

wanted no part of it. And yet, the philosophy of idealism which guided the thinking and the deeds of these men, the philosophy which had so much to do with shaping the fortunes of this nation, was as Christian as the Sermon on the Mount. It was the philosophy of humanism and the dignity and integrity of the individual. It was the philosophy of equality, brotherhood and freedom. It was the philosophy of the Man of Nazareth.

A great French statesman and political scientist of the nineteenth century, who wrote learnedly of the American experiment in democracy, pointed out that it was religion that gave birth to what he called the "Anglo-American Society." He said that "in the United States religion is therefore commingled with all the habits of the nation and all the feelings of patriotism, whence it derives a peculiar force." In tracing the roots of the American democracy to the teachings of Christ, he said:

"That religion which holds that all men are equal in the sight of the great Father will not refuse to acknowledge that all citizens are equal in the sight of the law."

I think the answer to our proposition clearly is that the Christian philosophy and Christian ethics very strongly influenced the vital decisions reached by our forefathers in erecting the framework of our government. It follows, in my mind, that this same philosophy and these same ethics should be used by us today in fashioning the policies and decisions of government and politics.

From the point of view of the person engaged in politics, what should be the relationship between religion and government—between the church and the state? Religion and government, with the family serving them both, are the fundamental institutions of our society. Church and state deal with the same people, each rendering them a vital and indispensable service, the one in law and order, the other in moral and spiritual values. A high barrier separates their functions, but not their mutual services. Ideally, they are the spiritual and temporal poles of all human life. Each should show sympathy one to the other, and, within the limits laid down by our federal and state constitutions, each should cooperate with the other. Each should also be jealous in the field of government and the church the rights in the field of religion.

If organized religion interferes with the operation of government, or if government intrudes in the field of religion, there is sure to be trouble. But if each, operating in its own sphere, supplements the other