

From their earliest origins, Baptists have proclaimed that religious liberty, the separation of church and state and an emphasis on the individual conscience were vital and indispensable to their identity. Respected Baptist historian Bill Leonard of Wake Forest University has written that “Baptists are among the most outspoken advocates of religious liberty in modern Protestant history.”¹ Leonard suggests that Baptists were “the first English-speaking religious communion to advocate religious liberty.”² Consequently, over the past 400 years, Baptists have demanded complete religious liberty for both believer and unbeliever. For Baptists, religious liberty inescapably was tied to the separation of church and state or “a free church in a free state,” the belief that government should not meddle in matters of faith and practice. Throughout the twentieth century, many Baptist leaders in the United States made an eloquent appeal for the historic Baptist doctrine of religious liberty and its essential corollary, the separation of church and state. This paper will briefly explore five important and often overlooked twentieth century Baptist leaders who have not betrayed the dominant, if not exclusive, Baptist witness regarding a theology of freedom for all.

The Justice

Charles Evans Hughes was one of the most influential men in American public life during the first half of the twentieth century. He was Governor of New York (1907-1910), Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court (1910-1916), Republican Presidential candidate (1916), United States Secretary of State (1921-1925), and Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court (1930-1941).³

Hughes was thoroughly Baptist. He was born into a Baptist family, served in Baptist leadership roles and died a Baptist. His father was a Baptist minister. Hughes himself felt “called” to the ministry until his senior year of college. He pursued that “call” at two of the most respected Baptist universities in America, Madison University and Brown University.⁴ Hughes was

theologically situated in the evangelical liberal tradition of Northern Baptist leaders, Walter Rauschenbusch and William H. P. Faunce.⁵ As a Sunday School teacher, Hughes expressed his dislike of creeds and distrust of dogmatists by focusing exclusively on the teachings of Jesus Christ with special emphasis on the Sermon on the Mount.⁶ In 1907, Hughes became the first President of the Northern Baptist Convention. His name attached to the new convention helped Northern Baptists attain greater national prominence. While living in Washington D.C., Hughes joined Calvary Baptist Church. “Charles the Baptist,” as he was dubbed when he was Governor of New York, remained a committed and faithful member of Calvary until his death in 1948.⁷

During his eleven-year tenure as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Hughes authored four key church-state opinions and voted with the majority in two additional decisions. According to one historian, “Hughes’s entire record... makes him one of the greatest modern exponents of civil liberties.”⁸ Under Hughes’s leadership, the Court made the First Amendment protections of freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and the free exercise of religion binding upon the states.⁹

Writing for the unanimous Supreme Court in *Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education* (1930), Hughes articulated an important concept in church-state relations known as the “Child Benefit Theory.” This theory held that the state may extend certain kinds of welfare aid to students attending private schools in situations where general aid to the private schools themselves would be unconstitutional.¹⁰ Hughes’s “Child Benefit Theory” was most notably applied in the 1947 landmark case *Everson v. Board of Education* by Hughes’s colleague and fellow former Baptist Sunday School teacher, Justice Hugo Black.¹¹ Distinguished political philosopher Martha Nussbaum asserts that Hugo Black announced a neutrality principle when he applied Hughes’s “Child Benefit Theory” in his *Everson* analysis. Rooted in the idea that all citizens are equal and should be shown equal respect, this “neutrality as fairness” principle, according to Nussbaum,

asserts that government must be “studiously neutral” on religious matters, “favoring or disfavoring no particular conception, not even religion over nonreligion.”¹² Nussbaum notes that Black’s “neutrality as fairness” principle with its origins in Hughes’s “Child Benefit Theory” can be traced back to the political thought of Roger Williams, founder of the first Baptist church in America. Nussbaum notes that Williams’s principle of neutrality along with his emphasis on protecting the individual conscience has formed “the distinctive American approach to religious fairness.”¹³ This specific neutrality principle has guided the Supreme Court in multiple cases throughout the years and continues to be affirmed by church-state scholars and religious liberty watchdogs. It should then come as no surprise to see twentieth century Baptists such as Charles Evans Hughes and Hugo Black draw deeply from the well of their Baptist forefather and adopt in their jurisprudence an approach to fairness that can also be described as distinctly Baptist.

In the *United States v. Macintosh* (1930), Hughes took a bold stand against the status quo and wrote a passionate dissent in defense of conscientious objectors and the “supremacy of conscience.” In the historic tradition of Baptist-styled theological dissent, Hughes emphasized that “the mere holding of religious or conscientious scruples against all wars should not disqualify a citizen from holding office, or an applicant otherwise qualified from being admitted to citizenship.”¹⁴ The legal reasoning found in Hughes’s *Macintosh* dissent would be adopted fifteen years later by a majority of the Supreme Court. Thanks mostly to Hughes’s *Macintosh* dissent and a sensible Supreme Court, applicants for citizenship who have objections to war based on their religious belief may swear to an alternative form of the naturalization oath.¹⁵

As a life-long Baptist, Hughes demonstrated a great appreciation for the best of the Baptist tradition. His historic speech in 1922 honoring Roger Williams demonstrated that he was quite familiar with Baptist history. Hughes’s speech also echoed several of the same themes voiced by prominent Southern Baptist G.W. Truett just two years prior on the steps of the United States

Capitol. Without a doubt, the distinctly Baptist beliefs concerning soul liberty, absolute religious freedom and respect for the conscience of each and every individual showed up in Hughes's church-state decisions when he was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The principles of neutrality and freedom of conscience that Hughes articulated can be gleaned from the writings of many of his Baptist forefathers, most prominently Roger Williams.¹⁶

The Pulpiteer

Southern Baptist voices for freedom of conscience and religious liberty were not rare in the Southern Baptist Convention's first 100 years. They continued to warn against the establishment of religion, a concern articulated by the earliest Baptists of the seventeenth century. In the twentieth century, two figures most clearly expressed Southern Baptist views on religious liberty: E.Y. Mullins, president of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (1899-1928) and G.W. Truett, pastor of First Baptist Church, Dallas (1897-1944), one of the most legendary Baptist ministers in the convention's history. Mullins and Truett served as president of both the Southern Baptist Convention and the Baptist World Alliance during their lifetime.¹⁷

One of the legacies of Truett's career was his address, "Baptist and Religious Liberty," given on the steps of the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C. on May 16, 1920 at the seventy-fifth anniversary celebration of the Southern Baptist Convention. Speaking to an audience of ten to fifteen thousand people, Truett declared that Baptists "have never been a party to oppression of conscience...Christ's religion needs no prop of any kind from any worldly source, and to the degree that it is thus supported is a millstone hanged about its neck."¹⁸ Quoting historian George Bancroft, Truett described religious liberty as a Baptist contribution to the American experiment. Truett emphasized that anything less than absolute liberty was unacceptable. According to Truett, "Toleration is a concession, while liberty is a right. Toleration is a matter of expediency, while liberty is a matter of principle. Toleration is a gift from man, while liberty is a

gift from God.”¹⁹ Truett continued, “It is the consistent and insistent contention of our Baptist people, always and everywhere, that religion must be forever voluntary and uncoerced, and that it is not the prerogative of any power, whether civil or ecclesiastical to compel men to conform to any religious creed or form of worship, or to pay taxes for the support of a religious organization to which they do not belong and in whose creed they do not believe.”²⁰ At a celebration commemorating Truett’s historic speech almost ninety years later, Congressman Chet Edwards of Texas reminded a group of diverse Baptists from all across America that Truett “stood on the steps of our citadel of democracy and re-lit the torch of religious freedom for a new generation and a new century.”²¹

The Theologian

E.Y. Mullins was the single most important shaper of Southern Baptists in the twentieth century.²² Princeton Seminary’s J. Gresham Machen described Mullins as the “spokesman not merely for the Southern Baptist Church (sic) or for the Baptist churches of America, but also to a considerable extent for the Baptist churches throughout the world.”²³ After the formation of the Baptist World Alliance in 1905, Mullins set out to unite Baptists throughout the world with a sense of identity and mission.²⁴ He did this through the publication of *The Axioms of Religion: A New Interpretation of the Baptist Faith*, a book which observers contend has done more than any other single volume to define Baptist identity in the twentieth century.²⁵

Mullins argued that the most distinctive and important of all Baptist beliefs is the belief in “soul competency,” that is, in the freedom, ability, and responsibility of each person to respond to God for herself or himself.²⁶ He wrote: “The sufficient statement of the historical significance of the Baptists is this: the competency of the soul in religion.” This basic theological assumption serves as an underpinning to all other Baptist assumptions.²⁷ Mullins proposed “soul competency” as a centering point around which a broad and diverse group of Baptists could come together.²⁸

From this simple “mother principle” of Christian truth and cardinal doctrine of Baptists, Mullins derived six propositions which he argued were axiomatic to all who accept Christianity. “A free Church in a free State” was Mullins’s fifth axiom known as the “religio-civic axiom.” Mullins believed that this axiom along with the other axioms comprised the “alphabet of the Christian religion.” In Mullins’s view, these axioms are “the great New Testament assumptions, which are the very basis of our Baptist faith.”²⁹ Mullins believed that soul competency implied a separation between church and state. According to Mullins, “When Roger Williams founded the Commonwealth of Rhode Island, a new era in man’s spiritual history began.” By rejecting mere toleration and embracing the separation of church and state, Baptists “made a real contribution to the world’s civilization.”³⁰

Along with George W. Truett’s historic 1920 sermon on the steps of the United States Capitol, Mullins’s sermon, “The Baptist Conception of Religious Liberty,” at the 1923 meeting of the Baptist World Alliance was an important summary of the dominant Baptist view of religious liberty and separation of church and state in the twentieth century. In this historic address, Mullins noted that Baptists understand religious liberty to “exclude certain things and implies certain other things.”³¹ According to Mullins, religious liberty excludes: state authority in religion, the principle of toleration in religion and the right of the state to impose taxes for the support of one form of religion against the conscience of the people. Mullins asserted that religious liberty implies the greatest of human rights, man’s right to search for truth in religion, the right of free utterance and propagation of truth, the right of free association and organization for religious purposes, and the right of free exercise of religion.³² Mullins emphasized that “Baptists believe in religious liberty for themselves. But they believe in it equally for all men...While we have no sympathy with atheism or agnosticism or materialism, we stand for the freedom of the atheist, agnostic and materialist in his religious or irreligious convictions.”³³

The Ethicist

T. B. Maston was one of the most significant Southern Baptists of the twentieth century. More than any other figure, Maston was the preeminent shaper of Christian ethics and Christian social concern among Southern Baptists. Maston's emphasis on applying the gospel to all aspects of life made his name synonymous with Christian Ethics in the Southern Baptist Convention.³⁴ During his forty-one year teaching ministry at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas Maston is estimated to have taught around 10,000 persons.³⁵ Throughout his entire teaching career, Maston wrote twenty-two books, nearly all of them dealing with ethics and social concerns, and published hundreds of Sunday School lessons and articles for newspapers and journals.³⁶ However, Maston's views on religious liberty and the principle of separation of church and state did not blaze new ground. Identifying with Isaac Backus, an eighteenth century Baptist pioneer of religious liberty, Maston continued to articulate positions voiced earlier by E.Y. Mullins, G.W. Truett and accepted by the vast majority of Baptists in the United States.³⁷

Maston's vision of religious liberty was rooted in the concept of voluntary faith.³⁸ For religious faith to be authentic, Maston believed, it must be free and cannot be coerced. He often repeated the popular Baptist understanding that God alone is Lord of the individual conscience. Maston contended that "the final authority for the individual is neither the state nor the church. Compulsion cannot touch the soul. Neither the state nor the church has the right to attempt such compulsion."³⁹ According to Maston, a theology for religious freedom is anchored in the "viewpoint of the Christian ethic...that man was created in the image of God." All freedom including religious freedom, Maston believed, is from God.⁴⁰ To Maston, separation of church and state meant an organizational and functional separation. Neither the church nor the state should seek to control the other or to use the other to promote its interests.⁴¹ Any threat to the separation of

church and state was a direct threat to religious liberty. In a 1963 address to the Texas Baptist Christian Life Commission, Maston expounded on this critical issue:

We believe that religious liberty, when properly defined and understood, provides for freedom of worship, conscience, and association for the individual. This means that he is free to believe or not to believe, to worship or not to worship, to associate or not to associate with others of his religious persuasion. He is free to share his religious experiences, opinions, and convictions with others, so long as he does not violate the rights of others. These basic rights of the individual belong to him within the Christian community as well as in the world....These and other rights must be exercised always with proper regard for the rights of others. Freedom for the Christian community also means freedom from external control due to any financial, political, or other connection with any political entity.⁴²

For over four decades, Maston addressed various church-state issues in his writings and through his writings and through his work with the Texas Baptist Christian Life Commission. Like many of his fellow Southern Baptists, Maston regularly identified and opposed instances of misguided government favoritism toward religion such as government-sponsored prayer, compulsory Bible readings in the classroom, tuition tax credits, and the appointment of a United States ambassador to the Vatican.⁴³ Maston also frequently addressed the controversial subject of churches and taxation. In his view, the acceptance of gifts and loans from the government weakened church-state separation and hence was a threat to religious liberty.⁴⁴ Going beyond the generally accepted separationist views of his Baptist colleagues, Maston asserted that “churches should voluntarily make a contribution for fire and police protection.”⁴⁵ He argued that only the property of local churches used for worship and educational purposes should be tax exempt. Revenue producing property owned by churches, benevolent institutions, seminaries, colleges, and other denominational agencies should be taxed, according to Maston. “Let church-related institutions be more concerned with what is fair and right than they are with what will be most advantageous to them.”⁴⁶ When it came to church-state issues and a defense of religious liberty and the separation of church and state, Maston continued the hallmark emphases of the historic Baptist

tradition. Maston's focus on religious liberty helped to keep Southern Baptists thinking about what their cherished principle meant.

The Activist

In the last half of the twentieth century, James Dunn has been the loudest and most aggressive Baptist activist for religious liberty in the United States. Dunn is best known for his leadership as Executive Director of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty, an organization comprised of multiple Baptist bodies that deals solely with religious liberty issues on Capitol Hill. Dunn's defense of religious liberty and the separation of church and state became one of the pivotal issues in the Southern Baptist Controversy during the 1980s. He was one of the primary targets of the "Conservative Resurgence" that ultimately gained control of the Southern Baptist Convention and subsequently defunded the participation of Southern Baptists in the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty.

James Dunn embodied and articulated a paradigm for Baptist political engagement in the public arena which was based upon the concept of soul freedom: voluntary uncoerced faith and an unfettered individual conscience before God. His vision of religious liberty and separation of church and state was especially rooted in the doctrine of soul freedom. Dunn argued that soul freedom is the cornerstone that precedes and demands religious liberty and separation of church and state for all persons in the political arena. With uncompromising intensity, Dunn defended soul freedom as the historic Baptist basis for religious liberty. Dunn attempted to so identify with the radical component of the Baptist witness to religious liberty that Baptist historian Walter Shurden has called him a modern day "John Leland," the eighteenth and early nineteenth century's strongest proponent of a thoroughgoing separation of church and state.⁴⁷

Ideas such as soul liberty and soul competency that had been trumpeted frequently in Baptist history found a home in the thought and rhetoric of James Dunn. Dunn became the heir of E.Y.

Mullins and those before him who insisted that freedom of the individual conscience and the emphasis upon direct personal experience of God without reliance upon ecclesiastical leaders were at the heart of the best of the Baptist tradition.⁴⁸ Throughout his career, Dunn has often described soul freedom as “the fire that burns in the innards of every true Baptist.” According to Dunn, since Thomas Helwys’ bold proclamation in 1611 that “the king is not Lord of the conscience,” the hallmark of the people called Baptist is that “dogged determination to be free – free and faithful.”⁴⁹

Dunn’s belief in soul freedom as the foundation for religious liberty and the separation of church and state can be seen in his reactions to recent attacks against the Jeffersonian metaphor of “a wall of separation between church and state.” Over the years, Dunn has had harsh words for former Chief Justice William Rehnquist who in *Wallace v. Jaffree* (1985) announced that “The ‘wall of separation between church and state’ is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned.”⁵⁰ Dunn retorted, “Some of us believe that it is a metaphor rooted in good theology—‘render unto Caesar what is Caesar’s, unto God what is God’s; that it has proved patently useful as the guarantor of liberty; that while it is not absolute, it is not obsolete and that it should be treated as a distinctive aspect of the American experiment.’”⁵¹

Dunn felt that the “utter wrong headedness” of Rehnquist was eloquently and adequately refuted in Justice David Souter’s concurring opinion in *Lee v. Weisman* (1992).⁵² There Souter wrote, “Forty-five years ago, this Court announced a basic principle of constitutional law from which it has not strayed: the Establishment Clause forbids not only state practices that ‘aid one religion over another,’ but also those that ‘aid all religions.’”⁵³ Like Souter, Dunn believed that the Founding Fathers intended church and state to be separated and for government to be neutral regarding religion.⁵⁴ According to Dunn, “if American history makes any eloquent appeal, it is for the separation of church and state.”⁵⁵

But Dunn understood that the separation between church and state is not always neat and never absolute: “It’s messy, difficult, inconsistent, and it always has been. Today more than ever it is important to apply proper tensions between an invasive, intrusive government and religious institutions which are also concerned with all of life. Government often favors religion when it should leave it alone. Churches appeal for state assistance without counting the cost. When government meddles in religion it always has the touch of mud.”⁵⁶

Dunn rejected all legislative efforts by accommodationists to fund religion. Due to America’s thriving pluralistic society, Dunn believed that government funded religion was not possible or desirable even if some of the Founding Fathers such as Patrick Henry envisioned it. “Persons of conscience of all religious and non-religious hues insist that it is impossible to attain an idyllic state of governmental fairness with aid and benefits for all religions.”⁵⁷ Dunn observed that “When the state gets into the missionary business, it fouls things up. When the government claims to aid all religions, it never fails to play favorites. When government tries to find an agreeable level of religious involvement, it winds up advancing an emasculated all purpose god, not the specific Deity of revealed religion.” Dunn advocated that strict neutrality, not benignity, is the proper role for government in regard to religion.⁵⁸

Concluding Thoughts

“Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.”⁵⁹ This famous phrase characterizes the ministry of Baptists such as Thomas Helwys, Roger Williams, John Leland and others. Add to this list of Baptist giants the names of Charles Evans Hughes, E.Y. Mullins, G.W. Truett, T.B. Maston, and James Dunn. Throughout the twentieth century, these five Baptists took a consistent stand for religious liberty and a thoroughgoing separation of church and state. For all of these Baptist leaders, their freedom theology was rooted in the belief that authentic faith is always voluntary and never coerced. Government must not interfere in matters of religious belief and practice. As James Dunn

keenly observed, “When government meddles in religion it always has the touch of mud.”⁶⁰ This gang of five has been extremely influential over the past century in articulating the dominant Baptist position regarding religious liberty and church-state separation. In recent decades a loud minority of fundamentalist Baptists have made an effort to reinterpret the Baptist doctrine of religious liberty. One such fundamentalist even declared that the “notion of the separation of church and state is the figment of some infidel’s imagination.”⁶¹ Historian Randall Balmer has claimed that these fundamentalists are in fact “counterfeit” Baptists because they have betrayed 400 years of Baptist history and heritage with their recent rhetoric and actions.⁶² These five authentic Baptists made a career out of defending these Baptist doctrines and surely have not betrayed the dominant, if not exclusive, Baptist witness regarding a theology of freedom of all.

¹ Bill J. Leonard, *Baptists in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 157-159.

² *Ibid.*

³ Clare Cushman, ed., *The Supreme Court Justices: Illustrated Biographies, 1789-1993* (Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1993), 306-310. See Timothy L. Hall, *Supreme Court Justices: A Biographical Dictionary* (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2001), 247-251.

⁴ William G. Ross, *The Chief Justiceship of Charles Evans Hughes, 1930-1941* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2007), 5. See Cushman, 306-310.

⁵ William H. Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004), 300-301. See J. Walter Sillen, “William H.P. Faunce: A Representative Liberal,” *Foundations* 2, no. 3 (July 1959): 239.

⁶ Merlo J. Pusey, *Charles Evans Hughes* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951), 1: 110-111.

⁷ Carl W. Tiller, *At Calvary: A History of the First 125 Years of Calvary Baptist Church, Washington DC, 1862-1987* (Manassas, VA: Trinity Rivers Publishing, Inc., 1994), 244-245.

⁸ Ross, 5-10.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Cohran v. Louisiana State Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370 (1930).

¹¹ *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

¹² Martha Nussbaum, *Liberty of Conscience: In Defense of America’s Tradition of Religious Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 2008), 282-285.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 66-68.

¹⁴ United States v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931). See Ross, 186-189.

¹⁵ Ronald B. Flowers, *That Godless Court? Supreme Court Decisions on Church-State Relationships* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 61-63.

¹⁶ Charles Evans Hughes, "Address of Secretary Charles E. Hughes At The Laying Of The Corner-Stone Of The National Baptist Memorial To Religious Liberty, At Sixteenth and Columbia Road," *Religious Herald*, April 27, 1922, 6.

¹⁷ C. Douglas Weaver, *In Search of the New Testament Church: The Baptist Story* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2008), 175-177.

¹⁸ George W. Truett, "Baptists and Religious Liberty," reprinted in *Baptist History and Heritage* 33, no. 1 (1998): 66-85.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Jeremy Learning, "Rally Around The Wall: Pro-Separation Baptists Celebrate Religious Liberty," *First Freedom First*, July 1, 2007, <http://www.firstfreedomfirst.org/node/626> (accessed December 9, 2008).

²² Timothy D. F. Maddox, "E.Y. Mullins: Mr. Baptist for the 20th and 21st Century," *Review and Expositor* 96, no. 1 (1999): 32.

²³ J. Gresham Machen, quoted in Dilday, "Mullins the Theologian: Between the Extremes," 76.

²⁴ E. Glenn Hinson, "E.Y. Mullins as Interpreter of the Baptist Tradition," *Review and Expositor* 96, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 109.

²⁵ Fisher Humphreys, "Edgar Young Mullins," in *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition*, ed. Timothy George and David S. Dockery (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2001), 187. Translated into many languages, Southern Baptist theologian W.O. Carver stated that Mullins's *Axioms of Religion* "became almost a character of Baptist orthodoxy...a touchstone by which Baptists around the world could recognize a similar heritage of faith – in no way a creed but a restatement (of historic Baptist distinctives) in the language for the day. See Carver, "Edgar Young Mullins – Leader and Builder," 135.

²⁶ Humphreys, "Edgar Young Mullins," 187.

²⁷ E.Y. Mullins, *The Axioms of Religion* (Boston, MA: Judson Press, 1908), 53.

²⁸ Maddox, "E.Y. Mullins: Mr. Baptist for the 20th and 21st Century," 93.

²⁹ Mullins, *The Axioms of Religion*, 27-29.

³⁰ Ibid., 186-187.

³¹ E.Y. Mullins, "The Baptist Conception of Religious Liberty," in *The Life of Baptists in the Life of the World: 80 Years of the Baptist World Alliance*, ed. Walter B. Shurden (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1985), 57-64.

³² Ibid., 60-61.

³³ Ibid., 61-62.

³⁴ Mark Wingfield, "Maston's Walking as He Walked," *Baptist Standard*, March 5, 1986, 9-10. By establishing a course on Christian Ethics and later a doctoral program in the same area at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,

Maston led the trend to focus on social issues among some Southern Baptists. Eventually, Christian Ethics would become a field of academic inquiry at every Southern Baptist seminary. Maston also helped to birth Christian Life Commissions, both on the national level and in many of the state conventions.

³⁵ William M. Pinson Jr., "Texas Baptist Contributions to Ethics: The Life and Influence of T.B. Maston," *Baptist History and Heritage* 33, no. 2 (1998): 17. Several thousand of Maston's students took three or more of his courses. See Don McGregor, "The Teacher," *Baptist Standard*, May 22, 1963, 9-10. Many of Maston's students served in high-ranking denominational roles. Forty-nine doctoral students at Southwestern Seminary received their Th.D. in Christian Ethics under T.B. Maston. Almost all of Maston's doctoral graduates have served as pastors, denominational workers, professors, or administrators in higher education. This influential list of ethicists includes forty-seven pastors, twenty-one denominational executives, fifteen seminary professors, fifteen college professors, thirteen missionaries, four government officials and two military chaplains. James M. Dunn, "Through Graduates," in *An Approach to Christian Ethics: The Life, Contributions and Thought of T.B. Maston*, ed. William Pinson Jr. (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1979), 92-93.

³⁶ Gary E. Farley, "T.B. Maston: Advocate for Living God's Work in the Marketplace," *Baptist History & Heritage* 31, no. 1 (1996): 31-33. As the foundation of Maston's social thought, the Bible was held to be authoritative, trustworthy, truthful and dependable. Maston's hermeneutic was Christocentric. He evaluated Scripture in light of the teachings of Christ. Although Maston had a profound appreciation for the discipline of sociology and other social sciences, he never allowed them to assume the position of Scripture. In his book *Biblical Ethics*, Maston argued that contemporary Christian living was morally deficient because it "has given up its own ethical standards drawn by the Bible." See T. B. Maston, *Biblical Ethics* (Waco: Word Books, 1970), v.

³⁷ Foy Valentine, "T. B. Maston: A Conscience for Southern Baptists," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 25, no. 2 (1983): 89-90.

³⁸ James M. Dunn, "The Christian and the State: A Constructive Task," in *Perspectives in Applied Christianity: Essays in Honor of Thomas Buford Maston*, ed. William M. Tillman Jr. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986), 22-27.

³⁹ T.B. Maston, *Christianity and World Issues* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1957), 211-212.

⁴⁰ T.B. Maston, "The Church, The State, and The Christian Ethics," *Journal of Church and State* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1960): 26-30.

⁴¹ Editor, *Journal of Church and State* 30, no. 3 (1988): 430.

⁴² T.B. Maston, "Christianity and Religious Liberty," in *Messages from the Eighth Annual Christian Life Workshop: Proceedings of the Texas Baptist Christian Life Commission* (Fort Worth, TX: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1964), 116-124. Maston did not make the mistake of equating "the separation of church and state" with the separation of religion from politics. In a pluralistic society, he fully understood that religion and politics would mix. Although, Maston believed that religion and politics should mix without merging church and state. He believed that Christian principles needed to be applied to the affairs of government. Thus, Maston advocated that Christians be engaged in public policy debates. He insisted that "one of the chief threats to political democracy is the poor citizenship of good people." According to Maston, Christian citizenship requires that individuals actively participate in the political process from the local level to the national arena. He emphasized that Christians should be encouraged to fulfill their Christian vocational calling in the political realm. See Dunn, "The Christian and The State," 22-27.

⁴³ Maston, "Christianity and Religious Liberty," 116-124.

⁴⁴ Dunn, "The Christian and The State," 29.

⁴⁵ T.B. Maston, "Taxation Analyzed," *Baptist Standard*, May 28, 1975, 19.

⁴⁶ T.B. Maston, *The Conscience of a Christian* (Waco: Word Books, 1971), 95-97.

⁴⁷ Walter B. Shurden, "James (Dunn) and John (Leland), Baptist Sons of Zebedee," in *James Dunn: Champion for Religious Liberty*, ed. J. Brent Walker (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 1999), 109-122.

⁴⁸ James M. Dunn, *Soul Freedom: Baptist Battle Cry* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2000), 63-65.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 67-68. Dunn believed that soul freedom was based on a biblical view of persons. In the creation account of Adam and Eve found in Genesis 1:26-27, God called the first humans *imago Dei* which presupposed freedom. Regardless of how one reads the biblical description of creation, in Dunn's view, it clearly suggests that all humans are moral beings, capable of responding to God. According to Dunn, whatever else the classical doctrine of *imago Dei* means, it reveals that persons, made by God, can respond to their Creator. "The roots of freedom are deep within the intimate personhood of God. All true freedom is in a real sense religious freedom. It is that which replicates the Divine in all of us that makes us *response-able*, responsible and free." See James M. Dunn, "The Baptist Vision of Religious Liberty," in *Proclaiming the Baptist Vision: Religious Liberty*, ed. Walter B. Shurden (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 1993), 32.

⁵⁰ *Wallace v. Jeffree*, 482 U.S. 38, 107 (1985), (Rehnquist, J., dissenting). See also James M. Dunn, "A Threatened Heritage," *The Whitsitt Journal* 1, no. 1 (July 1994): 6-8.

⁵¹ Dunn, *Soul Freedom: Baptist Battle Cry*, 47.

⁵² Dunn, "A Threatened Heritage," 6-8.

⁵³ *Lee v. Weisman*, 112 S.Ct. 2649 (1992), (Souter, J., concurring).

⁵⁴ Dunn, "A Threatened Heritage," 6-8.

⁵⁵ James M. Dunn, foreword to *The Myth of Christian America: What You Need to Know About the Separation of Church and State*, by Mark Whitten (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 1999), v.

⁵⁶ Dunn, "The Baptist Vision of Religious Liberty," 36-37.

⁵⁷ James M. Dunn, "Neutrality and the Establishment Clause," in *Equal Separation: Understanding the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment*, ed. Paul J. Weber (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 55-63.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Wendell Phillips, in *The Home Book of Quotations*, ed. Burton Egbert Stevenson (New York: Dodd & Mead, 1964), 1106.

⁶⁰ Dunn, "The Baptist Vision of Religious Liberty," 36-37.

⁶¹ W.A. Criswell, quoted in Leonard, 157-158.

⁶² Randall Balmer, *Thy Kingdom Come: How The Religious Right Distorts The Faith And Threatens America* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), 35-69.