

"Watchman, What of the Night?"

COMMENTARY

Volume VI

Number 2

ERODING RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Americans United for Separation of Church and State's (AU) 45th National Conference on church-state relations was held in Alexandria, Virginia, September 19-22. The editors of WNN attended this meeting along with over 200 others of diverse faiths. Speakers, many experts in the Religious Liberty field and Constitutional law, spoke on selected topics ranging from the history of religious liberty to current church-state issues. Four speakers were part of a panel, discussing where the religious communities which they represented stand on church-state separation. Combined with this meeting was the Madison-Jefferson Student Seminar in which 63 law and theology students participated. Following are the highlights of this seminar beginning, as they did, with some history.

"The Constitution of The United States is a document embodying the fundamental principles upon which the American republic is conducted. Drawn up at the Federal Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787, the Constitution was signed on September 17, 1787, and ratified by the required number of states (nine) by June 21, 1788...The Constitution has undergone gradual alteration with the growth of the country. Some of the 23 amendments were brought on by Supreme Court decisions. The first nine amendments, which constitute the Bill of Rights, were added, however, within two years of the signing of the Federal Constitution in order to insure sufficient guarantees of individual liberties. The Bill of

Rights applied only to the Federal government. But since the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment (1868), many of the guarantees contained in the Bill of Rights have been extended to the states through the "due process" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The First Amendment guarantees the freedom of worship, of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of petition to the government for redress of grievances." (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1958 ed.)

When the Constitution was being framed, the lack of a Bill of Rights was one of the main concerns of Thomas Jefferson. Writing from Paris, 20 December 1787, to James Madison, he confided: "First [I do not like] the omission of a bill of rights providing clearly & without the aid of sophisms for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, —restriction against monopolies, the eternal & unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land & not by the law of nations." (Thomas Jefferson, Library of America, pp 915-6)

According to Jefferson, the first amendment had created a "wall" between church and state. That wall between was created by these sixteen important words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.." These are the words referred to by courts and court watchers when the establishment or free exercise clauses are mentioned. "Madison held that the fundamental

principles of our government were so equitable, so liberal--so just to the Jew, to the Turk, to the dissenter, to the agnostic--that any bill guaranteeing this equality would probably be defective in that it could not be worded so as to be broad enough to cover all cases liable to arise. He was afraid that any provision they might make would be given too narrow a definition--not giving the full meaning intended." (American State Papers, p 183)

Jefferson and Madison understood the differences in a pure democracy (rule by the majority), a republic and a monarchy. Jefferson illustrated this understanding in a letter to Madison when expressing a second dislike to the draft constitution. He wrote: "The second feature I dislike, and greatly dislike, is the abandonment in every instance of the necessity of rotation in office, and most particularly in the case of the President. Experience concurs with reason in concluding that the first magistrate will always be re-elected if the Constitution permits it. He is then in office for life." (Thomas Jefferson, Library of America, p 916) Representatives of the people were to be elected by responsible individuals; and after serving a set time, would come up for re-election. The President was to be limited to serving two terms as an elected official.

UNDERSTANDING LIBERTY

What is religious liberty? Most individuals would answer this question in the understanding within the framework of their own religious beliefs. Are the problems today any different than they were 200 years ago? Many of the earliest settlers came in search of religious freedom; however, their idea of religious freedom was to worship the way they believed. So one of the first things they did was to formalize their beliefs into state churches. The various religions, opposed to the Church of England, settled in different colonies, each setting up their own state religion. It was Roger Williams of Rhode Island who

first came up with the radical idea of religious liberty. He believed that people should be able to worship any way they wanted; that religion should not be tied to any political entity. It took several hundred years, but the United States was the first nation that formed a government without a national religion. As a result, all citizens were granted the right to worship the way they chose, or--not at all. Reference to God was deliberately left out of the Constitution. The reason was so that the Constitution would not create even a shadow of a right for the general government to meddle with religion.

Today a SDA or Jew might focus on the right to observe their Sabbath from sundown Friday to sundown Saturday. A Catholic might choose to attend mass on Saturday or Sunday. But how do Catholics view religious liberty? Church & State commented - "Freedom of conscience is the most fundamental human right and world peace cannot be achieved without respect for it, according to Pope John Paul II." (Feb 1991, p 13). However, one must understand the Vatican position on religious liberty. "While focusing on the importance of religious liberty, John Paul's speech left ample room for the traditional Vatican stance on such issues as religion and politics, abortion legislation and tax aid for religious education. He charged that an 'extreme and uncompromising separation of religion and political life--effectively hinders believers from exercising their right to give public expression to their faith.'" Ibid. This merging of church-state relations does not agree with the position of our founding fathers and the writers of the U.S. Constitution.

What about the Jews? Panelist, Lois Waldman, Co-Director, Committee on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress, New York, N.Y. made an insightful observation. She stated: "The question may arise, how the Jewish community will view church-state in the future? This depends in part on the composition of the Jewish community and its history and

experience as time goes on. The fight against government and its identification with religion has improved the security of the American Jew. But that security has enabled Jews to move increasingly into the wider community and has re-enforced secularism within the Jewish world. That secularism coupled with intermarriage may leave the organized Jewish community with only the most parochial and particularistic interests. If that happens we might see a shift away from policies of strict church-state separation."

During the panel discussion, Dr. Robert Dugan, Executive Director, National Association of Evangelicals, Washington, D.C. detailed the "religious right" position. He stated that conservative Evangelicals view AU's position as being "hostile to religion"; that the recent decision in *Lee v. Weisman* was not regarded as a victory. Dr. Dugan made it clear that conservative evangelicals believe that religion should be a part of and an influence in government. To illustrate his point he referenced a letter written 31 July 1788 from Jefferson to Madison stating that Jefferson's concern was that the people be protected from the government, not that the government would be protected from religious influence. Dr. Dugan may not be aware of another letter written 15 March 1789 by Jefferson to Madison stating that he in fact was concerned about religious influence on government. Jefferson wrote: "I am much pleased with the prospect that a declaration of rights will be added; and hope it will be done in that way which will not endanger the whole frame of the government, or any essential part of it." (Thomas Jefferson, Library of America, p. 945)

As a part of the religious right, Pat Robertson, James Dobson and Donald Wildmon are included. "These national leaders of the Religious Right have attacked the concept of church-state separation openly, sometimes calling for its abolishment." (AU Annual Report, 21 Sept. 1992, p 1)

Another panel member, Dr. David Sapp, Pastor of Derbyshire Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., speaking, as he described, from the "trenches", very aptly stated the concerns of the populace when he said, "There is no longer concensus in the pews. The masses are genuinely afraid, and for good reason. They see moral disintegration, they fear for the integrity of their families and the future of their children, for the health care and care of their parents, for the security of their jobs and for the safety of us all. They see government as the enemy, God as the good. Many of them see the church as His instrument and Church dominance of the state as our only hope against these fears. (This was not Dr. Sapp's position) Separation of church and state in the minds of many people that sit in the pews where I preach, is the separation of values from government."

THE SABBATH QUESTION

One questioner, later identified as a Seventh-day Adventist, commented to Dr. Gregg Ivers, Assistant Professor of Government, American University, Washington, D.C., during the question period that it seemed as though the religious right was pushing for a "national day of rest". His first question was, "Do you think it is possible for the President to establish such a day?" Dr. Iver's answer was a flat "no". Not satisfied with the answer, the next question was, "Do you think there will ever be a national Sunday law?" Dr. Ivers had just given a flawless speech without looking at any notes; but to this question he appeared stumped for the right words. While his side comment inferred there would be, "zero possibility", he confined his direct answer to, "It was a very low possibility that the president would enact such a law."

Dr. Ivers' answer reflected the same viewpoint as others. Dr. Charles Haynes, Project Director, AU Research Foundation, referred to the problems and conflicts around the world,

stating that of the 32 conflicts he reviewed, 25 of them were over religious issues. While Islam is the major religion in 44 countries and the largest in the world, it would not necessarily dominate. Nations today are experiencing "exploding pluralism". This pluralism, it appears, would stop any one denomination from having the power to strongly influence governments or to force adoption of a specific day of worship.

KNOWLEDGE, THE FIRST STEP

As an American citizen educated in this country, I studied the history of the writing of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I even memorized the Declaration of Independence while in high school. But, I am ashamed to say that I have not thought much about them until recently. Am I the "typical American"? Today, the freedoms guaranteed by these documents are perhaps in the greatest danger ever, of being lost. How many Americans understand the true issues behind taking away "choice" in an abortion decision or supporting "parochial" schools with tax dollars in a voucher system? While these appear to be totally different issues, the former attacks the "free exercise clause" of the U.S. Constitution and the latter attacks "the establishment clause". These rights are not granted by the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a guarantee of God given rights, and it upholds what is written in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The first amendment, in particular "religious liberty", is the focus of AU. The theme at the annual meeting was "1992, YEAR OF DECISION". How

many are aware that religious liberty in America today, hangs but by a thread? Do Seventh-day Adventists realize this? Dr. Sapp summed up the situation by answering one question, Where do we stand politically? - "The support of our people in mainline churches for separation of church and state has been significantly eroded."

Protecting religious freedoms may be more important in the late 20th century than it was when the Bill of Rights was ratified.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor

The following AU report will help to put the Church-State conflict in perspective:

"This report covers the period of September 1991 through August 1992. Americans United does not present this report as a complete listing of all church-state conflicts in the country....This report focuses on the states and does not include church-state controversies at the federal level...A total of 196 incidents in 48 states was reported. This is a slight decrease over last year's total of 205 incidents in 45 states....The state-by-state breakdown found the following results in each category:" (# of incidents/in the # of states)

Public Funding of Religious Org:	65/35
Religion in Public Schools:	56/29
Free Exercise Disputes:	45/29
State Endorsement of Religion:	30/18

AU's 4th Annual Report on Church-State Conflict in the United States, Sep 21, 1992

"For the fourth year in a row, California led the nation with the highest reported number of church-state problems, with 17 incidents. New York was second highest with 10 incidents; Illinois had nine and four states, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Texas reported eight."

After giving this report some thought, an individual should be shocked. Every case, and this is not an exhaustive list, is an attack on your religious freedom, and the freedom of

someone not to be religious. The previous two years were just as bad. Why are there so many of these incidents? Again Dr. Sapp addressed the issue directly when he said, "In the trenches we do not think about separation of church and state, we do not talk about it, we do not educate our young about it, nor in any other way take it very seriously." He went on to say, "Somehow the issues must be engaged at a broader and more personal level so that mainliners come once again to understand that no one is free in a land where anyone is a slave."

THE HIGH COURT

There are four key Supreme Court cases involved in the present struggle. Three are rulings that have already taken place. The fourth, known as *Hialeah*, will be heard by the Supreme Court in November this year. Following is a brief overview of these cases:

Lemon v. Kurtzman, 1971. A ruling barring aid to parochial schools. The significance of the high Court ruling in this case is the three part test designed to determine violations of the Establishment Clause. To pass constitutional muster, a government action touching on religion, 1) must have a secular purpose, 2) must have a principal effect which neither advances nor retards religion, and 3) must not excessively entangle church and state. (This is referred to as the "Lemon test")

Lee v. Weisman, June 1992. A Rhode Island family, Jewish, objected to school sponsored prayer during their daughter's graduation ceremony. The Court ruled in favor of Church-State separation. However, this case is highlighted by the fact that the Bush administration sought to use this case to scrap *Lemon v. Kurtzman*.

Oregon v. Smith, 1990. The Supreme Court shifted gears on free exercise law when it released this ruling. The ruling curtails some of the freedoms established in the period from 1940 to

1970. In *Sherbert v. Verner*, an important 1963 case concerning sabbatarians' rights, the court devised the "compelling state interest" standard, holding that government may burden religious free exercise only after it has proven it has a compelling interest to do so and that no less restrictive means are available. The *Smith* ruling did away with this standard. The court ruled that any "generally applicable" and neutral law that has the inadvertent effect of infringing on religious freedom should be considered constitutional. In the face of this new test, minority religions have had an especially difficult time prevailing in court. AU and those that spoke at the annual meeting agree in their belief that this ruling essentially "gutted" the free exercise clause.

Church of Lukumi Babalu v. City of Hialeah, Florida This small church uses animal sacrifice in the practice of an ancient African religion, modified in the west. The city of Hialeah, in passing a law to stop the animal sacrifices, singled out a specific religion. The Supreme Court has accepted this case for the 1992 term. Because the case involves a city ordinance specifically directed at a religious practice (at sacrifice, but not at other forms of animal killing), it presents the Court with the opportunity to revisit its *Smith* holding. Arguments will be heard by the Court in November 1992. A decision is not expected until late in the term.

Oliver Thomas, General Counsel, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C., pointed out that the high court may be getting out of enforcing the constitutional clauses strenuously. This would tend to agree with what A.E. Dick Howard, Professor of Law and Public Affairs, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, said about the way justices have been selected over the last 12 years. Basically, individuals have been chosen more for the individual ideology rather than as

a pure political appointment as in the past. Both speakers mentioned that four or five of the justices are ready to "dump" Lemon. Both see the states getting more involved in applications of the clauses.

Douglas Laycock, Law Professor, University of Texas, Austin, stated that he felt that an individual would more likely be able to protect his rights under a state constitution rather than the Federal. This could be an interesting turn, in that as more states get involved, individual Christians would be able to be God's witness in the courts of the land, whereas they would not be able to appear before the U. S. Supreme Court.

"Many church-state scholars see the Supreme Court and the legal community as divided into 'separationist' and 'accommodationist' camps. The separationists advocate a clear division between the institutions of religion and government. In contrast, the accommodationists favor government assistance to religion as long as the aid is even-handed. In recent years, judicial appointments have often come from the accommodationist camp.

Critics of the high court, however, insist that the predominant trend is not toward accommodationism, but 'statism.' In other words, some members of the court are all too ready to defer to government whether its actions advance or inhibit religion. Americans who believe in broad protections for individual religious liberty have reason for concern about these developments. Church-state cases at the high court should be watched closely." (AU Video Study Guide, Religious Freedom: Made In The U.S.A., p 14)

U.S. LEADERSHIP

In the oath for office, the President is sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Looking at the records of Reagan and Bush, they have not done this where church-state separation is concerned. Instead, they have kept constant pressure toward breaking down the wall of

separation between church and state. And what if the Constitution were "re-interpreted"? Since 1980, five of the justices have been appointed by presidents Reagan and Bush. (Kennedy, Scalia, O'Connor, Souter & Thomas) In the words of Dr. Gregg Ivers of the American University, Washington D.C., "The wall of separation metaphor is on judicial life support." And citing an example of how important the influence of an appointee can be, Dr. Ivers continues, "Six years ago, Justice Rehnquist, in a dissenting decision wrote, 'The wall of separation metaphor is a bad metaphor, based on bad history and should be frankly and explicitly abandoned.' Six years ago it was seen as another of Justice Rehnquist's shots as a Lone Ranger. Now Chief Justice Rehnquist is in a position to lead the court fundamentally in a different direction." (Americans United video, Separation of Church and State, 1992)

Below is another example of the presidential administration applying pressure:

"In Lee v. Weisman, a Rhode Island parent had challenged school-sponsored prayers during graduation ceremonies at Providence's Nathan Bishop Middle School. Although the U.S. 1st Circuit Court of Appeals struck down the prayers, local school officials appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, which subsequently agreed to hear the case. The case took on added importance when the U.S. Justice Department filed a brief before the high court, asking the justices to scrap the traditional test [Lemon] for determining church-state violations and rewrite Establishment Clause jurisprudence." (Americans United Legal Program Update, Sep 1992, p. 6)

Council On Religious Freedom, an organization separate from the SDA Church and performing much the same function as AU, but staffed only by Adventists, supplied one of the three amicus briefs submitted. The brief sought to uphold the wall of church-state separation. In an article in CRF's FREEDOM ALERT, Lee Boothby, CRF

Vice-president & General Counsel, commented, "Many Court watchers believed that a majority on the Court was prepared to reinterpret the Establishment Clause and to reduce its effectiveness against government involvement in religious matters. To the surprise of many, three conservative jurist--O'Connor, Kennedy, and Souter--joined with Justices Blackmun and Stevens to proscribe state-sponsored religious prayers at graduation exercises. And to the dismay of the administration, one of the Republican's recent appointments, Justice Kennedy, wrote the majority opinion."

Reagan appointed an Ambassador to the Vatican and often consulted with the Pope on American foreign policy. He not only supported, but pushed the giving of tax dollars to parochial schools. Roland R. Hegstad, editor of Liberty Magazine was quoted in Church & State (Oct. 1985, p 16) as saying: "President Reagan is the worst president from the standpoint of separation of church and state since the U. S. Constitution was adopted." Bush has continued these same policies.

The next President will appoint one or two new Justices to the Supreme Court. Will it make a difference if Clinton is elected instead of Bush? Governor Clinton, according to Larry Abraham's INSIDER REPORT, Aug. 1992, is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission. It seems that being a member of these institutions is a must if you want to be an "Insider". As the INSIDER REPORT put it, "Yes, my friends, Bill Clinton knows how the world works and whose bidding he must represent. If he is elected..there is no doubt whatsoever how slavishly he will carry forward the insiders' New World Order agenda." Representatives of each political party spoke at the Americans United meeting. The first speaker to be introduced was a law professor from Georgetown University, Robert Drinan, a member of the Jesuit Order. Professor Drinan was representing the Democratic Party. (Yes--Democratic

Party!) One of the statements in his talk was, "If Clinton is elected, he will be the first Jesuit-educated President of the United States."

WHAT THE FUTURE HOLDS

For many years, the Catholic Church has had a strong lobby in the legislative halls of the United States. Although other churches have received government funds, including the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the Catholic Church has managed to have millions of tax dollars funded for various projects, including support of schools and colleges. Today they have their people in high government offices. The February 1992 issue of TIME MAGAZINE revealed that many of President Reagan's cabinet members were devout Catholics.

How will the Catholic influence affect American church-state separation principles in the future? An example of how their influence is felt in other countries was revealed in the following article which appeared in the ECUMENICAL PRESS SERVICE (6-10 October 1992, 92.10.38): "The strong alliance between the Roman Catholic Church and Nicaraguan President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro's government has angered many Nicaraguan evangelicals, reports 'Latinamerica Press' of 10 September. Although they make up more than 15 percent of the population, no evangelical holds a significant job in government. Evangelicals say such actions as the inclusion of Catholic catechism material in school primers, the use of public funds in the construction of Managua's new cathedral, and of both public funds and property for a new pontifical university, violate the separation of church and state guaranteed in the country's constitution. A recent decision to tax evangelical activities not dedicated 'exclusively to worship' has aggravated the tension. In a letter, dated 21 August, to Minister of the Presidency Antonio Lacayo, Gustavo Parajon of the Nicaraguan Council of Evangelical Churches complained of the 'apparent partiality of the government

towards the Roman Catholic Church'".

It is interesting to note that out of the six guest speakers, excluding the Discussion Panel, four mentioned the same date as being the time when religious freedom in America began to be seriously eroded. That date was 1980. Other speakers alluded to this date indirectly by continuous reference to the serious erosion as being in the last 12 years. You might recall that the final step in the fulfillment of Luke 21:24, was the action of the Knesset of Israel moving the capital from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem in 1980. That same year the Seventh-day Adventist Church, in General Conference session, voted the twenty-seven Statements of Fundamental Beliefs currently held, some of which compromise or destroy the sacred trust once given to the Church.

 A complete, documented study of Luke 21:24 is available from Adventist Laymen's Foundation, P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854

What does it all mean? Some of the foregoing details may be news to some. However, the end result should not be. The Bible teaches that the "little horn" makes war with the saints until the end of time. (Dan 7:21, 22). God's people know there will be national apostasy and the church-state wall will crumble.

"Romanism is now regarded by Protestants with far greater favor than in former years. In those countries where Catholicism is not in the ascendancy, and the papists are taking a conciliatory course in order to gain influence, there is an increasing indifference concerning the doctrines that separate the reformed churches from the papal hierarchy; the opinion is gaining ground, that, after all, we do not differ so widely upon vital points as has been supposed, and that a little concession on our part will bring us into a better understanding with Rome. The time was when Protestants placed a high value upon the liberty of conscience which had been so dearly purchased. They

taught their children to abhor popery, and held that to seek harmony with Rome would be disloyalty to God. But how widely different are the sentiments now expressed." (Great Controversy, p 563). Do SDAs see any threat from Catholicism today? The statement above should be a startling revelation in view of the Protestant move toward Rome in recent years. (Facts published in various documents by ALF.) For over one hundred years we have taught that just preceding the return of Christ, exercise of liberty of conscience would result in persecution. How much plainer can the signs of the near return of Christ be?

"And after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree. And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads." (Rev 7:1-3)

Are you ready for the four winds to be released?

WFO

 "While the Protestant world is by her attitude making concessions to Rome, let us arouse to comprehend the situation, and view the contest before us in its true bearings. Let the watchmen now lift up their voice, and give the message which is present truth for this time. Let us show the people where we are in prophetic history, and seek to arouse the spirit of true Protestantism, awaking the world to a sense of the value of the privileges of religious liberty so long enjoyed." (5 T 716)

WHAT TO DO TO BE INFORMED

Get on the mailing lists of Americans United and/or Council on Religious Freedom. Both groups publish a monthly paper that keeps the readers informed of the most important issues involving church-state separation issues.

The AU staff is composed of individuals from various denominations. They have a strong Baptist representation. SDAs do not have a strong presence, although two sit on the Board of Trustees.

The staff for Council on Religious Freedom, on the other hand, is composed of all SDAs. This includes all officers, directors, advisors and many laity and Church employees. "It is not directly tied to the church, hence it can freely involve itself in issues of religious freedom without reflecting on the church, while promoting historic church positions on issues which the church might justifiably not address." (CRF booklet, A CALL TO CONSECRATION, COMMITMENT AND COMMUNICATION, p. 1). According to Elder John V. Stevens Sr., President, CRF is involved in more court cases than AU and the SDA Church combined.

Addresses for each group appear below:

Americans United
8120 Penton Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Council on Religious Freedom
4545 - 42nd St, N.W., Suite 210
Washington, DC 20016

EDITORIAL COMMENT

We believed the best editorial comment would be a Book Review appearing in the Sabbath Sentinel, March, 1991, which notes a questionable use of the

Commentary is published semi-annually by the Editors of "Watchman, What of the Night?" for the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

Religious Liberty issue:

"Looks at Books"

A. Jan Marcussen, National Sunday Law.
Thompsonville, IL: Amazing Truth Publications, 1990. 94 pages.

I had problems with this book. On pages 45 and 46 Marcussen stated that "every seal has three parts:...the name of the ruler, the ruler's title,...and the territory over which he rules." He wrote that "in the 80's, when George Bush was elected president, America's official seal read" 'George Bush, President, United States of America.'" One needs only to glance at the back of a dollar bill to check that statement. If he meant the Presidential Seal rather than the Great Seal of the United States, he still erred; it says simply "seal of the President of the United States" and contains the Latin words "E Pluribus Unum" above an eagle. The president's name is not given. Queen Elizabeth's seal contains only the letters "ER" (Elizabeth Regina). It doesn't name the country she rules...

Pages 52 and 53 of the 1986 edition relate an appearance of "the President of the Lord's Day Alliance" on nationwide TV. He is said to have stated that execution of Sabbath Keepers is "what we're working for". After several readers asked for verification of this alleged event, Marcussen deleted it from later editions. Evidently he found no one who had seen the program.

I believe Sabbathkeepers need to be made aware of proposed laws that would threaten their freedom to keep the seventh day. But to resort to sensational and unfounded statements to create an artificial excitement is to imitate the boy who cried "wolf". It can blind persons from recognizing an actual danger when it comes.

Comment: Perhaps Marcussen should change the name of his publications to "Amazing Lies". What is more amazing is that individuals continue to buy into and distribute this sensational lying.