therefore, that some friend has subscribed for him; that the price has been paid; that he will not be asked to pay for it; and that at the end of the time specified on the label, the journal will be stopped unless ordered renewed, and the order paid for in advance.

---

IMMEDIATELY after the close of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference held at Philadelphia, Rev. Dr. S. F. Scovel, the chairman of the conference and president of the National Reform Association, was called away by death. Dr. Scovel was a scholarly churchman, a gentleman whom we learned greatly to respect as a man in spite of the great difference in our positions in the matter of liberty of conscience.

---

ON December 7 there was unveiled in Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C., a bronze statue of Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, a distinguished officer of the German army. Baron von Steuben became the drill-master of the American army, and it was under his efficient tutelage that the undisciplined army of the Revolution grew into an effective organization and brought victory and freedom out of discouragement and seeming defeat. In his letter to the American Congress he said: "The only motive I have in coming to this continent is the desire to serve a people engaged in such a noble war for its rights and liberty. I ask neither title nor money. My one

ambition is to win, with my blood, the honor that my name may be found among the defenders of your freedom." He won that honor and occupies that place in the history of this nation and in the hearts of its people. And while Americans honor Von Steuben, let them not forget that the liberty he helped to win can not be preserved without unshrinking allegiance to the fundamental principles on which the nation he fought for was founded — equal and exact justice to all, and the complete separation of the church from the functions of government.

---

THERE are some interesting facts contained in the article by J. N. Loughborough in the department of General Articles. As the Creator made provision for the salvation of repentant sinners before sin actually developed in this world, so the warning against the dangers of church and state union in this nation was ready and being given before the organization of the association whose purpose it is to unite civil and religious things in this country.

---

THE theatrical fraternity has at last staged a play, "La Samaritaine" (The Samaritan), in which actors representing Christ and his apostles are put before the footlights. In this play the one impersonating the Saviour is represented as bringing about the conversion of a woman of evil life, and imitates before the audience the performance of the Saviour's miracles. This turning of our Lord's great work into farce-comedy, to enhance box-office receipts, illustrates the lengths to which unbridled commercialism will go. The most sacred and essentially divine things this world possesses are turned into the channels of barter and greed and gain. The livery of heaven is stolen to cloak the worshiper at the altar of Mammon. The spirit in

such an enterprise would convert the very throne of God into a merchantable commodity if it could but lay its hands upon it. Surely the play-writer went far enough when he rifled the inmost recesses of the human soul, that he might expose them to view for a price, without attempting to levy on heaven itself and heaven's message to fallen men, to turn that also into silver and gold, to canker and rust and to worship and die with.

---

IN opposing state interference in religious things, we are not antagonizing government nor belittling religion. Far from it. It is because we believe in them both that we oppose a union of the two, which will be ruinous to them both. It is because we believe in religion, and in man's obligation to his Maker, that we oppose the state's regulation of any portion of religion. It is because we believe in the Sabbath of God's appointment as a true religious institution, and believe its keeping to be a religious duty, that we are opposed to the control or perversion of that institution and the prescribing of that duty by a power that has no legitimate authority in such matters.

---

THE *Christian Register* of Dec. 8, 1910, states this proposition:—

When a man, be he layman or minister, confesses that he can not do his work and succeed in it if he adopts the golden rule, or shapes his course according to the strict demands of fair play as between man and man, he confesses that, whether layman or minister, he is a weakling, not competent to play the part of a man.

It is true. And is it not just as true that he who claims he can not keep a Sabbath without a civil law compelling him to do so is "a weakling, not competent to play the part of" a full-grown Christian? The men of old "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the

mouths of lions, . . . from weakness were made strong," suffering "mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments," were not men who could not do right unless others did. They not only did not need a human law to compel them to obey God, but they obeyed him when human laws pronounced on them the death penalty for doing so. Such men have a right to the name Christian; but we can not say this of men who can not be religious without a human law to make them so; who can not keep Sunday unless there be a civil statute enforcing that religious ordinance upon them; who can not worship God in a church when they know their neighbor is working in his field. By enacting legislation to meet the demands of such individuals, the state would not only not be fostering true religion, but would actually be fostering a race of spiritual weaklings. The state has no business in religious things anyway; and when it enters that field, it hinders mightily and helps none.

---

#### *The Sin of the Ages*

SAID Rev. J. H. Haslam, of Philadelphia, in an address at the World's Conference on Christian Citizenship:—

The time has come for the whole church of God to move forward. Vast empires are awakened; spontaneous changes are taking place in all the world, making a supreme opportunity for the Christian religion. The rising spiritual tide, if taken at its flood, will carry whole peoples out of the stagnation of heathenism. The present state of things is drawing to a close in many lands. Out of the shadow of the night the world seems just now moving into the light. It is day-break everywhere.

True, it is the day of the church's opportunity; but what hope for good is there in the reflection that at such a moment an organization is formed to carry to the world—not the personal gospel of individual redemption, but that po-

litico-religious counterfeit, a "national religion," and the doctrine of the salvation of nations! Such a movement builds a Babel of its own whereon to mount to the skies over the outraged consciences of the people, as they are being lifted out of personal sin into personal righteousness through the power of a personal Saviour. What a travesty on true religion and gospel purpose it is, that when souls in heathenism have found the Saviour, have taken the Word of God as the man of their counsel, and have begun to drink in of its spirit and shape their lives in harmony with its precepts, the iron hand of a "national religion" should be clamped down upon them, crushing the finer instincts of the soul, outraging conscience, and turning into dead forms and perfunctory ceremonies what was designed of heaven as a living, moving, vital, and vitalizing Christian experience! It is the sin of the ages. If there be a greater, it has not yet been let loose upon the world.

---

#### *Profaning Holy Things*

THE demand for a "national religion" was strongly emphasized at the Philadelphia World's Conference on Christian Citizenship. In the very nature of things, those who make such a demand are bound to have their eyes blinded to the distinction which God himself has put between the sacred and the secular. Thus the president of the conference:—

The election of good officers of the government and pure administration is as sacred a duty as that of the ministry. The pulpit is no more sacred than the desk of the mayor or magistrate.

This commingling of sacred and secular things was one of the most striking characteristics of the conference. The above declaration of its chairman brings strikingly to mind the Lord's accusation against his disloyal priests anciently:—

"Her priests have done violence to my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have made no distinction between the holy and the common, neither have they caused men to discern between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." Eze. 22:26.

This accusation of our Lord was in all particulars applicable to this conference. Violence was done to his law by using it to bolster up a counterfeit sabbatic institution. The Sabbath that was established and hallowed by Jehovah himself was profaned by making it as one of the common days. By declaring that the pulpit was no more sacred than the desk of the mayor or magistrate, the chairman of the conference "made no distinction between the holy and the common." By putting politics on a par with religion, the conference failed to cause men to "discern between the unclean and the clean." And it was pre-eminently apparent that the members of the conference had "hid their eyes from" the only Sabbath the Bible recognizes, or God ever established as a period of rest and worship. If ever this world was warned against a movement by Holy Writ, it has been warned, in the above scripture, against this one, and will be without excuse for participating in it.

---

#### *The President at "Mass"*

THE New York *Witness* of Nov. 30, 1910, under the above heading, speaks thus of the attendance of President Taft and other government officials at what is termed Thanksgiving mass at St. Patrick's Church in Washington, D. C., on Thanksgiving day:—

This official attendance at mass is much to be regretted. It is likely to be greatly misunderstood by the people and the governments of Catholic countries in both hemispheres, which are struggling to rid themselves of papal domination. Nominally, at least, several of these Latin-



American nations recognize the Pope's temporal power by maintaining diplomatic representatives at Rome accredited to the Vatican. The Latin-American diplomats in Washington are probably Roman Catholics, in name at least, and their presence at a service of their own church was natural enough. But, whether the American people recognize the fact or not, the people of France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy know that the material and political greatness of this republic is due to the essentially Protestant principles upon which all her institutions are founded, and that the immense difference between North America and South America in progressiveness is due chiefly to the open Bible and our political system built upon it. Good ground will they have for amazement that, while they are struggling to reach the liberties possessed by this country, political expediency should cause the head of our government to do homage—in appearance, at least—to the very despotism against which they are in rebellion.

One year ago this function was instituted in Washington, and we predicted at the time that it would take on the nature of a perennial performance, the President's attendance being used as a precedent to govern the course of other presidents through the years to come. The purpose of the hierarchy in establishing such an institution is sufficiently apparent without elucidation by us. If there is to be no church and state union here, no religious organization should make the national government an agency for promulgating its dogmas. The presidency of the United States ought not to be counted by any religious organization as a missionizing asset. The organization which does so discredits the highest office in the gift of the people.

---

#### *Hard to Learn*

SPEAKING of the church in its relations to the state, W. R. William, in the *Western Recorder* (Baptist) of Jan. 20, 1910, says:—

Pillories, dungeons, racks, scaffolds, and inquisitions have been invoked to establish the cause of him who declared his own kingdom not one of this world. . . .

Some in our days have seen the evil of religious persecution, and yet have been unwilling to relinquish all national establishments, lest national ungodliness should be the result. They would have the state, by a strange impartiality, widen its establishment, varying its motley creeds and rituals according to the likings of its subjects. But they could furnish no test by which statesmen might be held to select and to establish only the true religion. Britain has thus subsidized Episcopacy in England, and Presbyterianism in Scotland, and has by more than one of her statesmen threatened to add to the staff of her ecclesiastical pensioners, by endowing Romanism in Ireland. By some of her Indian placemen she has contributed to the festivals of Juggernaut, foul and bloody as they are; and she has cashiered Protestant soldiers for refusing, in Malta, to share in the processions that gave to the mass idolatrous honor. Catholic France pays salaries to the Romish priest, the Protestant pastor, and the Jewish rabbi. Now a faith thus elastic, indiscriminate, and all-devouring can not honor God, or rightly develop conscience. Parity of reasoning would require it to extend salaries and subsidies to the impurities and defilements of Mohammedanism and Mormonism, should votaries of either delusion, in sufficient numbers, colonize its soil; and would even demand its patronage for the human sacrifices of Hinduism, and the cannibal feasts of New Zealand.

Mr. William shows, in a word, the result of governmental establishments of religion. They must rest upon the will of the people, upon the decision of majority rule; and this sort of religion entirely eliminates God from the question. When the matters of conscience become questions of political rule, or must be determined by the will of the majority, it makes religion a matter of caprice and mere human opinion and human control. How much better it is to recognize religion as the personal relationship existing

between God and each one of his creatures, and also to offer man the right to worship God as he shall determine to be his duty by the study of the Word, and by the leadings of the Spirit of God in his life!

---

#### *The "Padlock Bill" Passes*

ON December 24 the Spanish Chamber of Deputies, by a vote of 108 to 20, passed the famous "Padlock bill," which the whole Roman Catholic hierarchy has so vigorously opposed during the past months. The bill passed the Senate on November 4 by a vote of 149 to 58. In the passage of this bill the premier, Señor Canalejas, has won a striking victory. It is known that he had the cordial support of the king in this move for curtailing the activities of the Catholic orders in Spain. As originally drafted, the bill prohibited the creation of further monastic establishments in the country until the concordat had been revised or new laws passed that would deal with the matter. The government accepted an amendment limiting the time of the prohibition to two years. While the Vatican insisted that no action should be taken upon this matter until the concordat had been revised, the premier insisted upon a program of religious liberty, and maintained that the "Padlock bill" was not properly a matter for diplomatic exchanges between Madrid and the Vatican. It is one of the most striking of anomalies that while Spain is thus moving away from clerical dominance, such powerful forces are at work in the United States to bring in again a union of civil and religious things. The world's true progress would be much more rapid if the movement was not so often in a circle when it should be straight-away. Spain's victory is the more marked in this matter when it is remembered that both the king and the premier are Catholics, as are also both

houses of the Cortes. The revolt of Latin Europe against clerical dominance ought to be a warning and a lesson to America, and cause our legislators to look with much concern upon the movement toward church unity for political purposes.

---

#### *Religion by Bonus*

WE have heard the charge made that certain missionaries in foreign lands, more zealous for numbers than particular as to character of converts, have made it an object to the natives to become converts, and as often the charge has been indignantly, and we hope rightly, denied. But frequently organizations in America have made demands upon lawmakers and law-enforcers which are as uncomplimentary to themselves as the charges made against the aforementioned missionaries. Of such a type are the demands of butchers, bakers, and grocers for laws that will compel all the members of their occupation to close their places of business on Sunday, so that those who wish to close may not lose any trade or any profit because of their conscientious convictions in regard to the observance of the day.

Of the same character is the demand that is now being made by the barbers of Baltimore (and other cities, as well) for the enforcement of what is called the barbers' Sunday law. Some of the barbers want to rest upon that day (or at least they desire the day off), but fear that if they do, they will lose a portion of their custom; and so, rather than sacrifice their sheckels, they violate their consciences. One such, who desires to observe Sunday, but works instead, lest his brothers in the business take in more money than he, writes thus to the *Baltimore American*, of December 24:—

The barber who respects the sabbath day and wants to observe it as a day of rest is badly handicapped by the greedy

Sunday scraper. It is up to the authorities to enforce the barbers' Sunday law, without fear or favor, and put the full penalty on violators, which may be fifty dollars' fine or six months in jail, or both. One full dose like this would cure the worst case of the greedy Sunday scraper, and would surely be a lasting cure. Now let the cops get busy and gather them in, so as to better conditions in the trade.

The idea that such a plea is made out of respect for the day of worship is entirely erroneous. The plea is a specious one; there is nothing of religion in it. It is merely a matter of not wanting to lose anything while outwardly observing an ordinance of the church. Such persons are willing to act religiously if it costs them nothing. It is not of such stuff that any of the martyrs were made. There never would have been any Daniel in the lions' den, any Hebrew worthies in the fiery furnace, any victims of rack, dungeon, and thumbscrew, any *autos da fé*—in short, there would never have been any sacrifice on Calvary, if the character of those who suffered was of the same order as that of those who demand such laws on such grounds. Let us have men—men of character, men of principle, men who will do right without counting what it will cost them, and are willing to suffer for it if need be. We have had enough of religion by bonus.

---

#### *Who Was Disturbed?*

FROM the Boston *Evening Transcript* of Dec. 12, 1910, we clip this item, and ask the reader to ponder its import:—

For working on the Lord's day, Lidovico Lello, of Wakefield, was fined two dollars in the Malden court to-day. An officer watched Lello for about three hours Sunday while he repaired watches. After the court ascertained that all Lello made was one dollar seventy-five cents, a fine of two dollars was imposed, so as to take off the profit of the day's work.

Was ever the inconsistency, the ab-

surdity, the positive wickedness of the Sunday-law advocate's program better illustrated than in this instance? On their own ground and out of their own mouths they are condemned. Their plea for the Sunday law is that "the poor, tired laboring man may have a chance to rest," and that "worship may not be disturbed." Watch repairing is as quiet a business as reading a newspaper to one's self. Whose worship was disturbed? Whose liberties were imperiled? Whose rights were interfered with? Is honest labor a crime one seventh of the time? Such a travesty upon justice and such an exemplification of tyranny over human rights is worthy of the Dark Ages. Such is Sunday-law justice.

If this world were to stand another hundred years, one of two things would take place: either our descendants would look back upon such records as this with the same shame that we look back upon the whipping of Baptists and burning of Quakers, or the god of medievalism would be again on the throne of the world, with conscience outlawed, and the brutal business of the Inquisition in full swing. Was Lello fined in order that he might have an opportunity to rest? However strongly it may be asserted, the securing of rest for the laboring man is not the object of the advocates of Sunday laws. The object is the same to-day that it was in A. D. 401, that every avenue may be forcibly closed save that leading into the church. They are desired by the same element (and for the same purpose) that punished our colonial forebears for non-attendance at church.

Instead of such laws helping the "tired working man," they make his condition more distressing. Think of the spectacle of a great, prosperous state taking from a poor laboring man the product of his day's honest industry, the meager wage on which his family depended, and all because he had not kept

somebody's sabbath, had not followed the forms of somebody's religion, had not acted religious when he did not feel so! The saddest result of such a law is its tendency to break down respect for law itself on the part of those who suffer from its injustice. And for this result it is not they who are to blame but those who frame and advocate and enforce such iniquitous legislation.

---

### *The Bible and the Public School*

THE Supreme Court of Illinois has barred the Bible from the public schools of the State. The case whose trial resulted in this decision came up in Winchester, Scott County, and was due to the action of the Catholic citizens of that place, who protested against the reading of the Bible, singing, and prayer in the public schools. In handing down his decision, the judge said: "The wrong arises out of compulsion to join in any kind of religious worship. The free enjoyment of religious worship includes freedom not to worship."

The decision of the judge is founded upon correct principles. The public schools are for the public, not for any sect. They are supported by the public by general taxation, and the principle that no man should be taxed to support a religion in which he does not believe, necessitates just such a decision as that of the Illinois court, if the courts are to uphold that principle; and the courts must uphold the principle or be out of harmony with the fundamental principles of the government regarding the separation of church and state and the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

While we are, therefore, on principle, in harmony with this decision of the Illinois court, we are not in harmony with the *purpose* of the Catholic plaintiffs in excluding the Bible from the schools of

the State. Their purpose is to prevent the common people reading the Word of God or hearing it read; and with such a purpose, of course, we have nothing in common. While that church restricts the circulation of the Bible among the people, and keeps it largely hidden from her children, and would exclude it from the public schools in order to insure a more complete accomplishment of her purpose, it is our desire to see it in the hands of every human being — not through compulsion, however, but through invitation and through individual choice. While we, as believers in soul liberty, can not complain against the Catholics' protest in this matter, we must assert that the reason for that protest is as much out of harmony with our purpose and desires as anything can possibly be. The judge's decision is correct; but with the *purpose* of the plaintiff's protest this journal has no sympathy.

---

### *What Will Be the End of Earthly Governments?*

THOSE who are seeking to bring about the world's conversion by the power of the state, instead of by the power of the Holy Spirit through the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ, believe that eventually the kingdoms of this world will all be under the influence and control of Jesus Christ.

When such a condition has been reached, they believe that the millennium will have been ushered in and the reign of universal peace will have begun. They maintain that this condition is to be brought about through the medium of civil law. Let us examine the Bible and see whether it warrants men in holding the view that Jesus Christ is to reign as a temporal monarch in this world.

The prophet Daniel, in speaking of the end of earthly kingdoms, says that they are to become "like the chaff of the sum-

mer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them;" and in Rev. 19: 13-19, we are told what the attitude of the nations will be toward Christ at his coming:—

"And he [Christ] was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

"And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.

"And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army."

What more convincing evidence is needed to show that, instead of the kingdoms of this world proclaiming their submission and loyalty to Christ, and his ruling over them, the reverse will be true, and they will set themselves against him and his kingdom. The Word declares that he will smite the nations, and from the king on the throne to the humblest subject of the realm whose heart is unconverted, they will become food for the fowls of the air. But we read that before this occurs, "the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army." So let not those who read these lines be deceived by the seductive idea that this world, in the present order of things, will ever be brought

into subjection to the will of God. This condition will never obtain until after Jesus Christ has come the second time and destroyed all earthly kingdoms and established his kingdom, which will never pass away.

K. C. R.

---

### The Impossible

It is a fact, though not generally recognized, that Sunday, the first day of the week, is the one day which could not possibly be the rest day of the Creator. Any other day of the week might have been; but the first day could not possibly have been. To demonstrate: Instead of creating the heavens and the earth in six days, and resting on the seventh, God might have created these in five days, and rested on the sixth, and every sixth day have been the Sabbath; or in four days, and rested on the fifth; or in three days, and rested on the fourth; or in two days, and rested on the third; or in one day, and rested on the second; but he could not have created them on the first day, and rested on that same day. This would have been impossible; for God himself can not be doing a thing, and cease, or rest from doing it, at the same time. Thus, in changing God's rest day, men have chosen as *their* day of rest the one day of the week which, of all days, could not possibly be *God's* rest day.

This is the day which, for the past sixteen hundred years, men, in superstition, darkness, and apostasy, have been seeking to compel their fellow men to observe by civil laws; and concerning which there is now in progress a world-wide movement for its compulsory observance. This, in subtle and refined form, is but the returning to paganism and to pagan methods under a Christian guise. Every rival to God is idolatry; and corruption, intolerance, and oppression are invariable accompaniments of idolatry.

W. A. C.

## National Religion and Individual Religion

### A Concrete and Striking Object-Lesson

THAT kind of religion which is made dominant by statutory law, enforced upon the people under pains and penalties, is as much out of place in the gospel economy as the proverbial wild animal in the china shop. It can crush and trample and destroy, but can not construct or edify or perpetuate fundamental good. An illustration of this was found by former President Roosevelt in his journey through Central Africa, as told in an address at a Methodist missionary gathering held in Baltimore, Md., and reported in the *Literary Digest* of December 3. Mr. Roosevelt says:—

As a rule, I was immensely impressed with the improvement in the character of the natives who had been under missionary control. . . . When I passed through the Sudan tribe, I saw on every hand what the Mahdi rule had meant in the Sudan. Mahdism was really an outbreak of various Mohammedan proselytizers, which reproduced in the nineteenth century just the conditions of the seventh. . . . I passed through village after village in the Sudan where I could see native schools established in connection with the Gordon Memorial College. I would see a native school with a native teacher and lots of children up to twelve years of age, and perhaps three or four over that, and I asked about it. They said, "These are the government children." I asked what that meant. *All children were killed except as the government took possession.* I came upon tribes of pagans where there would be children and old men, and practically no men of middle age, because they had all been killed out by the Mahdists. . . . Out of about ten millions of people, nearly seven millions were killed during the years of the Mahdi uprising. . . . That is what missionary effort saved Uganda from, and I do wish that the well-meaning people who laugh at or decry missionary work could realize what the missionary work has done right there in middle Africa.

The missionary work of which he speaks, and which he commends, was not of the National Reform variety, the "conversion" of nations by legal process, the enforcement of religion by "external force of sheriffs," or bands of soldiery. It was the quiet, soul-searching, heart-converting work of the gospel upon individual men and women. That made Uganda a very different place from the Sudan. In the one place the conversion of souls was going on under the melting influences of the Word of God personally opened to individual persons. In the other place a national religion was crushing out both liberty and life to enforce a creed. In the one place was the power of love, cementing, building up, civilizing, educating, enlightening, Christianizing, and giving life. In the other place the hand of force was disintegrating, tearing down, heathenizing, darkening, brutalizing, and taking life.

America is being asked to-day to choose between these two systems—between the system she already has, wherein religion is made a matter between man and his Maker alone, and a system wherein religion is made a matter of human law, an affair of the state. If it be objected that Christianity, as a national religion, would not do what other national religions have done, we have only to say that wherever the *form* of Christianity has been made a matter of law, to be forced upon the people under penalty, there has been little choice between it and the national religion of Mohammed, so far as regard for the religious liberties of the people is concerned. Instance papal Rome, Russia, Greece, old England, colonial America, and the Catholic republics to the south of us.

There we see state religion as the National Reform Association is pleading for it here. There the religious forces

of the land made their demands upon the lawmaking bodies, and had their wishes crystallized into statutes, as

If a nation is a moral being, it must be a keeper of the moral law. As it can operate only through its citizens, it must then compel its citizens to keep the moral law. But that means the enforcement of religion by law under penalties, a thing which in actuality is impossible and in the attempt iniquitous and sacrilegious.

lighten it. It will be found that the contents are as black as the surrounding blackness of the room.

the Federal Council of Churches is seeking to have done in the United States. It seems as if it must have been by divine interposition that these concrete examples of the working of the two systems were laid before the attention of Americans just at this time, when a federated and power-coveting church is demanding a national religion.

He only has religion in truth who has opened every window of his soul to the sunlight of heaven, who has yielded himself completely to the control of the Just One; and when he has done that, he will find politics so uncongenial that he can no more stay in it than a tree can refuse to bud and blossom when the sun and rain have had their way with it.

### Mixing Religion and Politics

A WRITER in the *Chicago Tribune* of recent date says:—

You hear a lot of people say that you mustn't mix religion and politics. I've been noticing things for a good many years, and I've never seen any brand of politics that wouldn't be improved by mixing a little religion with it.

Religion, to be of any worth at all, must be real and indivisible. One either has it or he doesn't have it. He who attempts to mix some religion and some politics will find in the end that he has some politics and no religion. The attempt to mix a little religion with politics is a most thankless and profitless task. This is not saying that it would not be a good thing for all men to have religion. It would. But he who takes a little religion to put with his politics is simply using a sacred and divine grace to help him achieve a purely selfish and worldly end. Let religion, true, and full, and untrammelled, enter the lives of all, to sweeten and purify and ennoble, and fit them for the better life. But to "mix a little religion with politics" is like attempting to bottle a little sunshine and carry it into a windowless room to

Jesus Christ commissioned his followers to teach and baptize individuals, not governments. There is a heaven for saved individuals, but none for "saved" governments.

### The Idaho Sunday Law

#### A "Model" Law

ONE of the latest States, if not the latest, to pass a law enforcing the observance of Sunday, is Idaho. March 14, 1907, the legislature of this State passed a law which has been styled by its chief promoters a "model" Sunday law. In it, they assert, are combined "the best elements of forty other State Sunday laws." It ought, therefore, to be a most excellent law, if there is any virtue or excellence in such laws at all, and worthy of a careful and critical examination.

#### The Law Examined

This law consists of six sections, sections 6823-6828 of the revised code of 1908. The first section declares that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is hereby set apart as a day of public rest."

The second section provides for the compulsory suspension of business and trade, with certain exceptions, and reads as follows:—

Section 6824. Business to Be Suspended. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons in this State to keep open on Sunday for the purpose of any business, trade, or

sale of goods, wares, or merchandise, any shop, store, building, or place of business whatever; *Provided*, That hotels and restaurants may furnish lodging and meals; and, *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to livery-stables, or to stores in so far as the sale of medicines or sick-room supplies are concerned, or to undertakers while providing for the dead, or to news-stands in so far as the quiet sale and delivery of daily papers and magazines is concerned, nor to the sale of non-intoxicating refreshments, candies, and cigars. Any person or persons violating this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than twenty-five dollars nor more than one hundred dollars,



CAPITOL BUILDING, IDAHO

or shall be imprisoned in the county jail not to exceed thirty days, and upon a second conviction shall be punished by both such fine and imprisonment.

The question at once arises what right any State legislature has to prohibit honest business and trade at all on any day of the week. The logic employed by the Supreme Court of California in 1858, in setting aside the Sunday law of that State, is applicable here. The court said:—

The question presented in this case is not merely one of expediency or abuse of power; it is a question of usurpation of power. If the legislature have the authority to appoint a time of compulsory rest, we would have no right to interfere with it, even if they required a cessation

from toil for six days in the week, instead of one. If they possess this power, it is without limit, and may extend to the prohibition of all occupations at all times. — *9 California, 502.*

#### *Character of the Law*

As with all Sunday laws, this law makes criminal on Sunday that which is considered perfectly legitimate and proper on any other day of the week. It is the day, therefore, and not the deed which determines the character of the offense; and it must be the character which men have attached to the day, that lies at the foundation of this distinction. And what is this? Every one knows

what it is, though not stated in so many words in the law. It is its religious character. This being so, there can be no escaping the conclusion that, in essence and intent, the law itself is religious. But if the law is religious, it can have no rightful place upon the statute-books of any State—of a government ordained

of God, and, by its Constitution, commissioned by its citizens, to deal only with civil things.

The constitution of the State of Idaho positively forbids anything like religious legislation, religious or sectarian teaching in the public schools, or any interference with religious rights whatever. Article I, Section 4, of the constitution says:—

No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination, or pay tithes against his consent; *nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.*

That Sunday laws are sectarian in character is evident upon the slightest reflection. Besides the Jews, of whom



there are not less than two millions in the United States, there are, as is well known, whole denominations of Christians in this country who observe and worship upon another day. Sunday laws do therefore give preference by law to a certain class of religionists and to a particular mode of worship. And to enforce the observance of Sunday as a sabbath, or day of rest, upon those who conscientiously observe another day, is an interference with religious rights, and nothing short of religious persecution. Thus it has been held by one of the highest legal authorities in the United States. In his "Constitutional Limitations," page 476, Judge Cooley says:—

But the Jew [and it is equally true of all Sabbatarians] who is forced to respect the first day of the week, when his conscience requires of him the observance of the seventh also, may plausibly urge that the law discriminates against his religion, and by forcing him to keep a second sabbath in each week, unjustly, though by indirection, punishes him for his belief.

Unlike most State Sunday laws, the Idaho Sunday law makes no exception for those who conscientiously observe another day. In this respect it is not even tolerant, to say nothing of recognizing religious liberty and the equality of all before the law. And yet it is set forth as a model, and as combining the best features of all the Sunday laws in the United States.

#### *Another Inconsistency*

Another inconsistency that may be pointed out in this law is the fact that it penalizes the sale and supplying of the necessaries of life on Sunday, but permits traffic in the luxuries. To sell a loaf of bread on Sunday would be a misdemeanor under this law, and subject the offender to a heavy fine or imprisonment; but to sell "non-intoxicating refreshments, candies, and cigars" on that day entails no such consequences. To

quietly sell and deliver a coat or a pair of shoes to a needy family on Sunday might cost a man one hundred dollars and thirty days in jail; but "the quiet sale and delivery of daily papers and magazines" on Sunday is another thing. That is legitimate business and trade, even on Sunday.

The next two sections of the law, sections 6825 and 6826 of the code, prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, the opening of theaters, ordinary amusements, and horse-racing on Sunday. If any of these things are criminal, indecent, or immoral in themselves, they should be prohibited on all days; otherwise there is no basis in civil law for prohibiting them at all. Crime and immorality are not determined by the day of the week when done. Who would think of punishing only those murders, robberies, and assaults committed on Sunday?

#### *An Inquisitorial Provision*

The fifth section of the law, section 6827, is worthy of special note. This provides for the enforcement of the law in the following manner:—

Section 6827. Public Officers to Enforce Act. It shall be the duty of each prosecuting attorney, sheriff, constable, city or town marshal, or any and all other public officers in this State, to inform against and diligently prosecute any and all persons guilty of the violations of the provisions of the four preceding sections, either upon creditable information as to any such violation, or upon reasonable cause to believe that there has been any such violation. Any said officer who shall refuse or wilfully neglect to inform against and prosecute said offenders against the four preceding sections, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than fifty dollars nor more than five hundred dollars, and the court before which said officer shall be tried shall declare the office or appointment held by said officer vacant for the remainder of his term.

The inquisitorial character of this law

is revealed here. In an article in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, of

Dec. 11, 1907, Rev. W. F. Crafts, speaking of the new Idaho Sunday law, said:—

The weekly rest day being a religious institution, its enforcement by civil law means the enforcement of a religious act upon the people.

The Pacific Coast secretary of the International Reform Bureau [Rev. G. L. Tufts] combined in this bill the best elements of forty other State Sunday laws. It is especially a model to be studied and copied in that it provides that any executive officer found guilty of neglecting to enforce it is ineligible for any public office for two years. Every politician will see genius in that penalty, and will not be surprised to hear the law is well enforced.

This not only shows the origin of this law and the kind of laws these "reformers" consider "model" Sunday laws, but the shrewd, tactful, inquisitorial cunning characteristic of promoters of such legislation, for inventing methods to force the State to enforce their church and state laws, and do their bidding. Why should Sunday laws more than other laws contain coercing, intimidating threats to officials for failure to enforce the law?

There is a striking likeness between the penalty here laid upon civil officers for failure to enforce this law and that laid upon civil officers in the days of the Inquisition for failing to enforce the judgments of the inquisitors. Then any officer who refused to co-operate in the work of the Inquisition was excommunicated, and all who would hold intercourse with him; next, if necessary, the city of his residence was laid under interdict; and finally, if still more stress was needed, the officials were deposed, or "deprived of their posts." See "The Pope and the Council," by Janus, page 241, and "Romanism Analyzed," by J. McDonald, B. D., page 359.

The province of religion is not to increase the population of the jails, but to add souls to the kingdom of God.

Is it too much to say that the same spirit inspired both these provisions?

And can any one doubt that the revival of Sunday laws and Sunday enforcement will re-establish the Inquisition? If so, let him read carefully the following from a leaflet on "Plan of Work in Defense of the Lord's Day," prepared by Rev. W. F. Crafts and Rev. J. B. Davison:—

The Investigating Committee, appointed by the secretary and known only to himself, may consist of four or eight. The first (or first two) shall on the first Sunday of each month, the second on the second, and so on, report in writing and in detail to the secretary from careful personal observations made the previous day whatever Sunday work or dissipation was discovered. Or the whole city may be divided into small districts and one or two be appointed in each district to investigate every Sunday and report every Monday. These facts the secretary shall report early in the week to the proper civil officer, usually requiring him to secure his own evidence through the police or otherwise. The secretary shall also report these facts at the general monthly committee meeting, as the diagnosis through which cures of these evils may be wisely applied. The Press Committee shall report these facts, so far as it is wise, in the press once a month, showing progress or decline. As of old an unjust judge was aroused to justice by importunity, so many an executive officer may be driven from habitual perjury to the observation of his oath, if the record of his neglect is persistently set before him and the public month after month.

What would this be but the Inquisition over again? There is not another Sunday law in all the United States containing such a provision. The very fact that it was thought necessary to place in the law itself beforehand an intimidating threat to officials, in the way of a heavy fine or loss of office, to secure its enforce-

ment, is good evidence in itself that the law is illegal, unconstitutional, and out of place in any civil government. Instead, therefore, of this being the best Sunday law in the United States, it may more properly be styled one of the worst, if not the worst, in all the country.

The last section of the law simply directs that the fines collected from violations of the law shall be paid into the common school fund of the county.

#### *Origin of the Law*

The people of Idaho may as well know first as last the character, nature, and origin of the Sunday law which has been placed upon their statute-books. The leaflet just quoted, and the State Sunday law here reviewed, both had the same origin. Both emanated from the International Reform Bureau of Washington, D. C. In the *Twentieth Century Quarterly* for December, 1908, official organ of this bureau, Mr. Crafts, its superintendent, said:—

The most encouraging recent victory is the Idaho Sunday law, drawn and carried to victory by the Reform Bureau's Pacific Coast secretary, Dr. G. L. Tufts, who is now leading the united forces of California, in hopeful efforts to secure a similar law.

#### *Repeal the Law*

If persecuting laws of old, the Inquisition, and the inquisitorial methods of promoting religion and producing uniformity in religion practised during the Dark Ages, were wrong, so is the Idaho Sunday law; and the people of that State would do credit to themselves if, as one man, they arose and demanded the repeal of this iniquitous law which has thus been worked up and foisted upon them by parties *outside of their own State*, and upon principles both un-American and unchristian. For years Idaho had no Sunday law, and, like California for the past twenty-eight years, got along very well without one. Let her again take her

stand on the side of liberty and true American principles, as did California in 1883, when the legislature of that State repealed its Sunday law of 1861, though it had been upheld by the Supreme Court of the State when Mr. Justice Stephen J. Field became chief justice.

Religious liberty has cost too much to be lightly set aside now. Let men of principle come to the front and beat back the rising tide of religious bigotry, intolerance, and oppression. Let there be a recurrence to first and fundamental principles, and ecclesiastical despotism will be routed and driven from the field. Let that which belongs to Cæsar be rendered to Cæsar, but avoid, as you would the plague, that system of either religion or politics which would attempt to compel men to render to Cæsar or through Cæsar that which belongs to God.

W. A. C.

### *What Would Jesus Do?*

THE fundamental idea of the National Reform movement, which has now become world-wide, is that of having Jesus Christ enthroned as ruler of the kingdoms of this world. The way to determine whether Jesus would accept a kingship in this world would be to learn what his attitude was toward such a thing when he was here on earth. When Christ was asked by Pilate, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" he said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Again, when Jesus performed that great miracle of feeding the five thousand people with five barley loaves and two small fishes, the people desired to make him king. The record says concerning this incident, "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone."

From these, and other statements of Scripture, we learn that the idea of his

reigning as a temporal king was so repugnant to him that he not only disclaimed any relation to the kingdoms of this world, but even ran away to a mountain to escape being made king. For Jesus now to accept of a kingship in this world would be a complete reversal of both the precept and example that he gave when on earth, and this could not be: for he is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

In view of these facts recorded by the pen of inspiration, it is demonstrated that those who are so vigorously advocating the enthronement of Christ as a ruler of nations in this world, are champions of a proposition that is antichristian, as well as opposed to the fundamental principles of civil government.

K. C. R.

---

## A Centennial

### *A Century's Noble Record By Congress,*

#### *Refuses for a Hundred Years to Enact a Sunday Law*

It was in 1811, just a hundred years ago, that the first effort was made by some overzealous, misguided religionists to urge Congress to enact a Sunday law. But through all these years, up to Jan. 1, 1911, to the glory and honor of our national Legislature, one of the most distinguished lawmaking bodies in the world, it has never yielded to the insistent demands and the persistent pressure which have been brought to bear upon it to enact a Sunday law.

Perhaps one of the most effective blows against this proposed legislation was the famous Sunday Mail Reports, which were presented to Congress by Hon. Richard M. Johnson in 1829 and 1830 in opposition to a demand for legislation prohibiting the transportation of the mails on Sunday. This report succeeded in holding in check for many years the almost overwhelming demand for Sunday legislation. The following are

a few significant selections from these famous reports that indicate their nature. The first one is concerning those who petitioned Congress for a Sunday law:—

"The petitioners for its discontinuance [the sending of mails on Sunday] appear to be actuated by a religious zeal which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere, but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than a civil institution."

"Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God."

"If Congress shall, by the authority of law, sanction the measure recommended [which would prohibit the Sunday mail service], it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy in which even Christians themselves are at issue." (The controversy over which day of the week is the sabbath.)

"However satisfactory this may be to an ecclesiastical council, it is incompatible with a republican legislature which is purely for political and not for religious purposes."

"If the measure recommended should be adopted, it would be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession or how numerous the train of measures which would follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience."

The foregoing weighty observations require no comment, for they must strongly appeal to the intelligence of all who read them, indicating clearly the dangers that are threatened by legislation of the character named. One of the stock arguments of the Sunday-law advocates of more modern times as to why Congress should enact a Sunday law, is that a powerful influence for good would thus go forth from the nation's capital to every State in the Union, and to other lands as well. The facts are, however, that the influence exerted by Congress thus far in refusing to yield to such demands, is infinitely greater in the ac-

completing of good for this nation, and for the world, than any other one act it

The purpose of the gospel in the world is to set men free. All that a Sunday law can do for a transgressor is to lock him up.

has ever performed; because that which has made this nation great is her staunch adherence to the principle of a total separation of church and state, as voiced in the first amendment to the Constitution, which says:—

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

But should Congress eventually yield to this un-American and uncivil demand, it would produce a blighting influence upon every State in the Union, and upon every country in the world, and thus lead the nations back to the Old World system of a union of church and state. It is in the providence of God that Congress has so long withstood the assaults of these Sunday-law enthusiasts.

And may it be hoped that Congress will never yield to the appeals for legislation of this character; that it may ever maintain the noble position in this regard which it has held for the past century.

The Johnston Sunday bill, now in the hands of the District Committee of the House of Representatives, is in character the same as that which Congress has repeatedly refused to enact during the past century. This bill is claimed by its friends to be very innocent, because of the numerous exceptions it contains; but notwithstanding these exceptions, it nevertheless contains the virus of religious legislation; for any bill that distinguishes between days, on religious grounds, regardless of how innocently it may be worded, contains the element that will open the way for other and more oppressive legislation of the same character.

Some argue that

A Sunday law is demanded to shut off competition in trade; to enable a man to "keep the Sabbath" without losing any business; to be religious without costing him anything. But a religion which costs nothing is too cheap to be worth anything. Christianity costs something; the price of it is marked on the cross; and there has been no fall in the price since Calvary.

as this law is for the District of Columbia only, it is therefore merely a local affair,

which will give Washington a more orderly and quiet Sunday. This certainly can not be the reason, for recently, when the secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance in the United States represented Washington as having a wide-open Sunday, it was quickly denied by some of Washington's most distinguished pastors, who claimed that Sunday was observed better in Washington than in any other city in the United States. If Sunday is well observed in Washington, as stated by these men of prominence, what can be the reason for such a frenzied clamor for Congress to enact a Sunday law for the District of Columbia? The reason for it has been plainly stated by one of the leading champions of Sunday legislation. He says, in substance, that to have Congress enact a Sunday law for the District of Columbia would commit Congress to Sunday legislation, and thus pave the way for the securing of a national Sunday law, which would give effect to the State laws.

From this reason, it is clearly evident that this dangerous propaganda is only the beginning of an extended program to be carried out in this country for the enactment of religious legislation that will result in religious intolerance and persecution. Against this we have been loudly warned by the history of other nations. As Richard M. Johnson further says, in the Sunday Mail Reports: "All religious despotism commences by combination and influence, and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of the country, the civil power soon bends under it, and

the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence."

K. C. R.

---

### *A Resume of Significant Events for the Year 1910*

THE following are some of the leading history-making events either directly or indirectly making for the fulfilment of Scripture prophecies relative to the closing incidents of earth's career, and bearing directly upon the question of freedom of conscience:—

The United States Senate Committee on the District of Columbia reported favorably the Johnston bill for Sunday observance in the District, January 14.

Reintroduction of the Johnston District Sunday bill into the Senate, January 17.

Bennett bill, "providing for a weekly day of rest for certain post-office clerks and carriers (H. R. 26462), introduced into the House January 17.

The United States Senate passed the Johnston bill January 27.

Johnston Sunday bill introduced into the House January 28.

The "Fairbanks-Vatican Incident," February 7.

The Washington Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution disapproving the Johnston Sunday bill, February 8.

United States House of Representatives hearings on the Johnston Sunday bill, March 8, 16.

The "Roosevelt-Vatican Incident," April 5.

"God-in-the-Constitution" hearing before the Sub-Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, April 11.

War Department ruling against baseball playing on government reservations on Sunday—early part of the year.

Ex-Secretary John W. Foster's "universal war" address, June.

Judge Mullowny's decision that there

is in the District of Columbia no law against baseball playing on Sunday.

The Bucks Stove and Range Co., of St. Louis, Mo., yields its contention against the American Federation of Labor, and ceases to be an "open" shop, July 19.

World's Catholic Eucharistic Congress at Montreal, September 6-11.

The new republic of Portugal officially announces separation of church and state, October 28.

Favorable federal ruling in the case of Sabbath-keepers in the Soldiers' Home at Sawtelle, Cal., permitting them the undisturbed observance of the Sabbath, November 10.

New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, November 13-16.

The National Reform Association's World's Christian Citizenship Conference at Philadelphia, November 16-20.

States in which there has been Sunday-closing or other religio-legislative agitation during the year: California, Connecticut, Indiana, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, North Dakota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the countries of Canada, England, Italy, Portugal, Russia, Spain, and Switzerland.

---

### *In Him Is No Darkness*

"LET there be light." That is first among the chief requisites of every study. Very fitting, then, that it should be found in the first chapter of the first division of the Book of God. Ignorance is not only the mother of superstition, but the mother also of heresy, false doctrine, and schism, especially where that ignorance is an ignorance of the Word of God. That Word is designed for a lamp to light the pathway of men through a world of darkness and danger. Let it shine.

## Contributed Articles

### *Tinkering the Constitution*

S. B. HORTON

A STRONG movement is now under way in this country the purpose of which is the amending of the national Constitution so that it shall completely alter the government's attitude toward religious affairs.

That movement has now assumed such proportions as to make it worthy the attention of every legislator in the country, because of the fact that the amendment proposed will completely transform our fundamental law, both as to its spirit and its operation.

A convention known as the World's Conference on Christian Citizenship, which met in Philadelphia, November 16-20, had this undertaking for one of its most prominent projects. Among the resolutions passed was one concerning the amendment of the Constitution in that particular. It reads:—

*Resolved*, That this conference request its officers to petition the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives at Washington to report favorably on the proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, now pending before them."

In that bill it is proposed to insert in the Constitution, after the words, "We, the people of the United States," these words: "Humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority," etc. As early as 1864 this proposition was agitated by the National Reform Association, in the demand that this nation declare in its fundamental law that this is a Christian nation.

#### *Other Amendments Involved in This*

It may be that the promoters are not aware of the fact that such an amendment to the Constitution involves the

further amending of that instrument. At all events, our national lawmaking body should give this critical proposal that consideration to which it is rightly entitled, especially in the light of the principles underlying our civil structure.

It seems strange that the National Reformers need more evidence that this is a "Christian nation" than what they profess to have. Many speakers at the recent meeting in Philadelphia referred to the fact that all our past history as a nation from its earliest days shows that this is a "Christian nation." Add to this the recognition given the subject by the Supreme Court in 1892, through Justice Brewer, and we are justified in asking, Why tinker with the Constitution? Why go to the trouble and time and expense of putting a few more words in that instrument? Would the added words make the nation more Christian?

Let us consider what is involved in amending the preamble, which is:—

"We, the people of the United States [proposed amendment: acknowledging Almighty God as the source of power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority], in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States."

In the preamble are imbedded the fundamental reasons for the articles which follow. For instance, one object of the Constitution was to "establish justice," while another purpose was to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But back of this preamble was the charter for the founding of the republic, in which God was recognized in the most dignified way possible, in the terms:—

"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."

#### A Pertinent Question

Why was not such a statement put in the preamble as is desired at this time by the National Reformers? Let this question be answered by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, whose action on the subject, in 1874, was embodied in the report, a facsimile of which appears on another page of this number of LIBERTY.

If such phraseology as is suggested by the resolution of the National Reformers referred to above, and which is embodied in the bill H. R. No. 17, or S. J. Res. No. 86, had been inserted in the preamble by the framers of our Constitution, there would not have been written into that instrument Article VI, Section 3, which provides:—

"The senators and representatives, before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; *but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.*"

Again: in 1791, four years after signing and adopting the Constitution in Philadelphia, Congress felt that the Constitution did not contain a sufficient guarantee of civil and religious liberty, and proposed ten amendments, the first of which is:—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an *establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof*; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

It must be apparent to the student of this question that the proposed amendment of the preamble of the Constitution would make absolutely necessary the amending of Article VI, Section 3, and the repeal of the first amendment, or the securing of a judiciary which would nullify the provisions referred to; for the following reasons:—

#### What Such an Amendment Will Entail

1. It will be necessary to ascertain, prior to the election of an official, from the president down to the lowest political appointee, whether such prospective official will subscribe to the religious tenor of the preamble and is able to give evidence that he is a member of a church holding these views. This is tantamount to "a religious test" in order to hold office, and is in direct opposition to Article VI, Section 3.

2. The first amendment provides that Congress shall not only make no law respecting an establishment of religion, but it goes further, by saying that Congress shall make no law "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion.

These conclusions can not be disputed for an instant; they are self-evident. The proposed amendment, if carried into effect, will be a step backward. It will repudiate the true American idea of civil government and religion, and challenge the quality of the Christianity which guided our forefathers in the grand work they did for humanity.

It will mean, also, that the guarantee of "domestic tranquillity" set forth in the preamble of the Constitution will be dissipated in the wrangle which will surely come between the advocates of Christianity in America. There are at least two sects of Christians in this country which differ as to the "revealed will" of Jesus Christ, the manner of carrying it into effect, and by whom it is to be carried into effect. The Roman Catholic Christians in this country are as much entitled to give the nation's institutions the Christian complexion as they see it as are the National Reform Christians.



In this connection, let us note the opinion of Mr. Justice Joseph Story, in his commentaries on the "Constitution of the United States," page 690:—

"This clause [Section 3 of Article VI] is not introduced merely for the purpose of satisfying the scruples of many respectable persons who feel an invincible repugnance to any religious test or affirmation. It had a higher object: to cut off forever every pretense of any alliance between the church and state in the national government. The framers of the Constitution were fully sensible of the dangers from this source, marked out in the history of other ages and countries, and not wholly unknown to our own. They knew that bigotry was unceasingly vigilant in its stratagems to secure to itself an exclusive ascendancy over the human mind, and that intolerance was ever ready to arm itself with all the terrors of the civil power to exterminate those who doubted its dogmas or resisted its infallibility. The Catholics and Protestants had alternately waged the most ferocious and unrelenting warfare on each other, and Protestantism, at the very moment when it was proclaiming the right of private judgment, prescribed boundaries to that right, beyond which, if any one dared to pass, he must seal his rashness with the blood of martyrdom. The history of the parent country, too, could not fail to instruct them in the uses and the abuses of religious tests. They there found the pains and penalties of non-conformity written in no equivocal language, and enforced with a stern and vindictive jealousy."

References of similar character may be cited to show the reasons the founders of our constitutional republic had in mind when they omitted from the preamble of the Constitution any purely religious terms, and made such provision for religious liberty as is found in Article VI, and in the first amendment.

#### *How Earlier Legislators Viewed It*

But the promoters of the Christian citizenship movement assert that such

matters as affect religion should be determined by the majority of the body politic. It will be well to ascertain the mind of our political ancestors. A United States Senate report adopted Jan. 19, 1829, in dealing with an appeal for Sunday legislation, submitted this thought on the subject of majorities on such questions as would be involved in changing the complexion of our organic law from a civil to a religious one:—

"Under the present regulations of the Post-office Department, the rights of conscience are not invaded. . . . Passengers in the mail-stages are free to rest during the first day of the week or to pursue their journeys at their own pleasure. While the mail is transported on Saturday, the Jew and the Sabbatarian may abstain from any agency in carrying, on conscientious scruples. While it is transported on the first day of the week, another class may abstain, from the same religious scruples. The obligation of government is the same on both these classes; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other, unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority."

Following this came a report from the House of Representatives, in 1830, on the same subject, setting forth this thought:—

"The principles of our government do not recognize in the majority any authority over the minority, except in matters which regard the conduct of man to his fellow man."

It should certainly be the hope of every American citizen that Congress will refuse to pass the proposed amendment to the preamble of our national Constitution. To pass such an amendment would be to repudiate the work of our forefathers, to set aside the value of the American ideal of civil government, and to ignore or nullify the counsel of our Lord, "Render unto Cæsar the things [only] which are Cæsar's."

## *A World Movement With Much in It*

MELCAR S. WEILSSOHN

A CONFERENCE of more than ordinary importance was held at Philadelphia, Pa., from the sixteenth to the twentieth of November. It was designed to be the beginning of a world movement fashioned on the lines of the National Reform

ideas and the carrying out of the whole National Reform propaganda in all the nations of the world. For at least two years the project had been under consideration. Missionaries of various denominations in foreign lands had been secured some time in advance for a place on the program of the conference. It was international and interdenominational so far as the printed program was



DELEGATES TO THE WORLD'S CONFERENCE ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

This photo was taken in front of the

Association. In fact, the conference was called by the National Reform Association, and the president of that association was made permanent chairman of the conference.

The purpose of the National Reform Association in arranging such a conference was a far-seeing one, for it stands for the propagation of National Reform

concerned; but in conception and purpose and execution it was American National Reformism preparing to blossom out in all the world, and scatter its seeds among the active missionary folk in every clime.

The burden of the conference, both in the get-up of the program and in the strong undercurrent of instruction carried

by the National Reformers themselves, was seen to be the absolute necessity of a national religion for every nation of the world. However, no speaker from the home land and only one of those from abroad was bold enough to declare openly in favor of a union of church and state. Rev. James F. Dickey, of Berlin, Germany, lauded the principle of a union of church and state, and declared it founded on the

and found in it nothing to recommend. This was particularly noticeable in the address of Rev. Chas. E. Parker, a missionary from India, who said:—

“We [in India] can not recommend a change in the matter of the government favoring one religion above another. It helps the Christian missionary when he goes out to preach the gospel to the people if they can look to him as one who



CONFERENCE, HELD AT PHILADELPHIA, NOV. 16-20, 1910  
 which the conference was held

rock of Scripture. The enthusiasm of the speaker while dwelling upon this point made it evident that he considered himself in accord with the purposes of the National Reform Association, as indeed he was.

Several of the speakers gave evidence that they had studied the outworking of the National Reform idea in other lands

is advancing the real idea of Christianity, separate from the government. If the government were to favor the Christian religion above other religions, in the minds of Hindu and Mohammedan it would destroy the divine element in Christianity. It is a real help to the missionary on the field to be able to say that the government does not help us.”

He who knows what real heart conversion is, what personal religion is, what it means to have a personal Saviour, can appreciate what this missionary says. The Hindu and the Mohammedan and every other heathen is perfectly justified in judging that a religion which must be supported and defended by a human government can be only of human origin. There is the vulnerable spot in the National Reform armor, and Dr. Parker pierced it so truly that all who would might see it. He declared also in reference to the enforcement of Sunday-keeping that such an undertaking could not "be really a matter for the government. . . . The government must remain neutral on matters of religion." And it is to the interests of true religion that the government should remain neutral. Religion must rest on its own worth, on its own power to appeal to hearts, or it has no business in this world.

Such declarations of truth as contained in Dr. Parker's address were like oases in the desert; for the majority of the speakers favored unblushingly the National Reform program—morality by human statute, religion by the civil code, a sabbath made and enforced by the laws of man.

The kernel of the conference lay in the *Program for United Action for Christian Citizens in All Countries*

This program was presented by Rev. T. P. Stevenson, corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, and it was the principles contained in that program for united action that the conference urged the delegates to promulgate in all the nations of the world. That program contains the "gospel" they are expected to carry now to the peoples sitting in darkness. It is not the gospel of a personal salvation for sin-sick and perishing souls, but the establishment of "national religion" in the governments of earth. The salvation which Jesus Christ came to bring to individuals, that they "might not perish, but have everlasting life," this new "gospel" seeks to apply to "nations," that they may not

perish but continue imperishable. The doom which Inspiration pronounces upon impenitent individuals the National Reform program holds over impenitent nations—as if they had souls to be saved or lost, and as if there were a heaven for saved nations and a hell for unsaved nations. That program, in part, reads:—

"Nations are rewarded and punished and sometimes destroyed according to their moral conduct.

"The Lord Jesus Christ has been appointed by the Father the moral governor of the world. Nations, therefore, like all other moral beings, are under his authority, and bound to obey his laws; but his government is a government of mercy, not of wrath; for salvation, not for destruction. He offers himself to the nations of earth as their Saviour, and entreats them to accept his grace and yield to his authority, that they may escape the doom of impenitent, disobedient nations. . . .

"The nation which accepts and is guided by these principles will receive the forgiveness of national sins, and will enjoy the favor and blessing of God. Therefore these principles are vital to national welfare. It follows, moreover, that every nation which accepts these principles ought to make acknowledgment of them.

"Every Christian nation under the law of self-preservation ought to teach these principles to its citizens. . . . If a nation may thus informally and indirectly educate her citizens, her right to inculcate these principles directly and formally in the schools which she establishes for the training of her future citizens, is a right unquestionable. . . .

#### *The Program*

"It follows, first, That it is the duty of Christian citizens to publish and uphold these principles. Christian citizens in all countries ought to publish these principles and endeavor to persuade their citizens of their truth.

"2. The church, through her missionaries, literature, and schools, is a great

agency for teaching these principles to the world, and in doing this work she is rendering invaluable service to the nation.

"3. When these principles have been proclaimed among any people, and accepted by any number of citizens, it becomes their duty to get together as citizens, and make these principles dominant in the life of their respective nations.

"4. The nation and the family of civilized governments recognize in their laws the vital place which the nation has in the family. In order that these laws may serve the united group, the family, they ought to conform to the moral laws of the Christian religion.

"5. Christian citizens in all countries ought to uphold the right of the state to educate its citizens, and to inculcate these principles of Christian truth which relate to national life, and which have marked the character and institutions of the nation.

"6. The claims of any citizen, or of any minority of citizens, to the right to lay a veto on the free action of the state in this matter ought to be earnestly resisted.

"7. The public school ought to be used as the most efficient instrument in the possession of the nation for the uplifting of the nation through the establishment of right moral character in all her citizens.

"8. *The Observance of the Lord's Day.*

— Christian citizens in all countries are urged for the sake of the national welfare to show by their example their belief in the definite appointment of one day in seven as a day of rest and worship, to uphold the laws which safeguard it, to conform their social usages, the



CHAMBERS-WYLIE MEMORIAL CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA,  
IN WHICH THE CONFERENCE WAS HELD

usages of their governments, and the operation of all public utilities, to this beneficent arrangement of their Creator.

"9. *Righteous Men for Civil Office.*— We ask Christians of all nations, to consider whether any man who does not fear God and has no regard for his moral laws, can be safely elected to civil office. . . . Indifference to the moral character of those elected to civil office contra-

dicts the voice of God, who, as the Author of civil government, has prescribed the moral qualifications of rulers; 'He who ruleth must be just, ruling in the fear of God.' We appeal to good citizens in all countries to withhold their suffrages from men whose character shows them to be unfit to deal with the moral and religious interests of the people."

This is a skilfully worded document, designed to cleave its way into the work program of foreign missionaries "along the line of least resistance." Hastily read, it seems to mean little and have little if anything in it that a Christian could not subscribe to; but carefully studied, it becomes apparent that every paragraph is filled with that which no Christian ought to promulgate or support or countenance.

The commission given by our Saviour to his disciples was a commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to *every creature*, baptizing them. They had no commission to labor for any creature whom they could not baptize. It is certain, therefore, that governments were not to be the subjects of their missionary endeavor. The absurdity of the idea ought to be apparent to any thinking human being so soon as ever he attempts to think of carrying out the whole of the gospel commission in reference thereto. When he comes to consider that the National Reform program would require that he invent some process by which he could baptize a government, he would certainly conclude that there was a broken circuit somewhere on the line of his logic. The idea is utterly unchristian and entirely out of harmony with the purpose or program of the gospel.

But that is the curriculum of this new school of the nations in which they are to sit at the feet of the National Reform Association for a post-graduate course in the science of national religion.

Every heathen nation has had its national religion. Now comes the proposition to give them another, the Christian religion. To be sure, the promoters of this plan have the idea that Christianity

as a national religion will be better than the systems they have had; but it must be remembered that if a divine religion were dependent upon the enforcement of a human law, that religion would descend at once to the plane occupied by every heathen national religion. Making it dependent upon humanity, robs it of its divinity, and leaves it to stand where they all have stood.

#### *The Nation Not a Moral Being*

Every thinking individual ought to see at once the fallacy of the idea that because God has invited groups of individuals to turn from their sins and accept his proffered salvation, therefore nations or governments are moral beings, possessed of moral characters, for whose salvation Christ died. Nations are made up of individuals, for each one of whom Christ died. If half of those individuals are finally lost and the other half finally saved, then we have the peculiar and distressing anomaly of a "moral being" half saved and half lost, and to remain so forever. Surely such an idea is a monumental incongruity, to use the mildest term permissible. It would seem that the proposition must destroy itself by internal combustion, and yet it has the distinction of occupying first place in the National Reform program for the nations!

Every proposition in the foregoing program is diametrically opposed to the principles of the gospel and to the fundamental principles of the government of the United States. For instance:—

1. Nations are not "saved" as nations. Salvation is an individual matter; and there is no heaven for "saved" nations, because the fiat of the eternal One is that, when he comes, he will "smite the nations," and "break them in pieces."

2. Any nation which essays to teach religion in the schools, attempts to take up a work for which it bears no warrant from God. More than that, for this nation to do it, would be to "establish" the religion which it compels its agents to teach, and that would violate the national Constitution.

3. If Christians in all countries promulgate those principles, they promulgate that which is contrary both to Christianity and to the true principles of civil government. The civil government has no right to tax one man in order to teach his children a religion in which he does not believe.

4. The church which teaches such principle is not helping either religion or the nation, but is injuring both. She brings

program there lie hidden the dragon features of the power which that program is to develop. By that it is proposed that the state shall have the right to override every right of the individual if it shall choose so to do. That would scatter to the winds every guarantee of religious liberty for the individual, and put the whole world back again into the distressing conditions against which protested the apostles of the Reformation. It would



LEADERS OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

1. Rev. S. F. Scovel, president (deceased); 2. Rev. J. S. Martin, general superintendent;  
3. Rev. T. P. Stevenson (standing), corresponding secretary and editor of the *Christian Statesman*; 4. Rev. R. C. Wylie; 5. Rev. W. I. Wishart (standing); 6. Rev. H. H. George

the state into subjection to a class, and makes religion the football of majorities.

5. When any number of persons band themselves together to make their "principles dominant," force takes the place of love, and the religion of Jesus is thereby smitten in the house of its avowed friends.

6. When all the laws of the nations have been made to "conform to the moral laws of the Christian religion," then the Christian religion becomes "established" in all those nations. That means the union of church and state, not for America alone, but for all the nations of the world.

7. In paragraph six of the foregoing

mean the rule of an ecclesiastical hierarchy over again, with the state as the subservient tool of the church, to enforce its dogmas and punish the objects of its anathemas.

8. Paragraph eight makes the welfare of the nation—and the smile of God upon it—to depend upon the keeping of Sunday.

9. Paragraph nine violates both the spirit and the letter of our national Constitution, which makes every citizen equal before the law, and equally entitled to offices of public trust. The Constitution declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for the holding of an office; but par-

agraph nine of the National Reform program specifically demands such a test.

Nevertheless, the program was carried by the conference without a dissenting voice, and to that program the delegates, both from foreign lands and the home lands, gave their assent, pledging themselves by that assent to carry it out in the various mission fields to which they go. It means much to the nations of earth when America turns her face back into the darkness, and sets the pace for the world in that direction. The peoples of earth who were longing for light and liberty have long looked to America to show the pathway. She has done so, and multitudes have rejoiced; but if she shall now lead the procession back into medievalism, with darkness for light and oppression for liberty, her sin will be the darkest and most inexcusable that a nation has ever committed.

The program of the World's Conference on Christian Citizenship is pointed in that direction, and the influence of a federated church behind it is giving it a mighty impetus.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

---

### ***Putting God's Name in the National Constitution***

W. M. HEALEY

WHEN any number of people organize a company, or society, for the objects of religion, and associate themselves together as worshipers, they of necessity have some god to worship. Any society organized for business, for scientific research, for mutual assistance and protection, or for any purpose or purposes aside from religious worship, would not need to name any god as being at the head of the organization, because worship would not enter into the plans and purposes of the organization. While no god would need to be mentioned that must be worshiped, this would not prevent any member from worshiping if he chose to do so. All could worship one god, or each might choose his own god, or there might be no worship at all, and yet all the purposes

of the society or government be fully met.

If the government of the United States of America has been organized for the purpose of religious worship, it would be not only proper but necessary that its Constitution should have the name of god in it, and not only the name of god, but it should designate, by some means, the particular god to be worshiped. All foreigners who might wish to become citizens of the United States would have to subscribe to their faith in this god of the United States of America.

Ancient Rome was organized both for religious purposes and civil government. While it allowed the worship of many different gods, the constitution demanded the worship of Rome as the one great god. All citizens were compelled to worship Rome above all other gods, under penalty of banishment for the higher classes, and death for the lower classes of society.

If the United States is to mention the Deity (God) in its Constitution, it should carefully define who is meant. Would we have the God of the Jewish people, who would be denied as the one God, the Father of all? or would we have the God which Christians profess faith in? If we choose this God, then we have difficulty again, because some would insist upon adding to the Godhead still another person, called the Holy Spirit; and others would demand that our God should be a Father, Son, mother, and Holy Spirit in heaven, and on the earth a man, to whom all power had been delegated to rule over this world.

An attempt to put the name of God in the "fundamental law of the land," would place us in a plight much like that of the ancient Athenians in the days of the apostle Paul. The city of Athens, like the United States, had a cosmopolitan population, besides the different classes who visited there; and so they thought to erect an altar to the god of each sect who should reside in or visit the city. They erected their altars, until they had thousands of them, and then



they built one "to the unknown god," and left off erecting altars, leaving each person to name his own god before this altar dedicated "to the unknown god."

#### *A Better Basis*

The United States of America began very near where Athens left off. Athens, with her learning, philosophy, and experience, learned to allow every one to choose his own god to worship. Our forefathers founded this government on that principle of permitting and protecting worship of the god of one's own choosing. This government was not founded for the purpose of compelling worship in some particular way, or to compel worship at all; on the contrary, it was organized for the purpose of having a government where people would not be compelled to worship, and yet could worship if they choose to, and worship the god of their choice.

If some god is mentioned in the Constitution of the United States as being at the head of the nation, then the law must define and regulate his worship, and it would be incumbent on the executive department of the government to see that every one worships according to the law, under such penalties as would be necessary to compel such worship. If conscientious people refused to worship according to the prescribed form, it would follow that the penalties would be inflicted upon them. If a fine would not compel them, then it would be imprisonment, and finally, for those who would not violate their conscience, it would be death. All liberty would be at an end in matters of worship, and the cruelties of the Dark Ages would be in full flower again.

#### *Selecting a God by Vote*

Trouble would be sure to come: because it would be impossible to select any one god that all would willingly worship. If the word "god" alone was mentioned, it would devolve upon the lawmakers to decide what god was meant, and this might be decided by a majority of the people. This would permit of a change of gods as the majority should vote. The god of yesterday

might not be the god of to-day. We have placed on our coin the words, "In God we trust." It is quite probable that it would be true with the majority of people if the words were changed so as to read, "This is the god we trust;" and we should be worshipers of gods of gold and of silver.

Let conscience be left untrammelled; permit all to worship as they choose, or not to worship; and protect all in these rights as our present Constitution does, and as our government was intended to do.

*Los Angeles, Cal.*

---

### *America's Liberties in Jeopardy*

S. B. HORTON

THE Forty-third Congress of the United States was petitioned by citizens of Ohio to pass an act looking to the amendment of the national Constitution, so that it should recognize the Deity. The bill was introduced by Mr. Woodworth, of that State. The petition was referred to the Committee of the Judiciary, who, in a report submitted Feb. 18, 1874, advised against adopting the proposed legislation. In that report (a facsimile of which is given on the following page of this journal) it will be noted that the same question was brought before the convention which framed the instrument, and the committee based its decision upon the position held by the framers of the Constitution. Let us note this point in the report of the Judiciary Committee:—

"That, upon examination even of the meager debates by the fathers of the republic in the convention which framed the Constitution, they find that the subject of this memorial was most fully and carefully considered, and then, in that convention, decided, after grave deliberation, to which the subject was entitled, that, as this country, the foundation of whose government they were then laying, was to be the home of the oppressed of all nations of the earth, whether Christian or pagan, and in full

43D CONGRESS, } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. { REPORT  
1st Session. } { No. 143.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF GOD AND THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE CONSTITUTION.

FEBRUARY 18, 1874.—Ordered to be printed.

MR. BENJAMIN F. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following

REPORT :

*The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the petition of E. G. Goulet and others, asking Congress for "an acknowledgment of Almighty God and the Christian religion" in the Constitution of the United States, having considered the matter referred to them, respectfully pray leave to report :*

That, upon examination even of the meager debates by the fathers of the Republic in the convention which framed the Constitution, they find that the subject of this memorial was most fully and carefully considered, and then, in that convention, decided, after grave deliberation, to which the subject was entitled, that, as this country, the foundation of whose government they were then laying, was to be the home of the oppressed of all nations of the earth, whether Christian or Pagan, and in full realization of the dangers which the union between church and state had imposed upon so many nations of the Old World, with great unanimity that it was inexpedient to put anything into the Constitution or frame of government which might be construed to be a reference to any religious creed or doctrine.

And they further find that this decision was accepted by our Christian fathers with such great unanimity that in the amendments which were afterward proposed, in order to make the Constitution more acceptable to the nation, none has ever been proposed to the States by which this wise determination of the fathers has been attempted to be changed. Wherefore, your committee report that it is inexpedient to legislate upon the subject of the above memorial, and ask that they be discharged from the further consideration thereof, and that this report, together with the petition, be laid upon the table.

A FACSIMILE OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE'S REPORT

realization of the dangers which the union between church and state had imposed upon so many nations of the Old World, with great unanimity that it was inexpedient to put anything into the Constitution or frame of government

which might be construed to be a reference to any religious creed or doctrine."

In that convention the article now numbered VI was amended, after much discussion, by adding the words "or

affirmation" after "oath," and by adding the clause "but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

There was fear that religious liberty was not sufficiently guaranteed by the Constitution, while, on the other hand, some contended that the Constitution was too broad on that subject, and insisted that a religious test should be put into that instrument. An illustration of the feelings of the people who were called upon to ratify the Constitution may be gathered from the speeches made by delegates to the different State conventions. We will quote briefly from the record of the Massachusetts convention:—

"Jan. 31, 1788. In the conversation on the sixth article, which provides that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for office,' etc., several gentlemen urged that it was a departure from the principles of our forefathers, who came here for the preservation of their religion; and that it would admit deists, atheists, etc., into the general government, and, people being apt to imitate the examples of the court, these principles would be disseminated, and, of course, a corruption of morals ensue. Gentlemen on the other side applauded the liberality of the clause, and represented in striking colors the impropriety, and almost impiety, of the requisition of a test, as practised in Great Britain and elsewhere.

"REV. MR. SHUTE: Mr. President, to object to the latter part of the paragraph under consideration, which excludes a religious test, is, I am very sensible, very popular; for the most of men, somehow, are rigidly tenacious of their own sen-

timents in religion, and disposed to impose them upon others as the standard of truth. . . .

"To establish a religious test as a qualification for office in the proposed federal Constitution, it appears to me, sir, would be attended with injurious consequences to some individuals, and with no advantage to the *whole*. By the injurious consequences to individuals, I mean, sir, that some who, in every other respect, are qualified to fill some important post in government will be excluded



Cardinal Gibbons in miter and chasuble, and bearing the shepherd's crook, on his way to celebrate the Pan-American Thanksgiving Mass at St. Patrick's Church, Washington. See article on page 6

by their not being able to stand the religious test; which I take to be a privation of part of their civil rights.

"Nor is there to me any conceivable advantage, sir, that would result to the whole from such a test. Unprincipled and dishonest men will not hesitate to subscribe to *anything* that may open the way for their advancement."—*Elliott's Debates, Vol. II, page 118.*

In the North Carolina convention, July 30, 1788, Mr. Iredell, replying to some opposition to this no-religious-test clause, said:—

"I consider the clause under consideration as one of the strongest proofs that could be adduced, that *it was the intention of those who founded this system to establish a general religious lib-*

erty in America. . . . It never was known that a man who had no principles of religion hesitated to perform any rite when it was convenient for his private interest. No test can bind such a one. I am therefore clearly of opinion that such a discrimination would neither be effectual for its own purposes, nor, if it could, ought it by any means to be made. . . . Happily, no sect here is superior to another. As long as this is the case, we shall be free from those persecutions

ington, who had been the president of the convention which drafted our national Constitution, setting forth their fears. His reply to this address in part was as follows:—

“If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed by the convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it;



Pan-American Thanksgiving Mass procession entering St. Patrick's Church, Washington, where this celebration has twice been held with the President and highest government officials in attendance. See page 6

and distractions with which other countries have been torn. If any future Congress should pass an act which they are not authorized to pass by the Constitution, and which the people would not obey, every one would ask, Who authorized the government to pass such an act? It is not warranted by the Constitution, and it is a barefaced usurpation.”—*Elliott's Debates, Vol. IV, pages 192-196.*

Notwithstanding that the Constitution was finally ratified by the States, the Virginia Baptists were not fully satisfied with that document, and acting upon the advice of Madison, they prepared, Aug. 8, 1789, an address to President Wash-

and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny and every species of religious persecution. For, you doubtless remember, I have often expressed my sentiments that any man, conducting himself as a good citizen and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.”

A month later James Madison, with the evident sanction of Washington, proposed several amendments to the Constitution, the first of which was, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

As stated by Armitage in "History of Baptists," page 427:—

"The chief difference between the old Article VI and this amendment lay in the fact that in the first instance Congress was left at liberty to impose religious tests in other cases than those of office or trust under the United States; whereas, this amendment removed the power to make any 'law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'"

This amendment passed Congress Sept. 23, 1789, and was ratified by eleven of the thirteen States between 1789 and 1791.

Evidently, it was such history as this that the Committee on the Judiciary of the Forty-third Congress examined, and upon which they based the report to which we have called attention. And this report was the answer Congress then made to those who would turn the wheels of our national progress backward, and nullify the blessings of liberty, for which patriot and Christian contended at the birth of this country. Will the Sixty-first or any succeeding Congress find any warrant for answering the present petition of the National Reformers in any other way than was done by the Forty-third Congress? or will there be a fulfilment of Jefferson's prophecy? Jefferson foresaw a retrogradation in public opinion in the matter of individual rights. In his "Notes on Virginia," query 17, he said:—

"Besides, the spirit of the times may alter, will alter. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution and better men be his victims. It can never

be too often repeated that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is while our rulers are honest and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going down-hill. It will not be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion."

What shall the verdict be?

*So. Lancaster, Mass.*

---

### *Union Labor and the Civil Rest Day*

E. T. RUSSELL

MANY of the labor unions are declaring in favor of enforced Sunday observance, for civil or sanitary reasons. The leader of the National Federation of Labor expresses the position of that great order in the following words:—

"Not only am I personally in hearty accord with any movement which has for its object the preservation of one day's rest in seven, but the American Federation of Labor has emphatically declared itself in favor of the Sunday rest day, and it has done as much, if not more, than any other organized body of men and women to enforce the observance of the Sunday rest day."

These men have a perfect right to decide for themselves on what day they shall rest; but for them to impose their views upon those not of their membership would be an encroachment on individual rights, as every man has a right to determine what his work shall be, and when he shall rest. To prohibit men from exercising this right would be tyranny and oppression. The right to labor or rest is an inalienable right.

The state has no right to determine

the exact periods of rest which should be observed by its subjects. This thought is clearly expressed in the following judicial decision:—

"If we can not trust free agents to regulate their own labor, its time and quantity, it is difficult to trust them to make their own contracts." "If the legislature could prescribe the days of rest for them, then it would seem that the same power could prescribe the hours to work, rest, and eat." "If they [the legislature] possess this power, it is without limit, and may extend to the prohibition of all occupations at all times."—*Supreme Court of California, Ex Parte Newman, 9 Cal., 502.*

On this point another eminent authority bears the following testimony:—

"Everybody should enjoy complete liberty, provided that liberty does not interfere with the liberty and civil rights of others. To force people to observe Sunday is not protection of civil rights; it is interference with civil rights."—*Hon. G. Amyott, M. P., in Canadian Parliament, May 30, 1894.*

If sanitary reasons are urged by them for an enforced rest day, why limit the period of rest to a specific day? If a man should elect to rest on either Friday or Saturday, would not such rest be just as beneficial and tend to recuperate and build up his system as much as rest taken on Sunday? I realize that religionists who hold that Sunday is sacred might urge that by resting on that day one would receive certain beneficial results which could not be obtained by resting on any other day, but it appears strange that a secular organization should set forth such a claim. The unions have a perfect right to reason with men and instruct them in regard to the importance of rest as a health measure, but for a certain social combination to seek to secure a law to compel all to rest on a period of time that they may designate would be to make the people subject to their will. This would be a usurpation of natural rights and the worst of tyranny.

#### *Paternalism— or Freedom?*

While they have a perfect right to rest whenever they desire, the same right should be accorded to others. Any law that invades the natural rights of its subjects is unjust and despotic. Such laws should never find a place on the statute-books of any State in this free nation. As organized labor declaims against the oppression of organized capital, and rightly so, it should not manifest the same spirit; but, on the contrary, it should be especially guarded against encroaching upon the inalienable rights of the people. In the matter of choosing one's hours of rest and labor, the individual must be left free. While it is proper for the parent to direct the child in regard to its period of rest, it is not proper for the state to direct just when and how much its subjects should rest. That would be paternalism in government, to which free men ought not to submit. Each individual must decide this matter for himself.

#### *Jeopardizing the Right of Choice*

Some of the labor organizations believe that a law requiring all to rest on Sunday is much to be desired, but there are those who belong to the unions, as well as those who do not, who are not impressed that way. Then is it right for those who favor a compulsory rest day, through the power of combination, to have their wishes crystallized into law to be enforced upon those who chance to differ with them? Are they prepared to take such a step? Are not the rights of others as sacred as their own? "The men who believe that God has ordered all people to keep Sunday after a certain fashion have a right to persuade people to agree with them so far as they can; but they have no right to enforce it by law."—*Rev. Minot J. Savage.*

It is urged that rigid Sunday laws are essential for the protection of labor, because of the slavery of the wage-earners, owing to the greed of great corporations that operate their plants every day in the week. It is to be deplored that many

employers do not regard the interests of their employees as they should. It would be a happy condition indeed if such employers would undergo a change of heart so as not to consider their own interests to the exclusion of the welfare of their workmen. On the other hand, it is to be hoped that in the matter of the enforcement of Sunday rest the unions will not consider only what they may think is for their own interests, to the exclusion of the rights of others. At present, none are compelled to labor; but, on the contrary, they are protected from such compulsion, by the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which says: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the people have been duly convicted, shall exist in the United States or in any place subject to their jurisdiction."

#### *Legitimate Legislation*

As the laboring man is not compelled to work, neither should he be compelled to rest. If greedy corporations are requiring their employees to labor incessantly or beyond a proper limit of endurance, there should be some form of legislation limiting their demands of their workmen. By passing measures to control corporations in this matter, the state would be operating in its proper sphere. On the other hand, the state acting within its proper sphere can not abridge the rights of its citizens. Every man has a right to rest or not to rest at such periods as he may deem best. The natural time for rest is determined by the curtain of night and also by the physical needs of man.

Relief might come in most States by the state determining how many hours should constitute a day's labor. The government can as properly decide this question as that of correct weights and measures, or as our cities can pass measures in regard to the question of sanitation for the protection of its citizens. There is a difference between the state saying how many hours' work shall constitute a day's work and saying that labor on a certain

day is a crime. If a man should labor more than the number of hours designated by the state as a proper period for work, the responsibility of such an act would rest on himself, but he should not be considered by the state as a criminal. On the other hand, when the state determines the number of hours' work that employers can demand of their employees as a day's work, they prevent corporations from requiring their employees to labor beyond their strength.

"There are six days in which men ought to work." But the apostle Paul teaches that every man should be left free to decide how he should regard days, or whether he should regard them at all. See Rom. 14:5. *He should regard them, not as the state may direct or individuals determine, but he should "be fully persuaded in his own mind."* Then the question of days and how they should be regarded is left to each individual to decide for himself.

*College View, Neb.*

---

### *The Sabbath and the Civil Power*

H. W. COTTRELL

SABBATH-KEEPING is an act of worship, and due to be rendered not to civil government, but to God. Civil government can not enforce true worship, because true worship is spiritual. Sunday laws are enacted to establish a Sabbath. Sabbath legislation is religious legislation, and religious legislation is an unlawful union of church and state, and is a carnal invasion of the inherent rights of all men, whether they are Christians or whether they are not,—an intrenchment upon the rights of the non-Christian, because it is intended to compel him to act one day in seven as if he were a Christian, when he is not; an invasion of the rights of all Christians who observe the seventh-day Sabbath; an invasion of the natural rights of every man, whatever his belief.

It will doubtless be conceded, by both

those who favor Sunday legislation and those who oppose it, that the Sabbath and Sabbath-keeping are means to an end, that they lengthen life, or pertain to godliness. But the Scripture declares that everything pertaining to life and godliness is a gift from God. If the Sabbath is a gift from the divine government, then, if obtained, it must be received from where it is, the divine government of Christ, and not from where it is not, the civil government.

#### *Whence Comes the Sabbath*

If the International Reform Bureau and their supporters in Sunday legislation knew, individually, that all things that pertain to life and godliness come from God's divine power, that would forever quench their thirst for Sunday legislation. They would not appeal to the civil governments for that which God alone can impart, but would, on the other hand, direct all men who desire rest, whether they be factory employees, or employees of mines, or whosoever they be, to Christ, the Sabbath-maker and liberty-giver, the only "name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12.

The day of rest sought by civil legislation is either a sabbath or a holiday. If a sabbath, it is God's, and it is the duty of the individual to render it unto him. If a holiday, it should have no religious restrictions or penalties attached thereto. But every man should be free to rest or not upon the day, as he himself may elect to do; for such is the nature of holidays.

But it is sometimes contended by the advocates of Sunday legislation that the civil Sunday laws are neither in the interest of the sabbath nor of a holiday, but of a "civic" rest day; because, say they, it has been scientifically demonstrated that man, in order that he render his best service, must have one definite twenty-four-hour-day period of rest in every seven such consecutive periods, besides the nights; therefore the appeal to civil governments for legislation, requiring Sunday laws in States where none exist at present, and more stringent

ones in States where they do exist. But is there a man living who observes the scientifically demonstrated (?) rule? How about the literary men who frequently work into the small hours of the morning? And there are many other equally conclusive demonstrations of the absurdity of the Reform Bureau's proposition.

Every true-hearted, fair-minded man ought to be willing to abide by the decision of our Lord, and leave all questions pertaining to worship with the divine government, thus rendering to the divine government all things pertaining to religion — worship — and to the civil government the things that by divine right belong to it.

Let us not assume to stand in God's place, and trench upon the divine rights of our brother.

*Mountain View, Cal.*

---

### *The Laymen's Movement*

ALLEN MOON

THE Laymen's movement is at present attracting attention in church circles, and is regarded by many as a missionary movement worthy of confidence and support. The initial movement was the organization of Brotherhood societies in, and by, the leading Protestant churches of the land. These did not long remain independent, but very soon began a movement following in the wake of the churches looking toward the formation of a federal body.

The third annual meeting of the Presbyterian Brotherhood of America, held in Pittsburg, Pa., Feb. 24 and 25, 1909, was attended by between three and four hundred delegates, representing all branches of Presbyterian Brotherhoods. These were joined by delegates from the Presbyterian Brotherhood of Canada, and representatives of the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, United Brethren, Universalist, Christian, and Episcopal Brotherhoods of men's movements, and also delegates from the Young Men's Christian Association.



The result of the joint meeting of delegates was a federation to be known as "The Inter-Brotherhood Association." It was the declared design that this association should become a permanent church organization, and it began at once to legislate for all Protestants in America. A resolution was adopted making the first week in December a week of prayer in all Protestant churches.

The Inter-Brotherhood Association is expected to become powerful. At the close of the meeting a member said, "The organization is not yet powerful enough to take anything but church work." It was an open secret, however, that this newly organized body contemplates taking other than church work. The fact that another religious body is wielding power and influence in the affairs of the nation seems to have created in this new body a longing to become possessed of like power.

#### *Unity on a Divided Basis*

It was stated that the federation of laymen's religious bodies was for civic as well as for religious purposes. No expression was given to any desire for oneness on the basis of truth. There seemed to exist entire satisfaction with federal unity in diversity, not, as the Saviour prayed, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." Such oneness is attained only by being sanctified by the truth of God's Word. Forgetting that God has chosen the weak things of this world to confound the mighty, this body turns to human power, — that of the state, — for aid in its work.

The Brotherhood movement embraces that body of Presbyterians that has been so active as National Reformers for many years, and it is only logical to infer that the whole body will become permeated with the doctrine that the church, being the best element in the nation, ought by right to be the ruling element. The Laymen's movement, comprising more than a million members, may be counted upon in support of the demand for religious legislation by the government.

Although the meeting above referred

to represented a Laymen's movement, many prominent clergymen were present and were the leading speakers of the occasion. The leading theme of discussion was the federation of churches. Rev. Josiah Strong, of New York, said, "We need federation in local communities, and if the city is to be Christianized, the world will be Christianized." Federation, in the opinion of this speaker, would solve all social and civic problems.

The burden of thought seemed to be that Protestant federation is necessary to counteract an effort to paganize city and country and State — that is, to counteract an effort to resist church control.

#### *What Would Jesus Do?*

Think of Jesus, the Author of Christianity, organizing his followers in Judea for the purpose of influencing legislation by the Roman nation in favor of his church; his followers seeking positions of influence in the government in order to control religious sentiment — or to obtain a complete monopoly of religion. This, on the part of the Saviour, would have been an utter denial of his claim that all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth; and the further claim that he could pray the Father and he would send to his aid more than twelve legions of angels; and that he was the Creator of all things. Such a course on the part of his followers would have been a complete denial of their faith in the divinity, power, and mission of Jesus.

Jesus was greater than men; for he was the Creator of men: greater than all created beings; for he was the Redeemer of men. To believe and trust in his power is redemption; to trust in men is denial of his power. It is no less a denial of Jesus *now* when his followers turn for power to another source than to the mighty One.

The church was most powerful when, in its purity and loyalty to the great principles of truth, it went unitedly to all the world, preaching salvation through Christ, in the face of a hostile nation. When it had sacrificed truth for the friendship of the nation, it was shorn of

its power. The church exalted by Christ seeks no other power than his.

The last-day federation of religious bodies is fitly described in the language of the eighty-third psalm: "They have taken crafty counsel against thy people, and consulted against thy hidden ones. . . . For they have consulted together with one consent; they are confederate against thee."

*South Bend, Ind.*

### **Religious Liberty—Retro- spective**

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH

SOME persons may suppose that the earnest agitation of the subject of religious liberty by Seventh-day Adventists is simply an effort to oppose the work of the National Reform Association. For the information of such, and all others, it may be well to note a few facts.

Since the year 1851 it has been the faith of the Seventh-day Adventist people, on the authority of the prophecy in the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, that the power there represented, which would finally become a persecuting power, is the United States of America; that here, where there has been so great *profession* of civil and religious liberty, would yet be seen persecution through the enforcement of the Sunday sabbath, as opposed to the Sabbath commanded in the Decalogue. The same is also set forth in the warning of Rev. 14:9-12.

#### **A Bold Prediction**

In the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, Vol. I, No. 11, May 19, 1851, appeared an article by Elder J. N. Andrews, claiming that the prophetic symbol of Rev. 13:11, 12 represented the United States, and that it would yet enforce, by law, the Sunday institution upon observers of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. His article was also placed in tract form, and one thousand copies circulated.

There was no great stir on the Sunday-enforcement question at that time,

no organization of any sort urging a national movement of the kind. In that article there appeared a quotation from Dr. Durbin, found in the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, which indicated a possibility of such a movement at some future time. That was the only outside proof presented of an expressed desire for the accomplishment of such an undertaking. Elder Andrews' principal argument was based upon the prophecy itself. These are Dr. Durbin's words:—

"I infer, therefore, that the civil magistrate may not be called upon to enforce the Sabbath as required in the spiritual kingdom of Christ; but, when Christianity becomes the moral and spiritual life of the state, the state is bound through her magistrates to prevent the open violation of the holy Sabbath, as a matter of self-preservation. She can not, without injuring her own vitality, and incurring the divine displeasure, be recreant to her duty in this matter."

In the month of May, 1854, I published a pamphlet of fifty-two pages on the subject of the United States in prophecy. Of this one thousand copies were circulated. I had no stronger proof for a national movement looking toward persecution than that which had been presented before by Elder Andrews.

#### **Agitation for Political Religion Begins**

About that time two sermons were preached, by two prominent ministers, that had a strong bearing in the direction of the prophecy. One was by J. S. Smart, of the Methodist denomination, and was delivered in Jackson, Mich. Many hundreds of copies of this address, in tract form, were circulated. The topic of this sermon was "The Political Duties of Christian Men and Ministers." In this sermon he said:—

"I claim that we have, and ought to have, just as much concern in the government of this country as any other men. . . . We are the mass of the people. Virtue in this country is not weak; her ranks are stronger in numbers, and invincible from the righteousness of her cause. Invincible if united! Let not

her ranks be broken by party names."

The other discourse was by "a very popular clergyman," in Concord, N. H., "before a full, delighted audience," who manifested their appreciation by "frequent applause." His topic was "The Flag and the Cross." He said: "The Flag and the Cross is my theme to-night. The cross is the symbol of our religion.

It reminds us of the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the sacrifice of Christ, the redemption of the world. The flag is the emblem of our nationality, the symbol of liberty and order. They should be associated, intertwined about our altars. There is no desecration in the act. There is little danger of too intimate a union between church and state. . . . The assumption that ministers should not intermeddle with the affairs of the state is a great and dangerous heresy. We have undertaken as a nation to divorce the flag and the cross. Would we have our nation prosper, we must solemnize anew the union between the cross and the flag."

In the winter of 1857 I published a second edition of my work on the prophetic symbol of Rev. 13:11-17. At that time some of the States were getting very zealous for more stringent Sunday laws. Among these was Texas. Of its Sunday law, just then enacted, the *Watchman and Reflector* said: "The legislature of Texas has passed a bill to establish the 'Christian sabbath,' which provides for punishment, by fine or imprisonment, of such persons as may perform any labor or procure any to be done on Sunday."

This law the *American Baptist* styled

"an oppressive enactment, corresponding in character with the legislation, or edicts, which in some Catholic countries demand conformity to the dominant religion. Laws to enforce the observance of the 'Christian sabbath,'" said the *Baptist*, "are no less repugnant to the principles of religious liberty, and violative of the rights of the people upon



THE THIN END OF THE WEDGE

whom they are imposed, than would be laws to enforce the observance of Easter, Good Friday, or the practise of infant baptism."

Of course these movements added a little force to my pamphlet, showing that the people were beginning to move in the line designated in the prophecy. As yet there was no National Reform movement instigated, such as we now see, displaying its colors, and clamoring for recognition before Congress itself. Among the first indications of such a movement

was a meeting held in Saratoga Springs, N. Y., in the year 1860.

The *New York Observer*, of Aug. 23, 1860, speaks of that gathering thus: "A large and enthusiastic meeting was held at Saratoga Springs, August 12, the object of which was to consider the subject of taking effective measures to secure laws for the observance of Sunday. The Hon. Millard Fillmore, Ex-President of the United States, presided over the meeting; on his right hand sat Governor Buckingham, of Connecticut, and Hon. J. W. Beekman, of New York; and on his left, Governor Morgan, of New York, and the Hon. W. G. Alexander, of New Jersey, representatives (with the honored chairman of the meeting) of the three great political parties which, in the apprehended shock of their collision, now threaten to rend the land asunder.

"Probably no two men thought exactly alike on any other subject. Doubtless all did not agree as to the grounds on which public action should be taken, or as to the extent to which this action should be pushed. But I have no question, from the tone of the meeting, and from casual remarks I overheard, that if it had been put to the vote it would have been resolved by acclamation that our American Christian sabbath, the precious birthright of our national independence, must and shall be preserved."

Ex-President Fillmore said, in the conclusion of the meeting, he "had aimed to secure the benefits of the day of rest through a long career of more than ordinary physical and mental exertion," and had given his "full assent to the claims of all to make it a day of worship, and to vindicate the prerogatives of civil authority." While he "deemed it needful to legislate cautiously in all matters connected with public morals, and to avoid coercive measures affecting religion, the right of every citizen to a day of rest and worship could not be questioned, and laws securing that right should be enforced." He declared himself "happy

to perceive that the gentlemen of the Sabbath Committee had avoided the many mistakes connected with many attempts at moral reform," and their object had his "entire approbation."

#### *The Backward Movement Inaugurated*

The movement inaugurated at this meeting was a movement for the instruction of the people. To this end it was proposed to invite five of the leading clergymen of New York to preach a sermon on different phases of the Sunday question. The fifth was to be on the matter of legislation upon the subject. And these were to be put in book form and circulated among the people. The following winter the said sermons were preached, and in the spring of 1861 the said book, of some four hundred pages, appeared.

The next move of note in this line was the organization of the National Reform Association at Xenia, Ohio, in 1863. This movement, and the aims of it, are familiar to the readers of this journal. Candid thinking people, unbiased in their judgment, have from the first expressed their opinion that it is a movement to bring about in this country such a union of church and state as the inhabitants of the Old World are trying to rid themselves of.

As a sample of such decision, note the following from the *Pacific*, a San Francisco paper of July 1, 1869:—

#### *Neither Atheistic nor Irreligious*

"The *Independent* [New York] well answers those well-meaning but unthinking people who are forever charging that our government is atheistic and irreligious because it does not include a creed in its Constitution. Our government is just what it professes to be, a civil government, and no more. It is no more irreligious because it does not indorse a creed than chemistry is irreligious for the same reason. By the oath of office, the doctrine of a divine Being is inferentially sustained, and under our peculiar form of government perhaps anything more would be unwise. We should be

in no haste to bring upon ourselves the difficulty from which England and other countries are now suffering, an unnatural union of church and state."

In the *Alta Californian* of March 12, 1870, we read of this movement: "The parties who have been recently holding a convention for the novel purpose of procuring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the Deity, do not fairly state the case when they assert that it is the right of a Christian people to govern themselves in a Christian manner. If we are not governing ourselves in a Christian manner, how shall the doings of our government be designated? The fact is, the movement is one to bring about in this country that union of church and state which all other civilized countries are trying to dissolve."

The increased zeal of those engaged in the movement is seen in the declaration of J. S. Smart (before quoted), in a meeting of ministers held in Washtenaw County, Michigan, in January, 1868. He said of the Sunday movement then going on, that "the sabbath was as dear to the American citizens as any institution which they possessed, and that if it was necessary, they would shed blood in its defense as freely as they had during the war."

The religious liberty movement which began in this country in 1851 was inaugurated for the purpose of warning the people of coming dangers, and is not a late development to oppose National Reformism.

Lodi, Cal.

---

### **Back to the Night**

CHART PITT

BACK to a vague and shadowy land,

In a night of frenzied fears;

Where a grotesque god, with an iron hand,

Rules o'er the buried years;

Where the stifled moans of a fettered host,

And the drip of the falling tears

On dungeon floor and the whipping-post,

Mark the march of the years.

A demon lurks 'neath their banners  
white;

And the blight of his evil breath  
Is bringing again the voiceless night  
Of an age of fear and death.

The air grows thick with the fumes of  
hell,

And a madman prays, as the night  
grows late;

And Satan smiles o'er the bridal bells

Of a vampire church and a trusting  
state.

*Bellingham, Wash.*

---

### **The Germans Want More Bibles**

IN the British and Foreign Bible Society report for 1908, Mr. Morrison, the society's agent for Germany, is reported as estimating that the annual circulation of the Bible in Germany has risen from an average of twelve copies per one thousand persons in 1885, to an average of nineteen copies per one thousand in 1907. "That is to say," the Bible Society report goes on to remark, "in Germany, which is sometimes considered to be the home of destructive criticism and the headquarters of unbelief, three persons now buy a copy of the Scriptures for every two persons who did so a quarter of a century ago."—*The Missionary Review of the World, November, 1909.*

---

### **Demand for the Bible in France**

THE reports of the colporteurs of the "Société Biblique de France" show that there is a very general demand for the Scriptures among the French people, both among the working people and business men. They have found it profitable to visit the county fairs, since they find there many who desire to purchase a Bible or a New Testament. This fact indicates that the present is a critical time in the history of France. Great multitudes have drifted out of the Catholic Church into no religion at all. They know practically nothing about the Bible, and it is an opportune time to direct their attention toward it. The proclamation of simple gospel truths produces an impression in France that is remarkable.—*Selected.*

# Temperance

## *An Abstinence Testimony in a Strange Place*

F. FREDERICK BLISS

SOME years ago I was invited by the young people's society of a church not far from my home city to give them a temperance lecture. In the town to which I was invited was a distillery which was reputed to be the largest in the world. I had never visited such an institution, and had a strong desire to do so on this occasion. Timing my arrival in the town with this in view, I called at the "mill of the coils," and, piloted by a gentlemanly guide, was soon going the rounds with a fair-sized company bent on a curiosity-gratifying errand like my own.

I had been informed that, after a company had visited every process part of the distillery, it was the custom of the institution for the guide to conduct them finally to a sample-room, where they were offered their choice of the goods manufactured there. This was an ordeal I very much dreaded, as it seemed to me a little ungracious to accept the institution's civilities, and then refuse to sample its products.

Sure enough, it was not long before we found ourselves in the sample-room — and a gorgeous room it was. The refrigerator in which the goods were kept, the cut-glass services, the tables and the divans, and all the palace-befitting appurtenances, could surely not be provided for less than many thousands of dollars.

I did not feel at home; I was excessively uneasy. I could easily see that I was the oldest person in the company, and as such, if worst came to worst, would be looked to to take the lead in the sample-room formalities. One circumstance, however, somewhat relieved my apprehension. I noticed in the company an elegantly dressed and fine-mannered gentleman from San Francisco,

who impressed me that he was no stranger to such surroundings, and would probably be amply able to preside on such an occasion.

Once fairly within the sanctum of the tasters, the suave guide turned to the company and said: —

"Well, now, gentlemen, what will you have?"

Though it was a new language to me, I knew what it meant. But I was dumb, and so were all the rest. This made the situation awkward. I glanced at the San Francisco gentleman, and he glanced at me. The guide evidently concluded that we were all embarrassed, and thought he would better help us out. It might be we each wished the best drink he had, but felt some hesitancy in saying so. So he generously came to our relief: —

"Will you have a Scotch highball?"

This might have helped the rest of the company, but as for me I did not know a Scotch highball from an American football. But as the San Francisco gentleman at once said, "If you please," I saw that the next thing would be a glass handed me containing the drink named. I later came to understand that the Scotch highball was considered one of the finest of drinks. I saw that I must speak.

"Guide," I said, "when I was sixteen years old I took the Good Templar's pledge — not even to taste apple juice after it was three days old. I am now forty-six years of age, and have never broken that pledge. I am sure not one of you would have me do it now. Besides, I am to-night to lecture in a church in this city on the subject of total abstinence. I am confident you will all gladly excuse me from tasting anything here."

The guide watched me closely, and when I was through, he looked round upon the company and said: —

"Gentlemen, I respect such a position as that."

"So do I," said the San Francisco gentleman, "and, guide, I'll not take anything, if you please."

The others joined in this, and no intoxicant was taken by that company on that occasion.

*Takoma Park, D. C.*

---

### *America's Enormous Liquor Traffic*

THE magnitude of the liquor traffic, as a mere commercial enterprise, is suggested by the bald statistics of production of the various alcoholic beverages. So long ago as 1891 the consumption of intoxicating liquors in the United States rose to the billion-gallon mark. In 1896, the year covered by an important report of the United States Bureau of Statistics, the amount consumed was one billion one hundred seventy million gallons. At that time, according to the official report, the total capital invested in the liquor interests in this country was nine hundred fifty-seven million dollars, of which fifty-nine per cent was represented in retail trade exclusively devoted to alcoholics, and an additional fifteen per cent in retail trade combined with other business. The total government revenue from alcoholic liquors for the year 1896 was more than one hundred eighty-three million dollars.

There were 191,519 proprietors of establishments interested in different forms of the liquor traffic, and their employees numbered 241,755 persons. Some of these were not exclusively occupied in dealing with alcoholics; but an estimate was made of the number of persons that would be required for the traffic if so occupied. The aggregate was three hundred sixty-four thousand persons. If each one of these were supposed to maintain an average family of five, it follows that one million eight hundred thousand persons received their exclusive support from the liquor traffic.

This took no account of the individuals engaged in producing the materials from which alcoholic liquors are made, nor of those engaged in the transportation of these materials and of the finished products. If these were added, the total of persons supported by the liquor traffic in the United States in the year 1896 would doubtless include more than two million individuals.

Since the time when these statistics were compiled, the liquor traffic has increased at an astounding rate. In the year 1900, according to the census report, the total consumption of liquor was in excess of one billion three hundred twenty-two million gallons. Three years later it rose above one billion six hundred million gallons. In 1900 the capital invested in liquor manufacturing establishments was more than four hundred fifty-seven million dollars. The cost of materials used in these manufactories (farm products, etc.) was seventy million dollars, and the wholesale value of the product exceeded three hundred forty million dollars.

Such figures are confusing—in a sense, ineffective—from their very magnitude. A realization of their import must, however, be gained by any one who hopes to have an intelligent comprehension of the liquor problem. Perhaps the facts of the case will be a little clearer if we interpret them in the light of what we have previously seen of the effects of alcohol. Let us, for example, recall the experiment with the printers, made by Professor Aschaffenburg, in which experiment thirty-five grams of alcohol proved sufficient to decrease markedly the working efficiency of the type-setters,—the decrease amounting in one case to ten per cent. From this experiment we are justified in regarding thirty-five grams of alcohol as a quantity capable of producing a distinctly harmful effect upon an average adult. Now, if we analyze the report of the United States census for 1900, we find that the seventeen and one-third gallons of intoxicating beverages credited

to every man, woman, and child in this country represent a sufficient quantity of absolute alcohol to supply every adult — women as well as men, with no allowance for teetotalers of either sex — with this thirty-five-gram dose of alcohol on each week-day of the year, and with a double dose on every Sunday. It would suffice, in other words, to keep every adult in America permanently alcoholized to a scientifically measurable extent.

Of course, every one is aware that there are large numbers of individuals — some millions of them in the aggregate — who choose not to consume their share of the alcohol thus allotted, or any portion thereof; but it follows, as a simple matter of mathematics, that the remaining millions who are not abstainers consume just so much the more. By the simple logic of unchallenged figures, then, we are forced to conclude that the millions of non-abstainers consume, on the average, a daily quantity of alcohol very markedly in excess of the quantity which has been proved by rigidly conducted experiments to be highly injurious.

In other words, it is thus demonstrable that it is not merely the exceptional person, but the average drinker, who is taking alcohol in toxic quantities. This, surely, demonstrates that the alcohol problem, as presented to to-day's civilization, is a veritable race problem of appalling magnitude. It is a vital, living problem, the bearings of which impinge, directly or indirectly, upon the practical interests of every citizen, in whatever walk of life.—*McClure's Magazine, February, 1909.*

SAID a temperance worker who had felt the dreadful sting of the liquor business: "I hate the drink traffic as virtue hates vice, as truth hates error, as righteousness hates sin, as justice hates wrong, as liberty hates tyranny, as freedom hates oppression." Liquor is the greatest waster in the world, and wantonly squanders the world's most precious asset — manhood.

## Books

THE following books ought to be in the library of every lover of religious liberty:—

**The Failure of the Higher Criticism**, by Emil Reich. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati, or Eaton & Mains, New York; 203 pages; cloth, \$1.00 net. This book will be a valuable addition to the library of all who love the Word of God. It shows in a striking manner the emptiness of the charges made by the higher critics against the Bible, who think to retain the sentiment of the holy Book while destroying its substance. Those especially who have been troubled by the progress of the Higher Criticism and the assertions of its exponents should not fail to read this book.

**Romanism Analyzed**, by John McDonald, B. D. The Scottish Reformation Society, No. 17 George IV Bridge, Edinburgh, Scotland; 483 pages; cloth. For price, inquire of the publishers. This remarkable analysis of Romanism is conducted "in the light of Scripture, reason, and history," and in so able a manner as to leave nothing to be desired. Each doctrine or dogma that makes Romanism a distinctive religion is taken up in catechetical form, exposed and refuted in a fearless, refreshing, and convincing manner. In his attack upon the fundamental teachings of the Roman system the author's deductions are most forceful and his logic irrefutable. With this book at his elbow, the possessor can answer at once every vital proposition of the Catholic religion.

**The Beginnings of New England**, by John Fiske. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York; 296 pages; cloth; price, \$2.00. This is a well-written, careful portrayal of the interesting and important events connected with the establishment of the New England colonies. The writer deals largely with the Puritan theocracy in its relation to civil and religious liberty, after contrasting in an able and instructive manner the development of the two ideas of nation-making known as the Roman idea and the English idea. The work shows painstaking research, and will well repay careful reading and study.

**The Huguenots in France**, by Samuel Smiles. George Routledge & Sons, London, England, or New York; 528 pages; cloth. The history of the Huguenots who remained in France after the revocation of the edict of Nantes is made little of by historians in general, most of them seeming to have taken it for granted that Protestantism was completely snuffed out in France by the cruel edicts of Louis XIV. The thrilling pages of this author's work abundantly disprove any such assumption, and the experiences of that persecuted people ought to be made familiar to the reading public. Incidentally the author shows what a terrible travesty on both justice and religion is a union of clericalism and the civil power.





## The Greatest of all Health Magazines

No health magazine has ever before made the wonderful strides that this one has made. From a small, unknown and unnoticed publication, it has grown, almost in a few months, to be the leading health magazine in America.

**Life & Health**  
THE NATIONAL HEALTH MAGAZINE

is the kind of a health magazine the people have been waiting for—not the organ of some pet theory, or of some individual or institution, but, a rational, common-sense digest of competent authority, full of plain teaching on the science of healthful living.

You will like LIFE AND HEALTH. It's a dollar a year.

Agents will find LIFE AND HEALTH a good proposition. Many active workers are earning a good living with it. Send for our offer.

LIFE AND HEALTH  
Washington - - - D. C.

## The Protestant Magazine

A sixty-four page quarterly magazine, protesting against error and promoting truth; advocating primitive Christianity, and protesting against apostasy. Defining clearly the principles of Protestantism and Catholicism. Interpreting the prophetic utterances of the Bible upon the Papacy, and citing their fulfillment in the events of history. A magazine of thrilling interest and vital importance, marking a new epoch in the history of modern Bible Protestantism.

### THE PROTESTANT MAGAZINE

deals with principles, not personalities. It opposes Romanism only with the plain Word of God.

Send for a copy of the latest issue.

Ten or more copies one year, each, fifteen cents.

Four big issues every year.

Ten cents a copy. Twenty-five cents a year.

THE PROTESTANT MAGAZINE  
Washington - - - D. C.



# LIBERTY

*A Magazine of Religious Freedom*

*Set for the Defense of the Rights of Conscience, and  
therefore opposed to a Union of Church and State  
in name or in fact*

WASHINGTON, D. C., FIRST QUARTER, 1911

**Subscription Price - 25 cents a year**  
No Subscriptions accepted for less than one year

**Organ of the Religious Liberty Association**  
Published Quarterly by  
**REVIEW & HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.**  
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.

C. M. SNOW EDITOR  
K. C. RUSSELL {  
W. A. COLCORD { ASSOCIATE EDITORS

**Editorial Contributors** W. W. Prescott, W. A. Spicer, G. B. Thompson, A. J. S. Bourdeau, B. G. Wilkinson (Washington, D. C.); L. A. Smith, C. P. Bollman, P. T. Magan (Tennessee); J. O. Corliss, W. M. Healey (California); E. T. Russell (Nebraska); O. S. Longacre (Massachusetts); J. G. Lamson (Minnesota); S. B. Horton (New York); W. T. Bartlett (England); Jean Vuilleumier (France); A. W. Anderson (Australia); E. W. Thomann (Chile); E. F. Forga (Peru).

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.

THE International Reform Bureau, that most active agency in the enactment and enforcement of religious laws in this country, is to have a two-hundred-fifty-thousand-dollar home in the city of Washington, D. C.

IN our last issue we promised a further report on the case of religious persecution which recently occurred at Colonial Beach, Va., where an observer of the seventh-day Sabbath was arrested and fined for doing honest labor on the first day of the week to the disturbance of no one. A friend whose sense of justice was outraged by the occurrence paid the fine without the knowledge or approval of this persecuted Christian. That persecution was the real object of the prosecutor was demonstrated by his admission that he would not cause the arrest of any one save a Sabbath-keeper

for working on Sunday. The spirit of the Dark Ages still lives, and "eternal vigilance" is still "the price of liberty."

THIS magazine is sent out only on pre-paid orders. Any one receiving this journal who has not personally subscribed for it, may know, therefore, that some friend has subscribed for him; that the price has been paid; that he will not be asked to pay for it; and that at the end of the time specified on the label, the journal will be stopped unless ordered renewed, and the order paid for in advance.

WE are glad to acknowledge every manifestation of a desire on the part of those in authority to recognize the religious rights of men. Such a manifestation was given by the board of managers of the National Soldiers' Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, as evidenced by the following communication from the board of managers to the managers of the Pacific Branch:—

Pacific Branch National Soldiers' Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers: Pursuant to authority of the president of board of managers, dated Nov. 10, 1910, members of Pacific Branch desiring to observe Saturday as the Sabbath, who are members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, are relieved from all duty that conflicts with this observance. Members who avail themselves of the provisions of this order will be required to have their beds properly prepared for Saturdays, and all other inspections in barracks at such time in advance as not to conflict with their observance of said Sabbath. They will report at headquarters at 9 A. M. on Fridays for inspection.

One of the veterans who benefits by this just order says:—

We praise the Lord for this, and thank our home management and the president of the board of management, also Elder K. C. Russell, who interceded for us. Now we can freely attend our Sabbath service.

# The Perfect Law of Liberty

"He that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing." James 1: 25, A. R. V.

"Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." Lev. 25: 10.

## MAN'S DUTY TO GOD

### I.

"I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

### II.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them; for I Jehovah thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing loving-kindness unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

### III.

"Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah thy God in vain; for Jehovah will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

### IV.

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a Sabbath unto Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore Jehovah blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

## MAN'S DUTY TO MAN

### V.

"Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee."

### VI.

"Thou shalt not kill."

### VII.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery."

### VIII.

"Thou shalt not steal."

### IX.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

### X.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."

"On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets." Matt. 22: 40.

These precepts wrought out in human lives are the surest guaranty of human liberties.

# America's Greatest Menace

As a Congressman Sees It



HIS evil spirit of persecution is indeed very far from confining itself to the ignorant and depraved.

It not only nourishes those violent passions which lead to bloodshed and tyranny, it is almost equally objectionable for its meaner vices of treachery and fraud.

It engenders dissimulation of another kind. It pays an enormous premium for hypocrisy, and crushes out all independence and truth from the hearts of the people. Sincerity, even when it clings to an erroneous faith, is the first of virtues. But the brave, true men who would rather suffer than belie their honest convictions, are hunted down and sent to the stake, or at least are banished in disgrace from the public councils, while the knave or the coward, who is willing to profess whatever creed is safe or profitable, is rewarded for his baseness with influence, power, and place. Bigotry applies an infallible test to the merits of men. With unerring certainty she divides the chaff from the wheat; but the wheat she condemns to the unquenchable fire of her hatred, while the chaff is carefully stored away in her garner. Therefore it is that, when bigotry reigns, the public service is always crowded with the worst men. Hostility against an unpopular religion is easily simulated. When you make that a virtue, the infidel and the ribald can be as virtuous as anybody.

It is useless to describe any further the features of this monstrous demon. It is the Moloch of the earth, who sits on his shrine up to the ears in blood, and compels the children of men "to pass through the fire to his grim idol." It corrupts the morals, it pollutes the religion, it endangers the safety of any people who permit it to gain a foothold among them.

Our establishment of perfect religious liberty and equality has not only given happiness and peace to ourselves, but it has revolutionized the sentiments of the Christian world. We have led the grandest reform that has ever been since the days of the apostles. . . . She [America] stands pledged to this principle in the face of the world; she has solemnly devoted herself to its championship; she has deliberately promised it — not only to her own people, but to all others who would fly to her for protection — and, if she breaks her faith, it will be such perfidy as never blackened the brow of any power before.— *Hon. Thomas C. McRae, of Arkansas, in the House of Representatives, April 2, 1896, the question under consideration being a government appropriation for a sectarian purpose.*