

# JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES, II

Data On Mr. Graves' Career Are to be Found in "Who's Who in America"

## COMMENTS

"A perfect speech!"—Dr. John Finley, Editor Emeritus, New York Times.

"An interesting, beautiful and sympathetic address."—Walter Hampden.

"His speech interested us when we heard it and grew even more interesting when we discussed it."—Margaret Mitchell.

"His subject so fascinatingly presented it compelled greatest interest."—John L. Perry, President, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp.

"His address enthusiastically received."—Edward A. O'Neal, President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

"Have rarely heard so many enthusiastic comments."—Howard W. Odum, University of North Carolina.

"Treats the English language like a lady of rank."—Edwin Bjorkman.

"Beautifully done in every particular."—Douglas Southall Freeman.

"An earnest and gifted writer and brilliant orator."—Clark Howell, Sr.

"Mr. Graves speaks for the enlightened South."—Virginius Dabney, Richmond Times-Dispatch.

"One of the South's ablest, most liberal and best informed men about our Southern economic problem."—Clarence Poe, Editor, The Progressive Farmer.

"Gifted and charming."—Grover Hall, Montgomery Advertiser.

"One of the abler interpreters of the New South."—Harry M. Ayers, Anniston Star.

"Enchanted his auditors."—Memphis Commercial Appeal.

"Approaches a cross between Henry Grady and Walter Hines Page."—Birmingham News.

"Many faceted genius of the South."—St. Augustine Record.

"One of the republic's ablest editors and most brilliant speakers."—Ft. Wayne, Ind., News-Sentinel.

"Captivated our hearts and minds."—Executives Club of Chicago.

"Perhaps no honorary degree this season greeted with wider applause in the South than the award of the doctorate of civil laws to Mr. Graves by the University of the South."—Robert Lathan, Asheville Citizen.

"A statesman, a philosopher and a gentleman of the South."—National Safety Council.

"One of those rare speakers whose originality of thought and entertaining manner of presentation make him frequently sought for return engagements."—New Orleans Association of Commerce.

"Delighted our audience beyond words."—Francis P. Gaines, President, Washington and Lee University.

"Students, faculty and townspeople loud in praises of address."—O. C. Carmichael, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

"His appearance brought out more students than we have ever seen assembled at anything short of a football game or general chapel."—Vanderbilt Alumnus.

"He and Herbert Agar made best impression at our commencement of any persons in a decade."—Frank Graham, President, University of North Carolina.

"Captivated us on Armistice Day with eloquence and intelligence."—John J. Tigert, President, University of Florida.

"A masterful Founders' Day address."—F. D. Patterson, President, Tuskegee Institute.

"His audience sat spell-bound, held fast by the charm of person, voice, language and message."—North Carolina Clubwoman.

"Most certainly 'rang the bell'."—Gordon Gray, President, Young Democrats of North Carolina.

"One of the most wonderful addresses our body has heard."—Lloyd Foster, President Southern Association of Commercial Secretaries.

"He has, in addition to his famous father's felicitous command of words, an eager and liberal grasp of regional and national affairs which has made him one of the truly sought-after lecturers at a time when people are crying for light."—Atlanta Constitution.

## OCCASIONS

Town Hall, New York; Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia; Institute of Citizenship, Georgia School of Technology; Institute of Rural Affairs, Virginia Polytechnic; Chicago Executives Club; American Farm Bureau Federation; National Small Business Men's Association; National Safety Council; National Cottonseed Products Association; Delta Council; Rotary Clubs of Chicago, Cleveland, Toledo, Rochester, etc.; Commencement addresses, University of North Carolina, University of Arkansas, Randolph-Macon, University of the South, etc.; Washington and Lee University, Tuskegee Institute, Vanderbilt Student Union, University of Florida, University of Georgia, etc.; Education Associations of Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, Florida, Mississippi, etc.; American Pomological Society; Midcontinent Oil and Gas Association; Colonial Dames, Georgia; National Peanut Festival, Alabama; Jackson Day Dinner, Richmond, Va.; Young Democrats of North Carolina; University of Minnesota School of Business; University of Missouri School of Journalism; New Orleans Association of Commerce, etc.

## SUBJECTS

The Second Discovery of America  
My Country 'Tis of Thee  
Life, Liberty and Happiness  
The Sickness of Democracies  
What Price Government?  
The Problem of Problems  
A Newspaper's Responsibility

The South as a Modern American Factor  
The Unsolid South  
I'll Take My Stand  
The Return to Grace  
Industry and the South  
God's Commodities  
Human Being



**JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES, II**

**Editor :: Author**

Sep. 7  
Ch. & State

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

UNOFFICIAL—READ, THINK, STUDY

NOTE: There is so much of interest to which our readers should take heed. While we do not present these comments with any decided opinions, we give this information so that each may digest it and govern his actions by his own findings.

Congress is flooded with letters of suggestions and advice from all over the United States on these subjects, and the members of Congress necessarily pay attention to the views of their constituencies. So write to lawmakers your views, and take an active interest in civic matters.

### U. S. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION

THE 5-to-4 decision of the United States Supreme Court in the New Jersey Bus Case, regarding the use of public tax money for the transportation of children to parochial schools, came as a great disappointment. Naturally, we were not surprised at Mr. Justice Murphy's position, as the Roman Catholics, in the opinion of many, will always stand by their church and do what they can for it. There are a good many who are beginning to think that there is something in the charge that has been made by the anti-Catholic people that the Roman Catholics' first allegiance is to the Pope. Regarding that we have nothing to say, for Freemasonry is not anti-Catholic and it does not prohibit Roman Catholic men from becoming Freemasons, and many of them do. But when they do, the very act of becoming Freemasons excommunicates them from the Roman Catholic communion.

As a matter of course Freemasonry flourishes in all those countries where it is allowed freedom, and it has been beneficial to every country where it has been permitted to exist. Also, as a matter of course, it is not far wrong to say that Freemasonry is the handmaiden of the Church.

Returning to the decision of the Supreme Court, there have been many opinions and criticisms offered and printed. It is incumbent, and always has been incumbent, upon the Masonic Fraternity and upon all non-Catholics to maintain unimpaired the Constitution of the United States or other regu-

lar barriers to preserve the separation of Church and State, and there must continue a real separation of Church and State.

This decision really settled little and solved nothing. One of the statements sent out by the U. S. News Service includes Montana in the list of states that have authorized transportation of private and sectarian church school children at public expense. That is not true of Montana, and maybe of some of the other states mentioned.

The decision, as a matter of law, simply holds that a state may provide such transportation, which we believe is absolutely wrong and is shown to be so by the dissenting opinions of Mr. Justices Rutledge and Jackson. It does not affect the law of any state which prohibits free transportation of private and sectarian school children. Unfortunately, though, it adds fuel and raises ambitions and stirs desires on the part of those who favor the use of public funds for the transportation of children to private and sectarian schools. It may be reasonable to expect now that measures providing or even requiring free transportation of all school children at public expense will be introduced into many state legislatures. And so the dissensions and discussions and the antagonisms will continue and grow.

It would be very beneficial if every real, true, American citizen could read the decisions of both sides in this case. We think that the opinions expressed by Mr. Justices Rutledge and Jackson cannot be successfully refuted.



**"IT WILL NOT STAND"**

EVERYONE, almost, in the United States has heard of the Hon. Josephus Daniels, who was Secretary of the Navy under President Wilson during World War I and after, and who made an outstanding contribution to and conducted the office of Cabinet Member in a manner beyond compare. Afterwards he was Ambassador to Mexico and his work there was equally great. He now is owner and publisher of *The News and Observer* of Raleigh, N. C., and the leading editorial in that publication on February 23rd is one as patriotic in importance, as correct and as forceful as any which has ever come to the desk of THE NEW AGE and there is no hesitation in publishing it in full, as follows:

"In writing the majority (5 to 4) decision of the Supreme Court submarining the constitutional inhibition of Church and State, Justice Black also turned his back on this profound statement of Jefferson: 'To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.' And that is exactly what the Supreme Court compels citizens to do when public school money is used to transport children to a church school. This giving money to a church school to transport its students is a blow at the greatest American institution—the public school—and would make Horace Mann and Charles McIver turn over in their graves. If the subsidy can go to Catholic schools, it can go to all Protestant and other church schools and all private schools. If persisted in, it would annul the Constitution and strike a blow at the public school system, the bulwark of democracy.

"Justice Black declared that Church and State must be kept separate. He added: 'We could not approve the slightest breach.' And in the next sentence he did exactly what he declares should not be 'breached' by approving public money to support a Catholic school by transporting children to that

church school. He said one thing in one sentence and then repudiated it in another. As Justice Jackson pointed out: 'We know that such schools are parochial only in name—they, in fact, represent a world-wide and age-old policy of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . Catholic education is the rock on which the whole structure rests, and to render tax aid to its church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the church itself. If the state may aid these religious schools, it may therefore regulate them.'

"Justice Rutledge, dissenting from an infraction of the most fundamental American principle and policy, wrote a masterly opinion covering 47 pages in which he traced the long struggle by which the separation of the Church and State had been won. He said:

'No more unjust nor discriminatory in fact is it to deny attendants at religious schools the cost of their transportation than it is to deny them tuitions, sustenance for their teachers, or any other expense which others receive at public cost.'

"That 5-to-4 revolutionary decision will not stand."

**SCHOOL SAME AS CHURCH AID**

AMONG the most penetrating comments made on the 5-to-4 majority decision of the United States Supreme Court in the New Jersey School Bus Case was that of Mr. Justice Jackson who wrote an individual dissent which was concurred in by Mr. Justice Frankfurter. This dissent was apart from that by Mr. Justice Rutledge in which three other Justices agreed, Justices Frankfurter, Jackson and Burton.

Mr. Justice Jackson quotes from five sections of the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church by which all Catholics are bound, namely, Nos. 1215, 1216, 1217, 1224 and 1381 (the Rev. Stanislaus Woywod, *The New Canon Law*, under imprimatur of the Most Rev. Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York and others, 1940).

Mr. Justice Jackson then makes these observations: "I should be sur-

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

prised if any Catholic would deny that the parochial school is a vital, if not the most vital, part of the Roman Catholic Church. . . . Its growth and cohesion, discipline and loyalty, spring from its schools. Catholic education is the rock on which the whole structure rests, and to render tax aid to its church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the church itself. . . . The state cannot maintain a church and it can no more tax its citizens to furnish free carriage to those who attend a church. The prohibition against establishment of religion cannot be circumvented by a subsidy, bonus or reimbursement of expense to individuals for receiving religious instruction and indoctrination."

Let the Protestant free world (and non-Catholics who are not Protestants but who equally value their liberties that a Protestant tradition has made a reality) ponder and remember those ringing words of Mr. Justice Jackson quoted above: "to render tax aid to its church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the church itself."

S. W.

or association of churches, or any Sunday school association incorporated under the laws of this state, or any auxiliary thereof, such school to be conducted and maintained in a place other than a public school building, and in no event, either in whole or in part, at public expense," and no loss of credit in his public school work would be charged to the child.

This action of the Senate of North Dakota brings to naught the effort to inject religious instruction of a denominational character into the public schools of the state. It will not now be possible for ecclesiastical, catechetical instruction to be given a child in a public school building and at the taxpayers' expense, nor outside of the school building during school hours. This action of the legislators is encouraging to lovers of liberty and unity the country over. The released time system separates the various pupils of the public schools—it does not unify them and the grounds of our public schools are the places where American democracy finds development in childhood and youth.

E. R.

### N. D. BANS RELEASED TIME

THE North Dakota Senate in February defeated Senate Bill No. 164 which would have permitted the released time system for religious instruction in connection with the public schools. The bill was an amendment and reenactment of Section 15-3407, North Dakota Revised Code of 1943, which provides that a child may be "excused from school attendance for the purpose of sending him to any parochial school to prepare such child for religious duties, for a total period of not exceeding six months in the aggregate, and such period may extend over one or more years."

The new bill or amendment would have made it possible for a child of compulsory school age to "attend, for a period or periods not exceeding in the aggregate two hours in any week, a school for religious instruction, conducted and maintained by some church

### CONTROL OF PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

A FORTHRIGHT and farsighted comment on the first page of the February 21st issue of *The Protestant Voice* proclaims that "by a five-to-four decision of the United States Supreme Court, control of all Catholic parochial schools has been handed over to Protestants—if they have courage to seize the opportunity."

The New Jersey School Bus decision of the Supreme Court holding it constitutional to use public tax money for free transportation of parochial pupils is discussed from the standpoint of "No Taxation Without Representation," which was "the animating cause of the American Revolution."

Extracts from this fearless front page comment are given here for alert thinkers to meditate upon:

"If tax money is used for Roman Catholic parochial schools, the taxpay-

ers—all of them—are empowered to control the spending of that money. This is basic American doctrine.

"The taxpayers . . . can demand and enforce that nothing be taught in schools aided by tax money which reflects upon or builds any barrier between Americans.

"Wherever tax money is sought or used for school purposes, rigorous scrutiny of the books used in such schools becomes the right of all taxpayers. . . .

"This means that the teaching of the Roman Pontiffs in regard to democracy must be rigorously excluded from Roman Catholic schools where tax money is used for school buses.

"No man can read the teachings of the Pope without admitting that their doctrine is in violent conflict with the principles of freedom as Americans understand it.

"This will not be a disservice to the parochial schools. It will help them. In the November 2nd issue of *America*, a magazine published by the Jesuits, public admission is made of the intellectual bankruptcy of Roman Catholic schools.

"That magazine states that only three Roman Catholic institutions of higher learning in the United States have been able to qualify for financial assistance offered by industrial companies as grants in aid for postwar scientific research. . . .

"If the dead-hand grip which has stifled these colleges were removed by sharp Protestant criticism, the black blindfolds which have checked and hampered their scholars would be lifted; and they would be free."

#### WATCH PAROCHIAL TEXTBOOKS

WITH a keen sense of the issue at stake and with a courage to go all the way, *The Protestant Voice* of Fort Wayne, Ind., carries an article on its front page in the issue of March 7th regarding the U. S. Supreme Court decision giving tax money to aid sectarian education through providing free transportation for pupils. (The Su-

preme Court has denied a rehearing.) Says the Protestant newspaper:

"One thing is certain: if Protestant tax money is used for Catholic parochial schools, Protestants have the duty and obligation to demand control over the teaching in such schools.

"Roman Catholic strength in this country is concentrated in large cities. Protestants control the rural areas where bus fares are mostly needed.

"Therefore, whenever public money is given for Catholic school fares, Protestants should immediately start suit to enforce the placing of Protestants upon all Catholic school boards, and to make obligatory sharp scrutiny of all textbooks and all teaching in such schools to make certain that nothing is taught to which Protestants can legitimately object.

"Under this heading certainly come denunciations of democracy emanating from papal sources.

"By control of the schools, Hitler raised up a generation of Nazis. By control of the schools, Mussolini turned Italians into Fascists. By control of the schools, Russia produced a generation of Communists.

"Control of the schools must not go into the hands of a dictatorial power. This bus fare decision opens the means whereby control of sectarian schools can be obtained and enforced by Protestants.

"Another obligation rests upon Protestants. It is to cleanse the public schools themselves; to provide sufficient pay for teachers so that public schools will not—as in Dakota—be forced to call in the aid of teaching nuns, to prevent public schools from closing."

#### CHURCHES ON THE ALERT

CHURCHMEN as well as schoolmen the country over are viewing with alarm the recent U. S. Supreme Court decision that it is constitutional for public funds to be used to furnish free transportation for children attending parochial schools. A strong editorial in the *Southern Christian Advocate* would awaken churches to the





REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL  
JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC RELATIONS  
715 Eighth Street, N.W., Washington 1, D.C.

The Northern Baptist Convention  
The Southern Baptist Convention  
The National Baptist Convention  
The National Baptist Convention, Inc.

J. M. Dawson, Executive Secretary



E. HILTON JACKSON, Chairman

W. B. LIPPHARD, Secretary

*Religion*

*W. B. L.*

March, 1947

GOVERNMENT AID TO CHURCH SCHOOLS - SUPREME COURT DECISION REVIEWED

The five-to-four decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, handed down on February 10, 1947, has produced tremendous repercussions throughout the Nation. The majority opinion as read by Mr. Justice Hugo Black presented an eloquent and convincing account of the background which explained the American espousal of the doctrine of separation of church and state, the repudiation of religious establishment from which the colonists fled Europe, from which they had a taste of the same suffering on these shores, causing the adoption of the First Amendment forbidding any further imposition of the evils of an official, state-supported church. After such a deliverance, when he announced that his group would uphold the New Jersey statute, which provides tax money payment to Catholics for the transportation of their children to parochial schools, the words sounded almost incredible. The vigorous dissent voiced immediately by Justices Jackson, Rutledge, Frankfurter and Burton showed how certain facts involved were neglected or failed of true construction.

The relative merits of the majority opinion and the dissenting opinions are so susceptible to evaluation, the Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations for the Baptists of the United States determined immediately to publish the opinions themselves, together with a legal analysis of them, along with its estimate and certain representative press opinions, to be embodied in a booklet so that the reading public might pass its judgment in the case.

An alert press was not slow to speak up, as shown in this issue of Report From The Capital. We consider this another encroaching step toward changing the Constitution in a manner to give the Catholic Church a privileged position, hence a long step toward altering the culture of the country. It could wreck the whole cherished public school system, for if one religious group can receive government aid in support of their institutions, then all should. What would be the effect of allowing two hundred and fifty-eight religious denominations to get support for their church schools? How different is the plea of public welfare as a reason than public welfare served by religion? Isn't payment of priests and church upkeep as logical?

Baptists do not propose to sit complacently by, but will raise an outcry in the hope that the country may become aroused to this threat. Already nineteen states in which Catholics are strong have passed some kind of enactment providing tax aid to church institutions. If denied a rehearing before the Supreme Court in the New Jersey case, Baptists will appeal to Congress not to enact pending educational bills into law which would extend Government aid to Church schools; they will appear in other cases which will come to the Supreme Court; and they will continue publicly and extensively to make their argument against this portentous danger to religious liberty.

### CATHOLICS WRONG AS USUAL

Our Sunday Visitor, National Catholic Weekly: "Bigotry did its best to defeat the cause of private schools before the Supreme Court. The American Civil Liberty Union prepared an Amicus Curiae brief against it; so did the Southern Baptists; so did the Junior Order of United American Mechanics; so did the Seventh Day Adventists; so did another powerful organization which later withdrew its brief. And now bigotry will only begin to rant."

The above characteristic remark of Our Sunday Visitor contains three distinct errors in one sentence. First error: it says the Southern Baptists prepared a brief, whereas the Hon. E. Hilton Jackson, Chairman of the Joint Conference Committee representing the Baptists of the United States, North and South, white and colored, prepared the brief, which was not for Southern Baptists alone but for the Baptists of America. Second error: it says "another powerful organization which later withdrew its brief" entered the case, whereas the Clerk of the Supreme Court tells us no single brief was withdrawn, and furthermore we know that several other groups did desire to submit briefs against it along with Baptists but were not in time to qualify. Third error: it says "bigotry will not only begin to rant," whereas the reaction of the Nation's press as reflected in this issue of Report From the Capital indicates who is talking, and the Catholic editor could hardly stigmatize the secular press as guilty of bigotry toward the Catholics.

We welcome such a Catholic expression as this one from Our Sunday Visitor, because it will in future contests with the Catholic encroachments on the American Constitution everywhere afford a true indication of who is guilty of bigotry in this country.

\* \* \*

### BAPTISTS DISCUSS COURT DECISION

The Joint Conference Committee of the Baptists of the United States, by reason of its backing the appellant in the New Jersey case in which the Supreme Court rendered opinions sustaining aid to Catholic parents in transporting their children to parochial schools, finds itself under heavy pressure to meet invitations for public discussion both in the press and on the platform. The Honorable E. Hilton Jackson, Chairman of the Committee who prepared the Baptist brief as Amicus Curiae, has consented to address the annual convention of Congregational Churches of Massachusetts in Boston; a mass meeting of Baptists in San Antonio, Texas; The Baptist Seminary, Ft. Worth, Texas; and the First Baptist Church Brotherhood in El Dorado, Arkansas. Dr. J. M. Dawson, Executive Secretary of the Committee, will speak to a meeting of Baptist pastors and others in Atlanta, Georgia, Monday, March 17. He has recently addressed audiences at Mississippi College at Clinton, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N. C., and Meredith College at Raleigh, N. C. on the subject. Resolutions deploring the Court's decision have been prepared for both the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in St. Louis the first week in May and the Northern Baptist Convention to be held in Atlantic City the week following.

\* \* \*

### NOTABLE COMMENT ON COURT DECISION

To give some understanding of the country's reaction to the decision of the United States Supreme Court upholding the New Jersey law which provides payment of public tax money to Catholic parents for transporting their children to parochial schools, we are printing a few out of the many adverse expressions.



The Washington Post: "Only a narrow gap divides the five Supreme Court justices who upheld the use of public funds for transportation of students to church schools from the four who took the opposite view. But that narrow gap runs to immense depth. For the principle at issue is one of the most fundamental in the American concept of government - the separation of church and state....School children's bus fare is one of many items in our national bill of education. If citizens can be taxed to pay this expense, they can be taxed to pay the salaries of church school teachers and the cost of buildings for religious educational purposes. When and if this happens, the dominant group in any community will be in a position to dip into the public purse to propagate its own faith and the separation of church and State, as we have known it in the past, will be nothing but a myth. The majority opinion carries strong suggestions that the court would not go that far. But the court has destroyed the only basis on which a rational distinction can be made. Its resort to expediency in this instance will deprive it of an anchor to tie to when the larger issues are raised. Justice Black's argument favoring this relatively small encroachment upon a constitutional principle reminds us of the young woman who tried to excuse her transgression of the moral law by saying that her illegitimate child was only a small one. It is the principle that is vital, as Justice Rutledge made clear in his powerful dissent, and not the amount of the assistance given. Taxes are wholly public. The religious function is wholly private. The two cannot be intermingled, in our opinion, without grave damage to both. We should think that every religious group interested in maintaining freedom in its relationship to the Deity would understand and appreciate this fact. For, as Justice Jackson wrote in his separate dissent: "If the State may aid these religious schools, it may therefore regulate them." In this sense, the court appears to have struck a blow at religious freedom as well as the separation of church and state, for the two are inextricably woven together."

Scottish Rite News Bulletin, Washington, D. C., pp. 1: "After reciting the law, fact and our tradition for 160 years, which the Roman Catholic Church (a foreign temporal power) has tried in every way to strike down, bit by bit, one is amazed at the reasoning of the Court in its findings....It will certainly occur to but few students of the First Amendment that the Supreme Court has, in the New Jersey Case, kept 'the wall between church and state high and impregnable' when it succumbed to an alleged welfare statute of that state to strike down that wall or at least to breach it....In holding that it 'must not strike that statute down' because it is 'a public welfare legislation' the Supreme Court did strike down the First Amendment, the greatest public welfare organic law ever evolved by man in his age-long fight for freedom and peace. The Court not only superimposed a state statute of alleged welfare benefits above the First Amendment but in doing so veered far afield from its own sound definition of that Amendment, which it gave at length....When the Court hears from the country in no uncertain terms it may be cogent enough in its processes to grant a rehearing."

Time, New York: "The Court, operating more as a debating society than as the Government's judicial mind, could produce nothing better than a 5-to-4 decision which settled little and solved nothing. It did show - and thereby took aback those who fondly imagined that the question had been answered long ago - that the relations of church and state were still, or again, an issue....The issue was not settled. In the past, the courts of six states had thrown out, as unconstitutional, laws similar to New Jersey's permitting transportation at public expense for parochial-school pupils. There was talk of drafting a constitutional amendment to bar the practice. The issue would be before the people for a long time to come."

The News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.: "Last week in a five to four decision the Supreme Court of the United States struck the worst blow against the American complete separation of church and state of a century....For some years Catholic priests and others have been seeking to compel the State to transport children to church schools in

buses bought and operated by public taxation for the sole purpose of transporting children to the tax-supported public schools, and several States have passed acts permitting such transportation. The use of public money for church schools is contrary to the principles and policies which are the cornerstone of our republic. If the money appropriated for public education can be employed to transport children to the Catholic schools in New Jersey, or to Lutheran schools in Illinois, or Methodist schools in Michigan, public school money can be diverted not only to transport children attending all church schools, but it can be employed to pay teachers in church schools, erect buildings for church schools and go along toward undermining the whole public school system in the interest of the first steps of a return to the union of church and state....The narrow margin in the Supreme Court's reactionary decision gives rise to the hope of future overturning this dangerous departure from the rock-bed of hostility to anything that tends to overturn the Jeffersonian doctrine that has made this a country of religious freedom or any suggestion of church direction of public affairs.

Washington Evening Star: "The diversity and vigor of the court opinions evoked during the course of the litigation are indicative of the explosiveness of the issues involved. The New Jersey Supreme Court by a two-to-one vote ruled that the statute and resolution permitting payment of Catholic school students' fares are invalid. The Court of Errors and Appeals, by a six-to-three vote reversed that decision. And now the Supreme Court, by a five-to-four division, has upheld the New Jersey law and the township action under it....The dissenters pointed out that Catholic schools are bound to benefit by transportation aid, no less than they would by any other form of State subsidy; that Catholic schools are 'the rock on which the whole (church) structure rests' and that tax aid to a Catholic church school is 'indistinguishable' from rendering the same aid to the church itself. As for police and fire protection, Justice Jackson emphasized that these services are rendered not only to Catholic schools but to private schools of all description, whether operated for profit or not." At some length The Star insisted this was no small issue, and took its stand with the four dissenting Justices."

The Nation: "Not in a long time has the Supreme Court come up with a ruling as vulnerable as its recent decision that public moneys may be used to provide free bus service for parochial school....The reasoning of Justice Black appears to be shockingly loose....Nervously, haltingly, but surely, the Court majority has breached the wall of separation so carefully built up by Jefferson and Madison. We will hear more of this matter as other communities take their lead from the Ewing Township case. We can only hope then, that the Court will reverse itself, as it has on other occasions when its decisions have clearly misfired."

St. Louis Post - Dispatch: "If it were a unique and isolated instance, the Supreme Court decision in the New Jersey parochial school case might attract little attention. But this decision will not rest in some remote judicial plane. It lends abrupt support to an increasing and subtle encroachment on separation of church and state....The first real assault on the principle of separation of church and state came only after World War I....In the 30's parochial schools caught in the depression looked for public assistance. The chasm between church and state began to narrow....Amid the legal confusion, it is clear that many citizens are now taxed, however indirectly, to support religious teaching in which they have no conviction....But the astonishing thing is that after so many years of study and jealously-guarded independence, religion is now considered so feeble as to need government help."

Chicago Daily Tribune: "We believe, with the minority of the Court, that the line between church and state should be strictly drawn and that this strictness will, in the long run, redound to the benefit of religious organizations, and the preservation of



religious freedom....The teaching of religion should be encouraged in every way so long as it is carried out by the citizen himself in his home or through his church. It is not a matter with which any public body can safely concern itself, however indirectly."

The Christian Science Monitor: "Separation of church and state is a bulwark of religious liberty. To remove a stone from that bulwark is to weaken the fortress of religious liberty. In our opinion the Supreme Court, by its decision permitting the use of public funds to pay for transportation to sectarian schools, has torn down a whole section of that bulwark....The Court has opened a very wide door. Where will we draw the line? It might be well for the friends of religious liberty to carry a new case to the Court to permit it to call a quick halt to this breaking down of the separation of church and state - or even to reverse itself."

Alabama Baptist: "This decision of the Supreme Court is the most serious thing that has happened within forty years of our active life. It is the opening wedge whereby larger public funds will be asked for the support of Catholic institutions. The next step will be to get through Congress a bill to pay the teachers of Catholic schools out of public funds. The decision tends toward a union of church and state for which the Catholic church has stood since the church and state were united by Constantine, the Roman emperor, in 325 A. D. The decision tends to circumvent the Bill of Rights which separates church and state and guarantees religious freedom for all. And it will do more to widen the rift between Protestants and Catholics in America than anything else has ever done. More than that it is so loaded it will enter American politics, a thing which ought not to be done in this country."

Religious News Service, New York, Washington dispatch: "The Supreme Court decision in the New Jersey school bus case hit Protestantism generally and the Baptists in particular with the force of a judicial atomic bomb. As a result, it can safely be predicted that Monday, February 10, 1947, will be remembered in church history. For, as Arthur Krock, the New York Times columnist pointed out, the Supreme Court on that day did not end a controversy by its decision, but really gave birth to a continuing conflict. Protestant spokesmen here - other than the Baptists - generally restricted their statements to private expressions of opinion, but all of them agreed that the last has not yet been heard of the use of public funds for private schools. And that wasn't all. Protestant spokesmen here said freely, that the decision would stiffen their opposition to any federal aid-to-education measure, even the watered-down Taft bill that would allow the states to use the funds as state laws provide. The Protestants here have determined to fight every piece of legislation even remotely relating to cooperation between church and state more vigorously, but it remains to be seen whether their constituents throughout the nation feel the decision as keenly as the men in the capital."

The California Southern Baptist: "Baptists should never stack arms until men with such a warped sense of justice are shorn of their authority. All this coupled with the fact that President Truman still keeps his personal ambassador to the Vatican, Mr. Myron C. Taylor, on the job makes our patriotism stagger."

The Watchman-Examiner, New York: "The decision of the Supreme Court that public school funds raised by taxation may be used to pay for transportation of children to Roman Catholic parochial schools is the stiffest blow at the great American principle of separation of church and state since the Bill of Rights became law....The Supreme Court, however, has often shown sufficient ingenuity in the use of lawyers' language and the shuffling of its precedents - when its decisions have met with public disfavor - to correct its own mistakes. If sufficient numbers of Americans now tell the Supreme Court and their representatives in Congress what they think of this destructive decision, a way may be found to change it."



The Christian Index, Atlanta, Georgia: "One does not have to be a lawyer, much less a Supreme Court Justice, to know that if public tax money can be used to take children to private, religious, schools, public tax money can also be used to support religious schools, hospitals and orphanages. There is no difference in principle and we may rest assured that the Roman hierarchy will press its victory to its logical limit ....This decision will do more to fan the flame of religious strife in this country than Ku Klux Klans and Columbians could ever do. Intense and bitter controversy is bound to result if this decision is not reviewed and reversed. It is a body blow against the principles of separation of church and state and, if allowed to remain, is destined to destroy completely our Constitutional protection against the union of church and state. The decision forces every taxpayer to contribute to private religious schools. Unless the decision is changed, or a new Constitutional amendment adopted, soon millions of our tax money will be pouring from our public treasuries into Catholic institutions."

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, former President Federal Council of Churches: "If parents have the natural right to determine the education of their children, a privilege this Nation gladly gives, it follows that parents who refuse the benefits of these splendid public school educational opportunities....should pay for such private education as they insist upon. Otherwise, the Communist father and mother who may demand a Marxian education for their children may also call for private schools and logically ask for public support. Public funds should be used for public education."

The Standard, Chicago (Swedish): "Taken by itself this measure may appear to be quite insignificant, and many will look upon the act of the Supreme Court as a just and humanitarian one. Why should not the state have a right to spread its benevolent wing over pupils in Catholic schools as freely as over boys and girls in public schools? These arguments - the 'child benefit theory' and the extension of the police powers of the state - were also used by the majority in presenting its decision. But seen as a part of a definite program of advance by the Roman Catholic church of today this measure gains considerably in importance. It is another step closer to the fulfillment of the dream of a Roman state church in this country and farther away from the treasured democratic principle of separation of church and state."

Dr. Louie D. Newton, President, Southern Baptist Convention: "I see in the decision a dark shadow, now no longer, it may appear, than a man's hand, but portending a great and terrible cloud that may be drifting out over every hamlet and dale from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate to darken the torch of religious liberty."

The Baptist Review, Dallas: "National aid to parochial schools will be one of the great issues before the Congress in Washington. The National Catholic Welfare Conference with other Roman Catholic bodies will bring tremendous pressure on the senators and representatives to support such measures....It (the Roman Catholic Church) intends eliminating the public schools and every other institution which tends to create a non-sectarian unity within the nation....We are now passing through a period where the whole concept of democracy is being challenged....A bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by R. J. Welch of California to appropriate \$150,000,000 this year (and more thereafter) for 'elementary and secondary parochial and public schools.' Catholic spokesmen for this bill justify it because 'it recognizes that parochial schools are semi-public because they serve the public good.' Let that specious argument soak in! To justify the appropriation of public monies to sectarian institutions on the ground that they 'serve the public good' would open the treasury of the United States to every denominational school and hospital in the country. The whole objective of such bills is, as the Christian Century well says, to 'abolish non-sectarian schools; let the state support the schools; let the church (the Roman Catholic) run them!' Senator Aiken has introduced a bill, S. 199, which would, if passed, enable parochial schools out of tax

money to pay teachers, build houses, transport and equip pupils - in short, in the words of Dr. J. M. Dawson, 'provide what Protestants have long feared would be done under the Catholic appeal.' It is the solemn duty of every citizen to keep informed of this unrelenting, sinister, and wholly un-American fight of the Roman Catholic Church to feed at the trough of public monies for the support of their institutions."

Religious Herald, Richmond, Virginia: "The Roman Catholic Church has won a signal victory by this decision. The Supreme Court unconsciously gave 'the clock's hands a backward turn.' It is unfortunate that Protestants by complacency and compromise encourage this movement towards state religion. A statement of protest by the Baptist Public Relations Commission in Washington issued against the Supreme Court decision is made less effective by those who support the program to teach the Bible and religion in the public schools."

Western Recorder, Louisville: "Catholic education is the rock on which the whole structure rests, and to render tax aid to its church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the church itself. The State cannot maintain a church and it can no more tax its citizens to furnish carriage to those who attend a church. The writer cannot be accused of having a persecution complex. He would have been equally opposed to the decision had the point in question involved transportation of Baptist children. It is not, therefore, a matter of its relation to a particular religious group. Neither can any accuse us of being disloyal to either the whole or any branch of our Government. Loyalty to Government is a part of Baptist nature. Nevertheless, this is the long dreaded step toward the union of church and State - the support of religious groups from public funds. The decision in the writer's judgment will bring an unprecedented outcry. It will plant a fear in the hearts of the American public, lest the religious liberties purchased at so dear a price, shall under pressure be sacrificed. We as Baptists say calmly and without rancor that the decision is the most unfortunate act on the part of any branch of our Government within the memory of any now living."

The Churchman (Episcopal) New York: "When the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the New Jersey school bus case it hit Protestantism a wallop which may at last awaken it. Baptists, long champions of separation of church and state, spoke up immediately. Their Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations issued a blast against the decision that was heard 'round the nation....' 'The time is ripe, and rotten ripe', to use a line from James Russell Lowell, for Protestants to go to work against the political activities of the Roman Catholic hierarchy - as we have been gently insisting in this journal for several years. Because of their lethargy, due to their fear of being called 'bigots' and 'intolerant', Protestants got what they deserve in the Supreme Court bus bill decision."

The Christian Century (Non-denominational) Chicago: "Protestants can no longer be complacent in the face of such encroachments by the Roman Church. They should now see that the issue raised by the aggressive policy of this church involves much more than the determination of a legal point. It involves the ultimate character of American culture and the destiny of Protestantism in this country. A culture dominated by the Roman Church will be a different culture from one in which Protestantism is the ascendant faith. This incontestable fact should awaken all non-Roman citizens of the nation - regardless of their religious faith or lack of it - to see (1) that no further advances are made toward the goal of a privileged relation of this church with the government; (2) to undo by congressional action the effect of the two Supreme Court decisions which, as Justice Rutledge strongly says, mark the beginning steps toward that goal; and (3) to hasten the fulfillment of President Truman's promise to discontinue the American embassy at the Vatican. The membership of the Protestant churches must be aroused to an intelligent understanding of the issue which the Supreme Court's decision has not clarified. No



pulpit can be silent on this issue. The Protestant religious press can be counted upon to do its part. But the issue must be carried down to the grass roots of the churches, namely its voting members. As citizens, they have no more imperative duty than to exercise sharp vigilance in keeping open the forum of religious liberty. Neither the federal government nor the states must be allowed through blindness or pressure or sentimentalism to destroy this open forum."

Word and Way, Kansas City, Missouri: "The High Courts decision should be considered with great seriousness since this is the first time, it would seem, that the exact issues have been before that body. It sets a precedent for itself, and worse still, for the lower courts, where precedents carry great weight and are hard to break. There are, however, several precedents in lower courts where this issue has been tried and where Religious Liberty won. Non-Catholic groups, if at all observant, cannot fail to see that the lines are being drawn and that the traditional perpetrators of religious persecution are on the battle march in the courts, in legislative halls, through the myriad channels of education, through political maneuvering, and through pulpit and press. The niceties of apologetics are forgotten as in South America, the United States, and elsewhere they become openly hostile to all non-Catholics and alarmingly defiant to democracy. Any man that will call this timely warning of Baptists just so much 'rabble rousing' is, like the ostrich, burying his head in the sand."

\* \* \*

BOOK ON SUPREME COURT DECISION READY

The eighty-page book containing opinions of majority and dissenting justices in the Supreme Court decision in the New Jersey bus case, together with legal analysis of same, along with editorial expressions of leading newspapers, and put out by the Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations for the Baptists of the United States, is off the press. The edition of one thousand copies is the gift of the Baptist Sunday School Board, Nashville, Tennessee, Dr. T. L. Holcomb, Executive Secretary. While more than two-thirds of the edition has already been exhausted, this office will be glad to send one copy to each applicant as long as the supply lasts. This publication is likely to be of historic interest.

\* \* \* \* \*





REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL  
JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

715 Eighth Street, N.W., Washington 1, D.C.

The Northern Baptist Convention  
The Southern Baptist Convention  
The National Baptist Convention  
The National Baptist Convention, Inc.

J. M. Dawson, Executive Secretary



E. HILTON JACKSON, Chairman

W. B. LIPPARD, Secretary

May 28, 1947

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CITIZENS ON CHURCH AND STATE

On May 15, there was held in the National Memorial Baptist Church an informal conference of representative Protestant leaders on matters of church and state. The Executive Secretary of the Baptist Joint Conference Committee, who convened the conference, presided. Present were: Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Editor, The Christian Century; Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary, Federal Council of Churches; Dr. John H. Gardner, Jr., representing the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America; Superintendent William A. Cook, Cincinnati (the man in the center of the Catholic-public school debacle); Elmer R. Rogers, representing the Scottish Rite Masons; Doctors Yost and Longacre, national officers of the Seventh-day Adventists; Dr. Clyde W. Taylor, Secretary, National Association of Evangelicals; Dr. Frank Gigliotti, our recent emissary to Italy; Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, representing Northern Baptists; Representatives Joseph R. Bryson and Brooks Hays, who explained the proposed amendment; Dr. W. C. Smalley, Edmonton, Canada, representing Canadian Baptists; the Honorable E. Hilton Jackson, Chairman of the Joint Conference Committee; Dr. Raymond Wilson, representing the Friends; Dr. Thomas Keehn, representing the Congregationalists; Dr. Frederick E. Reissig, representing the Washington Federation of churches; Dr. James A. Crain, Executive Secretary, the Disciples, Indianapolis; Dr. Charles R. Bell, Jr., Chairman, Wisconsin Religious Liberty Association; Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, representing the Lutherans; Dr. W. O. Lewis, Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance; and a number of local pastors.

While no press releases regarding the Conference were made at the time, it can be stated that the discussion was thorough going, harmonious and determined. It can be announced now that another Conference was agreed upon, to be held at an early date in Washington, at which the following committee on plans and policies will report: Dr. Louie D. Newton, Baptist; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist; Bishop William Scarlett, Episcopalian; Dr. John A. Mackay, Presbyterian; and Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Editor of the Christian Century. Another committee to recommend the best legal approach will report at the same meeting.

This means that a united front along broad, constructive lines may be expected to grapple with the American crisis on church and state in concerted action. Despite the recent discouragements, the outlook brightens toward a new day in the life of the Nation.

\* \* \*

NEW JERSEY ACTS

On Thursday night, May 15, at eight o'clock, there was held a great Taxpayers' Rally in Camden, New Jersey. George F. Gray, of Trenton, presided. The purpose of the meeting as stated in thousands of handbills distributed was: "To protest the use of State Tax Money for transporting children to Parochial schools, which use weakens the barrier between Church and State." The address was delivered by E. Hilton Jackson,

prominent Washington Attorney, who argued the recent case coming up from New Jersey before the United States Supreme Court. The upshot of the meeting was to adopt resolutions looking to the repeal of the New Jersey law which the United States Supreme Court sustained. It thus appears that New Jersey is determined to meet the crisis precipitated by the decision in a very effectual manner, setting the example for other states which are afflicted with the same conditions imposed by acts of their legislatures. We quote from a part of Mr. Jackson's splendid address delivered on the occasion:

"The true remedy is that proposed by the people in the state of New Jersey in holding meetings of this character and thus arousing public opinion throughout the state with a view to a change by popular vote in the fundamental law of the state, and to cooperate with like-minded people in the remaining states to the end that they, too, might thus safeguard this eternal principle of liberty. Thus not only by eternal vigilance may we preserve the cherished principles of the First Amendment.

"We also believe that the Supreme Court, when once it is made aware of the anxiety felt by the people of the United States as they contemplate the opening wedge reflected in the Everson Case, will give further consideration in any case arising hereafter, and thus reexamine the question anew and by differentiation or repudiation refuse any longer to be bound by any abortive attempt to amend the Constitution by judicial interpretation. The citizens of New Jersey are to be congratulated in challenging the validity of the resolutions of the Board of Education, although made pursuant to a state statute. The people of the state by such conduct have presented to the Nation a consistent determination to preserve inviolate the liberties of our founding fathers. This state was the first to ratify in November 1789, the first ten Amendments constituting our Bill of Rights, and now stands ready to challenge and overthrow by all legitimate means the consequences of a decision which challenges the integrity of our public school system, and raises the question as to whether this Nation can survive two systems of education which would carry us back to the days of our forefathers who left the shores of Europe in order that they might worship here the Almighty according to the dictates of their own conscience without state aid and state control. It is believed that the issue may be summed up in the following language:

"The spirit which would make the state sponsor for any form of religion or worship, and the religion, whether Protestant or Catholic, which would make use of any of the powers or functions of the state to promote its own growth or influence, are un-American; they are not native to the soil; they are inconsistent with the equality of rights and privileges and the freedom of conscience which are essential to the existence of a true democracy."

"According to the Associated Press report, which came from Admiral Byrd's flagship on his recent expedition to the South Pole enroute to Australia, it appeared that prior to leaving this southern most point his plane was piloted over the exact location of the Pole, and that as he passed this pivotal point he dropped a bundle of flags tied together. These flags were not merely American flags, but represented all of the constituent members of the United Nations Organization. As he dropped them he made the historical remark, 'I have tied them together because they belong together'.

"It would seem that the time has arrived when all citizens who would preserve the priceless liberties guaranteed by this great charter of human rights must bind themselves together in a common objective until a government for all the people has been firmly established."



SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION AND THE JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Baptist Record, Jackson, Mississippi:

"Dr. Walter P. Binns of Missouri presented the report of the Committee on Public Relations and submitted the following recommendations which were adopted:

1. "That we express our appreciation of the pledge which President Harry S. Truman made to Dr. Louie D. Newton, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, and others, that he would recall Myron S. Taylor from the Vatican as soon as the peace treaties are signed. We hold that it was a violation of American policy for this representative ever to have been appointed and there is no valid reason for his continuation in the position he now occupies.
2. "That we register our firm opposition to the passage by the Congress of any bill for Federal Aid to education which includes provision, directly or indirectly, for the application of public tax money to church schools.
3. "That we call to the attention of all Baptist schools, hospitals and other Baptist institutions the danger of accepting grants of money from the government for buildings or equipment or for any other purpose. The acceptance of such grants upon any pretext whatever will weaken the Baptist witness in behalf of the principle of separation of church and state.

"Dr. J. M. Dawson of Washington, executive Secretary of the Joint Conference Committee of American Baptists, was applauded after he spoke vigorously in favor of the committee's report.

"Many people think of religious liberty as something that belonged to the days of Martin Luther, Roger Williams or Thomas Jefferson," he said.

"But recent circumstances have conspired to make religious liberty more alive, more nearly paramount than ever before in human history."

"Dr. Dawson asserted there was a 'deplorable drift toward the union of church and state, resulting in dangerous encroachment on the Constitution and the sinister growth of clerical control over government.' He declared this had come about largely through neglect, and he called for united action now.

"He said the Baptists were not impelled by any narrow, selfish bigoted spirit in their concern for separation of church and state, for they wanted all religious groups to have equal rights.

"The Richmond-Dover Memorial was presented by Dr. Jas. H. Ivey of Richmond, Virginia and enthusiastically adopted."

- - - - -

The above account is deeply appreciated. It is in line with interpretations given by the Southern Baptist press generally. President Newton's address, various resolutions adopted, and the whole attitude of the more than eight thousand messengers present combined to give strong support to the great objectives of the Joint Conference Committee.

The report to the Convention as presented by Walter Pope Binns, Chairman, was signed by the members of the Southern Committee: J. M. Broughton, E. H. DeGroot, Jr., E. A. Fuller, N. I. Gressett, L. L. Gwaltney, Brooks Hays, T. L. Holcomb, E. H. Jackson, C. O. Johnson, S. F. Lowe, R. P. Naney, L. D. Newton and M. T. Rankin.



NORTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION AND THE JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

The Northern Baptist Convention in Atlantic City, held May 19-24, adopted the following report on Public Relations which was signed by the fifteen members: W. W. Everett, Chairman; W. B. Lippard, Secretary; H. R. Bowler, D. B. Cloward, C. W. Cranford, J. C. Hazen, C. W. Cranford, Gordon Palmer, Gordon Poteat, E. H. Pruden, I. M. Rose, L. W. Smith, M. C. Stith, S. E. Stuber, E. B. Willingham and J. R. Wilson.

"The Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations is the only agency in which the Northern Baptist, Southern Baptist and Negro Baptist Conventions are organically related in a cooperative enterprise. Each of the participating Conventions has its own Committee on Public Relations, which together form the Joint Conference Committee whose membership comprises 15 Northern Baptists, 15 Southern Baptists and 7 Negro Baptists.

"Two meetings were held last year, at which various matters of national and international concern to Baptists were considered. On May 26, 1946, the committee achieved its long-cherished hope of opening an office in the national capital and of employing a full-time Executive Secretary. Dr. J. M. Dawson, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Waco, Texas, and chairman of the Southern Baptist Convention Committee on World Peace, was appointed to this position. It is gratifying to report that he has already proved to be the right man in the right place. Thorough unity of thought and heartiness of cooperation characterize the representatives of the participating conventions, and the committee looks forward to a long period of service and usefulness in the conservation of historic Baptist principles and in representing American Baptists in whatever issues of public interest, political, legislative, social and moral, are of Baptist concern. In the interests of efficiency and prompt attention to issues as they arise the committee in its organization is divided into four sub-committees dealing respectively with world issues, domestic situations, religious liberty and Baptist cooperation. In addition, the committee maintains a Finance Committee and an Executive Committee.

"Among issues to which the committee has given serious attention are Federal aid to public education, the Supreme Court's decision sanctioning the payment from public funds of transportation to Roman Catholic parochial schools, the President's personal ambassador to the Vatican, safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms in American legislation and in the activities and functions of the United Nations. Through Dr. Dawson the committee has been in contact with numerous government committees, and a significant publicity service has been rendered in supplying information and news releases to Baptist periodicals and to secular news agencies. In its activities the Joint Conference Committee feels free to proceed in matters where there is common ground and agreement. It acts in behalf of and on specific requests of national boards and agencies in the constituent conventions. It makes no commitments whatsoever that involve organic union or any infringement on the autonomous procedure of Baptists. It recognizes that there are ways in which Baptists can and should act independently of other churches, and that there are also great issues, such as the separation of church and state, upon which all Christians of whatever denomination or creed need to stand united against a peril that is common to all. The committee has established many legitimate contacts with various departments of the federal government, and through Dr. Dawson has been represented at various Congressional hearings the subjects of whose discussions were of concern to Baptists.

"The committee records with sincere regret the death of Dr. R. W. Weaver on January 31, 1947, who more than anyone else had envisaged the necessity and possibility of a Committee on Public Relations that would truly represent all American Baptists. He wrought wisely, diligently and sacrificially to bring about the establishment of this committee, and it is gratifying that he was permitted to live to see it as the culmination of his own long and distinguished career."

- - - - -

The Convention, through its General Council, made a special order for the consideration of strong resolutions asking for the recall of Myron Taylor from the Vatican, for the omission of government appropriations to church schools and for the establishment of a National Council of Citizens on Church and State. The Executive Secretary of the Joint Conference Committee was invited to address the Convention, which he did in support of the resolutions which were carried unanimously.

\* \* \*

#### RICHMOND-DOVER MEMORIAL

A paper, doubtless historic, adopted by the Baptist pastors and subsequently by the general pastors association of Richmond, Virginia, is being widely voted unanimous acceptance. Following its most illuminating whereases, it presents the following resolutions and plan of action.

"Therefore, be it resolved, that as American Citizens -

"1. We register our disappointment and alarm over the various legislative enactments both state and federal and the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court which permits the use of public tax funds for the support of schools other than public schools; by thereby infringing upon the separation of church and state and violating the guaranteed principles of our Constitution.

"2. We stand for the enactment of state and national legislation in language so clear that it cannot fail of true interpretation, which will preclude the use of public funds for church purposes or which will contribute to the benefit of any religious group.

"3. We propose that a determined effort be made to extend the principle of religious liberty to all nations of the world through the United Nations, and we earnestly petition the United States Government to champion firmly the rights of religious minorities everywhere in accordance with the Charter and Bill of Rights of the United Nations.

"4. We urge all American citizens to defend and to propagate the principle of religious liberty and separation of church and state and to make clear the issues involved by a constructive plan of cooperative action.

-----  
"We recommend this plan of action:

"1. The adoption of the above resolutions.

"2. That these resolutions become the basis for memorializing the other Baptist Associations of this State, the General Association of Virginia, and the Southern Baptist Convention meeting this spring in St. Louis.

"3. That a pattern which will serve as a program of action for our Baptist people be suggested to include:

"(1) Newspaper Display Advertisements -

"a. The Historic Principle of Religious Liberty in America.

"b. The Current Threat to Religious Liberty in America - the need of extended Religious Liberty as a World issue - setting forth its values in undergirding the whole process of democratic culture.

"c. The Public Schools as the unifying, integrating force and sponsor of Democratic Culture.

- "(2) That pastors be requested to preach simultaneously in cities and associations as early as practicable to be followed on Wednesday evenings by a study of our Baptist history.
- "(3) That the above resolutions upon adoption be sent to the members of the State and National legislative bodies; that pastors and laymen be urged to express their views on the principle of Religious Liberty and to voice their opposition to objectionable features of pending legislation by direct letter to their representatives; and that petitions be prepared for circulation among the congregations of various churches.
- "(4) That a brief and simple pamphlet be written on religious liberty and the issue before us for general distribution.
- "(5) That Dr. J. M. Dawson, Executive Secretary of the American Baptist Public Relations Committee be requested to present the above matters to the Northern Baptist Convention and the National Baptist Convention, Inc., and the National Baptist Convention, seeking to secure united purpose and action by Baptists of the United States.
- "(6) That the Dover Association authorize the Committee from the Richmond Baptist Pastors' Conference to act for the Dover Association and to carry through this program in cooperation with other agencies named.

"(Signed by)

"Reuben E. Alley,  
"John W. Hughston,  
"James H. Ivoy, Chairman."

\* \* \*

#### INDISPENSABLE BOOKS ON PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A FREE AND RESPONSIBLE PRESS: Report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press.  
University of Chicago Press. 139 pages. \$2.00.

Foreword by President Robert M. Hutchins. A general report on mass communication: newspapers, radio, motion pictures, magazines and books. Financed by Time and The Encyclopaedia Britannica. Confined to the roll of the agencies of mass communications in public affairs. Incomplete but informing.

BEHIND THE SILKEN CURTAIN: A Personal Account of Anglo-American Diplomacy in Palestine and the Middle East, by Bartley C. Crum. New York: Simon and Schuster. 297 pages.

An exceedingly lively story and eye-opening as to the Near East problem.

WHY THEY BEHAVE LIKE RUSSIANS, by John Fischer. New York: Harper and Brothers.

One of the most discussed books of the year. Very readable and regarded as fair.



MARSHALL: Citizen and Soldier, by William Frye. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company. 396 pages.

A careful biography important to possess when the office of Secretary of State is headed by a soldier in peace-making times. Laudatory but authentic.

GOD IN HISTORY, By Sherwood Eddy. New York: Association Press. 283 pages.

A Christian interpretation written by a competent man who summarizes his lifetime study, observation and insights in a single volume.

ON BEING FIT TO LIVE WITH, by Harry Emerson Fosdick. New York: Harper and Brothers. 219 pages. \$2.00.

Theme: You must not be part of the problem but help to be the answer.

WARTIME CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND POPE PIUS XII. New York: MacMillan. 125 pages. \$2.50.

Offers no light on the Pope's services to the United States during the war years. Fraternal exchange of courteous letters.

POLITICAL RECONSTRUCTION, by Karl Loewstein. New York: MacMillan, 497 pages. \$4.00. Author law professor in Germany until Hitler; later professor of Political Science in Yale; more recently at Amherst, also lecturer at University of California at Berkeley; 1942-1944. Special Assistant to Attorney General in Washington; now legal Adviser of Emergency Committee for Political Defense in Montevideo. Will be regarded by many as significant contribution.

FOUNDATIONS OF DEMOCRACY, by F. Ernest Johnson, Editor. New York: Harper and Brothers. 278 pages. \$2.00.

Anything the author writes is of value, but this volume is more mature and most timely.

USSR: A Concise Handbook, Edited by Ernest J. Simmons. Cornell University Press. 494 pages, \$4.50.

This is a factual book, not a set of opinions. It aims to present Russian geography, history, government, law, economics, banking, agriculture, industry, communications by means of railroads, highways and air; medicine and health, education, religion, Soviet philosophy, the language, literature, art, music, drama, architecture and science. The writers are recognized specialists.

AMERICA MUST BE CHRISTIAN, by H. C. Goerner. Southern Baptist Home Mission Board, 141 pages. \$1.25.

The gifted and scholarly professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, who succeeded Dr. W. O. Carver as head of the Department of Missions, has supplied the churches with an excellent class book for study groups.

MR. STASSEN'S PREFERENCE

The courtesy of addressing the Southern Baptist Convention extended to Harold E. Stassen, who is an avowed candidate for the Presidency of the United States, imposed a certain restraint upon the messengers. The candidate, before speaking at St. Louis, seized the occasion for declaring his disagreement with the Convention for unanimously adopting previous to his arrival resolutions demanding the recall of Myron Taylor from the Vatican and urging no government appropriations to parochial schools. Telegrams protesting Mr. Stassen's strange performance, out of regard for proprieties, were not publicly read. New Orleans Baptist pastors did, however, soon thereafter send him a telegram expressing that his position, in their judgment, was both "inconsistent and unthinkable". He did not lack for similar communications from multitudes over the country.

The Executive Secretary of the Joint Conference immediately wrote him, inclosing the secretary's statement made to the Senate Committee on pending education bills, which included numerous quotations from the great dailies and journals of the country adverse to the recent Supreme Court decision, suggesting that he was perhaps not aware of the pronounced hostile feeling of the public from coast to coast on this matter. The secretary did not accuse him of what the Christian Century declared was an obvious bid for the Catholic bloc of votes, to be expected in the 1948 election. He did suggest that while none might count on a Baptist bloc of votes (for there is no politically-minded hierarchy to over ride the full liberty of each Baptist citizen voter), presidential candidates might possibly awake to discover that the surest way to be defeated is to make a bid for the Catholic bloc! Protestants, and millions beside them numbered among the Masons, educators, Jews and citizens generally, stand strictly against clerical control over government and for the American traditional and Constitutional guarantees of separation of church and state.

Mr. Stassen's long telegram to the Northern Baptist Convention in Atlantic City proved even more offensive, for it attempted to rebuke the Baptists for deploring the recent decision of the Supreme Court, a right long established in law and exercised generally as proved by the overwhelming newspaper editorials. It further evidenced the certainty that if nominated and elected, Mr. Stassen would claim the right to maintain an official representative at the Vatican.

It is not surprising, therefore, that according to him the unhampered privilege of holding to his opinions, the program committee for the Baptist World Congress thought it better that he not attempt to interpret church and state to those attending the Congress in Copenhagen.

\* \* \*

## The Stassen Discourtesy

**M**R. HAROLD E. STASSEN of Minnesota was invited to address the Southern Baptist Convention at its recent session in St. Louis. The Convention rose to greet him and showed him every courtesy. In the second paragraph of his speech he went wholly out of his way to say: "I do not agree with the two resolutions which the press reports that you have passed on the question of diplomatic representation at the Vatican and the Supreme Court decision on school busses."

Mr. Stassen is an active candidate for nomination by the Republican party for President. His subject, "Baptists and World Peace," did not call for or even hint at a necessity or propriety for such a statement. Mr. Stassen knew that the Convention represents an overwhelmingly Democratic section of the country, and that any statement he might make could not affect his political fortunes. He knew also that a great Convention of more than eight thousand messengers assembled from Maryland to California with several thousand visitors in addition was a great sounding board for any political statement he wished to make. So he abused the courtesy of the great Conven-

tion with a slap in the face by dissenting from the unanimous vote of the eight thousand messengers who had condemned the violation of religious freedom by the Washington Administration, and by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Stassen plainly used our Convention as a sounding board from which to throw out a sweet sop to the Roman Hierarchy and to the Catholic votes of the Northern States. There are several logical and clamant deductions from this incident.

The first is that Mr. Stassen was utterly lacking in appreciation of the courtesy shown him by the Convention because he went out of his way to dissent from the Convention's most cherished and blood bought principles.

Second, he proved that he does not know what religious freedom and separation of church and state are, for he dissented from the Convention's action on the Vatican Ambassador matter and the Court's bus decision; and then made himself ridiculous and absurd by saying in the next breath that he believes in separation of church and state. So he is either lacking in intelligence or thoroughly disingenuous in his utterance.

Third, this utterance of Mr. Stassen serves due notice that if he should be elected President the Vatican ambassador violation of our federal constitution will continue. It indicates that like the President who first sent Mr. Taylor to the Vatican, who swore to uphold and defend the Constitution and then defied the Constitution (See Article II, Sec. 2, paragraph 2) by going over the heads of the Senate in the appointment of Myron C. Taylor to the Vatican, Mr. Stassen, if elected, would do the same unlawful act to appease and cajole the Roman Catholic vote.

Fourth, it shows that Mr. Stassen was willing to let his Baptist brethren down by a misuse of our courtesy, and to break with the most historic and important Baptist principle of the ages—all for a mess of political pottage.

Fifth, it points a lesson for our Convention: about calling in every political big shot who happens to wear the Baptist name and giving him the opportunity to use the Convention for his political purpose and thereby exploit the Convention for political ends. I don't know how often I have seen this foolish custom of calling in the political celebrities embarrass and disgust us. Let us be disgusted by our own folly and learn that the spiritual purpose of our Convention cannot be promoted by such political opportunists.

Sixth, it is interesting to remember that Mr. Stassen's own state, several months ago, repudiated Mr. Stassen's views about such matters as paying bus fare of parochial school children out of public funds.

L. E. BARTON.

Montgomery, Ala.

*The above article is rather sharp and pointed in its criticism of Mr. Stassen, but we are publishing it as a guest editorial because we feel that the point of view is essentially true and we feel that something like this needs to be said. The Editor of the RECORDER is certainly non-partisan when it comes to politics, but he has been an admirer of Mr. Stassen as an able and progressive leader, and he had looked forward with delight to hearing him speak at the Southern Baptist Convention. However, he has to admit that the total effect was disappointing. We felt that the speech of Mr. Stassen, although not particularly strong, was a good speech and did set forth some basic fundamental principles in good government for our nation and the world, but we regret that he brought in unnecessarily this comment on "diplomatic representation at the Vatican and the Supreme Court decision on school busses."—EDITOR.*





# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)