


LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM



PUBLISHED QUARTERLY 10 CTS. A COPY 35 CTS. A YEAR

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Religious Liberty Association

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

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

For further information regarding the principles of this association, address the Religious Liberty Association, Takoma Park, Washington, D. C. (secretary, C. S. Long-acre), 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, 51 Whitmore St., Hartford, Conn.; secretary, J. E. Jayne.

Canadian Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, and Newfoundland): Office, Galt, Ontario; secretary, C. H. Keslake.

Central States Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, and Wyoming): Office, College View, Nebr.; secretary, E. T. Russell.

Columbia Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland): Office, Takoma Park, D. C.; secretary, S. B. Horton.

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, 2713 Third Ave. South, Minneapolis, Minn.; secretary, Chas. Thompson.

North Pacific Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska): Office, College Place, Wash.; secretary, W. F. Martin.

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

Southeastern Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina): Office, 169 Bryan St., Atlanta, Ga.; secretary, C. B. Stephenson.

Southern Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Mississippi): Office, 2123 24th Ave., N., Nashville, Tenn.; secretary, L. A. Smith.

Southwestern Religious Liberty Association (affiliated organizations in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico): Office, Keene, Tex.; secretary, W. A. McCutchen.

FOREIGN OFFICES

Australia: Office, Mizpah, Wahroonga, N. S. W., Australia; secretary, G. Teasdale.

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

Read and Circulate This "America" Number!

Wherein Does the United States Government Differ From All Others?

Civil and religious liberty are closely related. Note what these prominent Americans have said about religious liberty, religious legislation, and the rights of the minority: George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln, James Madison, Roger Williams, Patrick Henry, U. S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, and many others.

Several ecclesiastical organizations are even now busily engaged in an effort to undermine the foundations of our American principles of liberty. How much are YOU willing to do to counteract the evil work that is being done by these modern religious "miners and sappers"?

This number of "LIBERTY" is the best ammunition you can use in this great religious liberty battle of the century.

Every Citizen, Be He Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or Infidel

should see to it that no laws are enacted which will in any way deprive him or his fellow citizens of different belief of the RIGHT OF CHOOSING or the RIGHT OF CHANGING his or their BELIEF in all RELIGIOUS MATTERS. He will ever insist upon the fullest enjoyment of his —

Civil Rights in Religious Matters

We believe that you are unwilling to allow any religious combination or combinations to secure the enactment of religious laws which would lead to religious bigotry, hatred, and persecution by the RELIGIOUS MAJORITY, as in the "Dark Ages." We therefore look confidently for your hearty cooperation in our campaign to SPREAD THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY in your vicinity and elsewhere. We therefore take the liberty of suggesting briefly —

How You Can Help

to stem the strong current of religious legislation and its attendant intolerance and persecution, through our "Liberty Magazine" campaign of education: —

FIRST.—You can send us \$4.00 for 20 (or \$2.00 for 10) yearly subscriptions in behalf of your friends. These will be sent to different names and addresses (your own included, if desired), or all to one address, as you may direct. Many churches and patriotic societies have sent in as many as 300 subscriptions each at this low rate.

SECOND.—By becoming our agent for your community, and purchasing from 5 to 1,000 copies each quarter, at the following wholesale, post-paid rates: 5 to 40 copies, ordered at one time, 5 cents a copy; 50 or more copies, 4 cents a copy. Selling this magazine is easy and profitable work. Write for full particulars to-day. Send 10 cents for sample copy.

ADDRESS AGENCY LISTED ON ANOTHER PAGE

Kindly Use Order Blanks on Reverse Side

ONE, THREE, OR MORE YEARS?

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed find \$.35 (\$.90) (\$1.00) (\$2.00) for which kindly send me *Liberty Magazine* for (1 yr.) (3 yrs.) (4 yrs.) (10 yrs.) ending (Cross out figures not desired.)

Name

Address

SPECIAL ORDER BLANK

GENTLEMEN: Enclosed find \$2.00 (\$4.00), for which please mail 10 (20) copies of *Liberty Magazine* for one year to the address or addresses found herewith. I understand you will mail these magazines to one or more addresses, as desired.

NAMES AND ADDRESSES

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10

APPLICATION FOR AGENCY

GENTLEMEN: I hereby apply for agency for *Liberty Magazine*. I desire to solicit subscriptions, and also to sell a supply regularly each quarter. Kindly send me your rates. Find enclosed recommendation vouching for my character and ability properly to represent your magazine.

Name

Address

NOTE.—Kindly order through our General Agency nearest you. See list on another page.

If you find a Renewal Blank inside the front cover, it indicates that **YOUR SUBSCRIPTION EXPIRES WITH THE RECEIPT OF THIS NUMBER.** Please fill out the Blank and send the same, with remittance, to our **NEAREST AGENCY.** See advertisement "Our General Agencies."

LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Editor: C. S. LONGACRE.

Associate Editors: C. M. SNOW, W. W. PRESCOTT

CONTENTS

GENERAL ARTICLES	PAGE
Christian Citizenship	149
Catholics and Protestants Possess Equal Rights	151
Religion in the Public Schools	153
American Principles	154
A Layman's View of National Reformism	155
Struggles for Freedom	157
Hon. Richard Bartholdt on Personal Liberty and Sunday Legislation	159
Forces Antagonistic to the American Government	162
Freedom of Speech	163
Looking to the State for Morality	164
Religious Liberty in the Philippines	165
EDITORIAL	
Editorial Briefs	156, 167
Roger Williams, "the First American"	168
The World's Christian Citizenship Conference	171
Constantine's Sophistry Practised on Americans	174
Jefferson's Prophecy Nearing Fulfilment	178
Voluntary Religion an American Policy	180
Mayor Gaynor's Rebuke	181
What Prominent Men Have Said About Religious Legislation	183
What Prominent Men Have Said on the Rights of the Minority	185
TEMPERANCE	
The Liquor Traffic a Menace to Personal Liberty	187

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.

PRICES, POST-PAID

Yearly subscription	\$.35	Four years	\$1.00
Three years90	Ten years	2.00
(Subscriptions for less than one year not accepted)		Ten copies, one year, to one or more addresses	2.00
Five or more copies, mailed by publishers to five addresses or to one address, post-paid, each			.05

NO EXTRA CHARGE ON FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS

HOW TO REMIT.—Remittances should be made by Post-office Money-order (payable at Washington, D. C., post-office), Express Order, or Draft on New York. **Cash should be sent in Registered Letter.**

DATE OF EXPIRATION.—Your address on the wrapper shows the date of expiration of your subscription. To avoid missing any numbers, please **renew early**, for we **stop** all subscriptions **promptly upon expiration.**


CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—When a change of address is desired, both the **old** and the **new address** must be given. The publishers should be notified six weeks in advance of the desired date of change.

SUBSCRIPTIONS GUARANTEED.—Our authorized agent will present signed **credentials** from our agency nearest you, also receipt for subscription money. If requested, he will also deliver the first copy to commence your subscription.

TERMS TO AGENTS.—5 to 40 copies, 5 cents a copy; 50 or more copies, 4 cents, post-paid, to one or more addresses. Foreign orders, 5 or more copies, 5 cents a copy, post-paid. Special discount on subscriptions quoted upon application.

YOU WILL NOT BE ASKED TO PAY for this magazine unless you have subscribed for it. Some friend may have subscribed for you. The receipt of a sample copy is merely an invitation to subscribe. So please do not refuse the magazine at your post-office for **financial reasons.**

A. J. S. BOURDEAU, Circulation Manager



SIGNING THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

LIBERTY

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

VOL. VIII

FOURTH QUARTER, 1913

No. 4

Christian Citizenship

L. A. SMITH

THE church has undertaken to save the world today by means of "Christian citizenship." By this expression is meant the application of Christian rules of conduct by Christians to political affairs.

The great trouble with the world today, say the advocates of Christian citizenship, is that Christians do not apply their Christianity in public affairs. They do not at the polls, in the legislature, and in public office, put their religion into practise. They allow the government to be run very largely by bad men upon bad principles, when it might be run by good men upon Christian principles.

In Christian countries good men, we are told, are really in the majority, and could control the affairs of government if they only would. We are told that if Christians everywhere would only wake up and take an active interest in politics, they could vote bad men out of office and good men in, who would make and enforce righteous laws, and the evils that afflict society would soon be remedied.

It is the mission of the church to save the world, and by "Christian citizenship" this salvation is to be effected.

The cities are to be reformed, all public offices are to be filled by Christians, Christian laws are to be enacted and enforced, and the wholesale regeneration of

human society is to be brought about.

They will admit that the old-time method of individual regeneration by means of a change of heart, is good to a degree, but altogether too slow for the present age, when the great need is to secure Christian government and establish Christian states.

The chief trouble with this program is that it is contrary to Scripture and to the mind of God.

Jesus Christ never commissioned his church to save the world by means of "Christian citizenship." The great gospel commission says nothing about reforming governments and saving kingdoms, but only about preaching the gospel of salvation by faith.

The Bible says nothing about salvation by the ballot, but it does say much about salvation by the cross of Christ.

The Bible nowhere says that the saints are to outvote the sinners and thus effect the world's salvation, but it does say that true Christians are the salt of the earth.

If there had been found ten righteous men in Sodom, God would not have destroyed the city. It is not necessary that the salt should even approximate in quantity the bulk of the substance which it preserves.

But it is necessary that the salt should not lose its preserving quality. If the

Christian church becomes like the world, then it is no longer the salt of the earth, and can no longer act as a preservative. It can no longer save the world from the judgment of an offended God.

For this reason God has always manifested more concern over the condition of his church than over the condition of the world. If his church is what he wants it to be, God can work through it with almighty power for the conversion of the world.

All God wants is the free chance to manifest himself to the world through his church. But if the church becomes corrupt or refuses to be a channel of divine light, God is given no opportunity to manifest his saving power either to the church or to the world. The salt has then lost its savor, the world its only light. This is the worst possible condition that could arise.

The greatest danger, therefore, is not that the world may do wickedly, but that the Christian church may lose its Christianity.

The danger, in other words, is not from the crimes of the wicked, but from the sins of the good; not from the deeds that shock society, but from the respectable sins that because of their popularity find easy entrance into the church and there perform their deadly work of damnation.

The danger is not from what the publicans and sinners may do outside the church, but from what the Pharisees and scribes may do within the church; not from the work of the saloon-keeper and the corrupt politician, but from the worldliness of church-members in good standing.

"Take heed, and beware of covetousness," was the oft-spoken admonition of Jesus. Two characters, Balaam and Judas, stand out upon the pages of history as an awful warning of the deadly nature of the sin of covetousness. And what will pride do? Pride cast down Lucifer from the position of covering cherub by the throne of God, and changed him into the devil.

Is there any pride or any covetousness in the Christian church today?

The great crime of the ages, the crucifixion of the world's Redeemer, was committed not by the publicans and sinners, but by the Pharisees and the Sanhedrin; in other words, by the outwardly good, religious element in the church. Pilate would have saved Jesus, but the church element demanded his death.

How much nearer shall we be to the kingdom of God when the church has succeeded in "turning the rascals out" of public office, but retains the respectable Judases and the pious Pharisees in her own communion? when she has reformed the wicked cities, but harbors the deadly sins of pride and covetousness in her own bosom? when she has cleansed Sodom, but has become herself like unto Capernaum?

There is something which in the sight of God is worse than the sins of Sodom, and that is the sin of having great light from heaven and hardening the heart against it. That was what the "good" city of Capernaum did, and therefore Christ declared that it would be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment than for that city.

Is any one concerned lest the church today should commit the sin of Capernaum?

And when, by decreeing that only Christian men shall be eligible to public office, the church sets up an inducement for office-seekers to enter her fold from hypocritical motives, how much will this tend to the welfare of the church?

What is to be gained by purifying the world at the cost of bringing corruption into the church?

Jesus Christ when he was upon earth made no move to reform the cities, but he did cleanse the temple of God. Is it not possible, nay, even probable, that, were he on earth today, he would show more concern for the purifying of the churches than for the reforming of the cities and the setting up of Christian states?

Let the cities be cleansed, by all means.

Let the saloons be driven out, let philanthropic men be put in office, and just laws be made and administered. But let it be remembered that it was the mission of Jesus Christ, and therefore that it is today the mission of his church, to save people from sin; and that not from other people's sins, but from their own sins.

And let it be remembered that the most dangerous sins are the respectable, popular sins; and that salvation from sin comes not from "Christian citizenship," but only from that gospel which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16.

Nashville, Tenn.

Catholics and Protestants Possess Equal Rights

F. M. WILCOX

ARE Catholics entitled to the same rights, privileges, and prerogatives as Protestants? Is there any reason why members of the Catholic Church should not fill offices of trust under the government of the United States the same as members of Protestant churches? Ever since the founding of this republic this question has been raised from time to time in various sections of the country by persons strongly anti-Catholic. It has been brought forward anew during the last few weeks by an action of the school board of Charlotte, N. C., in excluding two teachers from the public schools of that city on the ground that they are members of the Catholic Church. Much local feeling has been engendered by this agitation. The following report of the incident was given in the *Washington Post* of July 23:—

"By a vote of ten to five the school board of Charlotte, the largest city of North Carolina, at its meeting last week discharged the Misses Mary and Helen Clifford as teachers, on the ground that they are members of the Roman Catholic Church.

"This action was taken after a public hearing, at which pleas in behalf of the young women were made by prominent Protestant clergymen, a half-dozen of the leading lawyers of Charlotte, and other well-known citizens. Mayor Bland appealed to the school board not to discharge the Misses Clifford.

"No secret was made of the reasons for the removal of the young women. It was admitted that they were efficient

teachers, and that no charges had been made against their characters.

"After listening for three hours to arguments for and against the young women, the school board promptly dismissed them."

As a protest against this action of the school board, a mass-meeting of the citizens was called. This was addressed by a number of prominent men connected with the affairs of the city. The following resolutions were passed at this meeting:—

"*Whereas*, At a late meeting of the board of school commissioners two young ladies of culture, high character, and ability as teachers were defeated for re-election for no other reason than that they were members of the Roman Catholic Church: now therefore, it is—

"*Resolved* by the members of this meeting, citizens of Charlotte, That we believe the action of the members of the board in defeating them was for the cause above alleged.

"We believe that it is contrary to the laws of the United States and to the laws of the State of North Carolina to require any religious test as a qualification to any office or public trust.

"We believe the principal foundation upon which this government was built is civil and religious liberty.

"We believe that our brethren of the Roman Catholic Church are entitled to the full benefit and enjoyment of these sacred principles.

"We consider the action of the majority of the members of the board an act

of persecution on account of religious belief, and a denial of freedom of conscience, and that their action in depriving the two candidates for office of an opportunity to earn a support in their chosen occupation was cruel and unjust, and was in direct conflict with the law as explained to them by their counsel.

"We proclaim that the majority of the board acted in direct conflict with the opinion and wishes of the majority of the citizens of Charlotte.

"We call upon the people to show their disapproval of such conduct by all lawful means, that we may put an end forever to all religious persecutions in our midst.

"Apart from all consideration of religion and law, we believe that this action of the board has seriously injured the city of Charlotte commercially and industrially, and that it is a blot on the fair fame of this city so widely known for its humanity and love of civil and religious liberty."

With the spirit of these resolutions we are in hearty accord; and if the report given above is correct, and these teachers were dismissed from the public schools solely because they were members of the Catholic Church, then the action of the school board was wrong and wholly un-American.

We believe that every fair and unbiased mind must admit that under the Constitution of the United States, so long as members of the Catholic Church do not use public office as a means for the promotion of the interests of that church, they are entitled to absolutely the same rights, privileges, and prerogatives as are members of the Protestant churches. The use of an office for partizan purposes should debar the member of any church from holding public trust, whether Catholic or Protestant. This principle of absolute equality is stated in the original Declaration of Independence:—

"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 no advantage should be taken of the religious beliefs and prejudices of any citizen, the First Amendment to the Constitution provides:—

"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 or petition the government for a redress of grievances."

And as a further safeguard in the protection of this principle of liberty, Section 1 of Article XIV of Amendments provides that the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States, guaranteed to them under the federal Constitution, shall in no way be abridged by the States:—

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State in which they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Clearly the action of the Charlotte school board was in direct violation of this principle enunciated by the general government. And not only this, the action of the board was in direct violation as well of the principle clearly stated in the North Carolina Declaration of Rights. Article I, Section 26, says:—

"All men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no human authority should, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience."

We are in hearty accord with the great underlying principles of Protestantism. We differ from our Catholic friends in many essential particulars. We do not believe their religious doctrines, nor are

we in accord with the principles which they hold regarding the questions of church and state. We deplore the attitude which they have assumed for years with respect to the use of public-school money and their efforts to secure governmental recognition in various ways. But while opposing the positions they take with reference to these questions, we hold that as citizens of this country they are unqualifiedly entitled to the same rights and privileges in every particular as their Protestant neighbors. This is simple justice and equity; this is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; this is the spirit of the Declaration of Independence.

It is for us to differentiate between men and principles. Many principles held by Catholics we consider wrong; but while we recognize the evils of these principles, we must concede that there are many excellent people in the Catholic Church who believe these principles. In common with Protestants there are many Catholics who are good citizens and kind neighbors, and who we believe are quite as conscientiously serving God according to their belief as are members of

the Protestant church. If Protestants were to adopt these same principles, the same results would follow. This has been demonstrated in the past. The fires of persecution in the Old World burned no more fiercely than did those kindled by Cotton Mather and his zealots in the early days of New England. The persecutions of Queen Mary against her Protestant subjects were no more deplorable than the persecutions of Queen Elizabeth against Catholics and non-conformists. Following the same principles, these zealots, whether Catholic or Protestant, were led to do the same work.

Against these principles we protest, but for those who hold to them, whether Protestant or Catholic, we entertain a most kindly regard. We would seek to save them from the results of their own efforts. Their interests are our interests, and that which robs them in any degree of their rights is a blow against liberty and a menace to every citizen. In the words of an eminent statesman, we believe in "equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political."

Washington, D. C.



Religion in the Public Schools

W. F. MARTIN

SHOULD the Christian religion be taught in the public schools? This is a question that is seriously discussed by thinking men and women throughout the land today. In the following brief article it is desired to present some reasons against such teaching.

There is no desire to question the divine origin of Christianity, neither is there any questioning of its authenticity; but there is a question as to the propriety of its being taught in the schools established and supported by the state. The common or public schools are altogether secular. Their purpose is to make good citizens. They are supported by taxes paid by all the people, the non-Christian as well as the Christian, the Jew and the

Hindu as well as the worshiper of Jesus Christ and of the true God.

It can hardly be claimed that no one can be a good citizen except he make a profession of Christianity. Then again, Christians themselves are not agreed as to what constitutes the true principles of Christianity. If it is decided by the state that true Christianity is to be taught in the public schools, it will be necessary for the state to decide what constitutes true Christianity, or the true principles of the Christian religion.

When once the state does that, it has established a state religion. A state-established religion must have an established head. This head of the state-established religion would be a state-established

lished head. That means a union of church and state. It may be argued that this would not be a union of church and state, but rather of religion and the state. The terms are, in the nature of things, synonymous. The Christian religion is held to and propagated by the different churches. These ideas, whether held to by one church or several, if enacted into a law by the state, constitute a union of the church and state. Again, where there is a disagreement among religious bodies as to what constitutes true Christianity, and the law says the schools shall teach the true principles of Christianity, it will, of necessity, have to decide between the different sects as to which holds the truth. That would constitute a civil tribunal for the trial of an ecclesiastical question. Of necessity, some sect would be given a preference over others.


A noted jurist once made this statement: "There is not complete religious liberty where any one sect is favored by the state and given an advantage by law over other sects." In 1776 the noted

presbytery of Hanover sent a memorial to the general assembly of Virginia in which were the following pertinent truths: "It is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith without erecting a chair of infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome."

Once more, in defining religious liberty, Prof. C. F. James, a prominent Baptist, said that "religion is and must be a voluntary service; that only such service is acceptable to God, and hence that no earthly power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, has any right to compel conformity to any creed or species of worship, or to tax a man for its support."

If this definition is correct, and it is, then for the government to tax a man to have his children taught religion, whether or not of his own belief, would be contrary to the true principles of religious liberty. No true American can afford to advocate any theory that interferes with the soul freedom of his fellow men.

College Place, Wash.



American Principles

W. F. MARTIN

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

This First Amendment to the national Constitution was passed by Congress at its first session in 1789. It was introduced by a young man from Virginia, Mr. James Madison. Of all the galaxy of statesmen of this period, which boasts such men as Jefferson, Henry, Washington, and Hamilton, none shine with a clearer luster than Mr. Madison. He was a member of the convention that wrote the Constitution. Mr. Jefferson was in Europe at the time of the calling of this convention. In writing to Mr. Madison concerning the Constitution, and commending it in the main, he thought it did not sufficiently guarantee religious liberty. Jefferson thought it

should contain a bill of rights, insuring the liberty of the people against any undue dominance of the government. In this sentiment, Madison shared. So on his election to Congress, he introduced and caused to be passed ten amendments. The first one of these was the noted First Amendment, quoted at the head of this article. During the debate upon the adoption of these amendments, some very interesting things were said. Especial emphasis was given to the First Amendment. "The minority," they said, "must be protected; the majority will take care of themselves." In this, the key-note of liberty was struck. That is true Americanism. Majorities are not always in the right. Then the rights of the minority are fully as sacred as those of the majority. With this in mind, the First


Amendment as originally introduced read, "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief, nor shall any national religion be established; nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner or on any pretext infringed." Mr. Sherman, at that time a member of Congress, said he thought "the amendment altogether unnecessary, inasmuch as Congress had no power delegated to it to make religious establishments." Mr. Carroll said that "as the rights of conscience are in their nature of peculiar delicacy, and will little bear the gentlest touch of governmental hand," he was in favor of adopting the amendment. See *Annals of Congress*, Volume I.

In the course of the debate, Mr. Madison gave as his prime reason why the amendment should be adopted, the fear that "one sect might obtain a preeminence, or two combine together and establish a religion to which they would compel others to conform."—*Ib.*

These things show that it was deeply

entrenched in the minds of those early statesmen that there should be no religious coercion. It was their purpose to make an entire separation between church and state. Some years later Mr. Jefferson wrote, "I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state." As long as the First Amendment stands as a part of the national Constitution, it will be a protest against all religious legislation. If our government should yield to the demands of so-called national reformers, and turn away from this guaranty of liberty, it would yield its most precious heritage and surrender its strongest bulwark. Another great American said, "Liberty, the greatest of all earthly blessings, give us that precious jewel and you may take everything else."

College Place, Wash.



A Layman's View of National Reformism

DR. H. S. PETERS

WHAT does National Reformism hope to accomplish? Can we make laws that shall reach a man's conscience? Is there anything about our basic laws, or civil polity, that recognizes anything about Christianity, or any other form of religion? Do the National Reformers not know that this is a government without a religion, and that religion exists without state support? Do they not know that all religions, all sects, and all creeds stand upon the same equality and foundation before the national Constitution?

The seeking for laws to compel a stricter observance of Sunday, or any other day, as a day of worship will not make a man any holier or better. Anciently they made him fear to act his natural bent, therefore made a hypocrite of him.

Constantine's first Sunday law was en-

acted in the year 321 A. D. They did not say it was our sabbath, or rest day, or the Roman sabbath, because they knew better,—the same as they do now. It is the same spirit that is behind the Sunday laws now that was behind them then, only they proceed under a somewhat different nomenclature.

The religious organizations kept calling their councils, and gathering their big men in conventions, until at last they enmeshed the emperor, Constantine, in their church-and-state schemes. "They flattered him into the persuasion that he had a right to exercise an absolute supremacy over all the Christian communities in the empire. The most extravagant panegyrics were lavished upon him, and his unworthy adulators ascribed to him honors, and prerogatives of the Divinity. The office of prescri-

bing to the faith of mankind and of judging offenses against the gospel, which the invisible Head of the church had hitherto challenged as exclusively his own, was now accounted proper for a mortal! Constantine became the judge

These are simple historical facts, and we all should be conversant with them. What does this unholy combination mean,—this combination that is at work seeking for laws to interdict our freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom to



THE CHURCH ON THE MOUNT OF TEMPTATION

Satan once offered to Jesus Christ all the nations of the world on his conditions. Our Saviour spurned the temptation. Satan is now making a similar proposal to the professed church of Jesus Christ. Will the church do as her Lord did, or will she yield, and fall into the trap of the deceiver as she did in the early centuries? It looks very much as if she is preparing to yield. That will be the disaster of the ages.

of heresy. He summoned and presided in ecclesiastical councils. He published rescripts and issued edicts, not as formerly to assure the subjects of the empire of secure protection in the exercise of their religion, but to denounce religious opinions, and to threaten the infliction of tremendous punishments against all persons whose tenets and discipline did not accord with his imperial standard."—*Brooks's "History of Religious Liberty,"* pages 40, 41.

worship God, or not to worship God, according to the dictates of our consciences?

Sunday veneration, under this new combination of church and state, is the entering wedge now, as it was in Constantine's days; and those who will not observe this humanly ordained religious institution must be severely punished and penalized. The same unchristian measures that were used in the dark ages are employed by the modern Babylo-


nians. In this call for making stricter Sunday laws at these world conferences, men are following in the wake of the church councils of medieval times, and those who will not submit will feel the iron hand of oppression as it was felt in those dark and evil times.

The same kind of influence and power that was back of all previous Sunday-law, church-and-state legislation in the formation of the Papacy in Rome, is back of all this National Reform legislation. In those days there was a continual agitation for Sunday laws, just as there is today. There was a continual agitation for religious legislation by the first conspiracy, just as there is today. The things which happened back in the days under Constantine were done in the interests of social service and for the gen-

eral welfare of church and state; but in the end they proved the downfall of both church and state, and the greatest curse that ever befell society. This seems to be the trend of all Sunday laws and all religious legislation. It does not make Christians, but, inflated with civil authority, intoxicated with carnal power, and equipped with the civil sword, professed Christians become the worst of persecutors.

The Papacy was built up by the church dabbling in politics, coercing politicians, and cajoling state officers, until it obtained the support of the civil law in behalf of the church. The National Reform Association employs the same means and will accomplish the same ends.

Pittsburgh, Pa.



Struggles for Freedom

W. MAYHEW HEALEY

THE Stoic Epictetus, who taught philosophy in Rome about the middle of the first century of the Christian era, said of freedom: "He is free who lives as he likes; who is not subject to compulsion, to restraint, or to violence; whose pursuits are unhindered, his desires successful, his aversions unincurred. No wicked man, then, lives as he likes; therefore no such man is free. . . . Neither they who are called kings nor the friends of kings live as they like. Who, then, after all, is free?"

It is true that no one has *absolute* freedom, if one associates with others. All rights and liberties are circumscribed by the rights and privileges of others. If one withdraws from the society of others and lives alone, that very act deprives that person of liberty.

Man's first sin led him into spiritual and physical bondage; and to be a slave in this double sense is to be a slave in every sense.

Upon every page of human history, from the human standpoint, may be

truthfully written the word *slave*, and following it a pitiful story of struggles, desires, and cries for liberty. There has been one universal wail because of bondage to disease, pain, and death.

Nearly every soul has sometime cried for freedom from the power of its own passions and appetites.

Untold numbers have struggled for, and untold millions have given their lives to obtain, civil liberty,—freedom from oppressive laws and the cruel authority of men.

The tendency of human government, during all the ages past, in both church and state, has been toward the exercise of power to destroy the liberties and privileges of those who differed from it. This may not have been altogether from a desire to oppress. But the exercise of authority, in church or state, or anywhere else, increases the feeling of ability in those who exercise authority, and a corresponding depreciation of the capability of others, until it is thought by them an act of kindness to rule the slave, and

one of mercy to punish those who are held to be in religious error,—*all for their good.*

The gospel of Jesus Christ alone presents the principles and promises of *full and absolute liberty*. Spiritual liberty is offered "today" from the domination of sin. Liberty from all physical ills is promised through the resurrection of the dead. The true principle of all government is taught in these words, "Whosoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." A government on this principle would be one where each individual is endowed with equal rights, not only before the law, but in the making of the laws. Statesmen and philosophers, while acknowledging the above principle as ideal, have declared that a good government could not be maintained on it under the conditions that exist in the world. The majority of the people being bad, they claimed that they would make only bad laws, therefore authority should be kept from the people in general, in both church and state, and centered in the hands of a few. This has brought oppression and persecution in all the past ages. At different times in the history of the world attempts have been made to found governments on broader principles of *liberty* than were those then existing, but in the Old World they feared to adopt the true principle, and it was left to the American people to found a government on right principles of equal rights and liberties; each one being free to choose in religious matters.

All religions *not uncivil* being allowed, each individual could, if desired, have religious views differing from all others.

In civil matters all men are held to be equal—in rights and privileges—before the law, and alike entitled to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The experience of more than a century and a quarter of time has shown that these principles produce the greatest and best government of earth, and also proves that the humble Teacher of Galilee

knew better than the great and wise men of earth what were the true principles of government.

We have learned that bad men will vote for good laws to *govern others*,—and this is the principle that saves a republic founded by sinful men. A murderer would not dare to risk his life where the law permitted all to kill others at pleasure. The thief and liar would not care to live in a community where all others were just like themselves, and were allowed by law to be so. All want protection to their own lives and property.

Our ancestors, *when oppressed*, sought and prayed for a land of liberty, and found one; but when power came into their hands, they followed, in a measure, the common path of others who had ruled before them. They wanted liberty in religious matters *for themselves*, but none for the Quaker or the Baptist. The government offered civil liberty to all, and yet in it millions of people were held in slavery. Thanks to Him who has given us all the liberties we possess, we have "grown a bit" in knowledge and in practise, while the principles of government remain the same. We no longer persecute the Quaker or the Baptist. We have long ago ceased to hang witches. We have abolished slavery, though it cost us five hundred thousand precious lives, and suffering that cannot be told.

Let us stand by these true principles of government, and grant *equal* liberties to the Jew and the Gentile, to the Roman Catholic and the Protestant, to the Sunday observer and the Sabbatarian as well as to those who observe no sabbath day. To discriminate by law on any of these matters is to turn away from the principles of our government, the same as was done in persecuting the Quakers and Baptists, in hanging witches, and holding men in slavery.

What would our country be today if there had been no departure from the true principle of liberty?

San Diego, Cal.

Hon. Richard Bartholdt on Personal Liberty and Sunday Legislation

I AM convinced that the defense of personal liberty against the encroachments of sumptuary laws is as much the duty of every good American citizen as is the defense of his country against foreign invasion, for you must remember there is no liberty other than that of the individual man, and the nation which is so indifferent as to permit its restriction in anything which is not morally wrong is either no longer free or is in imminent danger of losing its freedom. "Eternal vigilance," we know, "is the price of liberty." Have we been vigilant? Or is it not true that, while we were quarreling with our neighbor about the trusts, the tariff, and all this progressive business, somebody burglarized our house and stole the crown jewels of our political heritage? . . .

On the ground of religion, people are deprived of their Sunday pleasures,—a clear violation, by the way, of the American principle of a strict separation of church and state,—and from these beginnings you can see it will not be a far step to a condition where we shall be told by law how to dress, what books to read, what church to worship in, to what schools we are to send our children, what to eat and drink, and where to go and where not to go. This is what is called sumptuary legislation, and there is at the present time unquestionably a trend in that direction not only in all our State legislatures, but also in Congress. Before I proceed to tell you why, from my viewpoint, all this is wrong, let me show you what is behind it. It is really a struggle between two civilizations, the Puritanical on the one hand and the Germanic or liberal on the other. Let us see how they differ. If my friend here is a Puritan, he believes all life's pleasures to be more or less wicked and displeasing to God, while I believe in the joy of living. He casts his eyes downward in pious resignation; I turn mine

up to the light of heaven in joyous expectancy of the good things to come. He wants you to creep along in the shadow of gloom; I want you to bask in the sunshine of happiness; and the happy laughter of men, women, and children, shocking to him, is sweet music in my ears. He believes, too, that man is made for Sunday, while I hold that Sunday is made for man. . . .

The struggle between these two wholly different theories of life is on, my friends, and it is becoming fiercer every day. The attempts to further and further restrict our liberties in a Puritan sense are carried on in the garb of a religious movement, and the ministers of all churches and the members of all congregations are constantly called upon for support and money to maintain lobbies in both the national and State capitals; and these lobbyists are cracking the whip over our lawmakers, and are urging them on to pass more and more restrictive laws,—laws which, in their mistaken zeal, they believe will make people good. I do not exaggerate, my friends, when I say that if this movement is not stopped, and stopped soon, the American people before long will find themselves wrapped up in a network of "don't's" which will completely hamper their freedom of action; and instead of being freemen in all matters of personal conduct, they will be slaves fettered by the chains of un-American laws.

Permit me, in this connection, to call attention to a most remarkable fact; namely, that the people in many cases actually vote to enslave themselves. History tells us of despots who kept their subjects in perpetual serfdom, and of rulers who robbed the people of their freedom; but there is no case on record, so far as we know, where the people of their own volition and by their own votes robbed themselves of their birthright. The United States is the first example

of this kind. The history of the human race is a constant struggle for liberty, and every concession wrung from its oppressors was heralded as a new triumph of progress and civilization. Here we have the example of a generation which, though born free, voluntarily surrenders its social liberty and forges with its own hand the fetters of slavery. Now, can you account for that? Is it because we do not sufficiently appreciate our heritage on the theory that what you inherit and what comes to you easily you do not value as highly as what you have to fight for yourselves? Or is it because the people do not fully realize just what they are doing by joining forces with those who are conspiring against their highest interests? I leave these questions for you to answer. Perhaps we are guilty on both counts.

Certain it is that no nation will ever be able to preserve its liberty which fails fully to comprehend its spirit and its meaning. And what are we doing to make the young generation to understand it?—Not one thing. There is no instruction in the public schools either on the science of government or on the fundamentals of our rights and privileges as citizens of a republic. In a monarchy such education may be unnecessary, because there the people simply obey the mandates of the government; but in a republic all citizens should be fully enlightened on such questions, for the simple reason that they are the government themselves. In the absence of such enlightenment and under circumstances

which leave many people ignorant of, and consequently indifferent to, their rights and liberties, it is not at all surprising that shrewd schemers and conspirators should find it easy to rob them of their political heritage. This may be one explanation of the deplorable fact that this robbery is actually and constantly occurring in all parts of the country, under the very eyes of the people, and largely even with their consent and cooperation.

Now, I have an abiding faith in the good, sound sense of the American people, and am confident that once they see through the bargain by which they are selling their birth-right for a mess of pottage, they will quickly drive the Pharisees from the temple. Therefore let us understand what is really at stake. What is personal liberty?—Freedom of action, the right to do that which is not morally wrong and

does not interfere with an equal right of our fellow man. Well and good! According to that, if we steal our neighbor's property or disturb his peace, we are doing what is morally wrong and interferes with the neighbor's rights, and should, therefore, be prohibited by law. . . .

Here we have the clear line of demarcation where prohibitive law should stop. The objection to sumptuary laws is that they do not stop there, but undertake to prohibit and punish acts which are right in themselves and in perfect harmony with the peace, morals, and good order of society. Gladstone defines liberty as "the power of doing whatever the laws



Copyright Harris & Ewing

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT

permit." While this is a correct legal definition, you can readily see that the laws might be such as to leave no liberty whatever. It might be liberty with the gallows alongside it and extend only the length of a chain. Therefore, I say, no nation which desires to be free must ever permit the invasion, by law, of inherent human rights. . . . These are inalienable rights, which means that they cannot be taken away, except under a despotic and tyrannical government, either by law or even a vote of the majority. Those who are now at work throttling these liberties under the pretense of curing a supposed evil are, in the language of Abraham Lincoln, "the vanguard, the miners and sappers of returning despotism." "We must repulse them," he said, "or they will subjugate us."

This, my friends, is the issue. In its moral, social, and political aspects it overshadows in importance every other issue of the present day, although the politicians are dodging it in every way possible. The reformers, the "better-than-thous," are evidently no longer imbued with the American spirit. They sneer at us when we assert the principle of personal liberty. . . . For a mere fad and to gratify their whims they are ready to barter the Constitutional guaranties of the American Bill of Rights for laws that will put the people under perpetual guardianship. And many a good man they have fooled; but, after all, I believe with Abraham Lincoln that you cannot fool all the people all the time. . . . Let me tell these reformers here and now that there is a principle at stake in this matter in which every man, woman, and child in the United States is vitally interested, and upon the preservation of which depends the stability of our free institutions.

The bill of rights in the federal Constitution is the charter of American liberty. This charter is the work of ages, the result of human effort to fix upon a mode of association among men called, in its higher form, government. It reads as follows: "No State shall make or en-


force any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall"—listen to this—"any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." In former times the danger of violation of such guaranties was from arbitrary power sought to be exercised by kings; today the danger lies in the assertion of supreme power on the part of self-appointed guides of the people, who by intimidation and threats force their opinion on Congress, legislatures, and courts, and cause them to subvert the clear meaning of those guaranties. The authority of the Constitution itself is held in some quarters to be inferior to the opinion of voters or of organized cults in a referendum. Let me warn you, my friends, that such unsettling of all foundations of liberty is the pendulum swing from kingly tyranny to popular tyranny, and we cannot wake up too soon to meet this danger.

"Let us remove the temptation," is the battle-cry of our would-be reformers. I wonder where we should land if this policy were applied to all kinds of temptation. First, we should have to abolish all money and all property, because its existence tempts people to steal it; and then we should have to do away with all foods and sweets and fruits, for there is always danger of overeating; and, finally, there are the sexual temptations, and so forth. When society would finally get through removing everything that might tempt man or woman, why, there would be nothing left but stones to cry to heaven bewailing the idiocy of man. No; our theory is not to remove the temptation, but by moral influences to strengthen man's resistance against it. We believe in stimulating the pride of manhood and womanhood and in rearing a race of people who can control and govern themselves properly in all matters of private conduct, realizing, as we do, that such people alone are fit to practise public virtues and to assume the duties and responsibilities of free citizenship. If the people cannot be trusted to shape their habits properly, how, I ask,

can they be trusted with the ballot? The fact is, a man's actions are solely controlled by his own mind and conscience, being the results of his opinions and inner convictions, and we know that these can be formed only by good example, moral suasion, and education. . . .

The great and all-absorbing question is, What are we going to do about it? Are we to stand meekly by while the fetters are being put on us, or shall we organize to manfully oppose . . . all these unholy attempts at Puritanizing the United States, to defend the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, and to uphold at all hazards the cherished tra-

ditions handed down to us by the founders of the republic? . . . Every observing man can see that American liberty is in distress. If neither of the great political parties will have the courage to come to its rescue, a great new party is destined to enter the arena, composed of all the liberal-thinking men of the nation and determined to enforce our great bill of rights in letter and in spirit, and to verify, if need be, the inscription written on their flying banners in the immortal words of Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death!"—*From the Congressional Record of July 9, 1913, pages 2664-2666.*



Forces Antagonistic to the American Government

F. W. STRAY

THERE was a time when the people lived in dense ignorance, and as a consequence they were destroyed because of a lack of knowledge. Kings and priests connived together to keep the people in ignorance of the fundamental principles of human liberty and their natural rights of self-government. There was no freedom of conscience until the Word of God had free course, and light was disseminated everywhere. The Bible is the greatest educator of all books in the principles of religious liberty and self-government.

According to Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, this is a government by the people; and when the people do not understand the principles of liberty and the science of self-government, then the reign of liberty comes to an end. If the system of self-government is to continue as it was begun, then each succeeding generation must be educated in the principles of separation of church and state, and civil and religious liberty for each individual.

As long as the generation of the founders of this government lived, not much could be done to overthrow liberty; but just when that generation was about gone, an effort was made, in 1830,

to undermine the principles of religious freedom in the Sunday-mail petitions to Congress. Some of the old guard still lived, and in refusing to turn back, the principles of liberty were restated with great clearness. The enemy ceased to antagonize openly for another generation after they had been rebuked by Congress, until 1863, when the National Reform Association was organized for the express purpose of reforming our government on Old World lines. Since then, our higher institutions of learning have become tainted with the doctrines of a theocratic government, which gives little attention to the rights of individual freedom and the science of self-government. As the so-called higher institutions of learning furnish nearly all the leading ministers for the church and educators for the schools, it follows that most of the people are kept in ignorance of liberty. As in the first centuries, the philosophers of today recommend their own writings instead of the Bible; and the people, ignorant of true liberty, are ready to follow their blind leaders back into Old World government; thus the ignorance of the people in the principles of liberty constitutes the greatest force antagonistic to our free government. A

free government by the people must be administered by a free people instructed in the principles of true liberty. The people of this country are losing this knowledge, and will one day speak with the voice of ancient Babylon.


In the closing years of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth centuries, God launched a movement to enlighten the world. First, he established this government on Bible principles. Second, he caused the Bible societies to publish the Bible in all languages. Third, a death-blow was given to the temporal power of the Papacy, the organization opposed to the extension of Bible knowledge and religious liberty. Fourth, men were sent into the great heathen world with the overwhelming desire to give the Bible to the people in their own tongue,—Judson in Burma, Carey in India, Morrison in China, and many others.

After this was accomplished, God launched a great movement in this country, insisting on the literal teaching of Scripture, and interpretation of symbolic prophecy only. Men who refused the light, rejected the Bible. The next logical step was the repudiation of the Bible principles of separation of church

and state in our government, which quickly followed. The Bible is now called a fairy tale, the Declaration of Independence only spectacular rhetoric, and the Constitution has been outgrown. This is all absolute, unmitigated ignorance; yet it is the education of today, and that education is antagonistic to the fundamental principles of our government.

God, foreseeing all this, prepared a message for the world, pointing out the time, the place, the thing itself, and the duty of his people in spite of the antagonistic forces which are at work. So while the majority are turning back toward the dark ages, a people has been raised up to go into all the world proclaiming liberty. That message found in the Revelation is the flaming torch of "liberty enlightening the world."

Who cannot see in all this the efforts of the dragon on the one hand to darken and enslave the world, and on the other the counter-working of God to enlighten it? The great controversy between Christ and Satan will soon involve the whole world as a battle-field, and the United States, as the stronghold of liberty, will become the chief point of attack by the forces of darkness.



Freedom of Speech

JOHN N. QUINN

RELIGIOUS organizations in the United States, with a membership of hundreds of thousands, have officially declared their determination that every voice protesting against what they term "our holy religion" shall be silenced. These organizations have the right to silence voices antagonistic to what they candidly believe to be the only true religion, but they must adopt proper methods. Argument must be met by counter-argument, and if false statements are made, the truth must be made known. Argument, persuasion, entreaty, truth,—these and these only,—are the Christian weapons of defense, and when used in the fear of

God and in the spirit of Jesus Christ, will convince the gainsayer and lead men to the true church, in which there is present peace and everlasting salvation.

However, methods other than these are proposed, chief among them being the boycott and an appeal to civil authority. The boycott is contrary to the teaching of Christ, who instructed his disciples to feed their enemies, and thus heap coals of fire on their heads, burning away prejudice and bigotry.

Civil authority can never justly be used in a religious controversy, as religion is entirely outside the realm of civil government. Each person has a right

freely to express his conviction concerning any religion, whether it is true or false, and no law of any government should in any way interfere to silence the voice, whether it is on the platform, in the pulpit, or the press. So long as personalities are avoided, and nothing libelous about the character of the individual professing religion is stated, no interference by the state is to be brooked.

Grant the right of the state to interfere with the free and untrammelled discussion of religion, and the Bible itself can no longer be preached. In the Old Testament repeatedly do we find the religion of the time denounced by priest and prophet, and the people who alone professed the "holy religion" were censured for their apostasy from the truth. Baal-worship was not spared, and no matter what the position of the apostate, his conscience was goaded by the spirit of reform and righteousness.


In the New Testament, the story is the same. The voice of John the Baptist rang out, in no uncertain tone decrying the errors of the religionists of his time; and later the voice of the Son of God was heard in unison with that of the man sent from God, whose name was John. With tears in his voice, Jesus Christ made known the errors of those who professed to be the only true church, and urged a return to the simplicity of truth. Apostle after apostle entered the ranks of protesters, and in this way the truth of the gospel triumphed. Truth is not afraid of investigation; it invites it.

In the book of Revelation terrible denunciations of error are to be found, and persistent pleas made to all to forsake systems of religion professing to be Christian, but which are proved to be false. The wrath of God is to be inflicted upon those who are followers of a religious system denominated by the term Babylon, and his people are urged to forsake the wrong way and worship God. How could this message, yea, how could the entire Bible be preached, if the state is granted the right to interfere with free religious discussion?

Religion, whether it is true or false, may be freely proclaimed by its adherents, and the province of the state is to protect each person in his right to advocate that which he believes to be the truth.

A religion which would use the sword of steel to silence the voice of an antagonist, cannot be the religion of Him who told Peter to put up the sword of steel lest he perish with it. True religion, like pure gold, will shine with added luster as it is rubbed by honest investigation or caustic criticism. Truth silenced is like water dammed by rubbish; it gathers force by opposition, and eventually sweeps away the rubbish, and makes fertile and fragrant the life into which it is permitted to flow. Christianity asks no favors from the state, and protests against all interference, no matter what the source.

Takoma Park, D. C.



Looking to the State for Morality


IT is one drawback to the faith in legislation which seems to prevail in certain quarters, that it tends to throw into the background the things which should be central. Men look to acts of Parliament for a new heaven and a new earth, and all the time sin and death are outstanding quantities, negligible remainders, apparently, to be thought about after the bills have been carried which are to make everything else new. A disposition is fostered which expects from law what law can never yield, and every advance in legislation is followed by a disappointment, not rarely by a reaction. It is not sufficiently considered that the law, which registers the average sense of right and wrong in the community, is only a challenge to the ingenuity of the bad; *it does nothing to make them good.* Frame it as subtly as men will, it is only a document after all, and the chances are that the wild living intellect of man will get around it somehow. The church's *direct interest* is not in framing acts of Parliament, no matter how Christian their mo-

tive; it is in regenerating men, who will give expression, indeed, to their new life, in their laws as in all their activities, but who, just because they are what they are in entire independence of the laws which they make, will have no vain expectations of what these laws will do for others.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the church will not only do its immediate Christian duty best, but best serve the state, if it leaves legislation to the institution to which in the divine order it belongs. To promote temperance lies properly within its duty, but it is as completely mistaken when it petitions for Mr. Asquith's bill as when it petitions for or against Mr. Balfour's. What is wanted is that *its members* act in either case with the sense of responsibility of Christ, not that *the church as a body* identify itself with a given policy. It may be properly eager to close public houses; but what it has mainly to remember is that they would all close automatically, within the briefest of time limits, if nobody went in. It may be properly interested in the material well-being of all men; but it is no part of its function to support anybody's right-to-work bill. It needs more than good will to act in such things; it needs an intelligence of conditions which it is no part of the church's business as a body to understand. The church's business remains, it may be said, when economic security has been achieved. It is not economic security which is going to secure the kingdom. It is some degree of insecurity, it is the painful necessity of being anxious about our livelihood, that generates the elementary virtues of industry and honesty on which the stability of society depends. If every man and woman in the British Isles had a hundred pounds a year absolutely secured, the real question would be, not whether the kingdom of God had come, but whether the country was habitable for decent people.


All concentration of mind on legal methods for attaining this or that end,

even in the moral world, is indirectly prejudicial to Christian character, because it destroys the sense of moral proportion. The devotees of single virtues or blessings to be compassed by act of Parliament are too often like men who have forgotten a main article of the Christian creed,—“I believe in the Holy Ghost.”—*Prof. James Denny, D. D., Theological College, Glasgow, Scotland, in Bible Student and Teacher, November, 1909.*



Religious Liberty in the Philippines

ACCORDING to the *Missionary Review*, the hand of Rome has been at work in the Philippines to restrict Protestant missionary effort, and with such success that the United States government prohibits American school-teachers in the islands from taking part in religious missionary work even outside of school-hours, while at the same time it leaves Roman Catholic teachers free to go on tours with their bishop for the purpose of spreading Catholicism. The Protestant teachers cannot teach a Sunday-school class in the church nor conduct a Bible class in their own homes. They are particularly enjoined not to encourage the study of the Bible. Such a condition of affairs is indicative of the success Rome is having in American politics today, and a warning of what may be expected of her in coming days, not only in American colonies, but in every Protestant land of which she can gain control.—*Oriental Watchman.*



At Lexington, Ky., on Sunday, August 3, a drastic Sunday-law crusade was inaugurated by the police commissioner, and seventy-two arrests were made. The crusade was followed with a general riot, and two men were killed as the result. Is this the meek and quiet way of promulgating religious institutions according to the gospel?

EDITORIAL

TRUE Americanism means loyalty to true American principles.

AMERICA stands for religious liberty to all, and not for mere religious toleration toward any.

THE American idea of civil government places the inalienable rights of the individual above every other interest the state was ordained to protect.

AMERICAN principles of civil government are unalterably opposed to a legal acknowledgment or establishment of any religion.

GOVERNMENT was not instituted to defend the majority. The majority are capable of taking care of themselves. But it was divinely ordained to protect the natural rights of the helpless minority, which are just as sacred as those of the majority.

THE true American principle of liberty is to recognize the equal rights of all citizens in matters of conscience, whether they are believers in religion or unbelievers. It says to the believers of all religion that it will recognize none, so all may stand on the same equality before the law. It says to the Sabbatarian that he has as much right to work on Sunday as the Sunday-keeper has to work on Saturday. It says that religion or non-religion, with all its attendant functions, shall forever rest upon voluntary acts. Since the state is the creature of all its citizens and is equally supported by all, to be just to all, it must maintain a neutral and impartial attitude toward all its citizens in religious matters.

AMERICANISM means equality of rights to all, with special privileges to none.

AMERICANISM is a synonym for "civil and religious liberty," for "separation of church and state," and for liberty to worship or not to worship as each may choose.

THE free institutions and equal privileges established by the American fathers in the Constitution for the benefit of the individual citizen, have made America the utopia of nations, the land of promise, a refuge for the oppressed, and a marvel among governments.

THE American government was the first to recognize the right of each individual to choose his own religion, and freely to exercise its functions, without state interference, so long as the exercise of his rights do not invade the equal rights of others. Any idea that is opposed to this principle is anti-American.

THE founders of this government decided not to recognize any religion in a legal sense in the civil statutes, not because they were hostile to God or Christianity, but they purposely avoided legislating upon the subject because of their friendliness to religion. They made no mistake. They knew that the only safe and permanent basis upon which to found religion was not to place its establishment upon the uncertain and fickle ground of popular opinion and the decisions of national assemblies, but to let it rest where Christ placed it—upon himself, the immovable Rock against which the gates of hell were not to prevail. In thus separating religion from

the state, the American government was founded upon Christian principles as first divinely announced by Christ, when he said: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Christ wanted no worldly recognition nor any help from the civil power, and he told his followers to tarry until they were endowed with power from above,—not from beneath. To establish the Christian religion by civil law would be to establish it out of harmony with true Christian principles.

"A WEEKLY Rest-day Bill has been laid before the House of Commons [England] by Lord Henry Cavendish-Bentinck, supported by members of various parties. As drawn, the bill makes illegal the employment of any person on Sunday in any business, trade, or labor. It does not forbid the doing of work at home by an individual working for himself, but it forbids his performing any act of labor on the premises of any other person. It also prohibits buying or selling on Sunday, or taking any part in or attending a public performance at which any fee is charged on any ground whatever. . . . The bill also calls for the closing of all shops on Sundays, with certain exceptions. . . . The penalty for a first offense is a fine not exceeding £5; for the second offense, within two years, a fine not exceeding £10; and for every subsequent conviction, a fine of twice the last maximum amount; no fine, however, to exceed £50. . . . This bill is the outcome of the labors of the Imperial Sunday Alliance, the object of which is to secure the compulsory observance of Sunday. . . . Genuine religion is not and never has been advanced or profited by state enforcement. If the religious bodies that are combined in the Imperial Sunday Alliance would follow the instruction contained in the Scriptures, they

would not be seeking the power of the state to buttress up their traditional institutions."—*Present Truth*, July 31, 1913.

THE supreme court of North Carolina recently decided a case of Sunday-law prosecution in which its verdict was that contracts and business transactions were valid on Sunday in that State. The court's decision was: "Anything that is lawful to do on any day is lawful to do on Sunday, unless there is a statute expressly forbidding it." The court further stated that the legislature has no power to prohibit any conduct on Sunday that it does not prohibit on all days, and then only "on the ground of public indecency. But when it goes further and prohibits labor which is done in private, the power is exceeded, and the statute is void."

It was reported that the United States government presented a note to the Balkan Peace Conference asking "that a clause be inserted in the Bucharest treaty stipulating the assurance of civil and religious liberty to the populations inhabiting the territory which may be ceded or annexed under the treaty." The president of the Peace Conference replied that each country represented at the Peace Conference has such a law on its statute-books, and it is therefore not necessary to put it into the treaty agreements. This shows how little civil and religious liberty are understood in some nations. Just recently some of these nations tried to convert members of the dissenting sects to the established Greek Catholic Church at the point of the bayonet. Some people favor religious liberty for themselves but not for the other party. We find this even in America. Is it too much to ask and expect that Christians should observe the golden rule?

Roger Williams, "the First American,"

THE one man, and the first man, who did more than any other man to lay the foundation principle of civil and religious liberty in American diplomacy and jurisprudence was Roger Williams. He was the first man that announced upon American soil and to Americans the right of individuality in religion and the free exercise of liberty of conscience without interference on the part of the civil magistrate. This doctrine was then denounced as rank heresy, and for

yielded the greatest harvest of blessing that this world has yet experienced.

What tribute, then, should Americans pay to Roger Williams? He was the great harbinger of American freedom in its truest sense. He first planted the seed of individual liberty and human rights in the hearts of his countrymen, and was "the bright and morning star" of a new reformation.

What Luther did for the church in Europe, Roger Williams did for the state in America.

He was the noblest type of an ideal American statesman. None was better fitted for the work to which he was called by divine Providence than he. He was a man sent from God to prepare the way for the establishment of the greatest nation the world has yet seen. Roger Williams came just at the right time to prepare the soil and to sow the precious seed of a new free-



STATUE OF ROGER WILLIAMS AND THE BETSY WILLIAMS COTTAGE IN ROGER WILLIAMS PARK, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

dom which was not only to shake the triple tiara, but the crown of absolute sovereignty, which for ages had enslaved the bodies and souls of men.

it he was banished from home, wife, and children, and had to flee as an exile into the wilderness. Jesus Christ said of John the Baptist that he was the greatest prophet that ever was born of woman. The angel Gabriel said of him, "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord," and yet "John did no miracle." What was it that made John the Baptist the greatest teacher that ever lived, outside of his divine Lord and Master? It was the fact that he was the chosen forerunner and harbinger of Jesus Christ, and delivered the greatest message that was ever committed to a mortal man. His message and his work made him great in the sight of heaven. He planted the spiritual seed which

The seed he sowed, and the correct ideas of liberty he implanted in the hearts and minds of the early Americans, yielded a bountiful harvest. He granted the freedom of worship and the liberty of conscience to those who fled, not only from European oppression and tyranny, but also from Puritan intolerance and religious despotism in New England, to his peaceful Rhode Island plantation. Roger Williams gave the early American patriots such a taste of the inestimable blessing of civil and religious liberty, which hitherto had been withheld from

them, that they finally resolved to die rather than be forced to go back under the old order of things. The spirit of freedom had been awakened, never to slumber again.

At last the battles for freedom in America were fought, and the victory was won. A nation was founded upon the identical principles for which Roger Williams contended, strove, and suffered from the time that he put his foot upon American soil in 1631. The flame of freedom he had enkindled in the bosoms of men, the doctrines he instilled in their minds, and the spirit and love for truth and justice he so firmly advocated, paved the way for the greatest crisis and revolution of modern times. Roger Williams first lifted the torch of liberty and sounded the battle-cry for freedom of conscience on Columbia's shores, which finally led to a mighty upheaval of old systems of government and the triumph of the grandest and noblest principles that ever emanated from the pen of man.

Those principles, like truth, are eternal.

As soon as the Puritans landed in New England, they established their own religion by civil law, and forced all dissenters to conform to their religious views and interpretations of Bible doctrines. They, of course, believed that they were justified in persecuting non-conformists because they were enforcing the true religion, but that England was wrong in persecuting the Puritans because she had a false religion. This has always been the argument of every persecuting power.

Roger Williams had no sooner landed in America than he began his opposition to their compulsory Sunday laws, and denied the right of the civil magistrate to punish a breach of the Sabbath, or

any other religious offense. On April 12, 1631, a letter was written to Mr. Endicott, by order of the general court of Massachusetts, in which the court charged Williams with having "declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the Sabbath, nor any other [religious] offense, as it was a breach of the first table."—*Knowles's "Memoirs of Williams," page 45.*

"He saw at a glance that corruption and persecution must work out in America the same results as they had wrought in England. At once, therefore, he pro-



ROGER WILLIAMS, AN EXILE FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE

tested, as a sound-minded man, that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the first table of the law, comprised in the first four of the ten commandments."—"History of the Baptists," page 628.

In Governor Winthrop's Journal, Vol. I, pages 52, 53, 162, we find that Roger Williams was twice summoned before the general court at Boston,—once in 1631 and again in 1635,—and was condemned for holding these "erroneous and very dangerous opinions" concerning "the civil magistracy and churches."

In the "Force Tracts," published by authority of the United States government, we find the testimony of Samuel Gorton, who landed in Boston very soon after Williams had been banished, as

follows: "They had formerly banished one Master Roger Williams, a man of good report for life and doctrine (even among themselves), for dissenting from them in some points about their church government, and that in the extremity of winter, forcing him to betake himself into the vast wilderness, to sit down among the Indians."

Thus they hoped to get rid of a troubler in their newly founded theocracy, and with one blow to crush forever the influences of his "very dangerous opinions," and silence forever "the voice crying in the wilderness" for soul liberty, for human rights, and for individual freedom of action in religious matters. But the banished statesman went bravely forward into the cold, bleak wilderness, and soon founded a new state and government, modeled after his high ideals of civil and religious liberty.

"Roger Williams," says Professor Gervinus, in his recent "Introduction to the History of the Nineteenth Century," "founded, in 1636, a small new society in Rhode Island, upon principles of entire liberty of conscience and the uncontrolled power of the majority in secular concerns. . . . The theories of freedom in church and state taught in the school of philosophy in Europe, were here brought into practise in the government of a small community. It was prophesied that the democratic attempts to obtain universal suffrage, a general elective franchise, annual parliaments, entire religious freedom, and the Miltonian right of schism would be of short duration. But these institutions have not only maintained themselves here, but have spread over the whole Union. They have superseded the aristocratic commencements of Carolina and New York, the High-church party in Virginia, the theocracy in Massachusetts, and the monarchy throughout America; they have given laws to one quarter of the globe; and, dreaded for their moral influence, they stand in the background of every democratic struggle."

"Roger Williams's whole being," says Mr. Scott, in his admirable work, "The

Development of Constitutional Liberty in the English Colonies of America," "was possessed by the one great principle that the soul should be free, and he was wont to express his heart's aspiration by the term 'soul liberty.' He boldly threw down the gauntlet to the world, by announcing that soul liberty was of God, that conscience was by nature free, and that it was the duty of human society to preserve intact that freedom, whereof the least violation was invariably but the first step to soul bondage. The conscience, the soul of man, being free, no limits bounded that freedom but those set by the Creator. . . . Religion being a relation that existed solely between the Creator and the created, God was the only judge of the latter. No religious organization, then, had a shadow of right to dictate what one should think or what one should do in matters religious. As a necessary deduction from this conclusion, no such right existing, there was no need of agents to enforce the observance of faith, nor any right to use them. Consequently, the use of the civil jurisdiction by the ecclesiastical, and the subordination of the former to the latter, had no justification, and was, in fact, a monstrous perversion of truth, which called for immediate reformation."

Thus Roger Williams first planted the precious seeds of true Americanism in fertile American soil, and framed a charter for his new colony, which in spirit and substance became the model for the great Magna Charta of human liberty and equitable jurisprudence of the American republic. Had it not been for the inestimable blessings that came to this little colony and the liberty-loving spirit so generously fostered and aggressively promulgated throughout the English colonies by the members of the Rhode Island democracy, there never would have been a Revolutionary war, no civil and religious liberty, and no republican form of government in America. Thus Roger Williams has been justly styled "the first American." We owe him a debt of gratitude equal to that of Washington. The work Roger Williams began in

America, George Washington finished. Let us not forget the rock whence we were hewn and the hole of the pit whence we were digged.

The eminent historian Bancroft pays him the following high tribute: "Roger Williams was the first person in modern Christendom to establish civil government on the doctrine of liberty of conscience. . . . At a time when Germany was desolated by the implacable wars of religion, when even Holland could not pacify vengeful sects, when France was still to go through the fearful struggle with bigotry, when England was gasping under the despotism of intolerance, al-

most half a century before William Penn became an American proprietary, and while Descartes was constructing modern philosophy on the method of free reflection, Roger Williams asserted the great doctrine of intellectual liberty, and made it the corner-stone of a political constitution. It became his glory to found a state upon that principle, and to stamp himself upon its rising institutions, in character so deep that the impress has remained to the present day, and can never be effaced without the total destruction of the work."—*Bancroft, Vol. I. pages 254, 255, last revision.*

C. S. L.

The World's Christian Citizenship Conference

THE Second World's Christian Citizenship Conference was held in Portland, Oregon, June 29 to July 6. This conference was simply a National Reform institute in expanded form. The purpose of these conferences is to make National Reform ideas and purposes popular both in this country and abroad. The representation from abroad was not large, and the audiences were almost wholly Pacific Coast audiences.

There was great disappointment in the city of Portland over the failure of the conference to meet the promises made by the promoters of the gathering. Portland had been caused to believe that there would be present on this occasion a delegation numbering approximately 20,000 persons, and that a considerable portion of this delegation would be from foreign countries. Portland had raised the handsome sum of \$15,000, and during the course of the conference about \$6,000 more is said to have been raised through gate receipts and hat collections. The firms of the city that subscribed to the \$15,000 fund feel that they have paid for something they did not receive. Mercantile establishments, railroads, hotels, rooming-houses, and whatever other in-

stitutions assisted in raising the \$15,000 expected that in some way what they contributed would come back to them. All were disappointed. The newspapers were not slow to express the general dissatisfaction in their editorial columns. The following from the *Telegram* of July 8 is characteristic of such utterances:—

There should be perfect frankness about the managers of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference. They did not begin to carry out their contract. They made many promises and fulfilled few. They got a large sum of money and made no accounting for it. They were to bring here not less than twice as many notable foreign speakers as they brought. They were to bring hundreds of visitors where they brought units. They did the very best they could while here to add to their receipts through various means, and succeeded to a degree.

Portland was bitterly disappointed in these men. It will not permit other communities to have experiences with them without a frank statement of its disappointment and the causes of it. This much we owe to ourselves and our neighbors. Portland would not get tangled a second time with the promoters of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference, therefore it should not permit its neighbors to get tangled up with them.

It is unfortunate that a cause professing to be Christian should thus disappoint men of the world, so many of whom make no such profession. It brings opprobrium upon our Lord himself when they who bear his name forget or fail to put into practise the principles that actuated him in dealing with others.

Perhaps the secret of the unfortunate affair lies in the fact that the National Reform Association has come to consider it its own prerogative to decide what are the rights of individuals and what individuals have rights. Frequently in the conventions, or institutes, of the National Reform Association the writer has heard the rights of the individual referred to as "so-called rights" and "miscalled rights." The Portland committee that raised the \$15,000 for the World's Christian Citizenship Conference felt that it had a right to know how the money was expended; but this seems to have been only one of those "so-called rights" or "miscalled rights." And this is the association that would make men moral by human law, that would convert nations *en masse* by forcing the name of God and of Jesus Christ into national constitutions and making God's law the basis of all human legislation! How infinitely much better to have the principles of Jesus Christ engrossed upon individual hearts, and make God's law the basis of individual human action! The individual thus controlled will never speak of other's rights as "so-called rights" or "miscalled rights." He will never force his own will upon another, or seek to deprive another of the rights which he demands for himself.

In his opening address, Pres. Henry Colin Minton gave expression to the purposes of the organization in these words:—

The spirit of a movement may be known by the spirit of the association

that is behind it. This association believes in Almighty God as the source of all earthly authority, the fountain of all human liberty. It believes in the universal application of his law alike in the lives of individual men and among the nations of the earth. It believes in the supreme lordship of the Man of Nazareth who lived on the earth some nineteen hundred years ago, and who, as the Son of God, is worthy to be, and is today, the King of kings and Lord of lords. It believes that in all the chances and changes of human history, in all the strides and stages of this world's development, allegiance to his scepter is the only spirit in which we are to conquer, and obedience to his law is the condition upon which may be solved all the problems of earth and may be overcome all the barriers that may be encountered. . . .

The good Samaritan did a great service and was a prince among social servants; but he who would clean out the robbers on the Jerusalem-to-Jericho road would have been a wiser social servant.

These two paragraphs are characteristic of, and in a way epitomize, all the addresses made at the conference by National Reformers. They contain a strange commingling of the things that are essential in the soul and experience of the Christian, and the things that dechristianize Christianity when an attempt is made to enforce them by compulsion of human law upon all men everywhere. When that is done, we have Babylon again—confusion—the spirit of the Papacy. To the true Christian, God is all and in all; but there is no process of *human law* by which he can be made that to all men. The will of God is the supreme law to the Christian; but to attempt to make that will the supreme law to everybody else, whether he will have it or not, is to lay the groundwork for another epoch of religious persecution, and make necessary another Inquisition.

Where this association makes its fatal and deplorable mistake is in trying to forge into the shape of iron law, com-

pulsory upon all, those principles that can never operate effectively save in the secret recesses of the individual heart, convicting and converting and by that process controlling the individual.

The true Christian everywhere will always acknowledge Jesus Christ as his **King** above all kings, his Lord above all lords; but when he attempts to compel other men to make that acknowledgment, he does despite to the very spirit of grace that called him to the blessed sonship of Christ. That acknowledgment cannot be forced, and it cannot be made the actuating principle of government. The attempt to make it so would turn this world into another shambles such as that over which Torquemada and Isabella gloated.

True it is that allegiance to the scepter of Jesus Christ is the only spirit in which the individual Christian can conquer; but when we attempt to compel every one else in the world to accept that allegiance and that scepter, we unchristianize ourselves and imbrue our hands in our brother's blood. But this was the spirit of the World's Christian Citizenship Conference, so far as the National Reformers had opportunity to express it. Everything that is essential to the triumph of the individual Christian they would enact into law and enforce upon others whether they are Christians or not. But that is not Christianity in any particular. That is the spirit that ruled and ruined in the dark ages, and that is what made the dark ages, and that will produce another dark ages if ever it becomes dominant again.

The second paragraph quoted above shows that the National Reformers are not satisfied or pleased with the illustration and example which our Saviour used—the good Samaritan. Had they been there, they would have advised him to drop out the good Samaritan feature of his discourse and substitute for it a

military expedition. This shows again that the National Reform idea is out of harmony with the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the religio-political aspirations of the organization show it to be out of harmony with the fundamental and vital principles of the government of the United States. It is not difficult to believe, therefore, that the two things which they are so completely out of harmony with may be in perfect harmony with each other. And they are in principle.

One of the topics most frequently referred to at this conference was the "Christianizing of the social order." By that is meant that all the activities of human existence are to be Christianized. There was much said about social redemption, about saving the nations, but nothing about converting individual hearts to God. The Christianizing of the nations, the Christianizing of the social order, is not expected to be done by bringing individuals to the acceptance of Christ; but human legislation is relied upon to bring about that wonderful transformation; and the kingdom of Christ comes into the realm of law through the gateway of politics. That is to them the coming of the kingdom, the consummation of the Christian's hope. Need we say that it is one of the great deceptions of the adversary to make men *unprepared* for the real coming of the real kingdom?

At this conference there were several eminent speakers, not members of the National Reform Association, and some of these gave utterance to thoughts that were diametrically opposed to the ideas and purposes of the association. The program was so arranged, however, that between the addresses of the more noted speakers there were sandwiched addresses setting forth National Reform principles. The eminent speakers drew the large audiences, and the National Re-

formers profited by this to set their views before thousands whom they would never have reached otherwise. While the convention was a disappointment to Portland, the National Reformers were elated over their success in presenting their views to such great audiences as they have never before been privileged to address. The National Reformers' part of the program was a rehash of what they have been giving from year to year at Winona Lake, Ind. At the latter place they addressed scores, while at Portland they addressed thousands.

The sectional conferences also helped to fasten the views of so-called National

Reform upon thousands of the people. It would be a mistake to discount the effect of such a gathering. It is certain to have a tremendous influence in turning the nation backward toward the principles of Babylon; and when the influence of such a gathering is added to that of a number of other large and influential organizations working for a similar end, those who love the principles that have made America great and free must view such developments with the utmost concern. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but Americans in general have ceased to be vigilant.

C. M. S.

Constantine's Sophistry Practised on Americans

DR. SHAILER MATHEWS, president of the Federal Council of the Churches, recently said: "It is true we want the church and state separate, but it is equally true that we want Christianity and democracy united. For one can aid the other." The Federal Council is mistaken if it thinks it can deceive the American people by such a mixture of spiritual matters with temporal affairs by equivocating terms into a meaningless illogicality. Constantine fooled the Christians of the fourth century by using precisely the same kind of sophistry. It was Christianity, too, as a whole, and not as any particular church or belief, that Constantine had established as the religion of the state.

In the edict of Constantine on polytheism, we read:—

"Victor Constantinus, Maximus Augustus, to the people of the Eastern Provinces: . . .

"My own desire is, for the general advantage of the world and all mankind, that thy people shall enjoy a life of peace and undisturbed concord. Let those, therefore, who are still blinded by error, be made welcome to the same degree of peace and tranquillity which they have who believe. For may be that this resto-

ration of equal privileges to all will have a powerful effect in leading them into the path of truth. Let no one molest another in this matter; but let every one be free to follow the bias of his own mind."—*"Life of Constantine," book 2, chap. 56.*

However, a more famous and universal edict was issued in 313 A. D. by Constantine.

The Edict of Milan

"Concluding some time ago that liberty of religion ought not to be impeded, but that it is necessary to leave to the judgment and free will of each one the power to practise divine worship according to his choice, we ordained that the Christians should therefore practise their faith in the religion professed by them.

"But since in that rescript in which this permission was granted to them they esteemed that many and divers conditions were clearly added, perhaps on that account some of them soon ceased to observe it,

"Therefore, both I, Constantine Augustus, and I, Licinius Augustus, having met at Milan and having come to an understanding on matters relating to the public weal and security, amongst other things that seemed advantageous to the majority of men, we decided, first of all,

to legislate on matters relating to the Divinity, and to give to Christians, like other men, full liberty to follow the religion they prefer, that the Divinity which dwells in the heavens may show itself placated and benevolent towards us and all our subjects.

“With good and just reason, then, we considered ourselves bound to embrace the conclusion that full freedom was ab-

“This much we thought it our duty to notify fully to you so as to acquaint you with the faculties granted by us to the same Christians. At the same time you will understand that for the peace of our times, full and perfect liberty to exercise their religion remains for all others. And this we have decreed in order that every one may have the power of professing that religion he prefers.”—



THE ARCH OF CONSTANTINE AT ROME, ERECTED 315 A. D. TO COMMEMORATE HIS VICTORY OVER MAXENTIUS

solutely not to be denied to any one belonging to the Christian body or to the observance of that religion which he deemed best; so that the Supreme Divinity, to the worship of which we are freely devoted, may grant us its accustomed favors and benevolence.

“Know, then, it is our will that, withdrawing all the conditions contained in the rescript addressed to you and which seemed severe as well as foreign to our clemency, each one professing the desire to observe the religion of the Christians may do so without fear and without annoyance.

Translation from the Catholic Standard and Times, April 5, 1913.

No sooner was the Christian church put on vantage-ground, in a legal sense, than she used the civil sword which was put in her hands to persecute all dissenters. The Roman historian Gibbon says:—

“The Edict of Milan [A. D. 313], the great charter of toleration, had confirmed to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion. But this inestimable privilege was soon violated; with the knowledge of truth the emperor imbibed

the maxims of persecution; and the sects which dissented from the Catholic Church were afflicted and oppressed by the triumph of Christianity. Constantine easily believed that the heretics, who presumed to dispute his opinions or to oppose his commands, were guilty of the most absurd and criminal obstinacy. . . . Not a moment was lost [after Christian-



STATUE OF CONSTANTINE

ity had been established] in excluding the ministers and teachers of the separated congregations from any share of the rewards and immunities which the emperor had so liberally bestowed on the orthodox clergy. But as the sectaries might still exist under the cloud of royal disgrace, the conquest of the East was immediately followed by an edict which announced their total destruction. After a preamble filled with passion and reproach, Constantine absolutely prohibits the assemblies of the heretics, and confiscates their public property to the use either of the revenue or of the Catholic Church. The design of extirpating the name, or at least of restraining the prog-

ress, of these odious heretics, was prosecuted with rigor and effect. Some of the penal regulations were copied from the edicts of Diocletian; and this method of conversion was applauded by the same bishops who had felt the hand of oppression, and had pleaded for the rights of humanity."—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* chap. 21, par. 1.

Thus it has always been with every religious organization; no matter how liberal and meek its principles were in its origin, just as soon as it acquired political power it began the work of persecution. For this reason, the framers of our national Constitution expressly prohibited Congress from legislating upon religious matters or in any way legally recognizing and establishing any religion whatsoever. They knew that if the clerical party was given as much as an entering wedge to pry open the doors of political power for the advancement of their own cause, it would inevitably lead to persecution and the reestablishment of the Inquisition.

Could anything have been more mild and humane than the Edict of Milan by Constantine? It must be remembered that he was a pagan ruler at the time he issued this edict of toleration. But just as soon as he espoused the faith of the orthodox church, he became intolerant toward all other sects, and took the liberties and privileges from them which he had previously granted. The orthodox clergymen told him that he had gone "too far in granting liberty to dissenting sects and heretics," and he was soon persuaded not only to withdraw all favors and liberties from them, but to put them under the royal ban and under the anathemas of the church.

Knowing, therefore, of how short duration and of how little significance the Edict of Milan, issued by Constantine in 313 A. D., really was, and that finally it meant religious liberty for only the established state church, and extirpation for all the rest, how can "all the faithful in Christ" throughout the world appropriately join in the commemoration of this event in 1913, and make it a "uni-

versal jubilee of the peace of Constantine," according to the encyclical of Pope Pius X, recently issued? How can the faithful in South America, Mexico, Spain, and other priest-ridden countries, rejoice in the proclamation of this edict, when those very liberties set forth in the edict are denied them even to this day? How can the truly faithful in Christ everywhere rejoice in the proclamation of this edict, when the edict was finally interpreted to apply only to the state-recognized orthodox church?

Everybody who knows the history of the past knows that just as soon as Constantine united the church and the state, the truly faithful to Christ and his Word had their liberties taken from them, and they were subsequently imprisoned, banished, and persecuted to death by the millions. The union of church and state under Constantine marks the opening era of the dark ages, so familiar to every historian.

The wheels of progress and civilization were turned backward instead of forward. All the world lost its liberties and privileges, which were theirs by natural right, and the established state church was given the sole monopoly of dispensing grace, mercy, forgiveness, and liberty, or to shut up its victims in prison, to burn them at the stake, to torture them on the rack, or to execute them on the gallows.

Is it any wonder that the Protestant world is discussing the propriety of their participation in an event which afterward turned itself into a most inglorious affair, and meant but the exaltation of one church above all the rest? If the history of the past could be blotted out and forgotten, it would be an easy matter for our modern so-called religious reformers to blindfold the present generation and lead them over the same road to ruin, and plunge the world into the same deplorable conditions of superstition and persecution it passed through before; but the voice of history refuses to be silenced. It warns the world in trumpet tones to heed the lessons of the past. Its flaming torch illuminates the path of

the future with the rays of light that shine out of the distant past. We would be ungrateful for our heritage of the historical lessons of the past and unfaithful to the responsibilities of the present if we did not heed the warning voice of history and profit by its valuable lessons.

We stand uncompromisingly opposed to a union of Christianity or any other religion with the state, because in its final analysis it means a union of the most popular and influential church with the state, while all other churches would soon be put under the legal ban of disfavor, and finally consigned to extinction, as they were in the days of Constantine. History repeats itself under like conditions, and we do not want the dark ages repeated.

C. S. L.

THE ministerial association of Asbury Park, N. J., held a conference recently at the Y. M. C. A. with Mayor R. S. Bennett, and asked him to inaugurate a "campaign for a more strict observance of the Sabbath in Asbury Park." Mayor Bennett gave the churchmen to understand that he was not going to enforce religion by law, whereupon Dr. Stockdale, the spokesman for the ministers, replied: "I know what will happen to you if you fail to change your present policy and refuse to close some of the places that are now allowed to remain open on Sundays."

"And I know what will happen to you if you try to close things tight," was the mayor's retort.

"So do I know what will happen to me," said Dr. Stockdale.

"What will happen to you?" asked the mayor.

"That is my business," replied the minister, angrily.

"You'll be looking for another church," angrily declared Mayor Bennett.

This sounds something like the quarrels between church and state officials in the days of medieval times, when church and state were united. Sunday laws are religious laws, and like all religious laws, they can make only for strife.

Jefferson's Prophecy ^{is} Nearing Fulfilment


JEFFERSON, and a number of his compatriots who were fighting the battle of religious freedom while the soldiers were fighting for civil liberty in America, saw that civil liberty could not be permanently triumphant unless full religious liberty was accorded to all American citizens. Jefferson and Madison were the Luther and Melancthon of the American reformation, and were opposed to the civil government having anything whatsoever to do with regulating and enforcing religious observances of any kind. Liberalism supported them generously in this movement for religious freedom.

They knew that the safety of the new republic could not be entrusted to the guardianship of liberalism, which is honey-combed with self-interests and forgetful of future contingencies, and unless the Constitution was properly safeguarded and fortified by its own statutes, the intolerant spirit of state-churchism would soon lift its venomous head and hand again, and would revive the old religious laws of the days of medievalism and Puritanism, by prosecuting Sabbatarians for Sunday labor, and establishing religion by law.

Jefferson sensed the gravity of the situation and the importance of starting the ship of state on the right course. He saw that unless the church and state were completely separated, and all religious laws were removed from the statute-books, the religious zealots would try to revive every existing fragment of relig-

ious legislation, even though such laws were considered as "dead letters" for centuries. As a wise statesman, he viewed the future in the light of the past, and after sober reflection and introspection, he uttered a solemn prophecy concerning the future of the new republic.

O, would to God, that his warning message might have been heeded, and that all the "religious shackles" might have been "knocked off" at the time of the founding of our government! Then our personal liberties might have been secured to us, and the prison, dungeon, and chain-gang would never have been used again, as they were recently, to incarcerate faithful and devoted Christian Sabbath-keepers because they would not also keep Sunday ac-



THOMAS JEFFERSON

ording to state law.

Jefferson prophesied: "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 then 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 money making, 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."—"*Notes on Virginia*," *Query XVII*, by Jefferson.

Before the general government drew up the national Constitution for the United States, Jefferson, Washington, Madison, Mason, Patrick Henry, and Franklin tried to disestablish the religious establishments which had already secured a tenacious grip upon the colonies and caused many good citizens to be severely punished because they had dared to dissent from the established churches.

Accordingly, Jefferson introduced a bill, entitled "An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom," into the Virginia Assembly, and it is said he took more pride in this act for establishing religious freedom than in anything else he ever wrote, except the immortal document of the Declaration of Independence. He labored incessantly from 1776 to 1786 to establish perfect liberty of conscience and to sweep away the religious restraints and legal establishments of religion in Virginia. He at last succeeded. When the national Constitution was finally drawn up for the central government in 1789, the great patriots were unanimous in their opinion that the common law of the land should be impartial to all, and should throw its "mantle of protection over the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian, and Mohammedan, the Hindu, and infidel of every denomination." No recognition was given to any religion, and all religions were placed on the same equality under the Constitution, and the free exercise of each was equally protected. Moreover, Congress was expressly prohibited from ever establishing any religion or interfering with its proper exercise.

But the State legislatures, when they drew up their constitutions, carried over many of the old religious establishments from the colonies into the new State governments. Thus the State constitutions differed from the national Consti-

tion, in that the national had completely divorced the church and her religious dogmas from its statutes, and the States still held to certain established church dogmas. Famous among these religious dogmas which the States incorporated bodily into their constitutions, were the obnoxious "Sunday blue-laws" with their attendant penalties.

The patriots tried hard to get the different States to rid their statute-books of all religious laws, and especially the Sunday laws; but the following extract, from the diary of John Adams, shows how stubbornly the Puritans held on to their religious laws: "I knew they [those trying to unite the colonies] might as easily turn the heavenly bodies out of their annual and diurnal courses as the people of Massachusetts at the present day from their meeting-house and Sunday laws." However, much was accomplished by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison in the way of severing the illicit and corrupting connection between the church and the state, by inducing the State legislatures to adopt the "Bill of Human Rights," and the theory of a complete separation of church and state. This practically made all the existing Sunday laws and other religious laws "dead letters" upon the statute-books of the various States.

But, as Jefferson said, unless all religious laws that remain even "as a dead letter" are swept from the statute-books, a single partizan zealot may revive them and commence persecution, and better men be his victims. The great patriots did what they could, and the unfinished task is left to us. The Lord did not drive all the nations out of Canaan at once when he gave the land to Israel for a possession, but left some hostile nations, "to prove Israel by them, even as many of Israel as had not known all the wars of Canaan; . . . to teach them war, at the least such as before knew nothing thereof."


A number of the States still have religious laws upon their statute-books, with their attendant penalties of confinement in the stocks, of being branded with

a hot iron, of being compelled to work in the chain-gang, of fines and imprisonment for violations of the "Sunday blue-laws," which our forefathers did not succeed in eradicating from the various local constitutions. These enemies of religious freedom have been left in the land to prove such of us as have not known all the fierce and costly struggles for religious freedom, to teach us so to fight such battles and to value the victories already won as to preserve this precious heritage to ourselves and to our posterity.

Let us not be as recreant to our duty as was Israel in subduing the remnant of their enemies, and allow our enemies to lead us into captivity and bondage time and again. Let us arise and finish the work so nobly begun by the founders of the national government, until we are not only free in theory, but "free indeed" in word and deed.

We must not be content with what our forefathers have accomplished, and with building monuments of fame to perpetuate their noble deeds and sacred mem-

ories. The best way to honor them and their deeds is to carry out their purposes, by "knocking off" the "shackles" which have remained with us so long, and which are growing heavier year by year. Unless this is done, the days of our prosperity, peace, and freedom are numbered, and Delilah (the symbol of the church) will secretly entice Samson (the symbol of the state) and rob him of his strength and liberty by shearing off his flowing locks, binding him hand and foot, and forcing him in his blindness to tread over the same beaten track of the slaves of the past, grinding grist for his enemies. May this not be the fate of the modern Samson, the colossal giant of nations; but if this republic is going to court the favors and listen to the entreaties of the great religious combine that is undermining the pillars of our government by incessantly demanding religious legislation, "our rights" ere long "will expire in a convulsion." It is time for the watchmen to awake, blow the trumpet, and sound the alarm. C. S. L.



Voluntary Religion an American Policy

THE American theory of the relationship between church and state is vastly different from that which is recognized in nearly all the other countries of the world. Principles were adopted at the time of the founding of our government which have never been recognized in other countries, but the benign results that have attended the adoption of a total separation of church and state and the making of religion and religious functions voluntary acts of faith, have exerted a tremendous influence among other nations in favor of liberty in religious matters.

It was a bold step that the founders of our republic took in divorcing religion from civil enactments. No nation in the past had ever ventured to try the experiment. All nations had entertained the belief that the church could not exist

unless it was united with the state, and that the state would not be secure unless it adopted the prevailing religion. In fact, they believed that both the church and the state would be cursed of God unless they were united and each supported the other. So every nation in the past has had an established worship and a national religion of its own.

The American patriots, as they read the history of these nations, soon discovered that nearly every page of their history was stained with the blood of martyrs. They saw that religious despots and tyranny had influenced and swayed the civil scepter to coerce the consciences of the individual and the minority. They believed that the rights of the individual and the consciences of the minority were just as sacred in religious matters, and should be protected

just as much, as were those of the majority. They saw that the only way to make secure the rights of all in religion was to separate religion from the state, and have religion rest upon the basis of voluntary service, and all religious sects stand on the same equality before the civil law.

The true conception of religious liberty has been well stated by Dr. Philip Schaff, as follows:—

“Religion and liberty are inseparable. Religion is voluntary, and cannot and ought not to be forced. . . . Such liberty is impossible on the basis of a union of church and state, where the one of necessity restricts or controls the other. It requires a friendly separation where each power is entirely independent in its own sphere. The church, as such, has nothing to do with the State except to obey its laws and to strengthen its moral foundations; the state has nothing to do with the church except to protect her in her property and liberty; and the state must be equally just to all forms of belief and unbelief which do not endanger the public safety.”—*Church and State*,” pages 9, 10.

This principle, put into practise in the American government, gave an unprecedented impetus to the prosperity of both the church and the state, and ushered in a period of peace and good will such as the world had never experienced before in its history. The cruel hand of persecution was stayed, which had desolated the fairest portions of the Old World. America at once became a peaceful habitation and an asylum for the oppressed of other nations where freedom in religious matters was denied them. They braved the dangers of the seas in their frail barks to find the land where the exile could find peace, happiness, and the liberty of conscience to worship God at the altar of free-will service. The liberty of choice and freedom of conscience in religion became the chief corner-stone in all American juris-

prudence, and has given a new crown and glory to the cause of Christianity.

But now we are told by men who still call themselves Americans that our forefathers “made a mistake in the first place in not founding our government upon Christian principles. The battle is raging between those who want Christian democracy and those who desire only civil democracy.”—*Utterances of Dr. J. S. McGaw, general field secretary of the National Reform Association.*

We accept this declaration from one of the leaders of the Second World’s Christian Citizenship Conference as a challenge of war upon the men who stand by the fundamental principles of the American government. The true American spirit of 1776 is as yet too strong silently to acquiesce in such a revolutionary proposition. However, if the guaranties of individual liberty are not more seriously regarded and defended than they have been lately when they were assailed, it will not be very long until these principles of soul freedom will be entirely forgotten, and the old religious hierarchy will hold high carnival again over the consciences of men. Shall we stand idly by with folded arms and sealed lips while these national reformers—“the buglers, the miners and sappers” of modern times—undermine the foundation pillars of popular democracy and civil and religious liberty? Let us sound the warning trumpet from sea to sea that they who appreciate American liberties may know the dangers that threaten.

C. S. L.

Mayor Gaynor’s Rebuke

It is a striking commentary on the blind inconsistency of some professional reformers and guardians of the public morals that they should themselves break the very laws which they are seeking to have enforced upon others—and break


them, too, in their efforts to enforce them on others. Here is one case in point: Rev. Joseph Keevil, the secretary of the Kings County Sunday Observance Society, wrote a letter to Hon. W. J. Gaynor, the mayor of New York, dated July 17, in which he complained that the law against Sunday baseball was being violated, and urged its enforcement. In the course of his reply, which was printed in the *New York Times* of July 26, the mayor said:—

Now I do not like to say anything to you in the way of admonition, although you write to me and admonish me, instead of going to the police captains and the magistrates, who are appointed to receive your complaints and act thereon. If I should admonish you, it would be in the most hesitant way—yet, even touching you only by the very tips of my fingers, so to speak. In that spirit may I say that some think that what you are doing on Sunday, namely, trudging all over the city and watching your neighbors, and receiving wages therefor, is "work" within the meaning of our Sunday law, and also of the divine commandment which says, "Thou shalt not do any kind of work" on the Sabbath. Your case, to say the least, may be as debatable as the case of the games on Sunday in the fields, which you are objecting to. If these games are of doubtful legality, is not that also the best that can be said of the work which you are doing on Sunday for pay? If a private citizen hires out to other private citizens to go about as a sort of catchpole on Sunday to watch whether his neighbors play ball, and stop them, is he not working?

We do not concede that there is any divine commandment forbidding work on Sunday, as the commandment says that "the seventh day [not Sunday] is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," but we think Mayor Gaynor puts Mr. Keevil in rather a tight place so far as the breaking of the civil law is concerned. We hope he will take to heart the mayor's admonition.

w. w. p.

CHINA recently granted full religious freedom to all Christians, and solicited the prayers of Christendom for the welfare of the new republic. But now, with one sweep of the pen, she strikes a deadly blow at religious freedom for the Christians because her request for a foreign loan was not granted. The government revived the sacrificial ceremony of Confucius in all colleges, schools, public bodies, and gatherings, making it obligatory upon all to perform the religious obeisances at the altar of Confucius. Yet Sunday-law advocates feel justified in compelling all men to do obeisance at the altar of "old Sol," by forcing them to keep Sunday whether they believe in it or not. After all, we ought to have considerable charity for the Chinaman's blindness.



EVERY two years the Statue of Freedom on the dome of the Capitol at Washington receives a complete overhauling. The dust and the grime, which accumulates on the face and figure of the goddess of liberty, marring the luster of her appearance, are removed. Freedom's jewels have to be replaced, as the seven platinum tips, which surmount her crown, become badly damaged by lightning. Hundreds of dollars' worth of precious metal is added to her brow to protect her from the elements, and to enable her to weather another attack of the thunderbolts of time. What a lesson to the guardians of liberty! Are not the principles of civil and religious liberty, for which the Statue of Freedom stands, in even greater danger of mutilation at the hands of its enemies than the mere statue? These principles need to be jealously guarded, polished, and newly set as they are attacked from time to time, in order to bring out their true luster.

What Prominent Men Have Said About Religious Legislation

George Washington: "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."
— *Reply to the Baptists in Virginia, 1789.*

Thomas Jefferson: "Almighty God hath created the mind free; all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as was in his almighty power to do."
— *Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, 1785.*

Abraham Lincoln: "The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both congresses and courts; not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution. . . . I insist that if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."
— *Lincoln's Speeches.*

Benjamin Franklin: "When religion is good, it will take care of itself; when it is not able to take care of itself, and God does not see fit to take care of it, so that it has to appeal to the civil power for support, it is evidence to my mind that its cause is a bad one."
— *Letter to Dr. Price.*

James Madison: "Religion is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both."
— *Letter to Edward Everett.*

John Clark Ridpath: "Proscription has no part or lot in the modern government of the world. The stake, the gibbet, and the rack, thumbscrews, swords, and pillory have no place among the machinery of civilization. Nature is diversified. So are human faculties, beliefs, and practises. Essential freedom is the right to differ, and that right must be sacredly respected."
— *History of the World, Vol. III, page 1354.*

Dr. Philip Schaff: "Secular power has proved a satanic gift to the church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the state."
— *Church and State, p. 11.*

John Wesley: "Let every one enjoy the full and free liberty of thinking for himself. If you cannot reason or persuade a man into the truth, never attempt to force a man into it."

Roger Williams: "The magistrate has no right to punish a breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offense that is a breach of the first table."
— *Memoirs of Williams, page 45.*

United States Constitution: "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."

Hon. Richard Bartholdt of Missouri: "I believe in a complete separation of church and state, and in this belief go so far as to assert that the daily prayers in this House, as well as all Sunday laws, are unconstitutional, because they signify a mixing of church and state. These views, although Lutheran doctrine, I hold not as a Lutheran, but as an American who reveres the Constitution. As such, too, I believe in religious freedom and religious tolerance."
— *Printed in the Congressional Record of Dec. 14, 1912, page 685.*



PRESIDENT WASHINGTON



PRESIDENT LINCOLN

Patrick Henry: "Religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience . . . unpunished and unrestrained by the magistrate."—*Tyler's "Patrick Henry,"* pages 183, 184.

Macaulay: "The whole history of the Christian religion shows that she is in far greater danger of being corrupted by the alliance of power than of being crushed by its opposition."—*Essay on "Southey's Colloquies."*

U. S. Grant: "Let us labor for the security of free thought, free speech, pure morals, unfettered religious sentiments, and equal rights and privileges for all men, irrespective of nationality, color, or religion; encourage free schools, resolve that not one dollar appropriated to them shall go to the support of any sectarian school; resolve that neither State nor nation shall support any institution save those where every child may get a common-school education, unmixed with any atheistic, pagan, or sectarian teaching; leave the matter of religious teaching to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution. Keep the church and state forever separate."—*Appleton's "Cyclopedia of American Biography."*

Senator Bailey of Texas, speaking in opposition to the Johnston Sunday Bill: "I am not disposed to allow any class of people to come to legislative assemblies of the country to settle controversies between them and their employees. I certainly



PATRICK HENRY



LORD MACAULAY



U. S. GRANT

would not insist that a barber ought to work if he does not want to work. . . . So far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to allow any class to come and ask for a law that interferes with some man who wants to pursue his calling, simply because some other man does not want to pursue it."—*Congressional Record,* Jan. 26, 1910.

Senator Heyburn of Idaho:

I have due regard for the observance of the Sabbath, and I believe it should be observed, but I do not believe in legislation compelling one to observe it. . . . It is such legislation as this that wrote the annals of bloodshed and oppression and intolerance in the religious history of the world where a part of the people undertook to be sponsors for the conscience of another part. . . .

"As to the use of the Sabbath day, every man, so far as personal acts that do not include any acts of lawlessness are concerned, should be the guardian of his own morals. It was never intended that the law should lay down the rules that should constitute a good man, and say that all men must live up to those rules. . . . Very soon after we became a nation and had organized government, we abandoned that kind of legislation. It was the legislation that resulted in whipping people at the tail of the cart, placing them in the stocks, branding them on the hands, etc. That was this kind of legislation under which some person or coterie of persons undertook to set themselves up as the censors of the morals of the people. I thought that age had passed. I never expected to see it revived, and I never expected to see an attempt made in the Congress of the United States to prescribe rules that are intended, I presume, to supplement the ten commandments."—*Congressional Record,* May 26, 1911.

What Prominent Men Have Said on the Rights of the Minority

Theodore Roosevelt, ex-president of the United States: "Discrimination against the holder of one faith means retaliatory discrimination against men of other faiths. The inevitable result of entering upon such a practise would be an abandonment of our real freedom of conscience and a reversion to the dreadful

dependent on the will of a majority, we shall fail at the cost of humiliation and ignominy to ourselves."—*Congressional Record, Aug. 7, 1911, pages 3689, 3690.*

Senator Borah of Idaho: "What is the basic principle of democratic or republican



THEODORE ROOSEVELT



SENATOR BORAH



SENATOR ROOT

conditions of religious dissensions which in so many lands have proved fatal to true liberty, to true religion, and to all advance in civilization.

"To discriminate against a thoroughly upright citizen because he belongs to some particular church, or because, like Abraham Lincoln, he has not avowed his allegiance to any church, is an outrage against the liberty of conscience, which is one of the foundations of American life."—*Roosevelt's letter on religious liberty.*


Senator Root of New York: "Would any senator say that no court can enforce the provisions of our Constitution in favor of religious liberty? New sects are continually arising in our country, and the votaries of the religious views of those sects are at the beginning small and insignificant minorities. Questions regarding their rights as religious bodies, questions regarding their rights to freedom of worship and of expression, are protected by the provisions of our constitutions, and against the wish, against the prejudice, against the passion, of the vast majority of the people; the courts, and the courts alone, can maintain the rights of the few to pursue the dictates of their own consciences rather than the will of the majority. . . . There is such a thing as justice, and though the greatest and most arrogant majority unite to override it, God stands behind it; the eternal laws that rule the world maintain it; and if we attempt to make the administration and award of justice

government? We sometimes urge that the first principle is that the majority shall rule. That is true in making laws and determining policies; but it has no place in and will destroy republican government if applied to the courts, or to controversies to be determined under the law. There all men are equal. Back of the rule of the majority is the great principle of equality, the basic, bed-rock principle of free government. The difference between the old democracies or republics, which perished, and ours is that the ancient republics could devise no way by which to shield the rights of the minority. Though the majority must rule, yet a government which has no method for protecting the rights of the minority—for it has rights—is a despotic government. I do not care whether you call it a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a republic. A government which will not protect me in my rights, though I stand alone and against all my neighbors, is a despotic government."—*Congressional Record, Aug. 7, 1911, page 3687.*

John Stuart Mill: "If all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind on religious questions and obligations."—*Essay on Liberty.*

Goldsmith: "As ten millions of circles can never make one square, so the united voice of myriads cannot lend the smallest foundation to falsehood."—*Gems of Great Authors, page 220.*

Senator John Sharp Williams: "I am not one of those who believe that tyranny is a particle sweeter because it is the tyranny of the majority. I believe, with old Roger Williams, that there are two classes of things in this world,—the things of the first table and the things of the second table. The things of the first table are those things which are between God and the individual man, and the govern-



SENATOR JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS

ment has no right to touch them. If 99,999,999 of the people out of 100,000,000 wanted to do anything in connection with them and one man stood up in his right and said 'No,' then that one man's voice should restrain all the rest. Among these things are freedom of religion and various other things that will occur to your own minds. Ninety-nine per cent of the American people, I suppose, are nominally Christians. One per cent of the American people are Jews. The people have voluntarily put upon themselves restrictions with reference to that matter. They have never established the Christian religion as the religion of their country. They had the power to do it. They had the power to refuse to restrict themselves from doing it. But they decreed that for all time there should never be among us an establishment of religion. They were wise enough to know that men always, everywhere, have weaknesses."—*Congressional Record*, Jan. 30, 1913, page 2276.

Gladstone: "Have not almost all the governments in the world always been in the wrong on religious subjects?"—*Macaulay's Essays*."

Christian Princes of Germany: "Let us reject this decree. In matters of conscience the majority has no power."—*Protest at the Diet of Spire*, 1529.

Supreme Court of Ohio: "The majority can protect itself. Constitutions are enacted for the very purpose of protecting the weak against the strong, the few against the many. . . . True Christianity never shields itself behind majorities. Nero, and the other persecuting Roman emperors, were amply supported by majorities; and yet the pure and peaceable religion of Christ in the end triumphed over them all; and it was only when it attempted, itself, to enforce religion by the arm of authority, that it began to wane. A form of religion that cannot live under equal and impartial laws ought to die, and sooner or later must die."—*Sec. 23 Ohio State*, 211 *et seq.*

C. H. Spurgeon: "I am ashamed of some Christians because they have so much dependence on Parliament and the laws of the land. Much good may Parliament ever do true religion, except by mistake! As to getting the law of the land to touch our religion, we earnestly cry, 'Hands off! Leave us alone!' Your Sunday bills and all other forms of act-of-Parliament religion seem to me to be all wrong. Give us a fair field and no favor, and our faith has no cause to fear. Christ wants no help from Cæsar. I should be afraid to borrow help from government; it would look to me as if I rested on an arm of flesh, instead of depending on the living God. Let the Lord's day be respected by all means, and may the day soon come when every shop shall



REV. C. H. SPURGEON

be closed on the Sabbath, but let it be by the force of conviction, and not by force of policemen; let true religion triumph by the power of God in men's hearts, and not by the power of fines and punishments."



TEMPERANCE

The Liquor Traffic a Menace to Personal Liberty

THE liquor interests often raise the cry that prohibition interferes with the personal liberty to engage in a business which yields splendid financial returns. The choice of a business, they claim, is a Constitutional right, and to forcibly take their business from them is interfering with their Constitutional rights.

The man who drinks also raises the cry that the prohibitionists are interfering with his right to drink what he chooses. He claims that it is not lawful to interfere with the right of man to eat, drink, or wear whatever he chooses, and that the state cannot prescribe these matters for man any more than it can prescribe his religion for him. They claim that the state cannot justly interfere, save with the man who commits crime while under the influence of liquor.

At first thought, such arguments seem very plausible from the viewpoint of the liquor men and the tipplers. But there is another side to look at. There is another party whose members are far more numerous and whose interests and personal liberties are vitally affected and menaced because of the unbridled liberties of the liquor business. That party is the innocent public. If the liquor traffic affected none but the manufacturers, dealers, and consumers of the beverages, it would be altogether a different question. But it is admittedly a question which affects the welfare and interests of the general public to a greater extent than it does the liquor interests.

Statistics show that more than eighty-five per cent of the murders which are committed are due, directly or indirectly, to the influence of liquor. The liquor man says, "Let the law deal with the man who commits the criminal act;"

but does the sole responsibility lie with the man who commits the criminal act while under the influence of liquor? Does not the law of justice assert that an agent, accessory, or abetter in a crime is equally guilty with the actual criminal and should be equally punished? Even Holy Writ sustains this verdict when it states: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, to thee that . . . makest him drunken . . . because of men's blood, and for the violence done to the land, to the city and to all that dwell therein." Hab. 2: 15-17.

When the Lord himself blames the liquor dealer for the blood that is shed and the violence that is done as the result of his nefarious business, he certainly ought not to raise the cry that he is being deprived of his God-given liberties when the state treats him as an accomplice in these criminal acts due to liquor influences.

When the liquor men voluntarily render a man temporarily insane or void of the right use and control of his faculties, so that he commits a crime and endangers the lives of others, the state has a legitimate right to hold the liquor men morally and legally responsible for every offense thus committed, as accessories in the crime; because men under the influence of liquor, when not having the full control of their faculties, have committed every conceivable crime, and are liable to do it again and again, a fact which is well known to all liquor dealers.

The writer twice in his life has had the experience of having a loaded revolver pointed at him, without any provocation, by frenzied men under the influence of liquor. He has also had occasion to conduct the funerals of individuals who were the innocent victims of men whose

minds were under the control of the drink demon. Not long ago an engineer, under the influence of this bewitching beverage, failed to discern the danger-signals and ran his train into the rear end of another passenger-train, killing scores of innocent people outright, and injuring many others for life.

Indeed, the liquor traffic must be dealt with from the standpoint of personal liberty. But whose personal liberty is



"PAY DAY" WHERE LIQUOR HAS FREE COURSE

involved in this question? Does not the general public have a right to life? Does not the individual have a personal right to be protected in life, body, and property from the probable attacks of these men who are bereft of their reason because of the promiscuous use of liquor?

Which right is the greater—the right to drink or the right to live? The three inalienable and Constitutional rights of every man are life, liberty, and happiness. It is too late to protect life after it has been taken. Preventive legislation is the only proper remedy. In nearly every State in the Union where prohibition has become an established fact in reality, as in Maine, Georgia, Kansas, and Tennessee, there are certain sections of the country where the jails are without criminals, and others have reduced the prison inmates more than seventy-five per cent. When the general public

largely pays the taxes to support the courts while they prosecute the criminals, and the jails while they confine them, whose personal liberties are being infringed upon when the liquor traffic is responsible for more than seventy-five per cent of the crimes that are committed?

When we consider that our almshouses are almost altogether filled with people who were caused to go there either directly or indirectly because of having wasted their fortunes and spent their incomes for liquor, so that they and their dependents became subjects for public charity, is not the liquor traffic a curse to society and a menace to the personal rights of all who are obliged to pay for the support of the almshouses?

When we consider the sorrow, disgrace, debauchery, immorality, and ruin the liquor traffic brings yearly to the wives and innocent children in the homes where the husband or sons are devotees at the altar of Bacchus, we are

forced again to ask whose personal liberties shall we consider—the innocent wives' and children's rights to live happily, or the husband's right to drink? If it is weakness to plead for the rights of the weak and oppressed, then we plead guilty to that charge. If it is weakness to rejoice when the weak and innocent ones are liberated from their thralldom and servitude, then we are guilty of a weakness from which we plead no exemption.

It is from the viewpoint of personal liberty that we are opposed to the liquor traffic, as it makes slaves and demons of its votaries, and scapegoats of all taxpayers, by forcing them to pay hundreds of millions of dollars annually to clean house for the devil's shopkeepers. We, therefore, protest against the liquor business as being a curse to society, a nursery of crime, and a menace to human liberties.

C. S. L.

PETITION TO CONGRESS

To the Honorable, the Senate, and House of Representatives
of the United States :—

Believing (1) In the separation of church and state;

(2) That Congress is prohibited by the First Amendment to the Constitution from enacting any law enforcing the observance of any religious institution, or looking toward a union of church and state, or of religion and civil government;

(3) That any such legislation is opposed to the best interests of both church and state; and

(4) That the first step in this direction is a dangerous step, and should be opposed by every lover of liberty;

We, the undersigned, adult residents of _____

State of _____, earnestly petition your Honorable Body not to pass the Sunday Observance Bill (S. 752), entitled, "A Bill for the Proper Observance of Sunday as a Day of Rest in the District of Columbia," * or any other like religious measure.

NAMES

ADDRESSES

* Introduced in the Senate by Mr. Johnston of Alabama, April 12, 1913. Now pending.
For full text of Bill, see other side.

Full Text of Proposed Sunday-Observance Law

Now Pending in United States Senate

63d CONGRESS,
1st Session

S. 752

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

April 12, 1913

Mr. Johnston of Alabama introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

For the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this Act it shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person to labor or to employ any person to labor, or to pursue any trade or worldly business on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, except in works of necessity, or charity, and except also newspaper publishers and their employees, and except also public service corporations and their employees, in the necessary supplying of service to the people of the District. In works of necessity or charity is included whatever is needed for the good order and health of the community. It shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, firm, corporation, or municipality, or any of their agents, directors, or officers, to require or permit any employees to work on the said day, excepting in household service, unless within the next succeeding six days during a period of twenty-four consecutive hours he or it shall neither require nor permit such employee to work in his or its employ.

Any person who shall violate the provisions of this Act shall on conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$50 for the first offense, and for each subsequent offense by a fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$100, and by imprisonment in the jail of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than one month nor more than three months, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 2. That all prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be in the police court of the District of Columbia and in the name of the District of Columbia.

This Proposed Legislation Is Unconstitutional, Un-American, Unjust, and Unnecessary!

Jesus Christ: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."
Mark 12: 17.

United States Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."—*First Amendment.*

U. S. Grant: "Keep the state and the church forever separate."—*Speech at Des Moines, Iowa, 1875.*

United States Senate: "Our government is a civil, and not a religious institution." "The proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as their civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy."—*Sunday Mail Report, 1829.*

OUR GENERAL AGENCIES

KINDLY ORDER "LIBERTY MAGAZINE" OR ANY OTHER PUBLICATION ADVERTISED IN THIS MAGAZINE FROM OUR AGENCY NEAREST YOU.

UNITED STATES

Alabama Tract Society, 1700 N. Seventh Ave., Birmingham, Ala.
 Arizona Tract Society, 615 N. Tenth St., Phoenix, Ariz.
 Arkansas Tract Society, Fayetteville, Ark.
 California Bible House, 2201 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, Cal.
 California-Nevada Missionary Society, 339 E. Lodi Ave., Lodi, Cal.
 California Bible House (Central), Box 1304, Fresno, Cal.
 California Tract Society (Southern), 417 W. Fifth St., Los Angeles, Cal.
 Chesapeake Tract Society, 1611 Ellamont St., Baltimore, Md.
 Colorado Tract Society (Eastern), 1112 Kalamath St., Denver, Colo.
 Colorado Tract Society (Western), 122 South Eighth St., Grand Junction, Colo.
 Connecticut (see New England, Southern).
 Cumberland Tract Society (E. Tennessee), 1214 Hawthorne St., Chattanooga, Tenn. Deleware (see Chesapeake).
 District of Columbia Tract Society, 700 Tenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Florida Tract Society, Drawer 28, Orlando.
 Georgia Tract Society, 169 Bryan St., Atlanta.
 Idaho Tract Society, Box 126, Nampa, Idaho.
 Illinois Tract Society (Northern), 3645 Ogden Ave., Hawthorne Station, Chicago, Ill.
 Illinois Tract Society (Southern), 304 West Allen St., Springfield, Ill.
 Indiana Tract Society, 521 East Twenty-third St., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Iowa Tract Society, Nevada, Iowa.
 Kansas Tract Society (East), 821 West Fifth St., Topeka, Kans.
 Kansas Tract Society (West), 508 Fifth Ave., East, Hutchinson, Kans.
 Kentucky Tract Society, Nicholasville, Ky.
 Louisiana Tract Society, 810 Jackson Ave., New Orleans, La.
 Maine Tract Society, 75 Grant St., Portland, Maine.
 Maryland (see Chesapeake).
 Massachusetts Tract Society, South Lancaster.
 Michigan Tract Society (East), 426 Trumbull Ave., Detroit, Mich.
 Michigan Tract Society (North), 510 Petoskey St., Petoskey, Mich.
 Michigan Tract Society (West), Otsego, Mich.
 Minnesota Tract Society, 336 East Lake St., Minneapolis, Minn. (Exchange case 45.)
 Mississippi Tract Society, 932 Union St., Jackson, Miss.
 Missouri Tract Society (North), Hamilton.
 Missouri Tract Society (South), 520 West Lynn St., Springfield, Mo.
 Montana Tract Society, Box 118, Bozeman.
 Nebraska Bible Supply House, 905 North California Ave., Hastings, Nebr.
 Nevada (see California-Nevada).
 New England Tract Society (Northern), 136 N. Main St., Concord, N. H.
 New England Tract Society (Southern), 51 Whitmore St., Hartford, Conn.
 New Hampshire (see N. New England).
 New Jersey Tract Society, 1109 Division St., Trenton, N. J.
 New Mexico Tract Society, Box 286, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
 New York Tract Society (Greater), Room 904, 32 Union Square, New York, N. Y.

New York Tract Society, 317 West Bloomfield St., Rome, N. Y.
 New York Tract Society (Western), 8 East Jefferson St., Salamanca, N. Y.
 North Carolina Tract Society, 711 W. Lee St., Greensboro, N. C.
 North Dakota Tract Society, Box 285, Fargo.
 Ohio Tract Society, Box 187, Mt. Vernon.
 Oklahoma Tract Society, Box 644, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Oregon Missionary Society (Western), 508 E. Everett St., Portland, Oregon.
 Oregon Tract Society (Southern), Roseburg.
 Pennsylvania Tract Society (Eastern), 4910 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Pennsylvania Tract Society (West), 7049 Hamilton Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Rhode Island (see New England, Southern).
 South Carolina Tract Society, 2332 Park St., Columbia, S. C.
 South Dakota Tract Society, Drawer R, Redfield, S. Dak.
 Tennessee River Tract Society (Western Tennessee), 509 Cole Building, Nashville, Tenn.
 Texas Tract Society, Keene, Tex.
 Texas Tract Society (South), Box 392, Austin, Tex.
 Texas Tract Society (West), Abilene, Tex.
 Utah Tract and Bible Society, 776 E. Sixth St., S., Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Vermont (see Northern New England).
 Virginia Tract Society, 2705 West Main St., Richmond, Va.
 Washington Missionary Society (Western), 1407 East Forty-first St., Seattle, Wash.
 Washington: Upper Columbia Tract Society, College Place, Wash.
 West Virginia Tract Society, Fairmont.
 Wisconsin Tract Society, Box 57, Grand Rapids, Wis.
 Wyoming Tract Society, Crawford, Nebr.

UNITED STATES POSSESSIONS

Hawaiian Tract Society, 767 Kinau St., Honolulu, Hawaii.
 Panama Tract Society, Cristobal, C. Z.
 Philippine Islands Mission, 613 Nozaleda, Manila, Philippine Islands.

CANADIAN AGENCIES

Eastern Canada:
 Canadian Pub. Assn., Port Hope, Ont.
 Maritime Tract Society, 457 Upper Robinson St., Moncton, N. B.
 Newfoundland Tract Society, Box 217, St. John's, Newfoundland.
 Western Canada:
 Alberta Tract Society, Lacombe, Alta.
 British Columbia Tract Society, 1708 Maple St., Vancouver, B. C., Canada.
 Manitoba Tract Society, 290 Bannerman Ave., Winnipeg, Man., Canada.
 Saskatchewan Tract Society, Box 244, Regina, Sask., Canada.

FOREIGN AGENCIES

Great Britain: International Tract Society, Stanborough Park, Watford, Herts, England.
 India Union Mission: 19 Banks Road, Lucknow, India.
 Mexico: Imprenta de la Verdad, 1420 Avenida 20, Tacubaya, D. F., Mexico.
 South Africa: International Tract Society, 56 Roeland St., Cape Town, South Africa.
 West Indies: Watchman Press, Riversdale, Jamaica, B. W. I.

LIBERTY MAGAZINE, Washington, D. C.

The Watchman

YOU NEED ITS ENCOURAGING GOSPEL MESSAGES
ITS CONTENTS WILL INTEREST YOU

Who Should Subscribe

Every earnest seeker after truth
Every one desiring to know Bible prophecy
Every one wishing a presentation of the Bible in its purity

Ten cents a copy
Sample free
One dollar a year

A monthly magazine considering present-day problems in the light of the prophetic Word.

Gives the Trumpet a Certain Sound

Send two dollars with the names of two friends and we will place your name upon our subscription list free for one year.

Order through your tract society or

Southern Publishing Association,

2123 24th Avenue N.,

Nashville, Tennessee

READERS OF "LIBERTY"

will be particularly interested in studying present-day world affairs and their significance, as presented in the

SIGNS OF THE TIMES MAGAZINE

AN ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY

\$1.00 A YEAR

10 CENTS A COPY

Advocate of Bible Protestantism. The Scriptures on Present-Day History. Articles on Home and Health. Defender of Civil and Religious Liberty. Bible Answers to Man's Inquiries. The Science of Temperance, or Self-Government.

**DO CURRENT EVENTS SHOW
THAT CHRIST'S COMING IS NEAR?**

No Truth-Seeker's Library Complete Without It

A dime or ten cents in stamps will bring you a sample copy. Agents wanted in every city and hamlet. Special terms quoted upon application.

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
Mountain View, California**

Portland, Oregon

Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Kansas City, Mo.



WRITE FOR AGENCY TODAY!

October "FRUIT" Number

Do You Read This Excellent Health Journal?

Tenth-Month Features

Beautiful Three-Color Cover
 The Medicinal Value of Fruits
 Chronic Constipation
 Fruits
 Wind-Instruments and Health
 Some Simple Fruit Desserts
 Americanized Coffee Cakes — No. 2
 Treatment of Digestive Disorders
 Pure Food Well Cooked
 Reducing the Meat Diet
 Protein Restriction in Kidney Disease
 The Cart Before the Horse
 Eugenics and Diet
 Early Diagnosis of Cancer
 Physiology of the Open-Air Treatment
 New York Life Table
 Tobacco and Inebriety
 Many Other Valuable Articles

\$1.00 a Year

10 Cents a Copy

Address

LIFE AND HEALTH

::

Washington, D. C.

THE
**PROTESTANT
 MAGAZINE**

ADVOCATING
 PRIMITIVE
 CHRISTIANITY

PROTESTING
 AGAINST
 APSTASY

**Catholic America
 the Promised Land**

Who hope for a Catholic America have as yet come only to the end of the desert. Like Moses are our missionaries of today, looking out from a new Mount Nebo, viewing the fair fields our own feet shall never tread.

The little chapels the Church Extension movement will build shall be their fortified camps, and the men whom our fathers of the apostolate will send shall be advance guards to point the way to the new and fertile fields that abound in the promised land.—*Rev. F. C. Kelley, President of Church Extension Society (Roman Catholic), in 1909.*

PER YEAR \$1.00 PER COPY 10¢
 WASHINGTON, D. C.

OCTOBER, 1913

You Can't Afford to Miss This "MAKE AMERICA CATHOLIC"

Number of the "Protestant Magazine"

OCTOBER CONTENTS

Striking Double Frontispiece
 The Land of Promise
 The Growth of the Roman Catholic Church in America
 The Papacy Foretold in Prophecy — No. 2
 Greater Accuracy Needed
 Catholicism and Americanism
 The Pope in Politics
 Vaticanism in Germany, and in the United States
 The Bible and the Believer
 A Present Christ
 "Rank Heresy"
 Proving a Roman Catholic Doctrine
 Liberty of Conscience a Hoary Error
 Vatican Finance
 The Gentle Art of Deceiving
 Roman Catholic Statistics
 Seeking the Tracks of the Devil
 And Many Other Articles You Will Want to Read

20 copies at one time, \$1.00; 50 copies at one time, \$2.00

WRITE FOR AGENCY TODAY!


\$1.00 a Year

10 Cents a Copy

Address

PROTESTANT MAGAZINE, Washington, D. C.

Undermining the Foundations



THE SAPPERS AND MINERS AT WORK

"We want state and religion, and we are going to have it."— *Jonathan Edwards, D. D.*
 "Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion."— *Prof. C. A. Blanchard.* "This nation must have a religion of its own, and a worship of its own."— *Christian Statesman.* "We made a mistake in the first place in not founding our government upon the Christian religion."— *J. S. McGaw.* "The object of this society shall be . . . to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will . . . place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."— *Article II, National Reform Constitution.*
 "If the American republic is to be sustained and preserved at all, it must be by the rejection of the principle of the Reformation [separation of church and state], and the acceptance of the Catholic principle by the American people."— *Catholic World, September, 1871.*