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1. EXPLANATION

Next Tuesday is the culmination of a great national political campaign. The stump speakers and the newspapers have been busy. Nice and useless have been prominent before us. The question is which party or set of men will control the national government for the next four years; and on Tuesday in city and country from St. Paul to New Orleans, from Portland, Me., to Portland, Oregon, some fifteen million or sixteen million voters will go to the polls to deposit their ballots. It is a significant hour. The issue rests on what the individual voter will do, and people have a perfect right to turn to us Covenanters and say: "Why don't you vote?" Since this is a free country and ours is a government by the people, and since there are important issues to be met, why don't you take hold and help with them? Is it through lack of patriotism, or because of indifference?

"This brochure contains, for substance, the material of two discourses preached by the pastor of the Eighth Street Reformed Presbyterian church of Pittsburgh, Pa., on the two Sabbath afternoons preceding the Presidential Election of November, 1912; and is published by request of the Young People's Society of the congregation; and at their expense. Free copies from James S. Toby, 411 Penn Building, Pittsburgh, Pa."
American flag bared in a certain country is around my pillow bared at once. This is not country. We are partisan.

We do not stay away from the polls because we think the Christian should not vote in politics. We do not think that for a moment. We do not believe that politics is sinful in itself, that it belongs to the Devil, and that the Christian man must always stand aloof from it. What we believe is that politics under certain conditions is sinful. On the other hand, I am sure that our people, even more than the average Christian does, believe that it is a man's sacred duty in a democratic form of government to go to the polls and vote, if there is no unfair condition present. It is either a sin to vote, or not to vote; and if conditions were what we could approve, I am sure you would find that the percentage of absentees among our people would be considerably smaller than it is among people in general.

It is not because we are opposed to the present form of government, the democratic, the republican form, a government by the people. We believe that the republican is the best form of government.

Nor is it because we deny this government rightful authority. We think it is defective, but we do not say it has no authority. A son has no right to disobey his parents because one or both of them are not Christian people. We obey the laws of our country, not because we must, but because we ought. We recognize that the government has in great
measure, at least, proper authority over us. Nor do we stay away from the polls because we are opposed to the church of the laws of this government. Some of them are wrong, of course; but many, perhaps the greater majority of them, are right.

It may be said here also, by way of explanation before we proceed further, that Covenanters are not divided in the opinion of church and state. Such is not our purpose; nor their desire.

Some years ago, in the Rocky Mountains, when the writer was engaged in conversation with an instructor in one of the high schools of Denver, the political attitude of the Covenanters came up for consideration. I explained as much length to the friend our position; and when I was through, while I have no doubt that he was not ready to admit that we were right, he said, "I regard you as good American citizens as I am."

On another occasion, it is said, and I speak from memory; that one of our prominent ministers was the subject of conversation between two men, for a short time, on a street car. One asked the other how the minister would vote at the coming election; and the reply was: "Oh, he is one of these Covenanters that do not vote;" and on being asked why, he answered: "I cannot tell you. All I know is that it is something about Christ." The speaker would like to say again in this general paragraph before undertaking to explain the Covenanters position of dissent from the government, that last summer he was privileged to call upon a Covenant friend who has since been called home. He was a scholarly, well informed, broad-minded Christian gentleman who was ready to cooperate in all good efforts. He was asked, with a view to the discussion outlined in this paper, about our position of dissent. His reply was: "It seems to me as plain as any Christian duty."

But now let us proceed to the consideration of reasons why, when on November 8, many of our citizens will go to the polls, the Covenanters will stay away; and as we endeavor to explain our position, it will be the aim to give not only what seems scriptural and logical to the speaker, but what will more or less fully describe the present attitude of the Covenanters Church, and its historic position on this matter. Let us notice here a few plain truths:

Every Christian man must take the law of Christ with him into every sphere of action. Christ is king in every sphere of your life, not only of your heart and your church, your office and your home, but your social life, and your politics. Christ has purchased the whole man, and a man's relational life must be under Christ's control. Wherever we go, whatever we do, in whatever relation we are, we still belong to Jesus Christ. We have given ourselves to him wholly. We say: "Where he leads me, I will follow, and where he does not lead me, I will not go."

Then a man can't consistently be a Christian in his own room, and a heathen behind that door.
the counter. He can't be a Christian at the prayer meeting, and a workman at the card table. He can't be a Christian in the church pew, and a pagan at the ballot box. If John Smith the farmer takes the blessing at the meal, and John Smith the carpenter puts up lumber in the building, John Smith the man is responsible for both. If John Smith conducts family worship at home, and up the street paul and in the sugar, John Smith the man is responsible for both.

This government is a representative government.

If it were an absolute monarchy, each man's responsibility would, except in a general sense, be very small. If it were a limited monarchy, each citizen's responsibility would be greater, but less than it now is. Ours is a republican form of government, a democracy, and therefore the people rule, or are supposed to do so.

Of course, there is much business, much ring rule, and much rule by parties in the present hour. We have something of an oligarchy at times, and not pure democracy; yet theoretically, and more or less in practice, the people rule, and therefore the responsibility rests upon the people, upon the voter. This is the second step in our explanation.

The authoritative standard in our government is the Constitution. Ours is a constitutional government. The Constitution is the supreme law, the basis of government. Bear this in mind as one more step in the argument.

Observe, the standard is not your own rules of conduct, or your own desires. The standard of government is not the moral sentiment that prevails among the people, and that expresses itself so fully in our laws and customs; nor is it the standard the many Christian institutions and features of our national life, nor is it the great body of our laws.

The basis of our government is not political platforms. Mr. Taft advocates one thing, Roosevelt another, Wilson a third, Debs something else, and Chauncy advocates prohibition; but whichever one is elected, he will take the oath of office, one to his platform, but in the Constitution of the country.

We have a written fundamental law. That is the basis of our legislation and governmental action. We do not say that other things may not have interpreting power with regard to the Constitution, but it is after all the rule of action.

Now observe clearly that every voter must subscribe to this document. This is a representative government and every considerable officer must subscribe to this fundamental law before assuming his official position. In taking the oath to the constitution, he acts for you and me, as well as for himself.

The fundamental law of a nation must contain such provisions as will house the King of nations and also furnish a basis for the settlement of moral and civil questions. This is the next step in our explanation.

It must honor Jesus Christ. If God has given the Mediator all authority in heaven and on earth; if Jesus is the rightful king,
over all men, and of all proper interests; if Jesus is the King of kings, and if a con-
sideration is a nation's pretended faith; if the latter is a great object lesson held
consistently before the people; if it is the
higher source of legislation, then it should
distinctly acknowledge the authority of the
Lord Jesus Christ. "He that honoreth me
the Son honoreth me also the Father that sent
him." We cannot properly exercise authority
under Christ without plainly recognizing the
nature of this authority.
Moreover, a Constitution is for the settle-
ment of moral as well as of economic ques-
tions; not only for the adjustment of such
things as revenue, taxation, tariff, finance,
and commerce. Thus such questions as
Temperance, or Divorce, or the Sabbath Day?
Clearly there should be in our written funda-
mental law a moral basis for the settlement
of such preeminently important questions.

Now, from this view point let us examine
our Constitution. Take it up and read it.
We find it an interesting, able and remark-
able document.
Surely we shall find in this magna carta of
our liberty some devout recognition of
divine authority! Surely, in view of God's
providential kindness in the discovery of
America, in such events as the landing of
the Pilgrims, and their solemn compact in
the cabin of the Mayflower,—"In the name
of God, Amen,"—surely, in view of the state-
ment in the Declaration of Independence
about "a firm reliance on the protection of
Divine Providence," and in view of the fact
that twelve of the thirteen original State
constitutions contain explicit acknowledg-
ments of God and Christianity, we shall find
some devout recognition of God in this re-
markable document!
We turn the pages of the Constitution and
pick for some acknowledgment of God. We
turn the pages carefully, but we find no
mention of his name.

We look again to see if Jesus Christ is the
king of men and nations be recognized, and
again we find no reference to him, except in
the date; and that can have no particular
moral significance.

We look still further for some reference to
the Word of God as a source of jurisprudence
and a guide in legislation, but we find none.
Now what is our national basis for the
settlement of the Temperance question, or
the Sabbath question, or the matter of Di-
Verse? Do we say these are State questions,
rather than national questions? But they
certainly are national questions, and pro-
cision should be made for meeting such by
our national Constitution. And there are
 hosts of moral issues in our national life.

Let us examine the Constitution still
further. We come to the oath prescribed for
the President. It says, "I do solemnly swear
or affirm..." to our faith. The oath taken by
John Haynes, when inaugurated Governor of
Connecticut in 1638—"I do swear by the
great and dreadful name of the ever living
God, to promote," etc., "so help me God, in
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Again, it should be remembered that the first Congress which convened under the new Constitution was aware in with an appeal to God, but that the first act which this Congress passed was to provide an oath with the name of God left out.

In conversation some years ago with a prominent attorney and lawyer in the City of Denver, we said that we did not understand how it came about that the Constitutional Convention omitted all reference to the authority of God, unless it was through the influence of French infidelity. His reply was: "Yes; French infidelity was rampant at that time," and his reason for the omission was "in a measure at least correct. A writer widely-informed on such matters has said that the national convention that framed the constitution manifestly desired that all acknowledgment of God should be omitted.

Let us now come to the application of all this in our political life. Let us keep carefully in mind what has already been said. You are approaching the ballot box. It is a solemn act. Should you not as a Christian voter think somewhat as follows—"I am a Christian man, and must take Christ with me wherever I go. This is a representative government. The man for whom I vote, if elected, will take the oath of office for me, but the fundamental law which must guide him, and me, does not recognize the authority of God, nor of Christ, nor his Law. God's name is even dropped out of the President's oath. I hereby depositing this ballot in an agreement on my part to continue the government on its
obtain secular basis. Am I willing so to do?" And the Conventer says: "No!"

2. OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

There are many objections to the Conventer position of not voting. It is not strange that this is so. Some of these are worthy of careful consideration. If this were not true, all clear-headed, consistent Chris-
tians would be on our side. Let us listen then with care and patience to the con-
sideration of some objections that have been made in the Conventer position on voting, or that might be brought against it.

1. "There must be civil government. Society cannot get along without it. We cannot ex-
pect it to be perfect. Every man owes certain duties to the society in which he finds
himself. He cannot avoid responsibility for it. Should we not all take hold and help
along the government as best we may? We are not responsible for all the defects in it."

On the whole I think that this is the strongest argument that can be brought against our position; but let us remember that nothing needs to exist on a wrong basis;
that we are not absolved from doing wrong because it may seem to us necessary. Be-
cause the family is necessary, and marriage a duty under natural conditions, a man
would not be justified in getting married on wrong conditions. He would not be justified in marrying his neighbor's wife.

We acknowledge that there are certain duties in civil life which every man is under
obligation to perform. He cannot possibly
Christian features, for which we are profoundly grateful, are not the basis of govern-
ment, nor the root of citizenship, but it is in the Constitution, that is the foundation, and
about Christ it is silent, with an audible silence.

4. "The lack of reference to God in the
fundamental law is only a small matter. It
is but the name of God in the Constitution.
Don't quibble. There is nothing perfect here
anywhere. Don't say out of the government
on a mere technicality. You would not do
Christian work, if you waited until all
conditions were perfectly satisfactory." We
reply by saying squarely that the error
in our governmental life is not small, not
technical, not indifferent, but fundamental,
rivet. Do you mean to say, Christian brother,
for the shadow of a moment, that omission
of God from the Constitution, and of Christ,
and of reference to his law, and the removal
of God's name from the Presidential oath,
are small matters? We answer that such
omissions are tremendous, deep-seated, far-
reaching matters.

Observe that our objection is not in errors
of administration. The governor of a State
may fail to bring lynching to justice. The
mayor of our city may fail to close up
distillery houses. But we are not sitting
out of the government because of such
failures as these; nor is the Carpenter
objection merely to bad legislation. We do
object to the twenty-five grounds of divorce,
and to the licensed liquor traffic; but such
objections, if the Constitution were right,
would not be sufficient to keep us from participating in the government.

Let us keep in mind that there are different degrees of responsibility, and different ways of freeing one's self from responsibility. Permit us to give a crude illustration. You are a member of a literary society. A proposal is made to change the hour of meeting from 8:00 to 7:30. In your judgment 8:00 is the proper hour, but you make no objection when the meeting is postponed. You feel that you are not particularly responsible. Let us suppose again that in this same society it is proposed to reduce the treasurer's salary from $2.00 to $1.20 per day. You believe that the man is entitled to the former amount, and accordingly you vote against the reduction, and by doing this, you feel you are free from further responsibility in this matter. Again it is proposed in the same society to hold its next meeting on Thanksgiving Day. In your judgment this is not in harmony with the purpose of the day, and when the motion is carried in favor of such meeting, you arise and enter your protest, thus freeing yourself from responsibility.

But let us imagine the effect of supposing that it is proposed to hold the regular meetings of this organization on the Sabbath day. As a Christian man now what will you do? Can you free yourself from responsibility altogether? Is there any separation from the society? When the error is fundamental, the only conscientious attitude for the Christian is that of separation.

5. "You Covenanted to pay taxes, and you pay them even for conscience' sake. Thus you recognize the government by supporting it. Does this not make you responsible for it?"

Of course we do pay our taxes as has been agreed, not because we must, but because we should. We are protected by the government, and enjoying this protection and our liberty, we feel that we should render a proper equivalent. Remember we do not deny this government legitimate authority. We believe that we should obey its proper laws. Observe here, however, that a taxpayer is not necessarily a member of the governmental body. The alien, the miner, the woman, even the non-resident, all pay taxes; and our being taxpayers does not make us members of the governmental body.

6. "But here are Biblical examples for you Christians. There was Joseph in the land of Egypt, and he was a man of fine character. He was a prime minister under Pharaoh. There was Nehemiah who held office under the King of Persia; and there were Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, and also Daniel, who held office in Babylon. If these men held office under these heathen governments, surely you Covenanted to pay taxes, and you pay them even for conscience' sake, do you say that you cannot hold office under such a good government as that of the United States?"

But notice, my voting friend, that these were not constitutional governments, not representative governments. They were not carried on by voting on the part of the people. These officials were not asked to swear allegiance to support a written constitution of government that contained no recognition of
the authority of God. There is no reason to assume that in the discharge of their official duties they were called upon to take any such position as this. We have no evidence that Drachuk, Morgan and Ashley, who faced the burning fire of a zeal rather than to abstract from its fundamental law that contained the decisions of the authority of the Lord of heaven.

7. "But the Constitution has a provision for an amendment. You don't mean to keep it just as it is. Nobody claims it is perfect, and you can accept it, intending all the time to secure as soon as possible the changes which you think it is necessary.

Yes, it is a good thing that the Constitution has such a provision. It is not perfect. It has had fifteen amendments already and will no doubt need more; but it is to be kept clearly in mind that the officer and voter accept it as it is, not as they hope it will be, nor as they intend to make it. You are not freed from its present stipulations because you intend to change them as soon as you can. Let us suppose that the Abolitionists before the war had said, "While I believe the Constitution supports slavery, I am willing to take the oath of office, because I intend to amend the Constitution in the matter of slavery, at the earliest opportunity." Would such a position have freed him from responsibility for the slave trade? and have made his acceptance of the Constitution consistent? Let us keep in mind that the candidate elected next Tuesday will swear to support not his own convictions nor even his party platform, but the Constitution.

8. "Well, then, you Covenenters should not live in this country. If you cannot help to conduct the government on its present basis, you should go somewhere else, and leave the country to those who feel free to carry on the government." In my hearing some years ago, a speaker said, "If a man cannot organize himself into a democracy in this country, I think he should go to Boston Bay. Yes, if I had my way of it, I think I should send him to Boston Bay."

In reply to such criticism we pleasantly say that this is God's country, and those who give their allegiance in civil matters first to God, have surely as much right on this soil as those who have set up a government without recognition of him; and the man who obeys God, and the laws of his country, who pays his taxes, who prays for his country's welfare, who gives of his means for reform, who labor and sacrifices in behalf of his nation, has a better right on this soil than the man who takes part in the government and perhaps does not pray; or the man who criticizes Covenanters, and if he be, never sacrifices for his country's sake. Why don't men talk of transporting certain of our infamous politicians to some other climate? In our judgment they could be spared with as much profit as Covenanters.

It is a tribe, just a tribe (logical), and we may say unchristian and unchristian, for a man, if he reflects on God's great goodness to America in the dark days of the war of
the Revolution and in the Civil War when we were kept from discussion on a nation: and if he reflects on our great forests, and rivers, and plains and orchards, and mines of ore and coal, which God gave us, and then remembers that we have set up a government without acknowledging God, so turn to the man who can't take part in the government because God is not acknowledged in it, and say to him he ought to get out of this country, and go some place else.

Q. "I think such an amendment to the Constitution as you Covenanters desire would be an infringement upon the rights of others who do not agree with you, such as the Jew, the scotarian, and the infidel. You have no right to enforce your convictions on them.

We reply, first, that a nation has rights of its own, and duties of its own. It is a moral person, and responsible to the moral Governor. Shall a nation, because of the objections of some, forget its own obedience to God."

The Lord Jesus Christ has rights. It is God's purpose that to him every knee shall bow and every tongue confess. The day is coming when all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him. He has purchased this exaltation by his death on the cross, and we have no right to withhold from him the honor which is his due.

The Jew has his rights and no one must be allowed to take them away, but what infringement would such acknowledgment in the fundamental law be upon the rights of the Jews in America than the Jew's rights? Are his rights more sacred than those of the nation? Are they more sacred than those of the majority? Are they more sacred than mine? He is not bound to take the oath to the Constitution. Nobody would compel him to do so. Covenanters do not say they are persecuted now because they cannot swear to the Constitution; and I imagine also that the Jew would not obtain from holding office, even if the fundamental law recognized the authority of Christ. Shall the family rule out the Word of God, and the family altar, and the breaking in pieces, because, forsook, one or two members of the family wish to deny the inspiration of the Bible, and the power of prayer, and the divinity of Christ?

If all men did as you do, anarchy would result. Some people must carry on the government. If all good people did as you do, affairs would go into the winter hand."

There is no danger that all will do as we do. If good people in increasing numbers would begin to abstain from governmental activity, the nation would soon get its eyes open, and we need not refrain from doing what is right for fear that if other people also do right great harm will result.

Do we not see also that this objection is on the basis of apparent necessity; that the end justifies the means? If it is wrong to engage in governmental activity in the pre-
sent hour, no argument will justify it. Are we so afraid of God's wrath, failing that we must do wrong to keep it from falling? Yet we do not fear so much the argument. We must show ourselves to be God's workmen. God has not said that His will is done. I am glad to think I am bound to make this good. I will do it with cheerful heart.

The work that God appoints, I will trust in him. That he can hold his own, and I will take his will. Above the work he sends me to be my chiefest good.

11. "You Covenanters are simply throwing away your votes. "You are free citizens, and yet you do not care to take part in great privileges which this government offers you." There are many others who throw away their votes. It is estimated that at the election to be held this fall there will be about fifteen million votes cast, and that there are about twenty-seven million men over twenty-one years of age in our country. Thus many millions throw away their votes, and few of them apparently for conscientious reasons.

How about the Pessimists? Do they expect to succeed at the next election? Are they throwing away their votes? Do the Socialists expect to elect Mr. Dewey? Are their votes only thrown away? Most people expect Mr. Wilson to be chosen President. Are all the others, then, simply throwing away their votes? No man who votes for a principle throws away his vote. I advise the Pessimists because they then stand by the principle of no-license. I admire the Socialists because he votes for what he thinks is a necessary social change.

12. "You Covenanters are not doing anything. You simply hold your hands, and sit idly by while others carry on the government. You let others do the work, and you enjoy the fruits of their labor. You are a do-nothing policy. You are drawn in the political beehive."

We are not afraid for a moment to meet this argument, or rather objection. The most prominent thing about it is that it is untrue. It is our duty to consider in how many ways a man can serve his country. He can lead an orderly life. He can help in the enforcement of law. He can vote no-license. He can pay his taxes. He can agitate for moral reform. He can contribute of his means to such reform. He can serve in the army and Navy. He can fight in its defense. He can vote for officials to conduct the government.

In how many ways according to this analysis can a man serve his country? Now and the Covenanters serve in every respect but one. Does he lead an orderly life? Not many of them are found to be. He helps in law enforcement. He is in harmony with his
church position in view for me, I see, where no oath is required to the Con-
vention. He pays his taxes. He continues
ly Felice for reform. This congregation
are last year for reforms about $2000
the year before $500. The young people of
our congregations have spent many an hour,
among-us at considerable sacrifice. In pre-
paring reform literature for distribution.
Congregations have often fought in defense of
their country, and yet, because we do not
see he is sometimes said that we do noth-
ing.

Did Dr. A. M. Milligan, who occupied the
pulpit for eleven years, do nothing for the
final triumph of religious truth in this great
land?

Did Dr. David McMillan who was active in
the pulpit, on the platform, and in the editor's
chair, for many long years, and whose
manners are an authority in political philosophy,
set with folded hands?

Was Dr. T. P. Stevenson merely a drone
in the political beehive? Our country has not
yet produced a greater Christian statesman
than he.

Is there any other hand of people in all
this city that does more for governmental
reforms than this congregation? Is there any
other body of 9,000 people in this country
that is doing more to present important truth
in the political sphere and to place our nation
on a permanently prosperous basis than the
Governing Church? We understandingly
answer, No!

Let us turn to our own friends, and ask,
What are you doing with regard to moral
questions in public life? You have been un-
done to the governments for one hundred and
driver years. What great moral reform has
been accomplished through voting? Do you
say slavery was thus abolished? We reply,
not permanently by voting, but by the hand
of God in the Civil War. We do not deny
that noble questions are involved in some
movements in the platform of the three great
political parties; but after all what great
moral question such as the Sabbath, the Sab-
bath, or Divorce, can the Christian man reach
by identifying himself now with any of these
three leading parties?

The position of protest is a position of
power. Remember Elijah, how he spoke the
truth to Ahaz. Zedach and his friends in
the house of danger in Babylon did not
acquiesce until the storm would pass by, but
boldly said, "We will not serve thy gods, nor
worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Would they have acted more
wisely and effectually to have yielded, and
then in some quiet hour to have approached
the king with their message? Peter and the
other Apostles said, "We ought not to obey
God rather than man." The stroke of Luther's
hammer as he nailed the ninety-five theses on
the church door at Wittenberg are still heard
in the world. The old time Abolitionists would
not accept the constitution because they be-
lieved it supported slavery. They asserted
that it was a covenant with death, and an
agreement with hell. They refused to vote or
incorporate with any political party; and a
government leader of their day, has said that
they did more to overthrow slavery than all
other influences combined.

A great difficulty in connection with this
whole subject is that men fall so much to
raise the Christian viewpoint in politics. We
have lurched so far from the approval of the
union of church and state, that we have come
great measure to the conception of civil
government as entirely secular. We have
been so afraid of mixing religion and politics
that we have given politics over to the devil.
We have become so insensitive to the rights of
conscience, that we have forgotten the rights
of Christ. We have been so confused about
the rights of the minority that we have for-
gotten the rights of the majority. We have
considered the claims of the Jew and the
non-believer that we have forgotten the rights
of the Christian. We have so considered the
rights of the individual that we have over-
looked the rights of the nation. In our con-
cern for the rights of man we have forgotten
the rights of God.

We Covenanters need not be disturbed at
the criticisms that are expressed about us.
I hear them. No doubt you do also. Perhaps
at the office last week someone said, "You
are one of those Covenanters that will not
vote. You fail to help us along in this gov-
ernment. You have no right to live here." I
allow this to refer to a letter received during
the past week after the discourse of last Sab-
both. A man, and he is a friend of mine,
though it may be fair to say he is not a
Christian man, and may have read a somew-
hat favorited account in the press of last
 Sabbath's discourse. He writes me as follows:

"Believe me, I have more respect for Tom Paine and Bob Ingersoll, in-
finite patrons..."

"To my mind such a creed as that of Covenanters is nothing
short of rank blasphemy, or moral cowardice, or blind bigotry.
That is plain language; isn't it? But it does not do me any harm.
I think of Jeremiah, of whom we talked recen-
tly, and who said, "I am become a laugh-
ingstock," but I am sure that Jeremiah in
recent times is glad that he was willing to
endure such things for the sake of his Lord; and I think of another, greater than Jeremiah,
of whom his friends said, "He is beside him-
self," and they were not to lay hold on him.

He is the true patriot who refuses to
identify himself with any evil in his coun-
try's life, and when some future historian shall
write the history of the United States he will trace a golden thread back to those who in
these days were willing, even at the price of
criticism and scorn, to stay out of the gov-
ernment because Jesus Christ was left out.