

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

S. A. KAPLAN

PUBLISHED FOR
THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20012

BY THE
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, DC

1967

www.MaranathaMedia.com.au

Contents

A WORD TO JEWISH READERS

1. STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN!
2. IT HAPPENED HERE
3. DANGER AHEAD: RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION!
4. PRELUDE TO PERSECUTION: SUNDAY BLUE LAWS
5. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY RESURRECTS BLUE LAWS
6. WHICH DAY DID GOD APPOINT AS THE SABBATH?
7. IS SATURDAY THE TRUE HISTORIC SEVENTH DAY?
8. WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH DAY?
9. THE BLANK-DAY CALENDAR-THREAT TO ETERNAL JEWISH VERITIES
10. ECUMENISM-A COMING DICTATORSHIP OF THE MAJORITY?
11. THE SOON-COMING CONTEST
12. IS A STATE CHURCH EMERGING IN THE U.S.A.?
13. WILL THERE BE PERSECUTION IN AMERICA?
14. WHAT YOU CAN DO

A Word to Jewish Readers

The Jewish historian Josephus in his Wars (VI, 5) writes that for more than seven years before Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus in AD 70 the city was solemnly and persistently warned of its impending doom, but the warning fell on deaf ears. Our forefathers believed that their city was invulnerable to any enemy attack. This false sense of security cost ancient Israel a million lives, besides another million who were made slaves by their Roman conquerors.

Overconfidence can be costly. On April 10, 1912, at Southampton, England, a supposedly unsinkable ocean liner—the Titanic—with many notables aboard, started on its maiden voyage across the Atlantic. Besides many other safety factors, the liner had two steel bottoms and sixteen watertight compartments. So confident were its builders and its personnel of the ship's unsinkability that they did not bother to provide it with the required number of lifeboats. Said one of the deck hands to an anxious passenger, "God Himself could not sink this ship!" Yet, one clear, balmy night just before midnight, after most of the passengers had retired to their cabins, that mighty leviathan of the seas was ripped wide open by a giant iceberg, and some 1,500 of its passengers went down with the ship into a watery grave!

Pollyanna like complacency can end in tragedy. German and other European Jews had been duly warned of the dreadful potentialities of Hitler's Jew-baiting long before that unparalleled genocide took place. But, as the tragic record shows, that warning went unheeded. Those who sounded that warning were

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

labeled as alarmists and as being unduly pessimistic and naive. But were they? Millions of European Jews would be alive today had they not labored under a false sense of security!

To warn when danger threatens is often a thankless job. Human nature is so constituted that it prefers to hear "Peace, peace" even when there is no peace. But if we are our brother's keeper, which we most assuredly are, we will sound the warning nevertheless, because it is our humane and positive duty to do so.

Fortunately, there are times when warnings are appreciated and are heeded. For instance, when warnings are broadcast that a hurricane is moving toward the mainland of a certain area, the residents of that region do not regard the warnings as idle tales. On the contrary, they are thankful for having been forewarned, and they brace themselves to meet the oncoming storm.

In this document we are sounding a most solemn warning of an impending crisis, a coming storm relentless in its fury. Some unvarnished, little-known facts are brought to light. With malice toward none and with charity to all, we are presenting much sobering and documented evidence to alert the reader to the dangers that lie just ahead.

Along our highways we often come across warning signs, such as Stop, Look, Listen! These signs are put there to save life. They indicate that the State or county cares for the welfare and safety of its people. We are confident that the reader perusing these pages will likewise sense that we care, and that he will seriously reflect on the warnings given, ever remembering that ostrich like smugness and undue optimism can be perilous, and can end in catastrophe. It is better to be safe than sorry.

To those of our readers who despite the plain, documented facts here presented may still not be entirely convinced, we respectfully suggest that they keep this book for future reference, and defer judgment, for as events here presented develop and come to pass, the reader may wish to look anew and discern the full meaning of all these things.

THE PUBLISHERS

1. Stop, Look, and Listen.

THE sun may well be about to set on minority rights in the United States of America. The dividing line between church and state is becoming increasingly blurred. Responsible Jewish leaders as well as all keen observers of the religious liberty scene are deeply concerned about the ever-growing trend toward religious legislation that threatens to breach the wall of separation between church and state. Dr. Leo Pfeffer, speaking on behalf of the American Jewish Congress, warns that "for the first time in American history the nation is faced with a serious challenge to the integrity of the Bill of Rights."

Whether open or disguised, the current threat to the Bill of Rights and separation of church and state comes simultaneously from many directions. Religious laws of every dye and hue, and all sorts of oppressive and unconstitutional measures have been introduced into Congress and the various State legislatures and city councils within the past few years. On the legislative calendar have been placed bills dealing with teaching religion in the public schools, appropriating tax funds for religious purposes, the curtailing of the freedom of speech and of the press, compulsory Sun-day observance and church attendance, censoring the mails and radio, certain alien and sedition measures, class legislation, and many other un-American and unjust, unfair, and discriminatory measures that infringe upon freedom of conscience and contravene our highly esteemed Bill of Rights. Of all these ill winds that are blowing across this land, Jewish and other religious minorities have most to fear from the following:

1. Mass psychology, mob rule, and the spirit of conformity to the will of the majority in religious matters that is rapidly leavening American opinion. Concerning this new phenomenon on the American scene, Walter Lippmann says:

"Mass opinion has acquired mounting power in this century. It has shown itself a dangerous master when the stakes are life and death." - *The Public Philosophy*, p. 20.

2. Powerful church groups are pressuring Congress to amend the Constitution in such a way as to permit state-sponsored and state-authored religious exercises in the public schools. The Becker Amendment was just a beginning. More is yet to come.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

3. The wall of separation between church and state has been weakened to an alarming degree by the 1963 Aid to Education Act of Congress, which grants indirect support to private religious schools from the public tax. This, says Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, makes the non-Establishment clause of the First Amendment “a mockery,” and makes light of Thomas Jefferson’s warning that “to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical.”

4. However, the most serious of all threats to our liberties is inherent in Sunday legislation. Since the Supreme Court in 1961 ruled that certain Sunday laws are constitutional, State legislatures have been swamped with Sunday blue law proposals that are subtly religious in design, but are so labeled as to conceal their real intent.

Religious Legislation Is Divisive

This kind of religious legislation is steadily eroding the wall of separation between church and state and is thus placing our cherished freedoms in jeopardy. Such legislation is inimical to a pluralistic society such as ours. It creates tensions and controversies between ethnic and religious groups. If we want to see Americans of different religious beliefs, which have hitherto coexisted in comparative peace and tranquillity, engage in endless bickering, animated rows, and angry squabbles, legislating on religion is a most effective way to bring this about.

The Founding Fathers of this country not only foresaw the possibility of such a crisis arising but also the resulting oppression of minority groups. These Founding Fathers had themselves come here from the Old World where the majority ruled the minds and consciences of men, and where nonconformists were often mercilessly persecuted. “Torrents of blood,” said James Madison, “had been spilt in the Old World by vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion.” – “Memorial and Remonstrance.”

America a Haven for Persecuted Jews

Of those who suffered religious persecution in the Old World, the Jews have had the lion’s share in czarist Russia, Poland, and other lands of Europe. In the aftermath of the pogroms and violence they looked longingly to the New World where they were told that the God-given rights of man were respected and that minorities enjoyed equal rights with other citizens. Thus some two centuries ago there began an ever-increasing tide of Jewish immigration to these shores.

Those escapees from oppression found freedom here, but they soon discovered that even in free America “eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.” This thought was ably expressed in a letter written by Thomas Jefferson, on May 19, 1819, to Mordecai Manuel Noah, prominent Jewish leader, author, and statesman:

“Your sect by its sufferings has furnished a remarkable proof of the universal spirit of religious intolerance, inherent in every sect, disclaimed by all while feeble, and practised by all when in power. Our laws have applied the only antidote to the vice, protecting our religious, as they do our civil rights, by putting all on an equal footing. But more remains to be done. For although we are free by the law, we are not so in practice; public opinion erects itself into an Inquisition, and exercises its office with as much fanaticism as fans the flames of an auto da fe {mode of burning heretics by the Inquisition}.”-Thomas Jefferson Papers, vol. 213, p. 37988, in Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.

The United States Constitution an Amazing Document

The lesson taught by the persecutions in the Old World was not lost on the Founding Fathers, and they were led to write into the Constitution the historic non-Establishment clause: “CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF.”

By writing this immortal clause into the Constitution, the Founding Fathers brought to light a principle that had been buried in the dust for centuries. Never before had a civilized government so clearly

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

recognized and defined the limits of its powers and authority as did the United States when it pledged itself not to establish a state church or to interfere with the free exercise of religion by its citizens.

One wonders: Where did these illustrious fathers such as Roger Williams, George Washington, James Madison, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and others learn “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness”? Who taught them the principle of absolute separation of church and state?

The answer is: These Founding Fathers were the product of the period known as the Age of Enlightenment, which in turn was the natural reaction to the bigotry, intolerance, clerical abuses, and the persecution of the Middle Ages. As will be shown in a later chapter, a kind, overruling Providence was the guiding spirit in this salutary transition.

This new era produced on the one hand, deeply religious, Bible-oriented men of the Protestant persuasion, and on the other hand, the so-called Secularists, Humanists, Encyclopedists, Free-thinkers, advocates of the Social Contract, and Deists. Yet, singularly enough, all these men, despite the difference in their religious, ethical, and political ideologies, had this in common—all of them were motivated by a profound conviction that there were grievous wrongs and abuses that must be corrected regardless of the risks involved, and that the time for setting things right was now! In his book *In God We Trust*, Norman Cousins, editor of *Saturday Review*, writes about that era:

“What was most significant about the Age of Enlightenment was that its impact was felt throughout a large part of the Western world. For many generations, inspiring things had been said about natural rights. Men like Francis Bacon, [Sir Isaac] Newton, Galileo, Copernicus, Comenius, Sir John Harrington, Sydney, Leibnitz, Locke, Hobbes, Montesquieu, Baron d’Holbach, and Quesnay provided the theory or demonstration or both.”

“It is significant that most of the Founding Fathers grew up in a strong religious atmosphere; many had Calvinist family backgrounds. Not all the founders acknowledged a formal faith, but it was significant that their view of man had a deeply religious foundation. Rights were ‘God-given’; man was ‘endowed by his Creator’; there were ‘natural laws’ and ‘natural rights’; freedom was related to the ‘sacredness’ of man.” - Pages 7-10.

The Influence of Hebrew Prophets

We therefore ask again: From what source did the Founding Fathers receive their inspiration and their wisdom to frame a Constitution which William Gladstone, four-time prime minister of Great Britain, characterized as “the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man”?

The answer is obvious. By and large, they drew their inspiration from the Hebrew prophets. The Bible is the book of freedom par excellence. This Book of books is interwoven into the very fabric of the American institutions. Its vast contribution to the physical, moral, and spiritual well-being of this country, and its influence and impact on the course of our history, can never be fully computed. The concepts of liberty, equality, and fraternity which are the core of the American Constitution were practiced by the children of Israel thousands of years ago, when Moses was bidden by God to “proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof” (Leviticus 25:10). One of the most thrilling chapters in the Bible tells how God delivered an entire nation—the Hebrews—from bondage to another nation—Egypt; and as soon as ancient Israel became a nation they were commanded to “Love . . . the stranger: for you were strangers in the land of Egypt” (Deuteronomy 10:19). “Love thy neighbor as thyself” (Leviticus 19:18); “Righteousness exalts a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people” (Proverbs 14:34). “Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all the nations” (Isaiah 56:7, Leeser’s translation). “Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s” (Matthew 22:21).

It was upon these Judaeo-Christian principles that the Founding Fathers built the government of these United States, and this accounts for the unprecedented growth and prosperity of this “marvel of nations.”

By incorporating the non-Establishment clause into the Constitution, the Founding Fathers built better than they thought. As an eminent member of the Judiciary put it

“Those great and good men foresaw that troublous times would arise, . . . and that the principles of Constitutional liberty would be in peril. . . . Wicked men, ambitious of power, with hatred of liberty and

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

contempt of law, may fill the place once occupied by Washington and Lincoln. . . . Our fathers knew that unlimited power was especially hazardous to freemen.”-From an address by Supreme Court Justice Daniel Davis, given in 1865.

In order to judge what effect such “troubled times”-some unpredictable crisis-could have upon this Republic, we need but recall what happened in the Old World since the dawn of this century. We have seen how in great crises the masses of otherwise civilized lands of Europe raised to uncontrolled power wicked men who hated liberty and who had nothing but contempt for the rights of the minorities, millions of whom they liquidated.

Minority Rights on Decline

The Kaiser, Hitler, and Mussolini are dead, but the cynical disregard of minority rights they generated is no longer confined to overseas; it is now very much in evidence here in the United States. Minority rights are increasingly looked upon with disdain. “Minority” has become a dirty word in the minds of many brain-washed Americans.

C. S. Longacre, in his book *The Church in Politics*, page 7, says: “It is quite common for well-meaning Christian people who really intend to be good loyal Americans to deny the existence of ‘inalienable rights.’ The contention is that only the majority groups have rights which should be respected by government.” This current trend is a far cry from the noble principles on which this country was founded. Note this statement by a great American and former Vice-President of the United States, Richard M. Johnson (1780-1850):

“The Constitution regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian, and gives no more authority to adopt a measure affecting the conscience of a solitary individual than that of a whole community.” - *American State Papers*, page 219.

“What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of government indulgence, but as rights, of which Government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotism may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.”-*Ibid.*, page 215.

The Approaching Crisis

American citizens of racial and religious minorities must be made aware that their inalienable rights guaranteed by the Constitution are already being whittled away, bit by bit, and that soon, sooner than many of us think, these God-given rights will vanish in toto. Daniel Webster well knew what this gradual emasculation of the Constitution would lead to when he warned:

“If the Constitution be picked away by piecemeal, it is gone-and gone as effectively as if some military despot had grasped it at once, trampled it beneath his feet, and scattered its loose leaves in the wild winds.”

Francis Clay Harley, the author of *The Key to the Constitution*, says:

“We have now reached the most critical period in the life of the Republic. A misstep now and the structure, which our fore-fathers so diligently, faithfully and carefully built, may crumble to the dust.” - Page 3.

When that happens, then what? If history teaches anything, it warns that, as night follows day, such a constitutional crisis results in bitter, merciless persecution of minorities. The cumulative documented evidence which we shall present in this book should alert all God-fearing, loyal Americans that bigotry-unashamed, unabashed, uninhibited bigotry-is about to assume uncontested reign in this land. Speaking of the present-day menacing trends on the religio-political scene in America, Paul Hutchinson says:

“There is reason to believe . . . that the old issue of church and state, or of church against state, will soon be upon us in a fury unknown for a thousand years.” - *The New Leviathan* (1946 ed.), page 19. (Italics supplied.)

Already there are omens of the gathering storm on the horizon, and from all appearances it is about to break upon us with relentless fury. We who belong to the religious minorities will be caught right in the center of its awesome swirl!

What to do about it? Shall we just sit back, fold our hands, and wait for the storm to come?

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

The wise man is not content to wait until the lightning flashes and the thunder rolls; he prepares for the storm before its fury is unleashed.

It is the purpose of this document to help you do just that.

2. It Happened Here

IT MAY come as a surprise to some to learn that persecution of minorities for conscience' sake has occurred on a large scale in "free" America. When? During Colonial and post-Colonial days. By whom? During Colonial days, by those who had themselves been persecuted in the Old World!

It is one of the inconsistencies of human nature that too often the oppressed become the oppressors, and this was notoriously true of the early American colonists. They fled from the old country because the majority were determined to compel them to conform to certain religious forms and practices. Yet almost as soon as they planted their feet upon these free shores they in turn persecuted their fellow immigrants who refused to conform to their religious dogmas. Before the Constitution was adopted, some of the colonies and States established an official religion, and they legislated what doctrines and precepts were to be observed by all the citizens. "The people were taxed, against their will, for the support of religion, and sometimes for the support of particular sects to whose tenets they could not and did not subscribe. Punishments were prescribed for a failure to attend upon public worship, and some-times for entertaining heretical opinions."-CHIEF JUSTICE MORRISON R. WAITE, in *Reynolds v. U.S.* 98 U.S. 145.

The Virginia Colony in 1610, among its religious enactment, section 3, decreed the death penalty for the following offense: "That no man blaspheme God's holy name upon pain of death, or use unlawful oaths, taking the name of God in vain, curse, or ban, upon pain of severe punishment for the first offence so committed, and for the second, to have a bodkin thrust through his tongue, and if he continue the blasphemy of God's holy name, for the third time so offending, he shall be brought to martial court, and there receive censure of death for his offence."-*Tracts Relating to the Colonies in North America* (Washington, 1844), volume 3, number 2, page 10.

Sunday Laws in Colonial Days

In 1705 the same colony passed a law that anyone who did common labor or travel on Sunday and failed to attend church on that day, was to pay a designated fine, and if he refused to pay the fine he was to receive ten lashes on his back.

Plymouth Colony, in 1671, passed a law invoking the death penalty for idolatry, witchcraft, and Sunday desecration. Massachusetts Bay in 1641 imposed the death penalty for idolatry, witchcraft, and blasphemy; in 1646 a law was passed compelling church attendance on Sunday; punishment for heresy; the death penalty for denying the Bible.

Maryland in 1723 enacted laws imposing varying fines for blasphemers, swearers, drunkards, and Sunday law violators. Pennsylvania, in 1681 and 1682, punished Sunday law violators and blasphemers.

Delaware in 1739-1740 publicly branded and whipped blasphemers (with 39 lashes on the bare back), put Sunday law violators "in the stocks" for up to four hours. Georgia, New York, and New Hampshire had their share of religious laws for blasphemy and Sunday desecration. (See *American State Papers*, pp. 17-77, Religious Liberty Association, Washington, D.C.)

Modern Sunday law legislation, which is rapidly becoming one of the great controversial issues of our day, is but a twentieth-century adaptation of the Sunday blue laws of the Colonial era. (Later chapters deal with the twentieth-century aspect of Sunday legislation and its ominous overtones.)

The first blue law that was passed in what is now the United States was enacted in Virginia in the year 1610. This law compelled everyone to attend Sunday morning services as well as after-noon worship. Those who failed to do this, forfeited their food supply for the following week. If they absented themselves the second time, they were deprived of their week's provision and in addition were whipped; for the third offense they suffered death!

The Massachusetts Bay Colony was established as a union of church and state, and as a natural corollary to a church-state, they enacted a compulsory Sunday blue law in 1629. That law was "blue" indeed, as records of the governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay show.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Five years later, in 1635, the Massachusetts general court de-creed that anyone within its jurisdiction who absented himself from worship “upon the Lord’s day” should be punished by imprisonment or a fine not exceeding five shillings for each offense. In 1692 the law was amended that “in case any such offender be unable or refuse to satisfy such fine, to cause him to be put in the cage, or set in stocks, not exceeding three hours.”

Religious Liberty of Jews Restricted in Colonial Era

In the eighteenth century, under the drastic Sunday laws of the States, Jews were liable to fines and imprisonment for their failure to observe Sunday after they had kept the seventh-day Sabbath. On November 27, 1786, the State of Virginia passed a law “for Punishing Disturbers of Religious Worship” and violators of the Sunday law. In order to survive economically many Jewish shopkeepers felt compelled to carry on business on their Sabbath. This may explain why in 1791 a Mrs. Rebecca Samuel, of Petersburg, Virginia, writing in Yiddish to her parents in London, England, stated that “on the Sabbath all the Jewish shops [except hers) are open, and they do business on that day as they do throughout the week.”- LOUIS GINSBURG, *Religious Freedom and the Jew in Colonial Virginia*, p. 7.

On August 17, 1790, the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, Rhode Island, addressed a letter to George Washington, expressing confidence that under the new government and under its administration, just inaugurated, all classes of people in the United States would enjoy equal opportunities and freedom under the law. Washington wrote in reply:

“All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.” - George Washington Papers, Letter Book 30, pages 19, 20.

When the Puritans, who had been persecuted in England, settled here, they became intolerant of the members of other churches. The Dutch in New York excluded Catholics from public office. In Pennsylvania and Maryland any man who did not profess a belief in the Christian religion was disqualified from holding public office. Roger Williams was banished by the Puritans from Massachusetts because of his religious views. Until up to the nineteenth century Jews and Catholics were not permitted to hold office in many States. Massachusetts required a religious test for office as late as 1826.

James Madison on Religious Liberty

In Virginia clergymen of nonconformist churches were treated no better than common criminals. When James Madison was a young man he listened with deep emotion to a sermon of a Baptist minister from the only pulpit available to him-the window of a jail! The impact which this scene made upon the mind and con-science of James Madison was never erased from his memory and did much to make him the intrepid advocate of separation of church and state. In his historic “Memorial and Remonstrance” of 1784 against a proposal of the Virginia House of Delegates to impose an annual tax for the support of the Christian religion, Madison declared:

“The 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. It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects?

“Experience witnesses that ecclesiastical establishments, in-stead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity [a reference to the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages) been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry and persecution.”

The Massachusetts Bay Colony was established as a union of church and state, and as a natural corollary to a church-state, they enacted a compulsory Sunday blue law in 1629. That law was “blue” indeed, as records of the governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay show.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Five years later, in 1635, the Massachusetts general court de-creed that anyone within its jurisdiction who absented himself from worship “upon the Lord’s day” should be punished by imprisonment or a fine not exceeding five shillings for each offense. In 1692 the law was amended that “in case any such offender be unable or refuse to satisfy such fine, to cause him to be put in the cage, or set in stocks, not exceeding three hours.”

Religious Liberty of Jews Restricted in Colonial Era

In the eighteenth century, under the drastic Sunday laws of the States, Jews were liable to fines and imprisonment for their failure to observe Sunday after they had kept the seventh-day Sabbath. On November 27, 1786, the State of Virginia passed a law “for Punishing Disturbers of Religious Worship” and violators of the Sunday law. In order to survive economically many Jewish shopkeepers felt compelled to carry on business on their Sabbath. This may explain why in 1791 a Mrs. Rebecca Samuel, of Petersburg, Virginia, writing in Yiddish to her parents in London, England, stated that “on the Sabbath all the Jewish shops [except hers] are open, and they do business on that day as they do throughout the week.”- Louis GINSBURG, *Religious Freedom and the Jew in Colonial Virginia*, page 7.

On August 17, 1790, the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, Rhode Island, addressed a letter to George Washington, expressing confidence that under the new government and under its administration, just inaugurated, all classes of people in the United States would enjoy equal opportunities and freedom under the law. Washington wrote in reply:

“All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.” - George Washington Papers, Letter Book 30, pages 19, 20.

When the Puritans, who had been persecuted in England, settled here, they became intolerant of the members of other churches. The Dutch in New York excluded Catholics from public office. In Pennsylvania and Maryland any man who did not profess a belief in the Christian religion was disqualified from holding public office. Roger Williams was banished by the Puritans from Massachusetts because of his religious views. Until up to the nineteenth century Jews and Catholics were not permitted to hold office in many States. Massachusetts required a religious test for office as late as 1826.

James Madison on Religious Liberty

In Virginia clergymen of nonconformist churches were treated no better than common criminals. When James Madison was a young man he listened with deep emotion to a sermon of a Baptist minister from the only pulpit available to him-the window of a jail! The impact which this scene made upon the mind and con-science of James Madison was never erased from his memory and did much to make him the intrepid advocate of separation of church and state. In his historic “Memorial and Remonstrance” of 1784 against a proposal of the Virginia House of Delegates to impose an annual tax for the support of the Christian religion, Madison declared:

“The 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. It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects?”

“Experience witnesses that ecclesiastical establishments, in-stead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity [a reference to the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages] been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry and persecution.”

Such is the fruit of “ecclesiastical establishments,” whether by Protestants or Catholics.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Early American Victims of Religious Bigotry

New England has the distinction of being first in inflicting martyrdom upon one of two victims of inquisitorial intolerance. In front of the State House in Boston are five statues, two of which are women—Anne Hutchinson and Mary Dyer.

In many ways Anne Hutchinson was a modern woman. She was intelligent, talkative, and strong-willed. Edward Johnson, a historian who was her contemporary, called her “a masterpiece of woman’s wit.” And she dared to think independently on religious and political subjects and to say publicly what she believed to be true. This alone was enough to cause the stern, self-righteous elders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to condemn her as a heathen, publican, and a child of Satan.

The story of Anne Hutchinson is significant today because it points up the evils of intolerance and the need for continued vigilance to protect our religious liberties from the encroachment of misguided zealots who seek by legal means to enforce conformity.

Separation of church and state was only a utopian dream when Anne Hutchinson and her husband, William, a well-to-do merchant, arrived in Boston in 1634. The Puritans, who had established the colony under a charter from Charles I, had come to America to find religious liberty for themselves—not freedom for others who happened to think differently. Although their colony was called the Bible Commonwealth, it was not a democratic or tolerant government. Civil authority of the colony was wielded largely by its religious leaders.

Convinced that they alone knew Biblical truth, the Puritan officials persecuted all who spoke out against their brand of religion. To quote the historian David Saville Muzzey:

“They banished clergymen who attempted to use the prayer book. They drove Roger Williams out into the snows of a New England winter to find a refuge among the more merciful Indians. They hanged Quakers on Boston Common and yielded to a perfect panic of persecuting zeal when a few poor old toothless, mumbling women were convicted of being the agents of Satan in bewitching the senses of the people of God.”—The United States of America, volume 1, page 17.

This was the America in which Anne Hutchinson found herself in 1634. Just a year after her arrival, Roger Williams, a young preacher who had horrified the Bay colonists by suggesting separation of church and state, had been found guilty of disseminating “new” and dangerous opinions” and ordered banished.

A keenly sensitive and religious woman, Anne Hutchinson was disturbed by what she saw and heard. Even the long, uninspired sermons of the Puritan clergy began to trouble her. Was this the American dream of freedom?

Banished from Boston, Anne Hutchinson went to Rhode Island, where Roger Williams had established a colony that practiced religious freedom and gave sanctuary to persons of various religious beliefs. Her husband, William, and all her children except one son accompanied her to Rhode Island. When her husband died in 1642 the family moved to Long Island, probably Pelham Neck. Her life ended in tragedy. She and all of her children but one were killed by the Indians.

Roger Williams and Mary Dyer Persecuted

Mary Dyer, a friend of Anne Hutchinson, also was a woman of strong convictions. She dared to be different when it was dangerous. She followed her friend into exile in Rhode Island.

Having gone on a visit to England, Mary, on her return, had to pass through Boston en route to Rhode Island. The Bay Colony arrested and imprisoned her. Her husband’s importunities secured the release of his wife. Later she returned to Boston to visit fellow Quakers in prison and to “bear witness to her faith.” Her insistence on risking her life did not bring her the customary tarring, feathering, and expulsion from town. She was condemned to be hanged in 1659, but reprieved May 21, 1660. To the last she lived by her affirmation of purpose: “My life not avails me in comparison to the liberty of the truth.”

These two statues and the story they tell are a sculptured refutation of the idea which some of us entertain that “it cannot happen here.” Not only can it happen here, but it did happen here! Mary Dyer finally was hanged on Boston Commons, not for any offense against a criminal code, but because of her religious convictions.

Perhaps the darkest page in American Colonial history is the treatment the “first great American” and the founder of the free State of Rhode Island, Roger Williams, received at the hands of the Puritans who established the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Roger Williams, a young British nonconformist preacher,

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

left England in search of freedom in the New World. He arrived in Boston in 1631, one year after the Puritans had come to these shores and founded that colony. The Puritans, however, who like Roger Williams had suffered bitter persecution under the established church in England, had apparently learned nothing from their experience, for they proceeded at once to establish a state church with a vengeance! All the religious observances were enforced by law, with severe penalties for the transgressor. Failure to attend church on Sunday or to pay tithes subjected the guilty party to cruel treatment and corporal punishment. One of their laws stated that anyone breaking the first four commandments of the Ten Commandments should be sentenced to banishment!

Roger Williams took a decided stand against this church-state regime. By voice, pen, and vote he condemned these inquisitorial enactments. He pointed to the sharp distinction between the first and second tables of the Ten Commandments, contending that the first four commandments were spiritual requirements which a man owed to God and not to Caesar! Arraigned before the Salem court, he launched his unanswerable broadsides against fifty of the ablest Puritan opponents. But because he championed the cause of absolute separation of church and state, his ideas were regarded as “dangerous to the peace and order of the commonwealth,” and he was sentenced to banishment in the wilderness, where it was hoped he would perish from want of food, shelter, and clothing. He fled from his home at night, in the dead of winter, but the freedom which he was denied by the “savage Christians” he found among the “Christian savages”—the Narragansett Indians, who welcomed the fugitive and ministered to his needs. For the two years that Williams remained among the Indians he was their teacher, translated parts of the Bible into their language, and won many to the unadulterated religion of Him who is no respecter of persons, who loves the red-skinned people no less than those whose skin is white.

Oscar S. Strauss, twice American Ambassador to Turkey, fittingly said of Roger Williams: “If I were asked to select from all great men who have left their impress upon this continent. I would without any hesitation select that great prophet who established the first political community [Rhode Island] on the basis of a free church in a free state, the great and immortal Roger Williams.” “Quoted in C. S. LONGACRE, Roger Williams, p. 61.

This Happened in Nineteenth-Century America

It seems incredible that the following story of religious persecution could have happened in America in the nineteenth century, but the records are there to confirm it. In the year 1885 the State of Arkansas repealed an exemption to the Sunday blue law of that State because some unscrupulous persons operated saloons, and other merchants conducted their business seven days of the week. The repeal of the exemption clause brought great hardships upon many honest, God-fearing people who observed the seventh-day—Saturday—as the Sabbath. They were penalized for working on Sunday on their farms and at other occupations. Many were arrested, fined, and thrown into prison.

A typical case was that of a Mr. McCoy, of Magnet Cove, who moved from Louisville, Kentucky, to Arkansas in 1873. He served as constable seven years, and two terms as justice of the peace, in Hot Springs County. In 1884 he became a Seventh-day Adventist. On August, 1885, following the repeal of the exemption clause, he was indicted for Sunday desecration, the particular charge against him being plowing on Sunday. The witness against him was a Mr. Wetherford, a member of the Methodist Church, who went into the field where Mr. McCoy was plowing and spent several hours with him, walking around as he plowed. The work was half a mile from any public road and entirely away from any place of public worship. In September, Mr. McCoy was arrested and placed under bond. With tears in his eyes he said to a friend that while he was reckless and wicked he was not molested, but that as soon as he turned and began to live a religious life, observing the seventh-day Sabbath in accord with the divine injunction, he was persecuted and fined for it.

Another case involved a Seventh-day Adventist minister, J. W. Scoles of Springdale, Arkansas. He was quietly and unobtrusively finishing a small strip of painting on the south side of his church on Sunday, clear out of sight of all public roads. He completed the painting in two hours and then went home. For this offense he was indicted.

At the fall term of the circuit court held at Fayetteville, J. A. Armstrong, of Springdale, was summoned before the grand jury. He was asked if he knew of any violations of the State Sunday law. He said he did. The following dialog ensued:

GRAND JURY: Who are they?

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

ARMSTRONG: The San Francisco railroad is running trains every Sun-day.

G.J.: Do you know of any others?

A.: Yes; the hotels of this place are open, and do a full run of business on Sunday, as on other days.

G.J.: Do you know of any others?

A.: Yes, sir; the drugstores and barbershops all keep open, and do business every Sunday.

G.J.: Do you know of any others?

A.: Yes; the livery-stables do more business on Sunday than on any other day of the week.

In spite of all this Pastor Scoles was convicted, and later the State supreme court affirmed the conviction. Twenty other cases essentially the same as that of Pastor Scoles also came up for trial. Commenting on this Sunday-enforcement crusade in Arkansas, and the character of the people being prosecuted, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of November 30, 1885, said:

“They have been from the first apparently an industrious and God-fearing people, the chief difference between them and other Christian bodies being that they observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, according to the commandment. It is a little singular that no one else has been troubled on account of the law, with perhaps one minor exemption, while members of the above denomination are being arrested over the whole State. It savors just a trifle of the religious persecution which characterized the Dark Ages.”

In January, 1887, a bill had been introduced in the Arkansas Legislature by Senator R. H. Crockett, grandson of David Crockett, one of the famous pioneers of the Southwest, for the restoration of the clause in the State Sunday law exempting observers of the seventh day. The bill passed with but two dissenting votes and the two were Sunday keeping ministers. One of these ministers, who was acquainted with many of the Sabbatarians, confessed in private conversation that they were all of excellent moral character and law-abiding citizens.

To list all the religious persecutions that took place in Tennessee, Georgia, Maryland, and other States in the eighties and nineties of the past century would fill an exceedingly large volume.

A Nineteenth-Century Attempt to Destroy Our Constitution

In 1863 at Xenia, Ohio, eleven Protestant denominations formed an organization whose avowed purpose was to introduce a religious amendment into the Constitution that would have nullified the First Amendment, which guarantees separation between church and state. The name of this organization was The National Reform Association. Had they succeeded in obtaining legal sanction for their religious ideals, all dissenters would have suffered, as is clearly indicated from the utterances of their leaders:

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion.”—C. A. BLANCHARD, Proceedings of the National Convention to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, Pittsburgh, 1874, page 71.

“Those who oppose this work now will discover, when the religious amendment is made to the Constitution, that if they do not see fit to fall in line with the majority, they must abide by the consequences, or seek some more congenial clime.”—DR. DAVID MCALLISTER, in National Reform Convention at Lakeside, Ohio, August, 1887.

This attempt in the nineteenth century to destroy the First Amendment failed, but the spirit that prompted the effort is still brooding over the land. Its philosophy was aptly summed up by Lord Macaulay: “The doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissension, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, and you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.”—Essay on “Sir James Mackintosh,” Critical and Historical Essays (London, 1865), volume 1, pages 333, 334.

All this and much, much more happened here in this land of the free, up to the end of the nineteenth century. Has our generation learned anything from the past?

3. Danger Ahead: Religious Legislation!

THE CONSTITUTIONAL barriers that were built to preserve religious freedom are in danger of being swept away by the mounting tide of religious legislation. When the Federal Government or a State

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

imposes religious practices by law, it enters a domain where angels fear to tread—the secret communion between the soul and its Maker. Do we not justly despise an individual who meddles in the private affairs of husband and wife? What shall we say, then, of a government or State that presumes to invade the inner sanctum of an individual’s conscience and his communion with God? Here is a word of warning:

“Among all religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated as the law of God. Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it. And the catastrophe of other nations {where this happened} furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.” —RICHARD M. JOHNSON, former Vice-President of the United States, in *American State Papers*, page 212.

The Becker Amendment

If today we are still free to practice the religion of our choice in this free America, we owe it to the farsighted Founding Fathers who gave us the Bill of Rights. This Bill of Rights, especially the First Amendment—the wall that was to keep the church from meddling in the affairs of the state, and vice versa—is about to crumble before persistent pressures by majority religious and political groups.

Typical of the efforts of these groups to override the Constitution is the now-defunct Becker Amendment, introduced in Congress by Frank J. Becker, former Congressman of New York. It was intended to bypass the Supreme Court ruling against State-sponsored religious exercises in public schools. The Supreme Court on June 25, 1962, ruled by a six to one majority that the reading of an official prayer in New York public schools violated the First Amendment of the Constitution. The prayer had been drafted by the New York Board of Regents and recommended for recitation by teachers and students in each classroom at the start of each school day. The nondenominational prayer read as follows: “Al-mighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.”

The Court held (*Engel v. Vitale*) that this constituted “an establishment of religion” forbidden by the First Amendment. The majority opinion, written by Justice Hugo L. Black, said that the First Amendment “must at least mean that in this country it is no part of the business of a government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by government.” He said the prayer violated the First Amendment regardless of the fact that it was “denominationally neutral” and that any child who objected was not required to participate. “The power the prestige,” and financial support of government behind a religious observance does tend to force conformity to it, said Justice Black.

Many religious leaders—Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant—immediately recognized the danger to religious freedom inherent in such an amendment, and they were outspoken in their opposition to it. Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, staff consultant of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, stated that “good religion does not need to make use of the coercive power of the state.” Dr. Edwin H. Tuller, general secretary of the American Baptist Convention, speaking in behalf of the National Council of Churches, told the House Judiciary Committee: “I fear state religion.” He contended that “Bible reading and prayers as devotional acts in public schools tend toward indoctrination, or meaningless ritual, and should be omitted for both reasons.” Dr. Leo Pfeffer, speaking for the American Jewish Congress, regards any attempts to amend the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools as the most serious challenge to the integrity of the Bill of Rights in American history.

Why a Bill of Rights?

America very early recognized the inalienable rights of its citizens to worship God as their conscience dictated, and in order to guarantee and protect these rights, erected a wall of separation between church and state. This safeguarding wall that guarantees your freedom to worship as you see fit is known as the Bill of Rights, which consists of the first ten amendments to the Constitution. Why was the Bill of Rights so essential? The answer is found in human nature itself. History and human behavior teach us that unrestricted power is dangerous whether in the hands of a dictator or in a government, and that men must place some check upon themselves and upon their rulers in order to possess any liberty.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Thus for the first time in known history a written constitution specified that certain institutions and human relations were to be outside the authority of government. The government was specifically forbidden to infringe them or to violate them.

This was a revolutionary concept of government. The idea of inalienable rights and individual freedom had never before been incorporated into a national constitution. Never before in history had the people said to the government: "Thou shall not." Always the government had been able to say to the people: "You may, or you must." Heretofore, government had granted certain freedoms and privileges to the people. But the Bill of Rights said, in effect: "We the people are endowed by our Creator with natural rights and freedoms. The only reason for our having a government is to protect and defend these rights and freedoms that we already have as individuals. It is sheer folly to believe that government can give us something that already belongs to us."

How the Bill of Rights Came Into Being

Let us see what led up to the writing of the Bill of Rights. In the year 1783, our country won its independence from Great Britain. For eight years after that, this country was governed under a constitution called the Articles of Confederation. These Articles, however, were not faultless. As time passed, difficulties arose between the States and there was danger that they might break away and become small separate countries. It was this that caused the nation's leaders to call a convention of citizens from the various States to meet and study these problems. This group of citizens is now called the Constitutional Convention. They began their meetings at Independence Hall in Philadelphia in the year 1787. All the men were leaders in their respective States. Among them were such famous citizens as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison.

For a while the delegates to the convention tried to patch up the Articles of Confederation and make them work. But they soon found it necessary to make an entirely new plan of government in order to form "a more perfect Union." They put their plan into final form and signed it on September 17, 1787. Thus it was that the plan for our government, the Constitution of the United States of America, was written. However, the original content of the Constitution did not include any specific guarantees of freedom of speech and religion, and other basic freedoms—an omission that aroused suspicion and distrust among the people at large. The Constitution dealt chiefly with the forms and machinery of government, but contained few express restrictions upon Congress with respect to individual and human rights.

Many felt that definite prohibitions upon Congress itself should be added, and that definite guarantees as to the rights of individuals should be given. A Constitution, they reasoned, should not only serve to establish a government, but it must also protect the people against government.

"Unlimited power," wrote Alexis de Toqueville, "is in itself a bad and dangerous thing. Human beings are not competent to exercise it with discretion. God alone is omnipotent, because His wisdom and justice are always equal to His power. There is no power on earth so worthy of honor in itself or clothed with rights so sacred that I would admit its uncontrolled and all-predominant authority."—*Democracy in America*, p. 260.

"In all cases where a majority are united by a common interest or passion," wrote James Madison, "the rights of the minority are in danger."—Speech at Constitutional Convention, June 6, 1787.

John Adams once said, "You have rights antecedent to all earthly governments; rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator .of the Universe."

Thomas Jefferson declared, "It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights. Confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go."

To safeguard the liberties of the people and of the separate States against possible abuses of power by the Government, the States insisted that before they would ratify the Constitution certain amendments must be added to it. Thus it was that the first ten amendments were added to the Constitution in a body in the year AD 1791. Collectively these amendments are known as the Bill of Rights, and their provisions include guarantees of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly and petition. A strict prohibition against unreasonable searches or seizures; freedom from double jeopardy and self-incrimination; they guarantee that the government will act only with due process of law.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

The Bill of Rights in Jeopardy

The idea that religion needs the support of civil power is rapidly gaining ground and gathering dangerous momentum in free America. That was the motivating reason that gave birth to the Becker Amendment. While its sponsors disclaimed any intent to weaken the wall of separation between church and state, the Becker Amendment if passed would have had the effect of circumventing the Bill of Rights by permitting individual States to enact laws relating to religion, thus nullifying the First Amendment, whose purpose was to prohibit the passage of any religious laws whatsoever.

Those who favored the Becker Amendment resorted to various ways and methods to gain the support of the grass roots for this un-American piece of legislation. Pretending to read the hidden motives of the heart, they asserted that the reason the majority of the Supreme Court ruled against State-sponsored prayers and Bible reading in the public schools was because of their antagonism to all religion.

Supreme Court Ruling Misunderstood

How much more misunderstood can a Supreme Court ruling be? Rightly understood the ruling only banned official prayers authored and sponsored by the State. It did not forbid the saying of a prayer in a public school, nor did it outlaw the mention of God. The Supreme Court decision was no more anti religious than the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights. It would be utter non-sense to say that the Founding Fathers were hostile or even indifferent to religion when they framed the Establishment clause, which “stands,” Justice Black declares, “as an expression of principle on the part of the founders of our Constitution that religion is too personal, too sacred, too holy, to permit its ‘unhallowed perversion’ by a civil magistrate. These men knew that the First Amendment, which tried to put an end to governmental control of religion and of prayer, was not written to destroy either. They knew rather that it was written to quiet well-justified fears which nearly all of them felt arising out of an awareness that governments of the past had shackled men’s tongues to make them speak only the religious thoughts that government wanted them to speak and to pray only to the God that government wanted them to pray to. It is neither sacrilegious nor anti religious to say that each separate government in this country should stay out of that business of writing or sanctioning official prayers and leave the purely religious function to the people themselves and to those the people choose to look to for religious guidance.”

As stated earlier in this chapter, the Becker Amendment is typical of the efforts now being put forth by certain religious elements to tear down the wall of separation between church and state and to destroy the spirit as well as the letter of the Bill of Rights.

But the gravest threat to our freedoms comes from another kind of religious legislation that is plaguing this country from end to end. This will be considered in the chapter that follows.

4. Prelude to Persecution: Sunday Blue Laws

SINCE the Supreme Court of the United States in 1961 upheld the constitutionality of certain Sunday laws, the demand by church-affiliated people for compulsory Sunday-observance laws has increased to an alarming degree.

Why this insistent cry for Sunday laws? The proponents of these laws tell us that it is because churchgoing Americans are alarmed at the rapid decline of morality in the nation, and they want quick action to stop or retard this downward trend. Wherever they look they see signs of moral decay—in politics, in business, in marital relations, in the unrestrained violence and the ever-increasing crimes against person and property. These church-affiliated folks have been led to believe that Sunday desecration, more than any other factor, is responsible for the present moral breakdown of society. So, they reason, we must find a quick and effective cure for these social ills.

The most definite proposal comes from the Sunday keeping churches that have united their forces and are pressuring State legislatures to enact Sunday laws enforced by the power of the State. They argue that church attendance is rapidly waning because of the ever-increasing worldly amusements and business transacted on the “Lord’s day,” and that if these activities were forbidden by law, many who are now careless about religious worship on Sun-day would “naturally drift back to the church.”

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

The ultimate objective of the churches was spelled out years ago by the influential Lord's Day Alliance:

“We propose by legislation to make it easier for people to go to church. In other words, we shall try to close the baseball parks [on Sunday], the golf links, the motion pictures and other theatres, the concert halls, the amusement parks, the bathing beaches and so on. We shall restrict the sale of gasoline for pleasure automobile and joy riding. We believe that if we take away a man's motor car, his golf sticks, his Sunday newspaper, his horses and prohibit him from playing outdoor games and witnessing field sports, he naturally will drift back to the church.”

Sunday Laws Now Falsely Labeled

This kind of Sunday legislation, however, with its pronounced religious coloring has encountered numerous roadblocks. The American people have been so long educated in the constitutional principle of separation of church and state that up to the present they have shied away from laws that would destroy this bastion of liberty. During the Colonial days, before the framing of the Constitution, demands for Sunday observance laws rested on purely religious grounds. Those laws referred to Sunday as the “Sabbath” or the “Lord's day.” There was no need, and therefore no attempt was made, to disguise the religious aspect of Sunday laws. However, today it is different. The religious flavor of Sunday laws must be camouflaged or they would not be palatable to millions of Americans. Therefore, the proponents of Sunday laws have removed the religious label from Sunday legislation and have attached a counterfeit by calling Sunday a civil institution and Sunday laws civil laws! This is a very clever maneuver, but full of ominous significance to those minorities who regard a day other than Sunday as the Sabbath.

The most common and most disarmingly deceptive argument in favor of Sunday laws is to call them a health measure, designed to provide all Americans with one day of rest in seven. This is a shrewd stratagem designed to conceal the religious issue. The Sunday law advocates are willing to go along with this camouflage if it will help to achieve their objective. Except that more people rest on it than on any other day, Sunday, in and of itself, is no more a day of rest than any other day of the week. A man can rest just as well on Saturday as on Sunday. The Orthodox Jews, Seventh-day Adventists, and Seventh Day Baptists are suffering no ill effects physically by resting on Saturday rather than on Sunday. Medical science has given us no evidence that rest taken on Sunday is superior to rest taken on any other day.

A Good Substitute for Sunday Laws

If Sunday law advocates were really concerned about the health of Americans they would accept an alternative rest law which would not conflict with the principle of separation of church and state, namely, a one-day-in-seven rest law, with each citizen free to choose for himself which day that should be. Such a plan has been adopted in some States because it does not discriminate against majority or minority rights.

1. The provisions of such a law declare that every person employed or engaged in any occupation of labor, business, or profession is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven. That no employer of labor can require his employees to work more than six days in seven, and furthermore, that the law in no sense should be construed at setting up the religious observance of the one-day in-seven rest.
2. A one-day's-rest-in-seven law recognizes the constitutional rights of all people in the State, whether or not as a matter of religious belief they observe Sunday, Saturday, or Friday, or some other day of the week as their day of worship or rest or recreation.
3. A one-day's-rest-in-seven law does not give legal preference or sanction to any religious belief or to the sacred day of any one particular religion, and therefore it avoids the pitfalls of religious legislation, permitting a spirit of harmonious cooperation between majority and minority religious groups.
4. A one-day's-rest-in-seven law permits the majority to rest on Sunday if they desire, and permits minority groups to adhere to their religious convictions without legal or economic discrimination.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Sunday Laws Are Religious Laws

The proponents of Sunday laws, however, are not content with the one-day-in-seven laws. They want the State to set aside Sunday as the official rest day, still declaring that it is in the interest of the citizens' health to do so. Despite their declarations, it is crystal clear that the real purpose behind this Sunday law agitation is not health, but the belief that such a law will stem the tide of crime and moral corruption. These Sunday law agitators must certainly know that people's hearts and characters cannot be changed by legislation.

Besides, when a State enacts and enforces a Sunday law, it renders less distinct the line of demarcation between church and state, giving the State police power over the individual conscience. The State, of course, can decide to grant exemptions to those observing an-other day than Sunday, but the State can also withdraw these exemptions whenever it thinks it expedient to do so. This unfortunately has often been the case.

Perhaps some readers will ask: "Do you not believe in majority rule?" To this we would answer Yes and No. In politics Yes. In matters of conscience No. The conscience of the minority is just as sacred and inviolate as the conscience of the majority. Everyone knows that the majority needs no law to protect its rights in matters of conscience. It is the minority that needs such protection, and this is exactly what the American Constitution provides. It is the State's function to safeguard the inalienable rights of the minority against encroachments by the majority. "When a State condemns an individual for breaking a Sunday law, it is arrogating to itself the work of a judge in matters of conscience, which is the prerogative of God alone.

Supreme Court Ruling on Sunday Laws

Minority rights suffered a terrific setback when the United States Supreme Court, in 1961, ruled that Sunday has lost its religious connotation with most Americans and has become a well-established civil holiday. Because of this ruling by the Supreme Court, the States are free to enact Sunday laws as civil statutes.

"There is no dispute that the original laws which dealt with Sunday labor were motivated by religious forces," said Chief Justice Earl Warren in the United States Supreme Court's Sunday law decision (*McGowan v. Maryland*). But the Chief Justice went on to say that these laws have now taken on a secular connotation—that is, they are no longer religious laws.

Well, let us take a look at the wording of a few of these so-called civil laws. The term "Lord's Day"—hardly secular—appears in the Sunday laws of Georgia, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire. "Sabbath day" is found in the laws of Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Washington, West Virginia. New Jersey improves the term to "Christian Sabbath," and adds a prohibition against "worldly employment."

"Worldly activity," "secular business," "secular calling," "secular work," appear in the codes of Delaware, Connecticut, Michigan, Vermont, Virginia.

"Sabbath breaking" or "desecration of the Sabbath day" is found in the codes of Missouri, New York, Oklahoma, and Wyoming.

Maryland uses "profane the Lord's day," and New York and Oklahoma speak of "holy time." Despite all this, the Court maintained that Sunday laws are not religious laws; that they are merely social and secular in character. Let us grant, for a few moments, that the religious terms in the Tennessee Sabbatarians in chain gang for the "crime" of working their farms on Sunday. This happened in the nineteenth century.

Sunday laws are simply relics of bygone days and that the leading "secular" and "social" organizations are merely pushing for Sunday observance—or should we say Sunday repose? Look at the organizations that are working for Sunday laws:

Organizations Backing Sunday Laws

"First there is the Roman Catholic Church, which has emerged within the past three or four years as the champion of Sunday observance. From Portland, Oregon, where merchants of all faiths and no faiths have been pressured to close their shops and stores on Sunday, comes a sample of Catholic thinking behind their drive for Sunday closing. Stores should be closed on Sunday—Life magazine quoted the archbishop

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

of Portland, the Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, as saying—because ‘selling or shopping on Sunday is a sin violating the biblical injunction: “the seventh day is the Sabbath. Every one that shall do any work on this day shall die.”

“Then there are the Protestant churches, whose Sunday law thermometer runs from lukewarm to hot. Behind most drives for Sunday law enforcement is the local ministerial association with a plea to preserve Sunday as a day of ‘worship and prayer.”

“And there are specialized organizations, such as the Lord’s Day Alliance, that recognize ‘the commercial and profane use of the Lord’s Day as a sin which can have profound results in our national life,’ and ask that ‘church members give encouragement to the enactment of such legislation as will protect the Lord’s Day from commercialism.’

“Of course, there are in addition genuinely secular or social organizations whose support of Sunday laws is not motivated by religion—the downtown merchant associations that are protecting themselves against discount houses; and labor unions that are looking toward a shorter—and shorter—work week. But even these organizations recognize the strength of the religious establishment behind Sunday laws.”

“Politicians, too, support Sunday-closing laws with a bow to-ward the altar. Witness Governor David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania —whose State Sunday law speaks of ‘worldly employment’ and the ‘Lord’s Day’—who is reported by the press to have called for an end to ‘Sabbath desecration’ in his State. To desecrate means to ‘disregard the sacredness of.’ “—Editorial, Liberty, November-December, 1961. Pray tell, just how religious does a law have to get to be religious?

Supreme Court v. Dr. Leo Pfeffer

By what process of reasoning did the Supreme Court majority arrive at its far-reaching decision? Sunday, they decided, is a day apart from all the other days of the week. The cause is irrelevant. The fact exists. That it is a religious holy day for the majority of the community was held by the Justices to be of no consequence. Sunday, said they, is a civil, even if also a religious institution, and, therefore, compulsory rest on that day may be legislated for civil reasons. Thus did the Supreme Court throw the minority rights to the wolves when it declared Sunday laws to be constitutional. In rebuttal, we quote Dr. Leo Pfeffer, distinguished authority on constitutional law:

“Sunday law statutes are unconstitutional because they in effect establish the first day of the week as the Lord’s day or as the official day of rest contrary to the religious faith of minority groups within the state, and therefore restrict the freedom of religious groups which observe Friday or Saturday or any other day than Sun-day as their day of sacred rest. Blue laws deny members of such faiths, and non religionists, equal protection of the law. The religious character of Sunday legislation and its discrimination in the field of religion as well as its discrimination in favor of certain business enterprises make such legislation an invalid exercise of the police power of the state.

“Sunday laws are religious laws and their enforcement is there-fore beyond the competence of a state constitutionally enjoined from enacting any law respecting an establishment of religion. Even if a Sunday law be deemed a welfare law it unconstitutionally restrains the religious freedom of persons impelled by conscience to observe a day other than Sunday as their weekly day of rest.”

“In the Everson case and again in the McCollum case, supra, the Supreme Court spelled out the meaning of the non-Establishment clause in the following definitive language:

“Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or unbelief, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect “a wall of separation between church and State.”

That wall is being breached and Sunday laws like an avalanche are descending upon us and making criminals of innocent, God-fearing Americans. Some of these laws have been on the statute books

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

of various States for a couple of centuries, and as they did in the 1880's, they are plaguing honest, law-abiding citizens today. Let us go back a few decades:

The year was 1889. The setting: Judge J. A. Barker's court-room in Obion County, Tennessee. Farmer R. M. King, a Seventh-day Adventist, is accused of plowing his field on Sunday, which was forbidden by a State blue law. The judge has already ruled that King is a criminal. The closing moments of the case have arrived. The atmosphere is charged with electricity. Onlookers converse excitedly. The judge pounds his gavel:

"Quiet! Quiet! There will be order in this court. Now, then, the law is clear. The court charged it properly. Laws are to be obeyed; and Mr. King and all other men should and must obey them or leave the country. I make these remarks that all may know that I intend to have the laws strictly enforced in the future."

Now the poor farmer speaks in his defense:

"I am here before this court to answer for my faith. I love my neighbors; I have good neighbors. It has never been my intention to annoy them. Now, I am a poor man; yet I am willing for this jury to pronounce me guilty if they see fit. But if they think a fine should be imposed, I am unable to pay my fine; and when I go to jail, my family is without means, without flour."

Nevertheless King was fined a total of \$87.85. That was an enormous fine for a poor farmer in those days. Is the lesson of the King case really relevant today? Where do we stand three quarters of a century later? Let us see what is transpiring in this our much-heralded "enlightened" twentieth century.

5. The Twentieth Century Resurrects Blue Laws

THE ANCIENT blue laws have come alive and are on the march all over the land. To exhaust all the cases of prosecution resulting from the blue law violations would fill volumes. Here are just a few instances typical of a host of harassment visited upon admittedly patriotic, loyal American citizens in this twentieth century because of Sunday blue laws:

The year was 1962. The place: New York City. The accused for violating the Sunday law is Mr. Pam, a pious Orthodox Jew who locks his store at sundown every Friday and does not open it again until Sunday morning. A few minutes after 10:00 AM, Sunday, July 11, 1962, while he was selling a can of tuna fish and a jar of baby food to a woman customer, he walked Patrolman James J. Dalton. He promptly spied the business transaction and wrote out a summons. The charge: violating of the New York Sabbath Law which limits the Sunday sale of cooked and pre-prepared foods (including canned foods) to the hours before 10:00 AM and between 4:00 and 7:30 PM.

Let us take another case. The year was again 1962. The accused, Howard C. Lund. He doesn't look like a criminal. He doesn't talk like a criminal. He doesn't act like one. But he nevertheless ended up in a New York City courtroom. An employee of Faith for Today, a religious telecast of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, he was operating a press on Sunday, January 7, 1962. He operated the press for the extra hours without additional pay. And he did it after having rested on the seventh-day Sabbath.

The officer who arrested him, was, of course, being paid. He earned his money by filing a complaint that concluded: "wherefore deponent prays that the defendant be dealt with according to law." He was. By a 2 to 1 vote the judges held that section 2144 of the New York code, which exempts "persons observing another day as a Sabbath" if they "disturb no one," provided Mr. Lund with a "complete statutory defense."

It is to be regretted that law-abiding citizens can be haled into court for doing that which is legal—and even praiseworthy—on all days other than Sunday.

A Case of Discrimination Against a Sabbath keeper

The year was 1964. Mrs. R. is discharged by her employer because she will not work on Sunday for conscientious reasons. Unable to find work with Sunday off, she applies for unemployment compensation and gets it, because "available for work," a requisite for compensation, is held not to require her to be "available for work on Sunday."

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

In the same State of South Carolina, a Mrs. Sherbert of Spartan-burg, a Seventh-day Adventist—a Sabbath keeper—is dismissed by her employer because she refused to work on Saturday, which, she explained to him, had been set aside by God as His Sabbath.

Mrs. Sherbert tried to find employment elsewhere, but all required Saturday work. She was compelled therefore to file her claim for unemployment compensation benefits with the South Carolina Employment Security Commission. She was denied these benefits because she refused to accept employment involving Saturday labor. She appealed to the courts but they upheld the decision of the Commission. While the South Carolina law protected Sunday-keepers, no law protected Mrs. Sherbert's right to "conscientiously" refuse Saturday work. She appealed to the United States Supreme Court.

During the hearing, Associate Justice Brennan asked Daniel R. McLeod, attorney general of South Carolina: "Say that two persons refuse, on the basis of conscience, to work; one on Saturday, the other on Sunday. Both apply for unemployment compensation. Does one get it and the other not?" The answer was Yes.

Then Justice Goldberg asked: "In terms of 'available work,' are you not . . . discriminating between those who observe Sunday and those who observe Saturday?" It was a clear case of discrimination, and the Supreme Court ruled in Mrs. Sherbert's favor.

Sabbath keepers Harassed

In Philadelphia five Orthodox Jewish merchants brought a suit before a special Federal court against Pennsylvania's Sunday blue laws. They contended, and justly so, that enforcement of these laws would violate their religious liberty since they observe Saturday as their Sabbath. It also would require them to remain closed two days a week, they said, which they cannot afford in this highly competitive age. The court dismissed the suit and declared itself in full accord with the reasoning and conclusion of another Federal tribunal that earlier upheld the constitutionality of these laws.

In Baltimore a man was spied upon by his neighbor and was reported for pressing his trousers in his home on Sunday. He was arrested and fined. Again in Baltimore, a delicatessen proprietor was fined \$360 for selling perishable goods, while almost next door food and drug stores were allowed to sell "necessities" like tobacco and cigarettes.

In Massachusetts three Seventh-day Adventists were arrested and fined for painting the interior of a house on Sunday. They had kept Saturday, and there was an exemption clause in the law that covered their case. In Nebraska eight boys caught pitching horseshoes on Sunday on a vacant lot near Lincoln, were fined \$5 and costs each.

In New Jersey the borough council of Linden brought indictments against a Jewish congregation for conducting a religious procession through the streets of the town on Sunday. Against a Jewish butcher for delivering meat on Sunday; and against a woman past sixty years of age for carrying seven apples from a neighbor's home to her own on Sunday morning.

In New York City a Jewish baker was charged with violating the Sunday law because he sold rolls on Sunday, after sacredly keeping the seventh-day Sabbath. In Tennessee a Seventh-day Adventist was found guilty and fined for hoeing corn on Sunday three miles from the public road and a mile and a half from any house, and so on ad infinitum.

In Little Rock, Arkansas, not long ago a Seventh-day Adventist merchant, Doyle Davis, said he would have to go out of business if forced to close his store on Sunday after religiously keeping Saturday as the Sabbath. "If I cannot operate six days a week like every other businessman does, then I'll have to get out."

His comment was made after Little Rock municipal court Judge Quinn Glover said he did not believe that Mr. Davis' constitutional rights were being denied him by the local Sunday laws, "since no type of sectarian religion is being forced upon him and he is totally free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience." Free? The judge must have meant that he was free to go out of business or carry on at the cost of approximately one sixth of his income.

The judge said he saw "a grave danger in setting such a precedent whereby other businesses might claim the same exemptions on the grounds of religious conviction, or non religious groups might say that they were being forced in the closing of their shops."

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

The Tyranny of the Majority

He further stated that he believed all citizens should abide by the laws accepted by a “majority of the people under a democracy.” Evidently to Judge Quinn Glover a man’s religion along with his politics is subject to majority vote, which is exactly the kind of laws that caused millions to leave their Old World homelands for America—where a man’s religion was entirely a matter between him and his God. What is happening to minority rights in this fair land of ours?

Some time ago Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania signed a bill hiking the fine for Sunday law violation from \$4 to \$100 for the first offense and \$200 for the second. Explained the governor: “There has been growing dissatisfaction in the disturbance of Sunday observance. I am signing the bill because I think it represents the will of the majority of our people that Sunday be observed as a day of rest.” No mention was made of the rights of the minority.

“The majority wants it that way,” said the governor. “The majority rules” is the battle cry of Sunday law promoters. It is from that quarter—from the majority—that persecution of dissenting minorities will come. In that same State of Pennsylvania, its founder, William Penn, spent much of his life resisting the will of the majority when it sought to coerce his conscience. Penn himself was arrested after his return to England for riding horseback on a business errand on Sunday, and as a matter of principle, chose to go to jail rather than to pay the fine.

In a number of the colonies it was the will of the majority that consigned to Gehenna and to the whipping post Catholic priests, Quakers, witches, users of profanity, absentees from church services, et cetera. In Colonial New York the first persecution of which we have any record occurred in 1655, when the Dutch who were then in the majority charged a Jewish merchant, Abraham de Lucena, with violating the law by keeping his store open during the Sunday sermon (A. V. GOODMAN, *American Overture*, p. 88). Do we want a repetition of this type of majority domination, only multiplied a thousand times?

Sunday Laws Gender Racial Conflicts

Most Americans—Christian and non-Christian alike—deplore anti-Semitism, and would gladly nip it in the bud wherever it raises its ugly head. Yet, these same Americans want rigorously enforced Sunday laws that seriously disrupt the Orthodox Jews’ social, commercial, and religious life! In Nebraska the Jews recently mobilized to kill a threatening Sunday law sponsored by Protestants.

In New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts the battle line between Jew and Christian has been rather sharply drawn over Sunday sales of kosher foods, and over other issues. In Atlantic City citizens held a meeting, led by Finkle, Fiere, Councilman Isaac Goldberg, and Abe Roth, to inaugurate the raising of \$ 10,000 to combat a Sunday law bill.

More Sunday laws—and they multiply very fast—only further glut our courts already swamped with cases ranging from over parking to murder. These laws would make criminals of law-abiding citizens who happen to be religious nonconformists. What has happened to “equal protection of laws” if Jews and other minority groups must give account to the governments of the various States for the personal use they make of the so-called Lord’s day?

In this chapter we have cited a few instances of harassment of Sunday blue law violators. Thousands more of such cases could be mentioned if space permitted. There is little or no evidence to prove that Sunday laws accomplished the objectives for which their advocates worked so zealously—namely, to improve the morals of society and cause everyone to worship on the same day of the week. If Sunday laws are retained on the statute books, they are certain to be clubs in the hands of bigots to coerce the consciences of free Americans in the future as they have been in the past.

The un-American and unchristian nature of Sunday legislation is seen in bold outline in the light of this statement by a great American patriot and former Vice-President of the U.S.A., Richard M. Johnson: “The proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike.”

“The Jews who in this country are as free as Christians, and entitled to the same protection from the laws, derive their obligation to keep the Sabbath day from the fourth commandment of their Ten Commandments. It is not the legitimate province of the Legislature to determine what religion is true, or what is false. Our Government is a civil and not a religious institution. Our constitution recognizes in every

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

person the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation.”—American States Papers, pp. 210, 211.

6. Which Day Did God Appoint as the Sabbath?

THE STRONGEST and deepest motivations of the human soul have their roots in religion. In the past, millions of martyrs were willing to lay down their lives for their faith. In this twentieth century also there are men and women who would sooner die than to profane the seventh-day Sabbath, commonly called Saturday. Why? Because, according to the Scriptures, God Himself set aside the seventh day as a holy day to be kept by the world as a sign of their faith in Him as the Creator of all things. Let us consider this most vital truth of Creation, which is the foundation of all true worship.

The fact of the creation of this universe is the most outstanding doctrine in all Scripture. This is as it should be, for if there had been no Creation, no world would be orbiting in the vast vacuum of space; there would be no life on this planet. We humans would not exist; and instead of the mighty universe there would be but a dismal vacuum of eternal nothingness!

Look up to the starry heavens on a clear, cloudless night. With the naked eye you can see only a few hundred stars. But if you were to scan the heavens through a powerful telescope, you would behold countless millions of these celestial orbs instead of just a few hundred. A world-renowned astronomer has calculated that the universe consists of some 200 billion galaxies like our own Milky Way, with each galaxy composed of billions of suns which are the center of solar systems like our own. Yet each of these constellations and their suns and planets speed on their appointed orbits with such mathematical split-second precision as to suggest that they must have been designed by an omnipotent Creator.

The spacious firmament on high,
With all the blue ethereal sky,
And spangled heavens, a shining frame,
Their great Original proclaim.
The unwearied sun, from day to day,
Does his Creator's power display,
And publishes to every land
The work of an Almighty hand.

How was this vast universe brought into existence? “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. For he spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast” (Psalm 33:6-9).

The Basis of True Worship

How mysterious and awe-inspiring is God's creative power! He utters the word, He gives the command, and lo, a tree, a person, a world, yes, a universe, springs into existence, and all out of nothing! Creation, therefore, is the most sublime self-expression of the Deity. By creating the universe, God displayed His infinite power, and stands revealed as the First Cause, the Fountain of Life, the Author of our very being, the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last.

The awe-inspiring fact that God is our Maker, our Creator, and we but the creatures of His hands, provides the basis of all true religion and worship. Were we privileged to commune face to face with our Maker, and were we reverently to ask Him on what grounds He required our adoration and worship, He would undoubtedly say: “I am your Creator!”

It is God's creator ship of the universe that distinguishes Him from all the false gods and idols invented by man. This is the thought expressed by Jeremiah the prophet in the following inspired scripture: “Thus shall you say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, . . . they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens.” The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting king.” “He has made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and has stretched out the heavens by his discretion” (Jeremiah 10:11, 10, 12).

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Is not such a Being worthy of our honor and worship? He is the source of every material blessing, of every earthly joy. What-ever works of Creation we may behold, whatever our senses may see or feel, whatever we enjoy in this life, all owe their existence to the Creator. Our very power of thought, our consciousness, our capacity to learn and to develop, are some of the gifts we have received from the God of Abraham. This being so, should we not render willing, loving obedience as well as grateful homage to the One in whom “we live, and move, and have our being”? Such worship is a most reasonable service, and a blessed privilege.

The Creator’s Memorial

Every patriotic American celebrates Washington’s and Lincoln’s birthday. Then, too, every city has its statues and monuments to memorialize its great men and the great events of its history. We have our Independence Day, our Flag Day, our Constitution Day, our Memorial Day, et cetera. Should we not expect to find a memorial in honor of the greatest of all events in history—the creation of the world? Most assuredly. And there is such a memorial to God’s creative power. We quote: “He [God] hath made his wonderful works to be remembered” (Psalm 111:4).

And again in Psalm 135:13: “Thy name, O Lord, endures for ever; and thy memorial, O Lord, throughout all generations.”

In order to learn what this divinely established memorial is, we must study the record of Creation. If we could turn back the hand of time six thousand years, and witness the creation of our little world, how thrilled we would be at the spectacle! We are told in the Bible that as God spoke this planet into existence, the created beings of the other worlds “sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy” (Job 38:7).

Archeology and Genesis

Since the book of Genesis contains the inspired record of Creation, it will be of interest to the reader to learn what impact archeological discoveries have made on the credibility of that book. Although archeology is relatively still one of the youngest of sciences, it has already accomplished a monumental work in confirming the factualness and trustworthiness of the Biblical record. In this substantially agree Albright, Nelson Glueck, Sukenik, Sayce, Unger, and others. Concerning Moses’ record of the Creation we quote the following:

“It is quite plain that the processes used by God in creation were utterly different from the processes which now operate in the universe! The Creation was a unique period, entirely in-commensurate with this present world. This is plainly emphasized and reemphasized in the divine revelation which God has given us concerning Creation.”—JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR., AND HENRY M. MORRIS, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 223.

“The Babylonian inscriptions and the records of Genesis evidently give us two forms of primitive traditions and facts concerning the beginning of the universe and man. These are not traditions peculiar to Semitic peoples and religions. . . . They are traditions common to all civilized nations of antiquity. Their common elements point to a time when the human race occupied a common home and held a common faith. . . . The Genesis account is not only the purest, but everywhere bears the unmistakable impress of divine inspiration when compared with the extravagances and corruption of other accounts.”—MERRILL F. UNGER, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 37. (Italics supplied.)

The Creator’s Memorial Instituted

In the first chapter of Genesis we learn that on the first day God created that mysterious something we call “light.” On the second day the life-giving electrifying atmosphere, or air, appeared. On the third day the dry land emerged out of the pristine waters, and vegetation sprang forth out of the ground. On the fourth day God made two great lights, the sun and the moon, “the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.” On the fifth day God created the water animals and the fowls, and on the sixth day, the land animals. And last of all, man, the crowning work of Creation, was formed out of the elements of the earth.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

With the bringing into existence of man, the work of Creation was completed. As the sun went down on the sixth day, the record says that “God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good” (Genesis 1:31). Mark you, it was not merely good, but very good; it was perfect.

However, one thing remained yet to be done. This great event of Creation must needs be memorialized and perpetuated in the memories of the human race for its own spiritual and moral uplift, and for its physical well-being. This the Creator proceeded to do in the following manner:

“And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.

“And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made” (Genesis 2:2, 3).

Here are several facts which cannot be successfully contradicted: First, the fact of there being a Creator. Neither this world nor the universe is the result of mere chance, or the product of blind, irresponsible forces. God is their Maker. Second, this world was created in six literal days, each day consisting of an evening and morning, the same as we have it at the present time. Third, God rested, blessed, and sanctified, or set apart for sacred use, not just any one day in seven, but the seventh day, for an everlasting memorial of His completed work of Creation.

Why was it necessary for God to rest on the seventh day? Certainly not because He was weary or exhausted. We read in Isaiah 40:28 that God “faints not, neither is weary.” By resting on the seventh day, the Creator sought to invest the Sabbath day with the dignity and distinction which this divine memorial deserves. To illustrate: I had the opportunity some time ago to visit the palatial residence of one of the wealthiest men of our day. After being ushered into the sleeping quarters of this great financier, I was shown the very bed on which this man of wealth had rested and slept. At times, guests were given the privilege of sleeping in that bed; this they considered a great honor. And why? Simply because the famous man had rested in it.

In like manner God blessed and sanctified the seventh day because it was on the seventh day that “he rested, and was refreshed” (Exodus 31:17). The seventh-day Sabbath is, therefore, honored above the other six days of the week, and it is indeed a great privilege for us to rest on the identical seventh day on which the Creator rested. God still further distinguished the seventh day above the other six days by pronouncing His blessing upon that day. He did not bless any of the other six days, but He did bless the seventh day, which is the Sabbath; and we are told that this blessing is to endure throughout all eternity, “for thou blesses, O Lord, and it shall be blessed for ever” (1 Chronicles 17:27).

God not only rested on the seventh day and blessed it but we read that He also “sanctified it.” To sanctify anything is to make it holy, to appoint it for a holy use. We might ask, What is it that makes the seventh day holy? The fact that God rested, blessed, and sanctified the seventh day is what makes it holy. God bids us “to keep it holy.”

It is significant to note that we are not commanded “Remember the Sabbath, to keep it holy,” but “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it [the day] holy.” When God made the Sabbath He used as His material the seventh day. The Sabbath is not something that God added on to the seventh day. It is the day itself. The Sabbath, therefore, cannot be shifted about and placed on any other day, for the two—the Sabbath and the seventh day—are inseparable, they are one.

The Sabbath was made for all time. It was established by God at Creation, and confirmed at Mount Sinai when with a clear, loud voice the Lord incorporated the Sabbath commandment into the very heart of the Ten Commandments, thus making the Sabbath doubly immutable, a perpetual sign of His creative power. Well has the psalmist written: “All his [God’s] commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever” (Psalm 111:7, 8).

When the present reign of sin is ended, and God’s everlasting kingdom of truth and righteousness is established, the blessed seventh-day Sabbath will still be sacredly observed by the nations of the saved as an everlasting memorial to God’s creative power, as stated in Isaiah 66:22, 23:

“For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, said the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain.

“And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, said the Lord.”

Can we know with absolute certainty that the seventh day, commonly known as Saturday, is chronologically the true seventh day? This vital question is answered in the next chapter.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

7. Is Saturday the True Historic Seventh Day?

THERE are skeptics and others—particularly those who have an ax to grind—who are seeking to create the impression that in the course of the centuries there have occurred slips and irregularities in the reckoning of days. That the weekly cycle has been tampered with; and that, consequently, it is impossible to know with absolute certainty which is the true, chronological seventh day of the week. If these skeptical views had any basis in fact, it would imply that Jews and other Sabbatarians cannot prove beyond the shadow of a doubt, that Saturday, the day which they sanctify as the Sabbath, is the correct, historic seventh day of the week.

We shall presently see that these assertions by skeptics are nothing but intellectual smog that dissipates into thin air just as soon as the sunlight of factual truth is focused upon it. Let us first establish which day of the original Creation week was appointed as the Sabbath. On this the Mosaic record is clear:

“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made” (Genesis 2:1-3).

Here we have the inspired record of the origin of the week and of the seventh-day Sabbath that crowned the first week of time. It is the only plausible explanation of how the weekly cycle was set in motion, for there is nothing in the planetary sphere to suggest a week of seven days. The origin of the year, month, and day can be traced to the movements of the planets. The year marks the time it takes for the earth to complete its circuit around the sun. The month corresponds to one revolution of the moon around the earth. The twenty-four-hour day equals a complete rotation of the earth around its axis. No such astronomical basis can be found for the weekly cycle. Its existence can only be explained by the divine decree that ordained the seven-day cycle.

Weekly Cycle Unbroken at Time of the Exodus

We have already considered the origin of Creation week. From Creation to the exodus of Israel out of Egypt there was a period of 2,500 years. Did there occur any break in the weekly cycle during that time? No, indeed. Following the Exodus, during the forty-year sojourn of Israel in the wilderness, God performed three miracles each week to point out and identify His Sabbath.

The people were commanded to gather a portion of manna each day, sufficient to supply their daily needs. Any surplus decayed and bred worms on the following day. On the sixth day, however, God gave them the bread of two days and instructed them to gather twice as much in order that they might have a sufficient supply for the following day, which was the Sabbath. The record says of the extra portion that “it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none” (Exodus 16:24-27). Thus we learn that for 2,080 consecutive weeks God performed this threefold miracle—the double supply of manna on the sixth day, the preservation of it on the Sabbath day, and the withholding of it on that same seventh day—in order to settle forever the question as to which is the true and original Sabbath day of Creation.

Furthermore, God spoke the Ten Commandments in thunder tones from Mount Sinai, and enshrined the Sabbath commandment in the very heart of the ten! We quote:

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shall thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shall not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it” (Exodus 20:8-11).

This divine proclamation from the summit of Mount Sinai is proof positive that there had been no interruption of the weekly cycle during the twenty-five centuries following Creation. Had there occurred any error in the reckoning during that period, God would certainly have revealed it to Moses and Israel. Instead, He reaffirmed the seventh-day Sabbath as the memorial of Creation.

From the time of the Exodus to our day, a period of some 3,500 years, no record whatever can be found anywhere of the disruption of the weekly cycle. During this long period the Jewish nation, despite its many wanderings and vicissitudes, has been a zealous guardian of the inviolability of the weekly cycle. Josephus, the ancient Jewish historian, wrote:

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

“Above the roof of the priests’ chambers [in the Temple] it was the custom for one of the priests to stand and to give notice, by sound of trumpet, in the afternoon of the approach, and on the following evening of the close, of every seventh day, announcing to the people the respective hours for ceasing work and for resuming their labors.”—The Jewish War (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), volume 4, pages 171, 173.

There is perfect agreement among all the segments of Judaism today that the weekly cycle and the seventh-day Sabbath have been preserved intact through the centuries by the Jewish nation. The Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform synagogues may differ among themselves as to what constitutes the essence of Judaism. They may disagree as to the exact manner in which the Sabbath should be observed; but there is perfect unanimity among them as to when it should be observed, namely, from Friday sundown to Saturday sundown.

Calendar Changes Have Not Affected the Weekly Cycle

There are some people who are of the opinion that calendar reforms have through the ages disrupted the weekly cycle. There is, however, not a particle of truth in this. While it is true that there have occurred changes in the calendar, from the time of Ptolemy till our era, those changes did not in the least affect the continuity of the weekly cycle. Since the advent of Christianity there has been but one significant reform of the calendar, namely, from the Julian to the Gregorian, now universally observed, but which was adopted in different countries at varying periods.

The Julian calendar came into use during the reign of Julius Caesar, and is named after him. It was instituted in 46 BC, and was in use for fifteen centuries in practically the entire civilized world. The Julian calendar was based on the assumption that the earth completed its yearly cycle around the sun in $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, whereas in actuality this circuit is accomplished in a little less time, namely, eleven minutes and a few seconds less than $365\frac{1}{4}$ days. By the sixteenth century this discrepancy between the Julian calendar and the actual solar cycle amounted to ten days. By that time the vernal equinox, which should always occur on March 21, fell on March 11. Pope Gregory XIII was induced to make the necessary change in the reckoning of the days of the month in order to synchronize the calendar with the solar cycle. He authorized dropping ten days from the calendar on Friday, October 5, 1582, by calling that same Friday, October 15. That is all that was done. Friday was still Friday and the following day was still Saturday, but instead of it being Saturday, October 6, it was Saturday, October 16. The weekly cycle was not disturbed by the change.

Spain, Portugal, and Italy adopted the new calendar at once. France instituted it later in the same year by calling December 10, December 20. The Netherlands adhered to the Julian calendar until AD 1700. Denmark and parts of Germany introduced the change about the same time. England adopted it in 1752. Russia, Greece, Romania, and Turkey instituted the new calendar in the early part of this century.

The Blank-Day Calendar Proposal

In the year 1929 Congress was debating the practicability of the so-called Eastman calendar that involved “blank” days and which, if adopted, would have definitely broken up the weekly cycle. A spirited debate ensued on the floor of Congress around the calendar issue. The most outspoken and vigorous opponent of the blank-day calendar was the late Congressman Sol Bloom, of New York City. Pleading for the preservation of the historic weekly cycle, Bloom declared:

“All historic and astronomical facts bear proof that none of the changes made at any time in the calendar by Ptolemy, Julius Caesar, Augustus Caesar, or Pope Gregory XIII affected the days of the weekly cycle but only the days of the months and the days of the yearly cycle. As reliable an authority as the Encyclopaedia Britannica states (page 664 in article called “Calendar,” under “Week”):

“The week is a period of seven days, having no reference whatever to the celestial motions—a circumstance to which it owes its unalterable uniformity. Although it did not enter into the calendar of the Greeks, and was not introduced at Rome till after the reign of Theodosius, it has been employed from time immemorial in almost all eastern countries. And those who reject the Mosaic recital will be at a loss, as Delambre remarks, to assign to it an origin having much semblance of probability.”

“The days of the weekly cycle have never been disturbed in any calendar changes which have been made. The Jewish race which has been strict in its observance of the seventh day Sabbath as long as

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

history can recall, has never altered its observance of the Sabbath day on the seventh day of the week.”—
From the Congressional Record, Tuesday, June 11, 1929.

A Prominent Rabbi's Testimony

For the promotion of the above-named calendar reform a sizable fortune was spent by the late George Eastman of Kodak fame. Arguments in favor of that blank-day calendar ranged from the sublime to the ridiculous, mostly the latter. For instance, a Mr. Marvin and a Mr. Cotsworth, who master-minded that calendar plan, asserted that Moses instituted a blank-day calendar for the children of Israel. Strange as it may seem, these two calendar re-form promoters based their preposterous claim on the writings of a prominent and learned rabbi, Dr. Julian Morgenstern.

**NAVY DEPARTMENT
U. S. NAVAL OBSERVATORY
WASHINGTON, D. C.
12 March 1932
Inclosures. 2.**

Dear Sir:
Your letter of 25 February, 1932, containing questions on the continuity of the weekly cycle is at hand.

As to Question (1) - I can only state that in connection with the proposed simplification of the calendar, we have had occasion to investigate the results of the works of specialists in chronology and we have never found one of them that has ever had the slightest doubt about the continuity of the weekly cycle since long before the Christian era.

As to Question (2) - There has been no change in our calendar in past centuries that has affected in any way the cycle of the week.

As to Question (3) - The answer is implied in the answer given to question (1).

Through the courtesy of the Superintendent, Captain Hellweg, I am inclosing an article on Calendar Reform, published by Admiral Upham, that might be of interest to you.

I am also returning your very interesting debate with Mr. Eastman. It was very considerate of you, for which, I thank you.

James Robertson,

**Mr. F.D.Nichol, Director American Ephemeris. The Advent Review & Sabbath Herald,
Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.**

Facsimile of U.S. Naval Observatory reply to an inquiry pertaining to the continuity of the weekly cycle.

Dr. Morgenstern was immediately approached by a leading Christian Sabbatarian with the question: “Have your researches led you to believe, as do the writers of this pamphlet [Messrs. Marvin and Cotsworth], that Moses devised a perpetual calendar that placed the Sabbath in a fixed relationship to the month, necessitating the existence each year of an extra Sabbath?” (which would have had the effect of destroying the weekly cycle of seven days). Dr. Morgenstern in his answer to the question indignantly denied the allegations of these two men, and we quote him in part:

“I am very happy to be able to assure you that Messrs. Marvin and Cotsworth have used my name in their propaganda for the new calendar entirely without my authorization and knowledge, and that the quotations from my article on The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel apparently altogether misrepresent the

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

facts with regard to the history of the calendar of ancient Israel which I have been able to establish. It is clear, therefore, that the above-named gentlemen have either not troubled to read my article carefully, or, if they did, have not understood it or have not wanted to understand it. Certainly, the facts which they state and the conclusions which they drew from them are altogether unwarranted by my article.” (Dr. Morgenstern’s full reply was published in the Congressional Record, June, 1929.)

Calendars may come and calendars may go, but the weekly cycle rolls on forever. The seventh day was, and is, and ever shall be the only true Sabbath day and memorial of Creation. It is, as we have learned, chronologically the identical Sabbath which God appointed in Eden at the end of Creation week.

The almost universal observance of the weekly cycle is striking evidence of its divine origin. Josephus, the Jewish historian, says of the Sabbath day, “There is not any city, of the Grecians, nor any of the barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever, whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come.”—Josephus Against Apion, book 2, chapter 40 (Whiston translation), page 899.

In his scholarly Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures, T. H. Horne writes: “One of the most striking collateral confirmations of the Mosaic history of the creation, is the general adoption of the division of time into weeks, which extends from the Christian states of Europe to the remote shores of Hindostan, and has equally prevailed among the Hebrews, the Egyptians, Chinese, Greeks, Romans, and northern barbarians. Nations, some of whom had little or no intercourse with others, and were not even known by name to the Hebrews.”—Edition of 1839, volume 1, chapter 3, page 143.

Dr. Lyman Coleman remarks:

“Seven has been the ancient and honored number among the nations of the earth. They have measured their time by weeks from the beginning. The original of this was the Sabbath of God, as Moses has given the reasons for it in his writings.”—Brief Dissertations on the First Three Chapters of Genesis, page 26.

Pagan Rome observed the same seven-day weekly cycle in the following manner:

Dies Solis	Sun’s day	Sunday
Dies Lunas	Moon’s day	Monday
Dies Mattis	Mar’s day	Tuesday
Dies Mercurii	Mercury’s day	Wednesday
Dies Jovis	Jupiter’s day	Thursday
Dies Veneris	Venus, day	Friday
Dies Saturni	Saturn’s day	Saturday

Another striking evidence that the seventh-day Sabbath was well known among the nations of antiquity is the fact that those nations designated the seventh day of the week by the name “Sabbath,” and in our own day many nations still call the seventh day “the Sabbath.” Dr. William Mead Jones, of London, in his A Chart of the Week, lists the names given to the seventh day in 160 languages, ancient and modern, that were used and are still being used in Europe, Asia, and Africa. One hundred eight of these languages, says Dr. Jones, “directly refer to the seventh-day Sabbath.” We list a few of these:

Hebrew	Shabbos
Greek	Sabbaton
Latin	Sabbatum
Arabic	As-sabt
Ethiopic	Senbat—i.e., Sabbath
Russian	Subbota
Polish	Sobota
German	Samstag—i.e., Sabbath
Hungarian	Szombat—i.e., Sabbath
French	Samedi—i.e., Sabbath
Italian	Sabbato
Spanish	Sabado
Portuguese	Sabbado
Hindustani	Shamba—i.e., Sabbath

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Read the Ten Commandments through carefully, and you will find that there is but one commandment in which the Author of the Ten Commandments—the Creator—is mentioned, and that is the Sabbath, or fourth, commandment. Without it we could not prove the identity of the God of the Ten Commandments, for, says the Bible, “there be gods many, and lords many.” The difference between the true God and these false gods is pointed out as follows: “All the gods of the nations are idols: but the Lord made the heavens” (Psalm 96:5). This scripture teaches the great truth that the Creator is the only true God!

If all the world had always kept the true Sabbath day there never would have been a heathen, an infidel, or a skeptic, for the observance of the Sabbath would have been a perpetual reminder and memorial of the Creator.

Read the Sabbath commandment and see if you can discover one essential difference between it and the other nine commandments. There is profound significance in the fact that this is the only commandment of the ten that begins with the word “Remember.” It would seem as if God in His infinite wisdom foresaw that the time would come when virtually all mankind would forget Him, their Creator, and would ignore His Sabbath, the memorial of His Creation. He therefore prefixed the Sabbath commandment with the word “Remember.”

Here is a curious and thought-provoking phenomenon: The world has forgotten its Maker, the Creator Himself. Being omniscient, God knew that this condition would exist, and He has moved upon His true followers everywhere, in this age of prevailing unbelief and infidelity, to reverse this trend. Do you know that thousands of voices around the circle of the earth are today calling on every nation, kindred, tongue, and people to “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy”?

The Creator’s Memorial Supplanted

In order to banish the knowledge of the Creator from the mind of man, some adversary of God and man has beguiled man into changing the Sabbath, the memorial of Creation, to Sunday.

Sunday is the very antithesis of what the Sabbath stands for. It is in no way associated with Creation, nor does it point to the Creator. It is a relic of sun worship. Its very name—Sunday leaves no room for doubt as to its pagan origin. Sun worship is Satan’s favorite method of luring the human race from the worship of the Creator to the worship of idols. Because idolatry is a challenge of God’s authority, He has branded sun worship as the greatest of all abominations. We quote Ezekiel 8, verses 15 and 16: “Then said he [God] unto me, Has thou seen this, O son of man? Turn thee yet again, and thou shall see greater abominations than these. And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord’s house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east. And they worshipped the sun toward the east.”

The substitution of the pagan Sunday for the Sabbath of the Lord robs God of the glory, honor, and homage due Him who is the Creator and Author of every blessing. Civilization cannot long survive while the Creator and His memorial are effaced from the minds of men. Because today men in general have no respect for the highest authority in the universe—the great Creator—and His Sabbath, which is the everlasting memorial of His great work of Creation, it is not to be wondered at that the world should show so little regard for the lesser authority—the laws of the land. Herein lies the basic cause of the epidemic of lawlessness and anarchy which today is threatening the very foundations of society.

Multitudes, both Jewish and Christian, are asking: How did the observance of pagan Sunday take such root in the religious world? Who has dared to strike out the most vital commandment from God’s eternal law and put in its place a counterfeit, thus not only creating schism and confusion in the religious world but dishonoring and insulting the Creator, the Majesty of the universe? The answer to this all-important question will be found in the next chapter.

8. Who Changed the Sabbath Day?

SOMEWHERE in the distant past unholy hands tampered with God’s sacred law, and made the first day of the week the day of rest instead of the seventh day. Who is guilty of this Heaven-defying act?

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

No Scriptural Basis for the Change

Not the slightest authorization for the transference of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday can be found anywhere in the Holy Scriptures. This is freely admitted by leaders in Christendom. The late Cardinal Gibbons declared:

“You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.”—The Faith of Our Fathers, 43d. edition, page 111. (Italics supplied.)

In the Bishop’s Pastoral (Methodist Episcopal), of 1874, this statement occurs:

“The Sabbath instituted in the beginning, and confirmed again and again by Moses and the prophets, has never been abrogated. A part of the moral law, not a jot or tittle of its sanctity has been taken away.”

Dr. R. W. Dale (Congregationalist), in his Ten Commandments, says:

“It is quite clear that, however rigidly or devoutly we may spend Sunday, we are not keeping the Sabbath... The Sabbath was founded on a specific, divine command. We can plead no such command for the obligation to observe Sunday. . . . There is not a single sentence in the New Testament to suggest that we incur any penalty by violating the supposed sanctity of Sunday.”—Pages 127-129.

The Church of England says:

“There is no word, no hint in the New Testament about abstaining from work on Sunday.”—CANON EYTON, The Ten Commandments.

“It is impossible to find in the New Testament the slightest interference by the Savior or His apostles with the original Sabbath, but on the contrary, an entire acquiescence in the original arrangement. Nay, a plenary endorsement [of the seventh-day Sabbath] by Him, whilst living. And an unvaried, active participation in the keeping of that day and no other by the apostles for thirty years after His death, as the Acts of the Apostles [one of the books of the New Testament] has abundantly testified to us.

“Hence the conclusion is inevitable; viz., that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists have the exclusive weight of evidence on their side, whilst the Biblical Protestant has not a word in self-defense for his substitution of Sunday for Saturday.”—The Catholic Mirror, Sept. 9, 1893.

Note the following statement made by a Jesuit priest:

“There is not a word in the Gospels about changing the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday. . . . Those who affirm that the Bible is the sole rule of Faith, should leave off Sunday church-going and worship on the Sabbath, as the Jews do to this day, and as the Old Testament ordains.”—MARTIN J. SCOTT, S.J., Christ’s Own Church, pp. 44, 45.

Jesus Didn’t Change the Sabbath

By both precept and example the Founder of Christianity up-held the sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath. We quote from the Gospel of Luke, chapter 4, verse 16: “And, as his [Jesus’) custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read.”

In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus declared that “till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled” (Matthew 5:18).

Jesus urged His disciples to pray that their flight from Jerusalem, when that city should be besieged by Titus in AD 70, should not occur on the Sabbath day: “Pray you that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day” (Matthew 24:20).

The Apostles Didn’t Change the Sabbath

Simon Peter and all the apostles kept the seventh day. When the Jewish apostle Paul preached to the Gentiles, he honored God’s Sabbath day. The record may be found in the book of Acts, 13:14, 42, 44; 16:13; 17:1, 2; 18:4, 11.

The Early Christians Kept the Seventh-Day Sabbath

Lyman Coleman, theologian and historian, wrote:

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

“Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was wholly discontinued.”—Ancient Christianity Exemplified, chapter 26, section 2, page 527.

Socrates, a Greek church historian of the fifth century, says:

“Almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week.”—Ecclesiastical History, book 5, chapter 22, trans. in ANF, volume 2, page 132.

The Exaltation of Sunday a Gradual Process

The eclipse of the Sabbath and the substitution of Sunday in its place was not sudden, but gradual, caused by the infiltration of paganism into the early Christian church. In his book *The Rest Day*, pages 220, 221, Hutton Webster, Ph.D., describes the change as follows:

“The early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish seven-day week with its numbered weekdays, but by the close of the third century AD this began to give way to the planetary week; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of planetary names by Christians attests to the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism. During these same centuries the spread of Oriental solar worships, especially that of Mithra [Persian sun god], in the Roman world, had already led to the substitution by pagans of dies Solis for dies Saturni, as the first day of the planetary week. Thus gradually a pagan institution was engrafted on Christianity.”

The downgrading of the Sabbath received added impetus by the so-called conversion of Constantine who was the Emperor of Rome from AD 306 to 337. He was a sun worshiper during the first years of his reign, but even when professing Christianity he was still at heart a devotee of the sun. This is what the eminent historian, Edward Gibbon, writes concerning this quasi-Christian ruler: “The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the Sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology. The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine. The Sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.”—*The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chapter 20, paragraph 3.

The earliest Sunday law known to history is that of Constantine, decreed in AD 321. It reads:

“On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain sowing or for vine planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations, the bounty of heaven should be lost.”

The end result of this amalgamation of corrupt Christianity and paganism was Roman Catholicism, and this unnatural blend of Christianity and paganism was the right climate in which the spurious Sabbath-Sunday observance—grew and flourished. The Catholic system and Sunday worship are in some respects parallel terms. Both originated in paganism, and both were grafted upon the Christian church at the same time. They both ruthlessly crushed all opposition, and became dominant factors in Christendom. The pope declared himself to be the successor of Peter, and Sunday the memorial of Christ’s resurrection. Both claims are utterly unfounded in sacred Scripture.

The Roman Catholic Church Admits Guilt

The most convincing testimony of the guilt of a person is his own voluntary confession freely admitting his guilt. Note the following boastful admissions made by Catholics. We quote from *The Convert’s Catechism of Catholic Doctrine*, by the Reverend Peter Geiermann, page 50, second edition, which work received the “apostolic blessing” of Pope Pius X, January 25, 1910.

“Question—Which is the Sabbath day?

“Answer—Saturday is the Sabbath day.

“Question—Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

“Answer—We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (AD 366), transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday.”

We quote from another Catholic source:

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

“Question—Have you any other way of proving that the [Catholic] Church has power to institute festivals of precept?

“Answer—Had she not such power she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority.”—STEPHEN KEENAN, *A Doctrinal Catechism* (approved by the Most Reverend John Hughes, DD, Archbishop of New York), p. 174.

The following two admissions by Roman Catholic authorities are most illuminating. The Catholic Mirror of September 9, 1893, had this to say:

“It is impossible to find in the New Testament the slightest interference by the Savior or His apostles with the original Sabbath. Hence the conclusion is inevitable; viz., that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists have the exclusive weight of evidence on their side. (Italics supplied.)

A letter from Cardinal Gibbons to John R. Ashley, of Rock Hall, Maryland, reads as follows:

“Cardinal’s Residence,
“Baltimore, Md.,
“February 25, 1892.

“John R. Ashley, Esq.

“DEAR SIR: In answer to your first question, directed by the cardinal to reply to your letter, I will say:

“1. Who changed the Sabbath?

“Answer—The holy Catholic Church.

“2. Are Protestants following the Bible or the holy Catholic Church in keeping Sunday?

“Answer—The Protestants are following the custom introduced by the holy Catholic Church.

“3. The Protestants do contradict themselves by keeping Sun-day, and at the same time profess to be guided by the Bible only. “I am,

“Faithfully yours,

“C. F. THOMAS, Chancellor.”

In a letter written in November, 1893, C. F. Thomas, chancellor to Cardinal Gibbons, replying to an inquiry as to whether the Catholic Church claims to have changed the Sabbath, said: “Of course the Catholic Church claims that the change was her act ... and the act is a mark of her ecclesiastical authority in religious things.”

Here is an admission by a popular Catholic publication:

“The [Catholic] Church took the pagan philosophy and made it the buckler of faith against the heathen. She took the pagan Sunday and made it the Christian Sunday. There is, in truth, something royal, kingly about the Sun. Hence the Church in these countries would seem to have said, ‘Keep the old, pagan name: Thus the pagan Sunday became the Christian Sunday.’”—*The Catholic World*, March, 1894 (Eastern issue).

And in our own day Pope John XXIII in an encyclical says:

“The Catholic Church has decreed for many centuries that Christians observe this day of rest on Sunday.”—*Mater et Magistra* (1961), par. 251.

God never gave anyone the authority to change the Sabbath commandment, for it is as eternal as God Himself. By counterfeiting the fourth, or Sabbath, commandment, the Roman Catholic Church has arrogated to itself the authority that belongs to God alone.

Change of the Sabbath a Subject of Prophecy

It is not a mere coincidence that this Heaven-defying act by the Papacy in deleting the Creator’s Sabbath from the Ten Commandments and replacing it by Sunday, a day associated with pagan sun worship, should have been foretold in a prophetic book of the Old Testament. Indeed, it would be inconceivable for the omniscient God not to have foreseen this attempt to eclipse His Sabbath, and

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

substitute a heathen counterfeit in its place. Space will permit quoting only part of Daniel's prophecy, which is most accurately being fulfilled in every detail in the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

“And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time” (Daniel 7:25).

The most God-defying act by a certain professedly religious hierarchy was its striking the seventh-day Sabbath commandment out of the Ten Commandments—the only commandment that points to the Creator as the author of the Ten Commandments.

That this prophecy met its perfect fulfillment in the Papacy is the unanimous agreement of all Protestant Bible commentators. The Papacy has indeed spoken “great words against the most High.” One of the authoritative Catholic works, Ferraris' Ecclesiastical Dictionary, in an article on the pope, says concerning his exalted position: “The Pope is of so great dignity and so exalted that he is not a mere man, but as it were God, and the vicar of God. Whatever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God. The Pope is as it were God on earth.”

In an encyclical letter dated June 20, 1894, Pope Leo XIII uttered these blasphemous words: “We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty.”—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII (New York: Benziger Brothers), p. 304.

The Papacy a Persecuting Power

The prophet Daniel gives us additional earmarks by which we may identify this “man of sin.” “He shall wear out the saints of the most High.” True to the prophetic word, the Roman Catholic Church has worn out, or persecuted, those who refused to accept her false doctrines and delusions. We quote the following authorities concerning these persecutions:

“The ferocious cruelties of the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands; the bloody martyrdoms of Queen Mary's reign; the extinction by fire and sword of the Reformation in Spain and Italy, in Portugal and Poland. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew; the long and cruel persecutions of the Huguenots, and all the infamies and barbarities of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which flung its refugees on every shore of Europe, were perpetrated by Papal Rome. Her victims have been innumerable. In Spain alone Llorente reckons as the sufferers of the Inquisition 31,912 burnt alive, and 291,450 so-called penitents forced into submission ‘by water, weights, fire, pulleys, and screws,’ and ‘all the apparatus by which the sinews could be strained without cracking, and the bones bruised without breaking, and the body racked exquisitely without giving up the ghost.’—H. GRATTAN GUINNESS, D.D., Key to the Apocalypse, pp. 91-94.

“It has been calculated that the Popes of Rome have, directly or indirectly, slain on account of their faith, fifty millions of martyrs; fifty millions of men and women who refused to be parties to Roman idolatries, who held to the Bible as the Word of God.”—GUINNESS, The Approaching End of the Age (London), p. 212.

That the Papacy has persecuted so-called heretics is acknowledged by Roman Catholic authorities themselves. For instance, at the recent Vatican Council, Josef Cardinal Beran, Archbishop of Prague, on September 20, 1965, confessed: “So, in my country, the Catholic Church at this time seems to be suffering expiation for defects and sins committed in times gone by in her name against religious liberty, such as in the fifteenth century the burning of the priest John Huss.”

The papal hierarchy has not only persecuted dissenters but the bloody hands of the Inquisitors have also reached out after the Jews. When Queen Isabella of Spain appointed the priest Torquemada as chief Inquisitor in the year 1483, it marked the beginning of the tragic experience of the Spanish Jews which culminated in their expulsion from Spain in the year 1492.

What was the hierarchy's attitude during Hitler's genocide of the Jews? First, it should be emphasized that many Catholics—German and others—risked their lives to snatch Jewish victims from under the wheels of the Nazi juggernaut. But the official church attitude, from the pope down, during that holocaust is too well known to need any elaboration.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Tampering With the Ten Commandments

The prophet Daniel also predicted that this power would presume to tamper with God's immutable law—the Ten Commandments. We quote: "He shall ... think to change times and laws [in Chaldaic and Hebrew, "the law"}" (Daniel 7:25).

This striking prophecy meets its perfect fulfillment in the Roman Catholic Church. The Papacy has indeed thought to change God's law. Her most daring challenge of God's authority consists, as we have seen, in tampering with the fourth commandment of the Ten Commandments, namely, her attempt to change the holy Sabbath of the Lord. The Papacy has substituted the observance of Sunday—the relic of sun worship—for the divinely ordained seventh-day Sabbath, the everlasting memorial of Creation.

Thus we see that Daniel's prophecy most accurately describes the papal church. There remains now only the time element of the prediction to consider, namely, how long was this apostate religious system to exercise its power and dominion? The last clause of Daniel's prophecy declares, "And they [the saints, the times, and the law of God] shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time" (Daniel 7:25).

In symbolic Bible prophecy "time" is synonymous with one year. The word "time" is used again in Daniel 11:13, 14, and in the original Hebrew says, "At the end of times, even years." So we see that "time" means one year; the word "times" then, means two years, and the "dividing of time" equals a half a year, making a total of three and a half years. A prophetic year in the Bible is composed of 360 days, or 12 months of 30 days each. Reducing the three and a half years to days, totals 1260 days. Since in Bible prophecy a day is a symbol of a year (see Numbers 14:34; Ezekiel 6:4), the papal power, according to Daniel's prophecy, was to hold undisputed sway over the world for 1260 years. It is interesting to note that in the New Testament the same power is spoken of as exercising dominion for "forty and two months" (Revelation 13:5), and "a thousand two hundred and threescore days" (Revelation 12:6). Note that all of these three time prophecies refer to the same power and add up to the same number of years—1260.

As we now consider the accurate fulfillment of this predicted 1260-year period, it should greatly stimulate our faith in the Bible as God's inspired Word. In AD 533 the Roman emperor Justinian elevated the pope as "head of all the holy churches." Five years later, AD 538, the Arian Ostrogoths who then ruled Italy, and who refused to recognize the pope, were defeated in battle, and thus the last obstacle to the papal supremacy was gone. Therefore the 1260-year period of papal domination began with the year 538, and ended in the year 1798 (538 plus 1260 equals 1798).

What is the testimony of history as to what happened to the Papacy in 1798? In that year in February, 1798, Napoleon's general, Berthier, entered Rome and took the pope prisoner. The pope died in exile the following year at Valence, France. For two years thereafter there was no pope, and the world regarded the Papacy as nonexistent. Thus was fulfilled with amazing accuracy the prediction of the Hebrew prophet Daniel concerning that apostate religious system which expunged the true Sabbath of Jehovah from the Ten Commandments and substituted a counterfeit in its place.

The Evil Results of Changing the Sabbath

The above array of facts is not intended as an indictment of individual members of the Roman Catholic Church. We are aware that there are many noble, God-fearing men and women of all faiths who keep Sunday, wholly unaware of its pagan origin. As long as this is true, God accepts their sincere worship. It is our purpose to show that the Holy Scriptures predicted that an apostate power would be guilty of counterfeiting the most vital commandment of the ten, namely, the fourth commandment, which calls on all to worship the Creator of heaven and earth by keeping holy the seventh day, the great memorial of Creation. It is impossible to overstate the evil results of this act of setting aside the Creator and His memorial. Not only does it do away with the remembrance and worship of the Creator from the hearts and minds of men, but it is the principal cause of the religious schisms, the lawlessness and violence, that are rapidly sweeping the world down the road to chaos and self-annihilation.

Since Sunday keeping is the acknowledged offspring of the Papacy and the "mark" of her authority in religious matters, the Catholic Church is anticipating the day when all the world will be compelled to observe this institution of her creation. In recent years the National Catholic Welfare Conference published a book entitled *The Liberal Illusion*, in order to underscore the teachings of Pope Leo XIII on the social order the church is seeking to establish in the world. The book created somewhat of a stir.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Its author, Louis Veuillot, had this to say regarding the Papacy's plan to enforce Sunday observance upon all, including' the unwilling dissenting minority who keep the seventh day as the Sabbath:

“When the time comes and men realize that the social edifice must be rebuilt according to eternal standards, be it tomorrow, or be it centuries from now, the Catholics will arrange things to suit said standards. Undeterred by those who prefer to abide in death, they will re-establish certain laws of life. They will make obligatory the religious observance of Sunday on behalf of the whole of society and for its own good, revoking the permit for freethinkers and Jews to celebrate, incognito, Monday or Saturday on their own account. Those whom this may annoy, will have to put up with the annoyance.”—Page 63 (second printing).

If the reader regards this statement as idle talk or mere wishful thinking, Chapter 11 on the long-range objectives of the Catholic Church should prove most revealing.

9. The Blank-Day Calendar Threat to Eternal Jewish Verities

THE on-again-off-again calendar issue is once more in the news. A bill proposing the adoption of the so-called World Calendar with its blank-day device was recently introduced in the United States Congress. Its sponsors, The World Calendar Association Inc., have the backing of a number of big corporations and business mergers. The Vatican also is currently manifesting more than a passing interest in this brand of reform.

The advocates of this calendar reform are making alluring and extravagant claims for this plan, promising that it will usher into this divided and feuding world an era of peace and harmony—a veritable utopia! One of the leading promoters of the blank-day calendar—Miss Elisabeth Achelis—in her book *The Calendar for the Modern Age*, page 189, claims that by this plan

“Mankind is given a beacon light by which, through the ensuing years and faith in action, he [mankind] can enter into the Golden Age where harmony reigns supreme. Humanity itself will then find itself blessed. Earth will be raised to a higher level and life will reflect WORKABLE WORLD HARMONY!”

Charmed and lured by such promises of an Elysian Garden of Eden and universal peace, the cherished dream of millions, many people have become enthusiastic supporters of this World Calendar. However, it is imperative that we examine the other side of the coin and learn why Jews, Seventh-day Adventists, and others are unalterably opposed to this blank-day scheme.

This controversial calendar has quite a history. It was first advanced in 1834 by a Roman Catholic priest, Abbe Marco Mastrofini, in an effort to develop a calendar with fixed days for annual feasts. This idea was adopted in our century by an Englishman, Moses B. Cotsworth, protege of the late multi millionaire George Eastman, and became known as the Eastman Plan. This calendar consisted of thirteen months of twenty-eight days each and a blank-day device. It was roundly defeated at the League of Nations owing to the combined thumbs-down attitude of the major world powers, the Vatican, world Jewry, and Seventh-day Adventists. As stated in an earlier chapter, this calendar proposal was also overwhelmingly voted down in the United States Congress, as a result of the deter-mined stand taken against it by Jewish leaders such as Sol Bloom, Rabbi Hyamson, et cetera, and the Seventh-day Adventists.

Following the demise of the thirteen-month calendar proposal, Miss Achelis, president of the World Calendar Association Inc., came forward with a twelve-month version of the blank-day principle that was supposed to eliminate all the undesirable features of the defeated thirteen-month plan. Actually, the difference is slight, since the twelve-month version embodies the same blank-day factor as did its predecessor. Under this plan the year would be divided into four equal quarters, each quarter consisting of three months of 31, 30, and 30 days, respectively, making a total of 364 days. By this new arrangement, the 365th day, or Sunday, December 31, would be made a blank day, a zero, unattached to any week or month, and would be known as World Day, to be celebrated as a secular holiday. If adopted, such a calendar would go into effect the year in which January 1 falls on a Sunday, such as the years 1967 and 1978.

For the first twelve months after its inauguration, the new calendar would be the same as the old. But from the last day of that year, which in the old calendar would be Sunday, December 31, the difficulties, the inequities, and the confusion inherent in the blank-day plan would become painfully evident, as we shall presently see.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

You ask, how would this blank-day factor and the resulting disruption of the historic weekly cycle affect the religious world—both Christian and Jewish? Let us find out by accompanying a Mr. and Mrs. Smith, who are accustomed to attend church services on Sunday. On that Sunday morning, December 31, they would be driving to their house of worship, perhaps unaware of the fact that under the new calendar, Sunday, December 31, was nonexistent, that it was counted as a blank day and was to be observed as a secular holiday. Arriving at the church they would see this sign posted on the door:

“NOTICE: THIS CHURCH WILL BE OPEN FOR ‘SUN-DAY’ SERVICES TOMORROW (MONDAY) WHICH IS ‘SUNDAY’ UNDER THE NEW CALENDAR.”

From that day on, the Smiths, like many other Sunday keeping Christians, would be compelled to worship on the synthetic “Sun-day” during that entire year. The following year “Sunday” services would be shifted to Tuesday. If the year after that happened to be leap year, “Sunday” services would be moved to Wednesday during the first six months, and to Thursday the last six months, because of the extra blank day! If the Smiths decided to live by the old historic calendar, they would be out of step with the rest of the world!

But the trying experience of the Smiths under the artificial calendar would have just begun! Not only Sundays, but other holidays, such as Easter, Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year, would be affected. If the Smiths desired to observe these holidays in their true chronological setting, they would again be out of step with the rest of the world! Between those who would go along with the re-form calendar, and those who would follow the old calendar, America would become a house divided against itself!

The adoption of the World Calendar would create more problems than it promises to solve. For instance, on paper the blank-day calendar would create the illusion that there are only 364 days in the year, when in reality there are 365 days, and in leap year 366! The World Calendar is trying to bury the undesirable blank days out of sight, but that just cannot be done. The sun would rise and set on those days, just as it does on other days. Babies would be born on that day; how would they be registered? How old would they be forty-eight hours after their birth on the morning of the blank day? How would birthdays, anniversaries, the fourth of July, and other holidays be observed under the new, controversial calendar? How would wills be interpreted and probated that were made out under the old calendar? It is beyond man’s ability to estimate how many heated arguments, court litigations, and legal entanglements would result from the reformed calendar which, according to its sponsors, is to usher in utopia, the long-looked-for millennium!

Actually it is utterly impossible in our modern world to have a true blank day, which would mean cessation of all activities.

Trains, buses, and airplanes must continue to operate; the mail must be dispatched; filling stations and restaurants must be kept open for business; the police and firemen must be on duty. Of all these activities records must be kept and wages must be paid. What government or large industry can drop a full day out of its reckoning as though it did not exist?

The Blank-Day Calendar and the Sabbath Keepers

Sabbath keepers, both Jewish and non-Jewish, are not opposed to calendar reform per se. They would welcome a constructive calendar that would retain the historic weekly cycle, and such calendar reforms have already been worked out and are ready to be put into operation. But seventh-day Sabbath keepers cannot accept a blank-day calendar, because it would irrevocably break up the weekly cycle.

Sabbath keeping is predicated on the belief that the seven-day weekly cycle was ordained by God at the end of Creation week. The fourth commandment of the Ten Commandments says:

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shall thou labor, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shall not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it” (Exodus 20:8-11).

This commandment as well as the other nine were written on two tables of stone with the finger of God (Exodus 31:18). The Creator Himself conceived and launched the week, which has continued its orderly sequences without a break to this day! (This subject is fully discussed and documented in chapters six and seven.)

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Dr. John Kitto, author of the *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature*, volume 2, page 655, says:

“We find from time immemorial the knowledge of a week of seven days among all nations—Egyptians, Arabians, Indians—in a word, all nations of the East have in all ages made use of this week of seven days, for which it is difficult to account without admitting that the knowledge was derived from the common ancestors of the human race.”

Dr. Lyman Coleman in his *Brief Dissertations on Genesis*, discussing the number “seven” and the measurement of time by weeks, says: “Seven has been the ancient and honored number among the nations of the earth. They have measured their time by weeks from the beginning. The original of this was the Sabbath of God, as Moses has given a reason for it in his writings.”

Just as the fact of ancient Israel’s deliverance from Egyptian bondage is the only plausible explanation for the Jews’ observance of Passover for thirty-five centuries, just so God’s creative act in launching the weekly cycle is the only plausible way we can account for the existence and the universal observance of the weekly cycle. Reason dictates that we accept the Mosaic record of Creation as truth, for truth indeed it is!

The Etymology of the Term “Week”

In an endeavor to disprove the continuity of the weekly cycle, the hard-pressed promoters of the blank-day calendar circulated the fantastic theory that Moses instituted one eight-day week at the end of Shavuot—the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost. A little simple etymology will suffice to prove that this allegation is without basis in fact.

The Hebrew word for “week” is *Shavua*. The Hebrew word for “seven” is *Sheevah*. The reader can see for himself that both words are spelled considerably alike. This is because both have a common root *Sheevah*, meaning “seven.” The term “week” is sometimes used in Scripture to mean “sevenfold” or a unit of seven (see Genesis 29:27), and is also a symbol of purity, completeness, and perfection (see Psalm 12:6). The Hebrew word for “eight” is *Shemoneh*, bearing no resemblance whatsoever to “seven” or “week.” An eight-day week is therefore a contra-diction of terms, and as absurd as it is to say that eight is seven or seven is eight!

Addressing the United States Congress on January 18, 1929, Rabbi Abram Simon, of Washington, DC, said the following in answer to the fantastic and absurd claim that Moses instituted an eight-day week:

“I heard one gentleman tell us what the Jewish calendar was, and how Moses slipped in an extra day. No man who knows any-thing about the Bible, and no man who knows anything about the Jewish calendar can permit such a statement to go unchallenged. It is not true that anywhere in all our 3,500 years of experience have we inserted a day that broke into the continuity of the seven-day week.”

That the week of seven days is a very ancient institution is evident from the book of Genesis, written by Moses thirty-five centuries ago. He records that the seven-day week was already current at the time of the Flood, which took place almost 2,000 years before Moses (see Genesis 7:4, 10; 8:10, 12). A week of festivities was arranged by Laban for Jacob and Leah (Genesis 29:22, 27). This accounts for the Orthodox Jewish custom of holding wedding festivities for seven days. The weekly cycle was observed throughout Israel’s forty-year journey in the wilderness, following their exodus out of Egypt. In all that time the Israelites were not to gather manna on the seventh-day Sabbath (Exodus 16:25-27).

The Blank-Day Calendar—A Deadly Peril to Minorities

If a blank-day calendar ever were to become operative in the United States, it would impose oppressive burdens upon Sabbath keeping Jews and Seventh-day Adventists. Sabbath keeping parents would be fined or imprisoned for refusing to send their children to school when the true seventh-day Sabbath falls on the artificial so-called Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday of the blank-day calendar. To prevent such fines from being imposed upon these parents, legislation would have to be enacted separately in all of the fifty States, and even if this were done, the children of these faithful Sabbath keeping would still lose one day’s instruction each week.

Sabbath keeping would also be affected economically. Since the five-day labor week is now the rule in practically all industries, Sabbath keeping union members would be compelled to rest on the artificial Saturdays and Sundays of the arbitrary calendar, leaving them 3½ to 4 days in which to earn their livelihood! In this highly competitive age this would impose an unfair burden, and untold hardships and

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

deprivations on Sabbath keepers. Religious casualties would be the tragic consequence of a calendar that discriminates against minorities.

Sabbath keeping would be affected politically. For example: of necessity there would be occasions when the true Sabbath would fall on the first “Tuesday” of November in an election year. Sabbath keeping would practically be disfranchised under those circumstances, for they could not conscientiously go to the polls on God’s holy day. The editor of The Jewish Forum, Isaac Rosen-garden, says concerning the blank-day calendar:

“To Jews, its adoption would mean a violation of God’s Fourth Commandment, a disregard of the distinctive ‘symbol’ of man’s recognition of God as the Creator of the universe, a wanton tampering with Israel’s most sacred institution, equal in importance to all the other ‘mitzvoth’ [commandments] combined. “Religious people must be defended in their right to observe their religion. They may be a minority, but even a minority has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and, in democracies, majorities do not rule when one’s conscience is affected.”

And the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise declared, “If there were but a thousand Jews left in the world to preserve their Sabbath, I would go through fire and water to help them keep their religion.”

Solomon’s Baby and Calendar Reform

It is a significant fact that Jews and Seventh-day Adventists are admittedly more zealous and persistent in their opposition to the blank-day calendar than are Sunday keeping Christians. This poses a natural question: Since Sunday as well as Saturday will be affected by the sword of calendar reform, why are Sunday keepers for the most part so apathetic in this conflict?

To find the answer to this question it would be apropos to re-call the incident in Solomon’s life when two women brought a baby before the king, each claiming that she was the mother of the infant. In order to find out which of the two was telling the truth, the wise king resorted to a most unusual stratagem. He commanded: “Bring me a sword. And they brought a sword before the king. And the king said, Divide the living child in two, and give half to the one, and half to the other.

“Then spoke the woman whose the living child was unto the king, for her bowels [heart] yearned upon her son, and she said, O my lord, give her the living child, and in no wise slay it. But the other said, Let it be neither mine nor yours, but divide it.”

The king was satisfied. There could be no doubt as to who was the real mother of the babe. Addressing his servant the king said: “Give her the living child, and in no wise slay it: she is the mother thereof.” (See 1 Kings 3:16-27.)

The application of this episode is clear enough. The Sunday-keepers are not too concerned if their Sunday is mutilated by the sword of calendar reform, because their Sabbath is but a man-made institution, whereas the Sabbath keeping “yearn” for the Sabbath, and would not shrink from any sacrifice in order to shield it from the sword of the blank-day innovation. Why? Because the Sabbath is a child of the Scriptures, ordained by the great Creator to be observed as a perpetual recognition of His sovereignty of the universe, and as a sign that we love Him and that we give Him the first place in our heart’s deepest affections.

The New York Times, December 16, 1931, in an article, “Continuity of the Week Held Vital to Us All,” declared:

“Adoption of this new calendar would mean the breaking of the continuity of the week. Any alteration of this kind means a death blow to the conception of the Bible and a distortion of the command of God for a day of rest sanctioned by Him, as contrasted to a man-made day of economic relaxation.

“While this program is quite in line with the destructive tendencies of our time in theories wherein the fundamental fact of the existence of a Creator is omitted or denied, we know that it is only an unconscious sub current of the happenings of this day and age in which the outstanding alarm is the daily murder of man by man, even within the ranks of the family. Without a Creator the bonds of human society are loosened; and it is the holy day of rest which constitutes the confession that there is a Creator of the world and a Father of mankind.”

No Jewish man or woman worthy of the name will lightly exchange the eternal verities for a mess of pottage!

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

10. Ecumenism - A Coming Dictatorship of the Majority?

ECUMENISM—a word that has for ages been buried in ancient books, edicts, and musty archives—has suddenly come alive! It is the magic word that has become the synonym of a lofty ideal, full of promise and hope, the eagerly sought topic of discussion everywhere. In the words of a leading Catholic author:

“Pope John’s electrifying, dynamic call for renewal of the Church and his appeal to all men of goodwill to prepare the way for Christian unity have caught the minds and hearts of men everywhere. The whole world watches with deep-felt concern the epoch-making sessions of the Council [Vatican II] summoned by the beloved Pope John and continued by Pope Paul to tackle earnestly this challenge to the Church today. People everywhere are passionately consumed with a thirst for information about the Council, for learning more about its repercussions throughout the world and its implications for all men, Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant, Jew, whatever their belief.”—Preface to *Ecumenism and Vatican II*, edited by Revelation Charles O’Neill, S.J.

Why this unprecedented interest in ecumenism? Because a distraught, bewildered, and frightened world, aware that it is heading toward a colossal confrontation of force with force that can potentially destroy all life on this planet, is gambling all on a world government! That which a century ago would have been considered a poet’s fantasy, or an extravagant notion of bleary-eyed dreamers, is now regarded as more truth than poetry, and as the inevitable world of tomorrow. The poet Tennyson, in 1896, envisioned such a world in some far-off remote period:

For I dipped into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be.
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales.
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations’ airy navies grappling in the central blue!
Till the war drum throbbed no longer and the battle flags were furled
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the world.

Tennyson little realized that just a few decades after these lines were penned, his dream of one world would be taking shape before our very eyes! For ages an unbridged chasm divided East from West, culture from culture, Protestant from Catholic, Christian from Jew, white from black. Suddenly, as if overnight, all these barriers are being lowered; friendly dialog between creeds, religions, and cultures that formerly were overt enemies is now the order of the day! Catholics, Protestants, Eastern churches, Cop-tic Christians, and Jews appear eager to outdo one another in calling for “understanding,” “mutual fellowship,” for emphasis on “doctrines that unite us rather than dogmas that divide us.” Suddenly all mankind sense that one world is the last trump card, the last ditch; that it is either union or explosion!

Pope John’s Vision of One World

As perhaps no other contemporary figure, the late Pope John XXIII read what was in the mind of the world and granted its desire by calling an ecumenical council—known as Vatican II—for the avowed purpose of healing the wounds that have festered for centuries, and to prepare the way for the coming one world. Said Pope John:

“We do not intend to conduct a trial of the past; we do not want to prove who was right and who was wrong. The blame is on both sides. All we want is to say: Let us come together. Let us make an end of our divisions.”

Thus with Pope John one era came to an end and another era began. By the magic gesture of ecumenism the late pope did much to change the image of his church in the eyes of millions who for ages associated that church with intolerance, the Inquisition, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Many Protestants Jews feel that the Catholic Church, which for centuries tyrannized the minds and consciences of men and women and martyred millions who challenged her teachings, has redeemed herself by no longer calling Protestants “heretics” and “schismatics” but by welcoming them instead as “separated brethren” whom she is waiting to receive back into the fold “with open arms and filial affection,” while with “deep contrition” she “confesses her former errors and abuses.”

To no other pope since the establishment of the church has the Jewish community as a whole reacted with such warmth and feeling as to Pope John. Partly because as papal legate in the Near East during the Nazi holocaust, he saved a number of Jews from slavery and death, and because as pope he took the initiative to strike out a sentence offensive to Jews from the Good Friday liturgy—Oremus et pro

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

perfidis Judaeis (“Let us pray for the perfidious Jews”). One rabbi, Reuben Siegel, spoke the mind of many Jews when he declared that

“Because of his actions and words, Pope John impressed every-one with the feeling that here was a man who was concerned about religious groupings outside the Church. Spontaneously men of all creeds turned with warmth toward him. When he took ill, prayers were recited in synagogues for his recovery, and, when he died, Jews joined in the mourning.” - Ecumenism and Vatican II page 8.

Dr. Abraham Heschel, prominent Jewish leader, who participated in dialog with the liberal Cardinal Bea, speaking on the Catholic Hour on May 26, 1963, also had words of commendation for Pope John:

“The great spiritual renewal within the Roman Catholic Church, inspired by Pope John XXIII, is a manifestation of the dimensions of depth of religious experience. It already has opened many hearts and unlocked many precious insights.”—Ibid., p. 18.

Pope John’s Blueprint for One World

A significant step toward achieving one world recently took place at the Assembly Hall of the Hilton Hotel in New York City when outstanding world leaders from America, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Japan, and Germany, and other prominent figures from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, met to do preliminary spadework for attaining what they hope will be a lasting peace for this troubled world. As a basis for their discussions they used Pope John’s historic encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, “Peace on Earth.” If there is any doubt in the mind of anyone that the one-world panacea has captured the minds of an amazing number of present world leaders, the following cross section of the more than two thousand delegates from twenty nations present at the conference should prove quite enlightening:

“There was the Vice-President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, who delivered the keynote address; Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Earl Warren; United Nations Secretary, U Thant; and the first President of the United Nations General Assembly from black Africa, Alex Quaison-Sackey. Paul-Henri Spaak, Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister of Belgium; Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Governor of Maharashtra, India, and former president of the United Nations General Assembly; Lord Caradon, England’s Minister of State for Foreign Affairs; Abba Eban, Deputy Prime Minister of Israel; Pietro Nenni, Deputy Prime Minister of Italy; Adlai Stevenson, representative of the United States to the United Nations. Theologian Paul Tillich; historians Arnold Toynbee and Yevgenyi Zhukov of Russia’s Academy of Sciences; Nobel-prize-winning scientist Linus Pauling; Deputy Chief Editor of Pravda, N. N. Inozemtsev.”—ROLAND R. HEGSTAD, *Liberty*, “Summit Peace Conference,” May-June, 1965, p. 22.

Israel’s delegate, Abba Eban, painted an impressive picture of the need of some kind of united world action by stating that one and one-half billion people are suffering from malnutrition; seven hundred million adults, or one third of the world’s population, are entirely illiterate. But the chief preoccupation of the speakers was the atom—which like the proverbial sword of Damocles is menacingly hovering over this troubled planet.

McNamara and the Russian Inozemtsev each gave his estimate of the cataclysmic effect of an atomic war, ranging anywhere from 149 million to a billion casualties, besides hundreds of millions more who would become victims of nuclear radiation—a living death. With the backdrop of such a threatening holocaust and with the atom figuratively occupying the chair, the assembled delegates—from John F. Cronin, the Catholic theologian, to Gus Hall, the Communist—were of one accord in so far as the need of some kind of action on a worldwide scale was concerned. The amazing phenomenon of an atom possessing the drawing power of bringing together around a peace conference leaders of such contrasting ideologies moved Luis Quintanilla, Mexican delegate, to remark that the atom rightly deserves the Nobel Peace Prize! But, in a way, the real chairman of this New York conference was the late Pope John XXIII, in absentia! His encyclical dominated that assembly as verily as his bodily presence would have done. In the words of the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Alex Quaison-Sackey, at the opening session of the New York peace conference:

“The voice of Pope John was never heard in this hall, but tonight we hear the echo of his papal message, and the voice of those leaders who have answered his call.”

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Who Will Get the Wheels of the World Government Turning?

The overriding theme of the historic encyclical was clear enough—the crying need of a world government! Roland R. Hegstad, editor of Liberty, gives a resume of the papal epistle:

“The message of the pope is not, from the standpoint of political realism, either radical or revolutionary. Perhaps what most ensured its reception was simply, as Time observed, that it contained ideas ‘whose time had come round at last.’”

“Basically, the encyclical discusses the rights and duties of individuals in their relationships with one another, and the correct relationship of state with state. The pope found the answer to these relationships in a cherished concept of Catholic philosophy —natural law—man’s instinctive knowledge of right and wrong. Man has the duty to cooperate with others in building an orderly world. Today, said the pope, the moral order demanded by natural law requires a ‘supranational public authority’—that is a world government. Here is his plea:

“Today the universal common good presents us with problems which are worldwide in their dimensions: problems, therefore, which cannot be solved except by a public authority with power, organization, and means coextensive with these problems, and with a worldwide sphere of activity. Consequently, the moral order itself demands the establishment of some general form of public authority.”—Liberty, May-June, 1965. (Italics supplied.)

Since the political, social, and religious thermometer increasingly indicates that the imminence of some sort of world government is a foregone conclusion, the question that is, and should be, uppermost in every mind is: who will call the tune, give directions, determine the rules of the game, and get the cumbersome machinery of the world government working? Would it not be natural for the world to look for guidance to the source from whence came the idea in the first place—namely, the hierarchy which gave the world a Pope John XXIII? It is the Papacy’s undisguised purpose to gather all the world under its wings. We quote from Pope John’s encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram*, outlining what were to be “the most pressing topics” of Vatican II:

“The most pressing topics will be those which concern the spread of the Catholic faith, the revival of Christian standards of morality, and the bringing of ecclesiastical discipline into closer accord with the needs and conditions of our time.” (Italics supplied.) What are these so-called Christian standards of morality that are to be revived in the interest of world unity? Are they truly the standards that Christ instituted, or are they precepts and standards which the church arbitrarily appointed as a substitute for the standards ordained by the Sovereign of the universe?

By her own repeated admissions, the enforcement of Sunday observance would be an integral part of a worldwide program of peace. It has been shown in chapter eight that the God of Israel fore-told through the Hebrew prophet Daniel that such tampering with the Sabbath of God would take place. That is a matter of record. It is also common knowledge that in his epistle *Mater et Magistra*, which preceded *Pacem in Terris*, Pope John said:

“The Church has always demanded an exact observance of the third precept of the Ten Commandments: ‘Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day’ [which, of course, by Catholic standards, is Sun-day). We call upon all public authorities, employers and workers to observe the precepts of God and His Church.”

(NOTE: The Sabbath commandment is the fourth in the Ten Commandments. In the Catholic version of the Ten Commandments it is the third commandment—EDITOR)

And in a subsequent address the pope added that this “Presupposes a change of mind in society, and the intervention of the powers of the state.”

Since the overwhelming majority of Protestants are already committed to the observance of Sunday—the man-made counterfeit of the true Sabbath instituted by the Creator—the entire world will ere long be swept into the Catholic camp.

The Catholic Church not only regards Sunday observance as the distinguishing mark of her authority, but she intends to enforce Sunday observance, as Pope John specifically stated, by “the intervention of the powers of the state”! When, therefore, ecumenism attains its ultimate objective—a world government that is based on Catholic standards of morality—we shall have, in effect, a dictatorship of the majority!

The dilemma such a situation would create for the Jewish and non-Jewish Sabbath observers can scarcely be overdrawn. They will be confronted by the grim alternative: either yield to the will of the

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

majority, which would mean to disobey God and violate their conscience, or keep the Sabbath of Jehovah and suffer persecution.

World Government and Prophecy

The current trend toward a supranational government is not without a precedent. There have been repeated attempts in the past by ambitious rulers to establish a Pan-European empire. The pages of history contain the record of four such world empires: Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome, but each has gone down into oblivion. It will be of interest to see how all these historic changes and events were accurately predicted in Holy Writ.

We read that the Hebrew prophet Daniel was at one time summoned by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, to interpret a dream in which this ruler saw a statue made of four metals. The head was of gold, the chest and arms of silver, the thighs of brass, the legs of iron, and the toes of iron mixed with clay. Then the king saw “a stone that was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. And the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth” (Daniel 2:34-36). According to Daniel’s interpretation, this dream foretold not only the rise and fall of four world empires but also the final events of this world’s history, the destruction of all earthly kingdoms, and the establishment of God’s everlasting kingdom.

As every high school boy and girl knows, there have been just four world empires since Daniel’s day, namely, Babylon, represented by the head of gold; Medo-Persia, by the arms and chest of silver; Greece, by the thighs of brass; and lastly Rome, by the legs of iron. The eminent historian Edward Gibbon, though himself a skeptic, in his book *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, employs the very same four symbols used by Daniel the prophet. Here are Gibbon’s own words:

“The arms of the [Roman] republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the Ocean. And the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations or their kings, were successively broken by the iron monarchy of Rome.”—Chapter 38, general observations at end of chapter, paragraph 1.

The prophet Daniel further explains that the feet and toes of that image represented the division of the Roman Empire. Both history and the map of Europe confirm this, for the Roman Empire was in fact invaded by barbarian hordes from the north—the Allemanni, Franks, Burgundians, Suevi, Lombards, Anglo-Saxons, Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Heruli, and the Vandals.

Since the division of the Roman Empire there have been numerous attempts to weld together the fragments of what was once the great iron monarchy of Rome into another cohesive Pan-European state. The complete failure of these attempts was also predicted by Daniel in this same prophecy; we read: “And whereas thou saw the iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay” (Daniel 2:43). The full import of this scripture is that the nations of Europe shall never again be a united Europe under one ruler.

Note how accurately this scripture was fulfilled throughout the centuries: Charlemagne, Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon Bonaparte, and the German Kaiser, all endeavored by sheer force of arms to build one Europe, but all failed miserably. The last abortive attempt was made by an Austrian paper hanger, Adolph Hitler, but his German Reich soon crumbled, and he ended up a suicide!

Not all the attempts, however, were of a military nature. The above text declares that “they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men”—a prediction of the intermarriage of the royal houses of Europe. This part of the prophecy was also fulfilled to the letter. Here is a bit of Europe’s royal family tree: The late King George V of England, the Czar of Russia, and the King of Greece, were first cousins. All were grandsons of Christian IX of Denmark. The late King George of England and the German Kaiser Wilhelm were cousins. The former Czarina of Russia, and the queen of Norway, and the queen of Greece, were all grandchildren of Queen Victoria, and were, therefore, first cousins to one another. The Kaiser, and Queen Sophia of Greece, were brother and sister, and so on ad infinitum.

Despite these blood relationships, however, World War I was not averted; it was appropriately called a “family quarrel”! The cryptic prediction of the seven words “they shall not cleave one to another” not only characterizes the divided state of Europe since the fall of the Roman Empire but also dooms any subsequent efforts to piece it together.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

It is a singular coincidence that a New York Times editor, in the issue of February 19, 1965, undoubtedly unbeknown to him-self, confirmed Daniel's prophecy when, commenting on the New York Pacem in Terris conference, he observed editorially:

"Throughout history different elements operated at different times to provide an anchor, an amalgam, a source of unity for societies. There were family bonds, great monarchs, great empires, the world's great religions and, in modern times, political ideologies. Today none of these factors seems strong enough to hold societies in check or to unite nations and peoples in peace. This is an era that has lost its bearings, that wanders in a wilderness, crying with rage and striking out in pain."

A Brighter Prospect

It is evident that this New York Times editor sees no prospect of a brighter future, and if the present world conditions are any criterion, he would most certainly be right. But the same prophecy that predicted the rise and fall of nations also tells us that "in the days of these kings" the God of heaven will dramatically intervene in the affairs of this rapidly deteriorating world and set up His kingdom of peace which will stand forever! We read: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: It shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever" (Daniel 2:44).

The effect of the current winds of ecumenism and the coming dictatorship of the majority with its oppression of religious minorities will not be "peace" but a sword, for it will lead to "a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation" (Daniel 12:1).

How reassuring the prospect that in this fast-moving, rapidly disintegrating and changing world it will soon be manifest to all that God has taken over the controls. In the words of a well-known author:

"Prophecy has traced the rise and progress of the world's great empires, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. With each of these, as with the nations of less power, history has repeated it-self. Each had its period of test; each has failed, its glory faded, its power departed. All that prophecy has foretold as coming to pass, until the present time, has been traced on the pages of history, and we may be assured that all which is yet to come will be fulfilled in its order."—Prophets and Kings, pp. 535, 536.

As if to remind a troubled and harassed world that God still guides the affairs of this earth, and in order to remove every possibility of doubt, the Lord bade the prophet to conclude his prophetic exposition with this significant postscript:

"And the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure" (Daniel 2:45).

11. The Soon-coming Contest

www.whiteestate.org/books/gc/gc.asp

IN THE movements now in progress in the United States to secure for the institutions and usage of the church the support of the state, Protestants are following in the steps of papists. Nay, more, they are opening the door for the Papacy to regain in Protestant America the supremacy which she has lost in the Old World. And that which gives greater significance to this movement is the fact that the principal object contemplated is the enforcement of Sunday observance, a custom which originated with Rome, and which she claims as the sign of her authority. It is the spirit of the Papacy,—the spirit of conformity to worldly customs, the veneration for human traditions above the commandments of God,—that is permeating the Protestant churches, and leading them on to do the same work of Sunday exaltation which the Papacy has done before them.

"If the reader would understand the agencies to be employed in the soon-coming contest, he has but to trace the record of the means which Rome employed for the same object in ages past. If he would know how papists [i.e., Catholics] and Protestants united will deal with those who reject their dogmas, let him see the spirit which Rome manifested toward the Sabbath and its defenders.

"Royal edicts, general councils, and church ordinances sustained by secular power, were the steps by which the pagan festival [Sunday] attained its position of honor in the Christian world. The first public measure enforcing Sunday observance was the law enacted by Constantine [AD 321]. This edict required

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

townspeople to rest on “the venerable day of the sun,” but permitted countrymen to continue their agricultural pursuits. Though virtually a heathen statute, it was enforced by the emperor after his nominal acceptance of Christianity.

“The royal mandate not proving a sufficient substitute for di-vine authority, Eusebius, a bishop who sought the favor of princes, and who was the special friend and flatterer of Constantine, advanced the claim that Christ had transferred the Sabbath to Sunday. Not a single testimony of the Scriptures was produced in proof of the new doctrine. Eusebius himself unwittingly acknowledges its falsity, and points to the real authors of the change. ‘All things,’ he says, ‘whatever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord’s day.’—ROBERT COX, *Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties*, p. 538. But the Sunday argument, groundless as it was, served to embolden men in trampling upon the Sabbath of the Lord. All who desired to be honored by the world accepted the popular festival.

Devious Ways for Exalting the Counterfeit Sabbath

“As the Papacy became firmly established, the work of Sunday exaltation was continued. For a time the people engaged in agricultural labor when not attending church, and the seventh day was still regarded as the Sabbath. But steadily a change was effected. Those in holy office were forbidden to pass judgment in any civil controversy on the Sunday. Soon after, all persons, of whatever rank, were commanded to refrain from common labor, on pain of a fine for freemen, and stripes in the case of servants. Later it was decreed that rich men should be punished with the loss of half of their estates; and finally, that if still obstinate they should be made slaves. The lower classes were to suffer perpetual banishment.

“Miracles also were called into requisition. Among other wonders it was reported that as a husbandman who was about to plow his field on Sunday, cleaned his plow with an iron, the iron stuck fast in his hand, and for two years he carried it about with him, ‘to his exceeding great pain and shame.’—FRANCIS WEST, *Historical and Practical Discourse on the Lord’s Day*, page 174.

“Later the pope gave directions that the parish priest should admonish the violators of Sunday, and wish them to go to church and say their prayers, lest they bring some great calamity on themselves and neighbors. An ecclesiastical council brought forward the argument, since so widely employed, even by Protestants, that because persons had been struck by lightning while laboring on Sunday, it must be the Sabbath. ‘It is apparent,’ said the prelates, ‘how high the displeasure of God was upon their neglect of this day.’ An appeal was then made that priests and ministers, kings and princes, and all faithful people ‘use their utmost endeavors and care that the day be restored to its honor, and, for the credit of Christianity, more devoutly observed for the time to come.’ THOMAS MORER, *Discourse in Six Dialogues on the Name, Notion, and Observation of the Lord’s Day*, page 271.

“The decrees of councils proving insufficient, the secular authorities were besought to issue an edict that would strike terror to the hearts of the people, and force them to refrain from labor on the Sunday. At a synod held in Rome, all previous decisions were reaffirmed with greater force and solemnity. They were also incorporated into the ecclesiastical law, and enforced by the civil authorities throughout nearly all Christendom. (See HEYLYN, *History of the Sabbath*, part 2, chapter 5, section 7.)”

“But notwithstanding all the efforts to establish Sunday sacredness, papists themselves publicly confessed the divine authority of the Sabbath and the human origin of the institution by which it had been supplanted. In the sixteenth century a papal council plainly declared: ‘Let all Christians remember that the seventh day was consecrated by God, and hath been received and observed, not only by the Jews, but by all others who pretend to worship God. Though we Christians have changed their Sabbath into the Lord’s day.’—*Ibid.*, pp. 281, 282. Those who were tampering with the divine law were not ignorant of the character of their work. They were deliberately setting themselves above God.

Rome Persecutes Sabbath Observers

“A striking illustration of Rome’s policy toward those who disagree with her was given in the long and bloody persecution of the Waldenses, some of whom were observers of the Sabbath. Others suffered in a similar manner for their fidelity to the fourth commandment. The history of the churches of Ethiopia and Abyssinia is especially significant. Amid the gloom of the Dark Ages, the Christians of Central Africa were lost sight of and forgotten by the world, and for many centuries they enjoyed freedom in the exercise of their faith. But at last Rome learned of their existence, and the emperor of Abyssinia was soon beguiled into

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

an acknowledgment of the pope as the vicar of Christ. Other concessions followed. An edict was issued forbidding the observance of the Sabbath under the severest penalties.

“The churches of Africa held the Sabbath as it was held by the papal church before her complete apostasy. While they kept the seventh day in obedience to the commandment of God, they abstained from labor on the Sunday in conformity to the custom of the church. Upon obtaining supreme power, Rome had trampled upon the Sabbath of God to exalt her own; but the churches of Africa, hidden for nearly a thousand years, did not share in this apostasy. When brought under the sway of Rome, they were forced to set aside the true and exalt the false Sabbath; but no sooner had they regained their independence than they returned to obedience to the fourth commandment.

“These records of the past clearly reveal the enmity of Rome toward the true Sabbath and its defenders, and the means which she employs to honor the institution of her creating. The word of God teaches that these scenes are to be repeated as Roman Catholics and Protestants shall unite for the exaltation of the Sunday.”

Rome's Far-reaching Plans

“Marvelous in her shrewdness and cunning is the Roman Church. She can read what is to be. She bides her time, seeing that the Protestant churches are paying her homage in their acceptance of the false Sabbath, and that they are preparing to enforce it by the very means which she herself employed in bygone days. Those who reject the light of truth will yet seek the aid of this self-styled in-fallible power to exalt an institution that originated with her. How readily she will come to the help of Protestants in this work, it is not difficult to conjecture. Who understands better than the papal leaders how to deal with those who are disobedient to the church?

“The Catholic Church, with all its ramifications through-out the world, forms one vast organization, under the control, and designed to serve the interests, of the papal see. Its millions of communicants, in every country on the globe, are instructed to hold themselves as bound in allegiance to the pope. Whatever their nationality or their government, they are to regard the authority of the church as above all other. Though they may take the oath pledging their loyalty to the state, yet back of this lies the vow of obedience to Rome, absolving them from every pledge inimical to her interests.

“History testifies of her artful and persistent efforts to insinuate herself into the affairs of nations; and having gained a foothold, to further her own aims, even at the ruin of princes and people. In the year 1204, Pope Innocent III extracted from Peter II, king of Arragon, the following extraordinary oath: ‘I, Peter, king of Arragonians, profess and promise to be ever faithful and obedient to my lord, Pope Innocent, to his Catholic successors, and the Roman Church, and faithfully to preserve my kingdom in his obedience, defending the Catholic faith, and persecuting heretical pravity.’—JOHN DOWLING, *The History of Roman Catholicism*, book 5, chap. 6, sec. 55. This is in harmony with the claims regarding the power of the Roman pontiff, that ‘it is lawful for him to depose emperors,’ and that ‘he can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous rulers.’—MOSHEIM, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 3, cent. 11, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 9, note 8.

“And let it be remembered, it is the boast of Rome that she never changes. The principles of Gregory VII and Innocent III are still the principles of the Roman Catholic Church. And had she but the power, she would put them in practice with as much vigor now as in past centuries. Protestants little know what they are doing when they propose to accept the aid of Rome in the work of Sun-day exaltation. While they are bent upon the accomplishment of their purpose, Rome is aiming to re-establish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. Let the principle once be established in the United States that the church may employ or control the power of the state; that religious observances may be enforced by secular laws; in short, that the authority of church and state is to dominate the conscience, and the triumph of Rome in this country is assured.

“God's word has given warning of the impending danger; let this be unheeded, and the Protestant world will learn what the purposes of Rome really are, only when it is too late to escape the snare. She is silently growing into power. Her doctrines are exerting their influence in legislative halls, in the churches, and in the hearts of men. . . . All that she desires is vantage-ground, and this is already being given her. We shall soon see and shall feel what the purpose of the Roman element is. Whoever shall believe and obey the word of God, will thereby incur reproach and persecution.”

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

12. Is a State Church Emerging in the USA

ENLIGHTENED Americans are looking on apprehensively at the significant change in the image of America from what it was conceived and envisioned by the Founding Fathers.

For the past two hundred years the American experiment in freedom, our Constitution, our principle of complete separation between church and state, won the admiration of the world. James Bryce, also known as Viscount Bryce (1838-1922), British ambassador to the United States from 1907 to 1913, in his monumental work *The American Commonwealth* penned this well-deserved eulogy to America:

“In examining the National government and the State governments [of the United States] we have never once had occasion to advert to any ecclesiastical body or question, because with such matters government has in the United States absolutely nothing to do. Of all the differences between the Old World and the New this is perhaps the most salient. Half the wars of Europe, half the internal troubles that vexed the European states . . . have arisen from the theological differences or from rival claims of church and state. This whole vast chapter of debate and strife has remained virtually unopened in the United States. There is no Established Church. All religious bodies are absolutely equal before the law, and unrecognized by the law, except as voluntary associations of private citizens.”—Volume 2, page 695.

“So far from suffering from the want of State support, religion seems in the United States to stand all the firmer because, standing alone, she is seen to stand by her own strength.”—*Ibid.*, p. 711.

The eminent British statesman William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898), four times prime minister of Great Britain, said the following about our Constitution:

“The American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.”—*Gleanings of Past Years*, volume 1, page 212.

Henry Cabot Lodge is quoted as follows:

“The Constitution in its development and throughout our history has surpassed the hopes of its friends and utterly disappointed the predictions and criticisms of its foes.”—*Great Debates in American History* (New York, 1913), volume 1, page 12.

John Foster Dulles correctly stated that from the beginning “ ‘the great American experiment’ in freedom caught the imagination of men everywhere.”—“Our Experiment in Human Liberty,” *Department of State Bulletin*, May 12, 1958.

Dr. Glenn Archer, executive director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, in an address given at Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., made these observations concerning “the great American experiment” in freedom:

“We have had religious peace among the 257 different churches that operate in our Republic. We call this a pluralistic society. Let me remind you that this society has resulted in the greatest nation in the world, a nation that today is feeding many of the nations that have clerical states and have church and state working together in such a way that the people have lost confidence in both.

“The concept of church-state separation is relatively new as history counts time. It departs from the policy that Constantine inaugurated in the fourth century. [This is a reference to the church-state establishment by that Roman emperor.] It is a departure from the plan that our forefathers encountered in the Old World, where the Roman Church dominated the state. It is a departure from the Protestant establishments in the Scandinavian countries and in Great Britain. It is a departure from the Mohammedan plan in the Arab world where one religion is elevated to the pinnacle and becomes either a tool of the state or the agency that dominates the state. It is, in fact, a departure from the plan now prevailing in Latin America where one church has dominated the politics and controlled the religion of the people.

“The plan that we have adopted in this country differs in that we do not believe that the state ought to be above the church and to use the church as its tool. Nor do we believe that the church ought to be above the state and use the police power of the state to invoke religion upon the people. Religion that is coerced is not religion at all. Religion is an inner conviction. It must rise from the heart, and it can never be forced upon anyone.

“Our forefathers, on the anvil of trial and error, hammered out a new plan. It was that the state should be sovereign in civil matters, and the church should govern in spiritual affairs, and that the functional gears of these two great institutions should never mesh. Under this plan we have developed certain cardinal principles that have benefited men of all creeds and men of no creed. The first of these is that equality of creeds exists in the courts of our land. The second is that the Federal Government and the state governments should not subsidize religion. We believe that if religion is good it will find its own voluntary support.”

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Thus for the first time in history, there emerged a nation not legally founded on religion. The Founding Fathers, with vivid memories of religious persecutions they had suffered in the Old World under church-state regimes, determined to do their utmost to prevent an establishment of an official national religion or state church in this land. To accomplish this objective—although deeply religious themselves—they insisted that neither Christianity nor any other creed should have legal status in this country. To this end they embodied the principle of absolute separation between church and state into the Constitution through the First Amendment. Furthermore, the Constitution declares that no religious test should be required for holding a public office. Thus religion was held to be essentially a private concern of each citizen and completely outside the jurisdiction or dictation of government. This new concept of what constitutes a government was aptly de-fined by the late Justice John Walsh:

“Government is an organization for particular purposes. It is not almighty, and we are not to look to it for everything. The great bulk of human affairs and human interests is left by any free government to individual enterprise and individual action. Religion is eminently one of those interests, lying outside the true and legitimate province of government.”—American State Papers, p. 277.

The treaty which this country concluded with Tripoli in 1797 contains this historic declaration: “The government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion.” Such treaties, as we all know, are considered the law of the land!

Such was the foundation upon which the United States was established, and in an amazingly short time this country became the greatest and mightiest nation in the world. This phenomenal growth and prosperity was achieved only because America, since its inception two centuries ago, has been the only country to open wide its doors and its heart to the oppressed and persecuted of every land—whether they were Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or Mohammedan, white or black, believer or unbeliever. In short, this beloved country—the United States of America—became the world’s melting pot, in which all had equal opportunity to become Americans without having to surrender any of those rights of conscience that are built into every man’s soul by nature and nature’s God.

Why the American Image Is Changing

This resplendent and noble image has, alas, grown hazy and faded, and in consequence there now is a marked dampening of the world’s enthusiasm and admiration for America. Note this statement by the late John Foster Dulles: “I am afraid that we attempt to justify our society and to make it appealing without regard to the spiritual concepts which underlie it and make it work.” —Department of State Bulletin, May 12, 1958.

Mr. Dulles was so right. The American ship of state has broken away from the old moorings—the noble and proved principles that made us a great nation—and we are slowly but surely and dangerously drifting downstream.

If George Washington were living today and were to survey the contemporary American scene, we can well imagine what emotions would rise up in his heart as he observed the mass of religious bills descending upon our Congress and State legislatures. As he saw church and state unceremoniously trespassing on each other’s territory. States making criminals of loyal American citizens for buying a loaf of bread or a milk bottle for the baby on Sun-day; and churches persistently demanding that the state finance their private parochial schools, et cetera. What do you think Washington would say to all this?

Based on his past actions and utterances, he would categorically state that when legislatures attempt to determine for American citizens by law which Deity they should worship or which day they should observe, they are nullifying the great principle proclaimed in the treaty with Tripoli that “the government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion.”

A Church State Is Emerging in the United States!

All past history relating to church and state contains this sobering warning—that legislating on religion once embarked upon, inexorably runs on and on, from bad to worse, until it ends in the persecution of dissenters. Note this thought-provoking statement by Richard M. Johnson (1780-1850), former Vice-President of the United States:

“If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum.”—American State Papers, p. 215.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Stated in simpler terms, this means that when Americans once accept the principle that the government can trespass on the religious sphere and enact religious laws, then America has reached the point of no return, and must go on and on until the ultimatum—the establishment of a national religion, a super church that is wedded to the state. Has America reached that point? That we have is the unbiased judgment of responsible leaders:

Dean M. Kelly, executive director, Religious Liberty Department, National Council of Churches, writing in *Liberty* magazine of July-August, 1963, declared: “While we have fought valiantly in the trenches against the establishment of any denomination as the National Church, we and our various opponents have consented to the gradual establishment of the State Religion, in which we are all involved—non preferentially, of course.”

Dr. Glenn Archer, executive director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, addressed a mass meeting, previously referred to, in Constitution Hall. What was his topic? “The Emerging State Church”! He cited numerous instances in which the Government poured in many tax dollars into the churches under various pretexts:

“I fear that many of our churches have been tempted—and a good many Protestant churches are in that category—to reach into the public treasury for support. There is going to be a day of reckoning. There will come a day when the government of the United States or the government of a particular state will say to a sectarian institution: ‘Remember, we gave you \$150,000 for your institution last year—we want some votes in return.’”

“Great evils will descend upon the church if it does not more clearly commit itself to church-state separation. Remember that in Germany the church was so definitely tied to the state by subsidy that the church was idle while six million Jews were massacred. Do you know that taxes to churches inevitably destroy the spiritual life of the church?”

Jewish Leaders’ Attitude

It is heartening to observe that many Jewish leaders, believing with Thomas Jefferson that “it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties,” are quick to react to any threat to the American tradition of church-state separation. When President Johnson’s proposal to aid education, including parochial schools, was made public, Jewish leaders were among the first to express their decided opposition to this plan. The New York Board of Rabbis, largest group of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis of New York, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

“The religious school clearly is established to serve the sectarian purposes of the sponsoring religious group. It is a violation of our understanding of the hallowed principle of church-state separation to require the state to support religion. Furthermore, we consider it ultimately harmful to our religious institutions to depend on state funds for the furtherance of their programs.”

Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, addressing the biennial convention of UAHC’s northern California region, said:

“Concealed inside this highly imaginative package of an aid to education bill is a proposal to give aid to parochial schools, a proposal which has never been adopted in this country.”

“Millions, and ultimately billions, will be poured into our parochial schools, thus depriving our public schools of the tax dollars desperately needed for the fashioning of a good public school system in this land. And the aroma of Federal funds will ultimately tempt every religious group to develop elaborate networks of parochial schools.”

The Jewish press, generally, reacted in a similar manner to President Johnson’s proposal. C. S. Longacre, former editor of *Liberty*, and a lifelong crusader for separation of church and state, drawing on his vast experience gained from many years’ association with outstanding legislators and statesmen, sounds this timely warning:

“Unless the drift toward church-statism is checked in America, it will not be long until our nation will establish a national religion, and we will travel over the same rocky road that all state religions have experienced in the past. Religious forces and movements have persistently knocked at doors of Congress, demanding a revival of the blue laws of colonial times with all their Puritan rigidity.”

While Americans remain in unblissful ignorance, expecting business as usual for many years to come, “dark clouds” are indeed already hanging over this land, presaging a storm of unprecedented fury. Congress and the courts are systematically and persistently being pressured to modify—a bland word for

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

nullify—our principle of separation between church and state. For what purpose? “In order,” it is said, “to enforce the moral and spiritual values of the nation, to resist secularism and materialism, to encourage religion, and to help churches and synagogues.” These pious slogans have succeeded so well in brainwashing millions of Americans that “any congressman or court,” says Dean Kelly, “that dares to oppose government handouts to church-related institutions is branded as hostile to religion.”

All Is Set for a Church-State Union

All the necessary ingredients for the setting up of a super church in America are already present. All that is needed is some unpredictable crisis that would create the right climate for the establishment of a national religion enforceable by law. The majority will then demand that this be done. When that hour strikes, the dissenting minorities will learn from actual personal experience what the term “tyranny of the majority” really means.

Human nature being what it is, it is unwise to place unlimited power in the hands of men or of governments. Under the ancient Jewish theocracy the power of kings was circumscribed by the wise Ruler of the universe. No king of Israel was ever permitted to trespass on the duties of the priesthood. The king and the priest each had his legitimate sphere of authority and neither was to invade the realm of the other. There was one king, however, Uzziah by name, who defied this divine prohibition by presuming to do the priest’s appointed task. God’s judgment upon Uzziah was swift and severe, and it corresponded to the enormity of his transgression. He was stricken with that most dreaded of all diseases—leprosy—for the rest of his life. The God of heaven had this tragic experience recorded in His Book for our instruction and benefit. Referring to this Bible episode, the great American patriot Richard M. Johnson draws the obvious lesson:

“A Jewish monarch, by grasping the holy censer [which only the priest was to handle), lost both his scepter and his freedom. A destiny as little to be envied may be the lot of the American people, who hold the sovereignty of power, if they, in the person of their representatives, shall attempt to unite, in the remotest degree, church and state.”—American State Papers, page 218.

When this solemn statement was made, America had not as yet reached the point of no return. But that time has now caught up with us!

13. Will There Be Persecution in America

LEADING observers of the American scene agree that the ensuing years will be the most crucial in United States history, and that the political posture of this country may alter considerably from what the accepted American tradition has been. That the image of America is even now undergoing a perceptible change has been amply shown in the preceding chapter. What will the new American image be like? Which road will this republic travel? It is not necessary to speculate what the answer to these questions is, for, as we shall presently see, coming events cast their shadow. In the meantime, during its present period of transition, this country is following a pattern that is not very reassuring, as indicated in the statement we have already alluded to by Paul Hutchinson:

“There is reason to believe that the old issue of church and state, or of church against state, will soon be upon us in a fury unknown for a thousand years.”—The New Leviathan (1946 ed.), page 19.

A Study in Contrasts

In this chapter we shall endeavor to show that the changing image of America is taking us down the road that leads to the Dark Ages, the road the Roman Catholic Church has traveled without deviation for many centuries. The changing pattern of the United States is at the present time too obviously reflecting some of the policies of the Catholic Church. This should not be glossed over or ignored. To point up the perils threatening the United States if it continues to pattern after the policies of the Papacy, we will compare the basic principles of Americanism as conceived by the Founding Fathers with the policies of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. First we will consider the United States principles:

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

George Washington: “Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.”

Thomas Jefferson: “Almighty God hath created the mind free; all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitation, 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 coercions on either, as was in His almighty power to do.”

Benjamin Franklin: “When a religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself. And, when it cannot support itself, and God does not take care to support it, so that its professors are obliged to call for the help of the civil power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one.”

James Madison: “Religion is essentially distinct from civil government and exempt from its cognizance; a connection between them is injurious to both.”

These are some of the foundation principles upon which America was built, and for which millions of Americans have laid down their lives. These lofty and righteous principles have raised this country to the pinnacle of power, prosperity, and influence that has made it the envy of the world. Let us now contrast these noble declarations with the policies that have for ages constituted the essence of Catholicism. Bearing in mind that it is the boast of Rome that she never changes, we now list some of the basic tenets of the Roman Catholic Church laid down in the Syllabus of Errors by Pope Pius IX, generally regarded as of great authority:

No one is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true. No person outside the Catholic Church has any hope of eternal salvation. The church should not be separated from the state, nor the state from the church. In the present day it is still expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship.

The Church has the power of using force, and possesses temporal power, directly, or indirectly. Here is an additional statement of Catholic policy, from a Jesuit source:

“The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. The Catholic Church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim, theoretically or practically, that error can have the same rights as truth, especially where the supreme duties and interest of man are at stake. The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.” (A statement from the official publication of the Society of Jesus in Rome, *La Civiltà Cattolica*, quoted in *American Catholics; a Protestant-Jewish View*, pp. 82-86.)

And, finally, this statement of Catholic policy in dealing with dissenters or “heretics” when the church has the power to execute her will:

“When confronted by heresy she [the church] does not content herself with persuasion; she has recourse to force, to corporal punishment, to torture. She creates tribunals like those of the Inquisition, she calls the laws of the State to her aid, if necessary she encourages a crusade, or religious war.”—ALFRED BAUDRILLART, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism*, pp. 182, 183.

Does the present ecumenical movement indicate that the Papacy has changed its over-all policies? Did any vital reform take place in the teachings of this church during Vatican Council II? We shall find the answer in the following statement by Pope Paul VI in his closing address at the third session of the council:

“Nothing is really changed in the doctrine of the church. What the church taught for centuries, we teach also.”—Quoted in *Christian Heritage*, February, 1965, p. 9.

In all fairness, it should be stated that there are many Catholic laymen and even prelates who are urging the church to repudiate these intolerant policies and to declare herself unqualifiedly in accord with the principles of true religious liberty and separation of church and state.

United States Patterning After the Papacy

In view of the abysmal disparity between Americanism and Catholicism, it would seem incredible that America would knowingly exchange its high and lofty principles for those that prevailed during the Dark Ages. Nevertheless, as has been shown in the preceding chapters, this strange transmutation of the American way of life into the Catholic pattern is proceeding before our very eyes.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

The United States is just now in the process of exalting the most distinguishing doctrine of the Catholic Church—the Sunday institution—and when this process is completed, it will, as we shall presently see, prove the nemesis of this republic which has hitherto upheld the principles of civil and religious liberty, and has been signally blessed and favored of Heaven because of this.

Despite Protestant awareness that Sunday observance is but a human institution, many of their leaders are urging and even demanding of lawmaking bodies the passage of a national Sunday law under civil penalties. Here is a sample of what some Protestant leaders are crusading for:

“Give us good Sunday laws, well enforced by men in local authority, and our churches will be full of worshippers, and our young men and young women will be attracted to the divine service. A mighty combination of churches of the United States could win from Congress, the State legislatures, and municipal councils all legislation essential to this splendid consummation.”—Revelation S. V. LEACH, DD, in *Homiletic Review*, November, 1892.

“The misuse of a day of rest and worship is the crowning American sin and the root of much, if not most, of our troubles in every department. Christians first of all must awake to the seriousness of our defection in the matter of keeping one day out of seven as holy unto the Lord. We have so generally substituted pleasure for ourselves instead of reverence to the Lord that we are reaping a terrible harvest and will one day reap worse. We welcome any-thing that will bring back the American Sabbath, such as our fathers knew.”—*The Lord’s Day Leader*, April-June, 1937.

A prominent Protestant minister, Dr. H. W. O. Millington, said:

“We may not be able to control the weather, but we are going to control Congress in reference to the securing of a Sunday law.”

And last,

“We insist upon the challenge, ‘All must rest, that all may.’ We stand by the battle cry, ‘No special privileges and no seventh day subsidy’ [i.e., no exemptions to Jews and Seventh-day Adventists who keep the seventh-day Sabbath]. If the Sabbath [Sunday] laws need adjusting to ‘works of necessity’ of the twentieth century, we will alter and adjust them ourselves.”—*Christian Statesman*, March, 1927.

This Protestant demand for Sunday legislation has lately assumed avalanche proportions. In 1959 a total of 62 Sunday bills were proposed in 15 State legislatures. However, since the Supreme Court declared Sunday blue laws constitutional, such legislation has gathered great momentum, so much so that in 1961, 150 Sunday bills were proposed in 32 States. In 1963, there were 240 bills in 41 States; in 1965 there were 184 bills in 34 States; and if this trend continues, it will not be long before the demand for Sunday blue laws will assume the nature of a national religious crusade.

The Catholic Church Joins Sunday Law Movement

Sensing that this is *der Tag* she has been waiting for—when Protestants would take the initiative to exalt Sunday, a Catholic institution—the Papacy has suddenly cast off her former lethargic indifference and even apathy for Sunday legislation and has become an effective ally to Protestant efforts to secure the passage of Sunday laws. Paul Blanshard, a keen analyst of Catholic attitudes, writes concerning this new phenomenon:

“One of the oddities of the situation is that—in the North, at least—the Catholic Church, which was once the chief opponent of Sunday laws, has now become one of their chief defenders. Catholicism has begun to place new emphasis on a non-commercial Sunday. Both Cardinal Spellman and Cardinal Stritch issued special statements in 1956 championing Sunday laws. Cardinal Cushing, in 1959, severely criticized a three-judge federal court in Massachusetts for declaring the Sunday law of that state unconstitutional in a kosher market case.”—*God and Man in Washington*, page 71.

Catholics are astutely aware that every new Sunday law is another nail in the Protestant coffin, while at the same time it enhances Catholic prestige. Behind the present Catholic cooperation with Protestants to secure Sunday legislation is the same long-range objective that has always inspired the Roman Church, namely, to make America Catholic. In a sermon delivered in 1889, at the centenary of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States of America, Archbishop Ireland declared:

“Our work is to make America Catholic. Our cry shall be, God wills it, and our hearts shall leap with crusader enthusiasm.”

In his famous encyclical *Immortale Dei*, Pope Leo XIII stated that:

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

“First and foremost it is the duty of all Catholics worthy of the name and wishful to be known as most loving children of the Church to endeavor to bring back all civil society to the pattern and form of Christianity which We have described.”—The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, p. 132. (Italics supplied.)

A more recent Catholic pronouncement in a textbook on public ecclesiastical law expresses a similar objective. We quote:

“Catholics must make all possible efforts to bring about the rejection of this religious indifference of the State [a reference to the American principle of church-state separation] and the institution [establishment], as soon as possible, of the wished-for union and concord of State and Church.”—Quoted in JAMES HASTINGS NIGHOLS, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1951), page 266.

Will the United States go all the way in copying the above pattern? Will America repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican form of government and become a perfect image of the Roman Catholic religio-political system? To answer these questions we refer the reader once more to the solemn and thought-provoking statement of Richard M. Johnson:

“If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum.”

This New Phase of America Foretold in Scripture

We have seen from chapter eight that the Holy Scriptures fore-told the rise of the Papacy and its liquidation of the Sabbath commandment by intruding a counterfeit Sabbath in its place. All who are conversant with the Holy Scriptures know that many nations and powers were subjects of prophecy. Judea, Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, pagan Rome, to name just a few, were subjects of Bible prophecy whenever the people of God were in any way affected. Many Bible commentators concur in this. Is it conceivable that this great country, the United States of America, the mightiest nation on earth, where for two centuries or more the most far-reaching experiment in freedom was wrought out and where the most stupendous crisis involving this freedom is now developing—is it conceivable that this country has not been given a page in the prophetic scroll? It will be of interest to the reader to learn that this nation is accurately depicted in Holy Writ—its peaceful rise in the Western hemisphere, and its metamorphosis into a persecuting power akin to that of the Papacy—all is clearly foretold in Scripture. In the words of the Hebrew prophet, “Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he reveals his secret unto his servants the prophets” (Amos 3:7).

In the last book of the Bible, the book of Revelation, chapter thirteen, there is a double-barreled prophecy: one is about the Papacy, paralleling Daniel’s prophecy (described in detail in chapter 8, *Who Changed the Sabbath?*). The other is about the United States—that it would emerge as a nation about the time the pope was led into captivity by Napoleon’s emissary, General Berthier—thus most accurately fulfilling the prophecy that “he that leads into captivity shall go into captivity” (verse 10).

Using appropriate symbols to represent these two powers—the Papacy and the United States—the prophecy in one short verse predicts that this country will pass through two sharply contrasting phases in its history. In its first phase the prophet sees it “coming up” silently, like a plant, from vacant unoccupied territory—“out of the earth.” In prophecy “waters” are symbolic of “peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues” (Revelation 17:15). And its appearance is like a lamb with “two horns” (Revelation 13:11). Historian G. A. Townsend in his book *The New World Compared With the Old*, pages 462 and 435, writes as follows about the rise of this country:

“Since America was discovered, she has been a subject of revolutionary thought in Europe. The mystery of her coming forth from vacancy filled the minds of men with unrest.” “The history of the United States was separated by a beneficent providence far from this wild and cruel history of the rest of the continent, and like a silent seed, we grew into an empire.”

The lamb like horns indicate youth, innocence, gentleness, fitly representing the character of the United States in its first phase. From its very beginning America became an asylum from royal oppression and priestly intolerance of the Old World, and its Declaration of Independence sets forth the great truth that “all men are created equal” and are “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,” that among these are “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Republicanism and Protestantism became the

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

fundamental principles of this nation—a state without a king, and a church without a pope. Such was to be the lamb like phase of America, the America we have known and loved.

The Second Phase—Image, or Replica, of the Papacy

What a different America is delineated in the last part of that same verse! According to this prophecy, this lamb like country will yet become a perfect replica of the Papacy. Says the prophet, “He spoke as a dragon.” The Bible interprets itself. In Scripture (see Revelation 12:17), a “dragon” is a symbol of a cruel, tyrannical, persecuting power. How does a country speak? Obviously, through its laws. A transformation in the principles of the United States is here indicated. America’s Republican and Protestant principles will yet be cast aside, and the policies of the Roman Catholic Church will be adopted. This country will establish a state religion and will repudiate every principle of its Constitution. The Scripture continues: “And he causes all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark” (Revelation 13:16, 17).

Here is indicated a boycott and disfranchisement of those who refuse to receive the mark. What is this mark? The Papacy calls Sunday, the counterfeit Sabbath, the mark of her authority. She boasts of having substituted the pagan Sunday in the place of the seventh-day Sabbath, the divinely appointed memorial of Creation—and calls her act a “mark” of her power. Patterning after the Papacy, the United States will yet exalt this papal institution—Sunday observance—by enacting a national Sunday law and, “dragon”-like, will persecute those who refuse to conform. It will forbid these nonconformists to “buy or sell.” Then, according to verse 15, dissenters who “would not worship the image should be killed.” In other words, in Protestant America the death penalty will be invoked upon those who refuse to follow the multitude in keeping Sunday.

It seems utterly incredible as of today that our beloved land would be capable of inflicting such un-American inquisitorial judgments upon any segment of its citizens, but Holy Writ informs us that this will indeed take place, and current events indicate how near we are to the fulfillment of this prediction.

The following quotation from one Protestant clergyman shows that those who crusade for a national Sunday law can and do think along such lines:

“There is a class of people who will not keep Sunday unless forced to do so. But that can easily be done. We have twenty million of men, besides women and children in this country who want this country to keep Sunday. If we would say that we will not sell anything to them, nor buy anything from them, we will not work for them, or hire them to work for us, the thing could be wiped out, and all the world would keep Sunday.”—From a sermon by Revelation Bascom Robins, preached in Burlington, Kansas, Sunday, Jan. 31, 1904.

The Papacy’s “Number” Revealed

The prophecy of Revelation chapter 13 ends with a most intriguing postscript. We read in verse 18:

“Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six (666).”

In the Catholic Bible (Douay Version) there is an interesting footnote to the above verse 18. We quote:

“Six hundred sixty-six. The numeral letters of his name (i.e., “man” referred to in above verse 18) shall make up this number.”

The “man” who stands at the head of the Catholic Church is the pope, who has assumed the title Vicar of Christ, or Vicar of the Son of God. In Latin, the official language of this church, this title, Vicar of the Son of God, is VICARIUS FILII DEI.

We are told in Scripture to “count the number” of this “man.” As we do this, we shall find that the “numeral letters of his name” do indeed make up the number 666!

V 5
I 1
C 100

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

A	0
R	0
I	1
U	5
S	0
F	0
I	1
L	50
I	1
I	1
D	500
E	0
I	1
Total	666

The stage is all set for the final act of the drama. The mounting demands for religious legislation, the United States Government using tax dollars to support parochial schools, the Protestant-Catholic alliance for pushing Sunday legislation, the Supreme Court ruling that Sunday laws are constitutional, and above all, God's in-fallible Word—the Bible—all point to the supreme crisis soon to overtake us—a national Sunday law with consequent oppression of those who keep the Sabbath of Jehovah. With the specter of persecution hanging over America, the following warning from a well-known Protestant writer is very pertinent:

“Marvelous in her shrewdness and cunning is the Roman Church. She can read what is to be. She bides her time, seeing that the Protestant churches are paying her homage in their acceptance of the false Sabbath, and that they are preparing to enforce it by the very means which she herself employed in bygone days. Readily she will come to the help of Protestants in this work. God's word has given warning of the impending danger; let this be unheeded, and the Protestant world will learn what the purposes of Rome really are. Whoever shall believe and obey the word of God, will thereby incur reproach and persecution.”—The Great Controversy, pp. 580, 581.

God Will Vindicate His Downtrodden Law

If an enemy of the United States wished to demonstrate his disrespect for, and defiance of, this country, all he would need to do is to publicly trample the United States flag under his feet. He, of course, would soon be apprehended and properly dealt with. Why? Because the flag he has thus dishonored represents the authority, the sovereignty, of the United States and all that it stands for.

In Isaiah 58:13 God counsels us to “turn away thy foot from the Sabbath.” To supplant the Sabbath by a counterfeit is a standing insult to the Sovereign of the universe, for the seventh-day Sabbath points to the Creator, and its observance is a recognition of our constant dependence upon His providing care. To nullify the Sabbath—God's memorial of Creation—and to put in its place a human institution is presumptuous defiance of His authority; it is akin to unseating the Creator from the throne of the universe.

Sacred history contains many valuable lessons of God's dealing with the nations. Each was given a period of probation and ample opportunity to act in accordance with justice and mercy. Ancient Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Rome, and many other nations were thus tested. When they passed laws which conflicted with the law of God they were visited with His righteous judgments. Thus each nation is still being tested. We quote a well-known author:

“With unerring accuracy the Infinite One still keeps account with the nations. While His mercy is tendered with calls to repentance, this account remains open; but when the figures reach a certain amount which God has fixed, the ministry of His wrath begins. The account is closed. Divine patience ceases. Mercy no longer pleads in their behalf.”—Prophets and Kings, p. 364.

The law of God cannot with impunity be tampered with or be changed, for it is a transcript of His character and is as unchangeable as God Himself. His eternal law and His authority will in the end be

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

vindicated. While truth may for a time be crushed, it shall rise again. The Scriptures picture those who honor God against all odds by obeying His commandments as finally victorious and triumphant. We quote: “And I saw them that had gotten the victory over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God” (Revelation 15:2, 3). This has reference to the song of triumph after Israel’s victory over their Egyptian oppressors (see Exodus 15:1). That song parallels the experience of God’s commandment-keeping people in the closing scenes of this world’s history.

How true the words of the poet James Russell Lowell:

Careless seems the great Avenger;
History’s pages but record
One death-grapple in the darkness between old systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And, behind the dim unknown,
Stands God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above His own.

As a loyal American citizen, is there something you can do? These words of Edmond Cahn are pertinent:

“Freedom is not free. It requires resolution, faith, and courage to maintain what Madison called ‘the Great Rights of man-kind.’”—Quoted in *These Times*, January, 1965, page 31.

In view of what is before us, the next chapter suggests what you can do to meet the approaching crisis.

14. What You Can Do

THE HISTORY of the Jewish nation has always been intimately and inextricably associated with the Sabbath, so much so that it came to be affectionately known as Shabbos Hammalkah—“The Sabbath Queen.” It was the center around which all the religious ceremonial of the Jews revolved. What the Sabbath meant to the Jewish people throughout their stormy history was succinctly expressed by the late philosopher of Zionism—Achad Ha-am, in this inimitable play on words: Freely translated this means: “The Sabbath has kept Israel more than Israel has kept the Sabbath.”

The Sabbath has been the sheet anchor of Judaism throughout the centuries. It marked off the Jewish people as the worshipers of the true and living God—the Bore’ Ha’olam—the Creator of heaven and earth. It kept them from being drawn into the vast ocean of paganism that surged all around them, and from becoming submerged in idolatry. The Sabbath was the gauge, the thermometer, of their success or failure. When they kept it they were secure; when they cast it aside they became an easy prey to their enemies. The Sabbath and the Jew were inseparable. To this day they stand or fall together.

To countless thousands of Jews today, the Sabbath Queen has lost none of her ancient charm. The Sabbath is the connecting link that binds them to their glorious past. Many still keep it, often-times against great odds, and even at the loss of their possessions and their lives. When the evil hour strikes, and this country enacts and enforces a national Sunday law, these faithful, obedient sons and daughters of Abraham will be in the forefront in their loyalty to Jehovah and His memorial of Creation—the Sabbath. At that time even though you may not be a practicing Jew, or a Sabbath observer, you will be deeply involved. Can you imagine yourself looking on with stoical indifference while a fellow Jew suffers imprisonment, disfranchisement, or death for adhering to the Sabbath of Jehovah? His affliction will be your affliction; you will feel his distress just as keenly as though you and not he were the victim, for you are indeed and in truth your brother’s keeper!

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

Your Commitment a Must

It follows that whether you are an observing Jew or not, you will ere long be confronted with a grim choice—you will either honor your Maker, or follow the crowd. None can be neutral in the coming contest. While the vast majority will choose to follow the path of least resistance, God, your Creator, says, “You shall not follow a multitude to do evil” (Exodus 23:2). God cannot use men who in time of peril, when the strength, courage, and influence of all are needed, are afraid to take a firm stand for the right. To stem the present tide of evil which is threatening to engulf us, men of strong moral fiber are needed, men who are committed to the right, come what may. As a well-known writer expressed it:

“The greatest want of the world is the want of men—men who will not be bought or sold, men who in their inmost souls are true and honest, men who do not fear to call sin by its right name, men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole, men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall.”—Education, page 57.

Moses was such a man. In an hour of widespread apostasy, when Israel sank so low as to bow down and worship a golden calf, Moses gathered the children of Israel together and called upon them to commit themselves unequivocally either for God or Baal: “Who is on the Lord’s side?” he cried. “Let him come unto me” (Exodus 32:26). Because of Moses’ decided stand, the camp was cleared of idolatry and the nation was saved.

Elijah was such a man. In his day, Israel again turned their back on God and served Baal, the sun-god. Only a small remnant remained true to Jehovah, the God of Abraham, but they were hidden away in caves in order to escape annihilation. This well-nigh universal apostasy in Israel was stemmed by one man—Elijah the prophet. Loyal, courageous, and unafraid of the rebellious, disobedient majority, he gathered all Israel and the priests of Baal upon Mount Carmel, and cried out in a clear, trumpet like voice: “How long halt you between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him” (1 Kings 18:21). Then, bowing reverently before the invisible God, Elijah raised his hands toward heaven, and offered a simple prayer: “Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant.”

For a moment a solemn hush rested upon that vast assembly. The priests of Baal trembled as if sensing their humiliating exposure and impending destruction. Suddenly, a dazzling flame of fire descended from heaven and lighted upon the prepared altar, consuming the sacrifice, and licking up the water in the trench around the altar. Israel trembled lest that flame also consume them. Convicted of their sin, they cried out together as with one voice, “The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God.” Thus, by one man’s determined stand, Baal worship was wiped out, and Israel was saved.

The three Hebrew youths were such men. The three youths defied Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, when the haughty ruler of that mighty world empire set up a golden image on the plain of Dura, and commanded all to worship it. This command was in direct conflict with God’s law, and for this reason the three youths could not obey the king’s demand. While the multitude bowed down to the image, these three worthies stood upright knowing full well that a fiery furnace awaited them for their loyalty to the God of Abraham. The infuriated king commanded that the furnace be heated seven times hotter than customary for such occasions, and into this flaming inferno were cast the three intrepid Hebrews who were bound hand and foot. But He who rules over the elements made these three Hebrews fireproof! Imagine the king’s astonishment and terror as he looked into that furnace and saw four men walking unharmed, and the record tells us that the fourth was God Himself! In His presence the flames had no power over the heroic youth who were willing to stand up and be counted for the Holy One of Israel!

Important lessons can be learned from the experience of these three noble Hebrew youth, for history is to repeat itself. In this so-called enlightened age many Jews and other Sabbath keepers will ere long suffer persecution and abuse at the hands of those who, inspired by satanic influences, are filled with envy, hate, and religious bigotry. The wrath of the Sunday law advocates and promoters will be stirred against those who hallow the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and this animosity will culminate in a universal decree denouncing those who refuse to honor the man-made Sabbath, pronouncing them as deserving of death. But it is in such crises as this that God reveals Himself. He who walked with the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace will be with His faithful followers wherever they are. Did God forsake Daniel when he was cast into a den of hungry lions for praying to the God of Abraham? Did God forget Israel when Haman masterminded a decree to put the people of God to death? Neither will He forget those who will honor their Maker by keeping His Sabbath, despite the death decree that will confront them for violating the man-made counterfeit Sabbath.

CAN PERSECUTION ARISE IN AMERICA?

As the crisis involving religious minorities is building up, there is much we can learn from a parallel experience in the era of Queen Esther. It is recorded in the book bearing her name that Haman the Agagite authored a decree for the destruction of the entire Jewish nation. Happily, that decree proved abortive. Why? Because Mordecai the Jew was determined to do whatever was in his power to save his nation from imminent destruction. Addressing Queen Esther, Mordecai solemnly said: "Think not with thyself that thou shalt escape in the king's house, more than all the Jews. For if thou altogether holds thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed: and who knows whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" (Esther 4:13, 14).

It was against protocol for a queen to ask for an audience with the king on her own initiative, but Esther was determined to save her people at any cost to herself, as seen from her response to Mordecai's appeal: "I will go in unto the king, which is not according to the law: and if I perish, I perish" (verse 16).

In the face of such a crisis, decision and action were imperative. The noble queen rose to the occasion, and because of her firm stand for the right, God wrought a great deliverance for Israel.

As you ponder the tremendous issues involved, you may well ask yourself: "Is there anything that I can do to help avert or at least delay the crisis that is already in the making?" Indeed, there is much that you can do!

The Sabbath-Sunday question is ere long destined to become the most controversial issue not only in this land but the world over. You can do the part of a modern Paul Revere. Whether at public hearings, or in the social circle, share the information you have obtained in this book.

None can be neutral in this conflict. Like Mordecai, like Queen Esther, like the three Hebrew youth, determine to stand for the right though the heavens fall. Do not violate your conscience by conforming to man-made laws that are in direct conflict with God's law. If obedience to God's commandments gets you into difficulty, do not despair. He who so mightily wrought for Israel anciently will not fail you in the day of your adversity. God always reveals Him-self in a crisis.

Standing as we are on the threshold of the most stupendous religious crisis in history, Mordecai's words addressed to Queen Esther apply with equal force to every one of us: "Who knows whether you are come to the kingdom for such a time as this?"