

DID YOU KNOW THAT THE PHRASE "SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE" IS NOT FOUND ANYWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION?

The idea that it **is** found within the U.S. foundational document, and its frightening misinterpretation has been propagated throughout this great land with an increasing voracity within the last 50 years.

The phrase "**Separation of Church and State**" has been associated with (but NOT FOUND WITHIN) the **Establishment Clause of the First Amendment** to the U.S. Constitution. The First Amendment actually reads like this:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Again, the phrase "**separation of church and state**" is not found in this amendment, nor is it found anywhere else in our Constitution. And yet jurists today cite it as proof and precedent in present day court decisions to **unconstitutionally** limit religious public speech and activity. They venerate this phrase without question, as if it (and their interpretation of it) were the official wording of our hallowed foundational document, sanctioned and supported by the whole of our founding fathers, without dissent from any other statesmen.

This could not be further from the truth!

What's more, the meaning of the phrase is taken out of context from the corporate opinions, behaviors, and common law of the day. In other words, even if the statement **were** in the Constitution, it's meaning has been twisted into a dogma that it was never intended to portray not even by the statesman who wrote it.

The American Founding Fathers (men who had significant input and guidance in some form or fashion in the origination and early development of our nation) **are about 250 to 300 in number**. There were **55 Constitution drafters, 56 Declaration of Independence Signers, and 90 Bill of Rights Drafters**.¹ Many others were involved in the formation of our new government at either the Federal or State Level, having effect in their official positions (for example, as educators, clergymen, or statesmen) or simply through the influence of their educated opinions.

To gain a grasp on historical accuracy, every American should read, if only a small amount, the written opinions of all the founding fathers. These are the men who attended and debated the issues at the 1787 Constitutional Convention, or attended state conventions to ratify it; the Clergymen, the Congressmen who later formulated the Bill of Rights, the first Supreme Court Judges, the educators who founded our great universities, or the newly formed Executive Branch.

Presently, these and hundreds of other opinions of the founding fathers are virtually **ignored** when it comes to interpreting the first amendment today. Instead, the sentiments of **Thomas Jefferson** and **James Madison** are repeatedly quoted to reinforce the separationist dogma that has become prevalent in many courts today.

JEFFERSON AND MADISON

James Madison expressed some of the more extreme views on the relationship between government and religion in his later writings and official documents. But his opinions of his later life were at a direct variance to his earlier opinions, and to many of his actions as a Virginia statesman and as president. He and **Jefferson's Virginia Statute of 1786** is misinterpreted today to represent "**separation of church and state**", when in actuality its purpose was to secure religious expression equally for all denominations.

² As president, **Madison** signed a federal bill that gave financial aid to a **Bible Society** for the mass distribution of Bibles,³ and he also issued several proclamations for **national days of prayer, fasting, and thanksgiving**.⁴ Together, **Jefferson** and **Madison** proposed bills in Virginia such as "**A Bill for Saving the Property of the Church Heretofore by Law Established,**" "**A Bill for Punishing Disturbers of Religious Worship and Sabbath Breakers,**" "**A Bill for Appointing Days of Public Fasting and Thanksgiving,**" and "**A Bill Annuling Marriages Prohibited by the Levitical Law and Appointing the Mode of Solemnizing Lawful Marriage.**"⁵ **Jefferson** authored a work entitled **The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth**,⁶ and while president, approved several measures assigning **federal financial aid for Christian Missionaries to the Indians**,⁷ and signed three separate laws to **appropriate government land**, again, for the use of **Christian Missionaries to evangelize Indians**.⁸

As a result of their disdain for religious tyranny (but not for "pure" religion in general), these two men were intent upon creating and maintaining a government free from the dictates of any one religious sect,

but they were not religion hostile. Both **Jefferson** and **Madison** supported the **real** purpose of the First Amendment ... to prevent the Federal Government from establishing a **national denomination**. And **Jefferson** particularly felt that it was the right of the states **alone and individually** to establish and/or deal with religion as they saw fit.

JEFFERSON SPEAKS

Many **Thomas Jefferson** written opinions, as well as his personal and official behavior revealed a mindset that was different from the very broad definition of separation of church and state that is supported and propagated in courts today. While **Jefferson** despised the infighting, corruptions and misunderstandings of scriptural intent that was manifested, at times, between the religious sects, he never intended that **religion** in general and its influence be **forbidden** within government. The following are **Jefferson** quotes:

*"[I consider] ethics, as well as religion, as supplements to law in the government of man."*⁹

*"The Christian Religion, when divested of the rags in which they (the clergy) have enveloped it, and brought to the original purity and simplicity of its benevolent institutor, is a religion of all others most friendly to liberty, science, and the freest expansion of the human mind."*¹⁰

*"The precepts of philosophy ... laid hold of actions only ... (But Jesus) pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man, erected his tribunal in the region of the thoughts, and purified the waters at the fountain head."*¹¹

*"In extracting the pure principles which Jesus taught, we should have to strip off the artificial vestments, in which they have been muffled ... there will be found remaining the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has ever been offered to man."*¹²

*"My views ... are the result of a life of inquiry and reflection, and very different from the anti-christian system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions. To the corruptions of Christianity I am, indeed, opposed; but not to the genuine precepts of Jesus himself. I am a Christian in the only sense in which he wished any one to be; sincerely attached to His doctrines in preference to all others ..."*¹³

*"I hold the precepts of Jesus as delivered by Himself, to be the most pure, benevolent and sublime which have ever been preached to man..."*¹⁴

*"And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis – a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that His justice cannot sleep forever."*¹⁵

JEFFERSON WARNS ABOUT THE JUDICIARY

It was the **abuses** within religions that **Jefferson** despised, not the religion, itself. And while he may have questioned some of religion's supernatural elements, he was mindful of its value toward the maintenance of morality within society, and within government. To forbid its efficacy upon the very institution that wields power over the people would have been unwise. While he strongly upheld the First Amendment's directive in prohibiting a **national denomination**, he never meant to bar Christianity in general from being a political and governmental influence. **Jefferson** was a champion of liberty in all things ... especially the freedom of man to think for himself. To see the **Court-sanctioned censorship of Christianity** in the public square today and the accompanying demise of morality and decency that has come with it would have been as offensive to **Jefferson's** sense of liberty, morality and equality as the religious disparities and abuses of his time. It would have been especially repellent in the light of the fact that today's censorships have come down from the courts **against the will of the majority of Americans!** His **prophetic fear of judicial tyranny** over the will of the people was evident in these statements:

*"The Constitution is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the Judiciary, which they may twist and shape into any form they please."*¹⁶

"You seem . . . to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions; a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men and not more so. They have, with others, the same passions for party, for power, and the privilege of their corps. . . . [A]nd their power the more dangerous as they are in office for life and not responsible, as the other functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal." ¹⁷

Abraham Lincoln was one of many American leaders who concurred with this **healthy suspicion toward the Judiciary** that has unfortunately become obsolete in today's system:

"I do not forget the position assumed by some that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court. . . . At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made . . . the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having . . . resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal." ¹⁸ --Lincoln's Inaugural Address

The **Judiciary** was intended to be the **least powerful** branch of the government, particularly because it was an **unelected branch**, and its sole purpose was to **interpret laws as they were originally written**, not to twist old laws into new laws as they deem fit. **Lawmaking** must be left in the hands of the **legislative branch** ... the branch elected by and therefore subject to the people.

WHO ACTUALLY WROTE THE FIRST AMENDMENT?

A cursory study of the dialogue between the framers of the **Bill of Rights** would quickly prove that the phrase "**separation of church and state**" was not even on their minds. In fact, in the **Congressional Records (June 7 to September 25, 1789)** covering the months of debate between the statesmen who formulated the First Amendment, **NOT ONE OF THE ATTENDING FOUNDING FATHERS EVER MENTIONED THE PHRASE "SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE"!** ¹⁹ Likewise, in future court cases, the phrase was referred to only rarely, and was never invoked until over 150 years later. ²⁰

And to cite **Thomas Jefferson** as an authority in this matter becomes even more questionable when one realizes the circumstances of the framing of the **First Amendment**. **Thomas Jefferson** had nothing to do with the amendment's writing. **Jefferson** was not a part of the amendment debates, nor was he a delegate to the **1787 Constitutional Convention**. **Jefferson** was not even a member of Congress in the year of the Amendments' ratification (1789). At the time of its inception, **Jefferson** was out of the country, serving as **U.S. Minister to France!** ²¹

While **Jefferson** had little to do with the formation of the **First Amendment**, **James Madison** did play a role, but only in league with many other statesmen, such as **Fisher Ames, Elbridge Gerry, John Vining, Daniel and Charles Carroll, Benjamin Huntington, Roger Sherman, Oliver Ellsworth, and William Paterson**. These other men had an equal or even more direct role in the forming of the clause, ²² and many were openly Christian in **both** their personal **and** public lives. Beyond **Jefferson** and **Madison**, their influence is largely **ignored** today.

And even though **Jefferson** and **Madison** are often cited with regard to the Amendment, **James Madison** initially opposed the **Bill of Rights** altogether (and therefore the First Amendment), until he realized that the **Constitution** would not be ratified without these amendments. Amongst many other officials, he had a hand in the amendment debates. And while his proposed amendment was more specifically pointed to what the amendment was to represent: "**The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established.**" ²³ he was **not** its official author. His and other statesmen's proposed versions were discarded in favor of the one we see today, authored by statesman **Fisher Ames**.

KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND IS ESSENTIAL!

We simply cannot trust the voices that have become prominent in recent court decisions, in order to accurately interpret the true spirit and original intent of the **First Amendment**. There has been an **extreme** liberty taken in selectively "interpreting" our forefathers' intentions. We **MUST** study the spiritual and political commentary, as well as the societal backdrop of **ALL** of the founding fathers, from the earliest roots of America until the actual birth of the new nation.

Jefferson, himself, understood the importance of **rightly interpreting law as it was originally intended**, when he asserted that ...

"On every question of construction, carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed."²⁴

And likewise:

"A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; that second for a third; and so on, till the bulk of the society is reduced to be mere automatons of misery, to have no sensibilities left but for sin and suffering."²⁵

Justice Joseph Story, nominated by James Madison to the **Supreme Court**, and **founder of Harvard Law School** added that

"The first and fundamental rule in the interpretation of all instruments (documents) is to construe them according to the sense of the terms and the intention of the parties."²⁶

Justice James Wilson, one of the first original **Supreme Court Justices**, one of only six men who signed both the **Declaration of Independence** and the **Constitution**, and co-author of **America's first legal commentaries on the Constitution**, stated that...

"The first and governing maxim in the interpretation of a statute is to discover the meaning of those who made it."²⁷

And **Noah Webster** warned about the effects of **interpreting the language of any writing**, without discerning the common knowledge of the period in which it was written:

"In the lapse of two or three centuries, changes have taken place which in particular passages obscure the sense of the original languages ... The effect of these changes is that some words are ... being now used in a sense different from that which they had (and thus) present wrong signification or false ideas. Whenever words are understood in a sense different from that which they had when introduced ... mistakes may be very injurious."²⁸

All four of these founding fathers (and many others) understood the abuses that could arise when officials do not take the time to carefully study the background of the ordinances they are appointed to interpret. With societal changes, misinterpretation comes easily when decades or even centuries have passed between the period the law was written and the period in which it is being interpreted.

SO WHERE DOES THE "SEPARATION" PHRASE COME FROM?

The phrase "separation of church and state" originated in a letter written by President **Thomas Jefferson** to **The Baptist Association of Danbury, Connecticut**. The Baptists had written **President Jefferson** conveying their joy that **Jefferson**, a **fellow Anti-Federalist**, had been elected President, but also expressing concern that the constitution's protection of religion may not have the strength of substance they had hoped for. They were fearful that **"...what religious privileges we enjoy (as a minor part of the State) we enjoy as favors granted, and not as inalienable rights."**²⁹

Inalienable rights are also referred to by the founding fathers as **"natural rights"**. These are rights they considered to be granted by God, and God alone, and nontransferable to the government or anyone else. The correct pronunciation of "unalienable" would actually be "un-a-leen-able", not the "un-a-le-un-able" that is often quoted today. The inference being that these **natural rights** (such as the rights of **life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness**) may not have a lien placed upon them by our government. These rights belong to the people, and to them alone ... and the only Person who can remove those rights is **God**.

The Danbury Baptists' desire for these religious protections was shared by **President Jefferson**. He supported the prohibition of an established **national denomination** in the United States, thereby allowing all to worship freely within their own belief systems and traditions. His famous letter that contains the **"separation"** phrase is as follows:

Gentlemen

The affectionate sentiments of esteem & approbation which you are so good as to express towards me, on behalf of the **Danbury Baptist association**, give me the highest satisfaction. my duties dictate a faithful & zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents, and, in proportion as they are persuaded of my fidelity to those duties, the discharge of them becomes more & more pleasing.

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man & his god, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" thus building **a wall of separation between Church & State.**

Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience I shall see with friendly dispositions the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced that he has no natural rights in opposition to his social duties."]

I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection & blessing of the common father and creator of man, and tender you for yourselves & the **Danbury Baptist [your religious] association** assurances of my high respect & esteem.

Th Jefferson
Jan. 1. 1802. ³⁰

Jefferson's conviction was that citizen's individual rights to religion were **natural, God given rights**, and that the **federal government** was **not to interfere** with these rights. Likewise, the intention of the **First Amendment** was **not to censor religious expression in public or otherwise** ... unless the religious acts disrupted "**peace and good order**", or, as the **Danbury Baptists** put it ...worked "**ill to (one's) neighbor**". ³¹ And the "**free exercise**" clause of the amendment is there, specifically, to **protect** religious expression! This Amendment as a whole was enacted, in fact, **not to keep Christian beliefs and influences out of government, but to keep the national government out of Christian beliefs and practices!**

And with regard to the phrase "**separation of church and state**", which is erroneously attributed to the **First Amendment**, David Barton stated in his book "*Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, and Religion*" that "**There is probably no other instance in America's history where words spoken by a single individual in a private letter – words clearly divorced from their context –have become the sole authorization for a national judicial policy.**" ³²

CHRISTIANITY IS THE BASIS FOR A FREE SOCIETY **(Founders' Quotes)**

In fact, a large portion of the founding fathers felt that **Christianity was the very basis** for a **free society** ... and that it was essential in keeping government leaders and citizens **moral**, and therefore indispensable to the peace and good order of a new republic. **Consider the following founders' quotes:**

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars." ³³ –George Washington

"Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds ... reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." ³⁴ --George Washington

"The propitious (favorable) smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained." ³⁵ -- George Washington

"Is it not that the Declaration of Independence first organized the social compact on the foundation of the Redeemer's mission upon earth? That it laid the cornerstone of human government upon the first percepts of Christianity?" ³⁶ --John Quincy Adams

"That book, Sir, [The Bible]... is the Rock on which our Republic rests." ³⁷ --President Andrew Jackson, 1845

"I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth – that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We've been assured in the sacred writing that, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." ³⁸ --Ben Franklin

Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of masters. ³⁹ --Benjamin Franklin 1787

"We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice, ambition, revenge, or gallantry, would break the strongest cords of our Constitution as a whale goes through a net. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." ⁴⁰ - John Adams

The great pillars of all government and of social life ...(are) virtue, morality, and religion. This is the armor, my friend, and this alone, that renders us invincible. ⁴¹
--Patrick Henry

One of the beautiful boasts of our municipal jurisprudence is that Christianity is a part of the Common Law ... There never has been a period in which the common Law did not recognize Christianity as lying at its foundations ... I verily believe Christianity necessary to the support of civil society. ⁴² --Joseph Story, Supreme Court Justice, founder of Harvard Law School.

"Human Law must rest its authority ultimately upon the authority of that law which is Divine ... Far from being rivals or enemies, religion and law are twin sisters, friends, and mutual assistants. Indeed, these two sciences run into each other. The Divine law ... forms an essential part of both." ⁴³ --James Wilson, signer of the Constitution, original Supreme Court Justice, coauthor of America's first Commentaries on the Constitution.

"Let us enter on this important business under the idea that we are Christians on whom the eyes of the world are now turned ...Let us in the first place ... humbly and penitently implore the aid of the Almighty God whom we profess to serve – let us earnestly call and beseech him for Christ's sake to preside in our councils." ⁴⁴ --Elias Boudinot, President of the Continental Congress

The Christian religion –its general principles –must ever be regarded among us as the foundation of civil society. ⁴⁵ --Daniel Webster

The religion which has introduced civil liberty is the religion of Christ and His apostles ... and to this we owe our free constitutions of government. ⁴⁶ --Noah Webster

"The truth announced in the Holy Scripture, and proven by all history (is) that, 'Those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord.'" ⁴⁷ --Abraham Lincoln

"No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state or national, because this is a religious people ... This is a Christian nation." ⁴⁸ --U.S. Supreme Court, 1892

"Whatever strikes at the root of Christianity tends manifestly to the dissolution of civil government." ⁴⁹ -- U.S. Supreme Court, citing a previous 1811 court ruling.

And from a recent statesman:

Without God, there is no virtue, because there's no prompting of the conscience. Without God, we're mired in the material, that flat world that tells us only what the senses perceive. Without God, there is a coarsening of the society. And without God, democracy will not and cannot long endure. If we ever forget that we're one nation under God, then we will be a nation gone under. ⁵⁰
--Ronald Reagan

...where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. --2 Corinthians 3:17, NIV

These are but a few examples from a vast wealth of quotations that convey the Christian Political beliefs of our early fathers. Christianity's influence was largely welcomed into the framing of public policy and law. Had this not been so, **American jurisprudence** would not have had its basis in **Judeo-Christian law**, taken from **Biblical scripture**. Likewise, there would be no **Bible verses, Ten Commandments**, or **paintings of religious acts** displayed or etched onto dozens of our national and state edifices under the authority, direction, agreement, and support of our forefathers.

These **religious displays have met with little argument until just recently**. It is an amazing fact that during our first 200 years ... these overt **Christian expressions** have been painted or engraved upon our state and national monuments and currency; **Christian ideology** has been inbred deeply within our laws; Congress has traditionally opened with prayer; school days started with prayer until the unfortunate court ruling in 1962; and Thanksgiving and Christmas were official national holidays obviously devoted to **Christian events and tradition**. And yet liberal ideologues today promulgate the idea that from the beginning, the founding fathers never intended even a hint of religion to enter into the governmental arena!

If their assessment of "separation of church and state" is true, then how on earth did all the previous government officials miss what was such an obvious breach of the First Amendment for the first 150 years??

The answer is clear. The acknowledgement or encouragement of **God** in the public or government arena **was not in conflict** with the **First Amendment** at all. In fact, the founding fathers **encouraged** God and His influence within government, education, and society, because they instinctively understood that our new nation would not survive long without His input, and His blessing.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT LIMITS GOVERNMENT, NOT RELIGION

As was previously stated, the **Federal Government's purpose for the first amendment** was not to inhibit religious displays or practices, but to **limit ITSELF** from interfering with the **"free exercise thereof"**. In other words, the limitation was **NOT imposed upon religion** (whether it be on government property or elsewhere). Quite the contrary ... the limitation was put upon **government**.

Justice Joseph Story (Supreme Court Justice and Founder of Harvard Law School) stated: **"We are not to attribute this (First Amendment) prohibition of a national religious establishment to an indifference to religion in general, and especially to CHRISTIANITY (which none could hold in more reverence, than the FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION) Probably, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the Amendment to it now under consideration, the general, if not the universal sentiment in America was that CHRISTIANITY ought to receive ENCOURAGEMENT FROM THE STATE ... An attempt to level all religions and make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference would have created universal disapprobation (disapproval) if not universal indignation (anger)."**⁵¹ (emphasis added)

The House Judiciary Committee in 1853-54, asserted that **"Had the people, during the revolution, had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that Revolution would have been strangled in its cradle. At the time of the adoptions of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that CHRISTIANITY SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED, not any one sect (denomination). Any attempt to level and discard all religion would have been viewed with universal indignation. IT (RELIGION) MUST BE CONSIDERED AS THE FOUNDATION ON WHICH THE WHOLE STRUCTURE RESTS. ... In this age there can be no substitute for Christianity; that, in its general principles, is the great conservative element on which we must rely for the purity and permanence of free institutions. That was the religion of the founders of the republic, AND THEY EXPECTED IT TO REMAIN THE RELIGION OF THEIR DESCENDENTS."**⁵² (emphasis added)

The Senate Judiciary Committee (1853-54) put it this way: **"They, (the founders) intended, by this Amendment, to prohibit "an establishment of religion" such as the English Church presented, or any thing like it. But they had no fear or jealousy of religion itself, nor did they wish to see us an irreligious people ...THEY DID NOT INTEND TO SPREAD OVER ALL THE PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND THE WHOLE PUBLIC ACTION OF THE NATION THE DEAD AND REVOLTING SPECTACLE OF ATHEISTICAL APATHY."**⁵³ (emphasis added)

Our forefathers **high regard for Christianity in the public square** was understood. The thought of removing it to make government **"neutral"** was unthinkable. **Dr. Benjamin Rush (educator, signer of the Declaration of Independence)** put it this way:

"Such is my veneration for every religion that reveals the attributes of the Deity, or a future state of REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, that I had rather see the opinions of Confucius or Mohamed inculcated upon our youth than see them grow up wholly devoid of a system of religious principles. But the religion I mean to recommend in this place is that of the NEW TESTAMENT (A)ll its doctrines and precepts are calculated to promote the happiness of society and the safety and well being of civil government." ⁵⁴

REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS MAKE BETTER CITIZENS

This idea of **Christian "rewards and punishments"** is peppered throughout the writings of our early officials. They understood that government leaders, as well as their constituents, would be more self-governed, honest, hard working citizens if these same people believed there was a **God who would reward them** in the afterlife for their deeds. They also understood that while no one is perfect, **Godliness and virtue** generally follow one another.

"If men are so wicked with religion, what would they be if without it?" ⁵⁵ --Benjamin Franklin

This belief was absolutely key in creating a government and society that was moral, peaceful, and productive. **Christian ideas** and statements were not *incidentally* placed throughout our founders' writings, documents and monuments. They were in fact, representative of the founding fathers deep and abiding belief that a **free society** cannot ultimately survive without **God's Higher Laws** as its foundation!

As was stated before, the **First Amendment** assured citizens that there would be no **"establishment of religion"** on a **national** basis. To be more specific: Since our nation was and **is** predominantly a **Christian society**, the directive assured that there would be no specific **"Christian"** denomination chosen as our **national denomination**. Even though there were several faiths represented in early America (including Native American religion, Judaism, Islam, and Buddhists), the great majority of the population was Christian, and **Christianity** was the preferred religion of the founding fathers.

These **Christians**, represented by varying sects, deeply cherished and guarded their beliefs. Many years prior, a **large portion of early Americans' ancestors** had left their European homes with a few small possessions and crossed the treacherous Atlantic Ocean in order to **escape religious persecution**. This was a response to the **nations in Europe** that had established **national Christian denominations**, which in essence drove these dissenting sects onto the shores of **America** in hope of finding a new freedom to worship in their own way. It is important to note that these were **Christians** who were **earnest enough about their religion to leave their homes and all they knew**, oftentimes risking their lives enroute to a new and unknown world. **They were not nominal Christians** ... they were serious about their faith.

This **Christian "establishment" tradition of European nations** (the formation of **national denominations**), including **Great Britain's**, therefore became repugnant to the American forefathers ... and in part resulted in some of the extreme views that were, at times, expressed by statesmen such as **James Madison**. Most of our founding fathers, however, held much more traditional and moderate views with regard to government and Christianity. And while all basically agreed on **establishing no particular national Christian denomination**, many believed that **government should be allowed to sanction religious practices** (such as days of prayer and fasting); if not on a national level, most certainly on a state level. It is very important to note that the **First Amendment** was drafted to **limit Federal Government** with regard to religion, but this amendment **had no jurisdiction over state religious laws and practices!** Religious establishment and officially sanctioned practices **was left to the power and preference of each state.**

STATES SHOULD STILL BE MAINTAINING THEIR RIGHTS!

The Federal Government and Courts' current power of jurisdiction over states that is in effect today was not prudent, in fact it **was illegal** in the minds of the original founders. This is why the **Bill of Rights** was added to the **Constitution** ... in order to **limit the Federal Government's power**, thus preserving the **states' sovereignty**. **Jefferson**, himself, was a champion of the importance of the **states' autonomy**, and the essential **limitation** of a federal centralized government. He wrote that the ... **"power to prescribe any religious exercise must rest with the States"**. ⁵⁶ **Justice Joseph Story**, nominated by **James Madison** to the **Supreme Court**, and **founder of Harvard Law School** stated that ... **"the whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusively to the State governments to be acted upon according to their own sense of justice and the State constitutions"**. ⁵⁷ This left the states to do as they wished with regard to establishment of a state denomination. **The greater freedom with regard to religion was theirs**, and the federal government

was not to interfere with their rights or choices. This followed the pattern of **limited national government**, which was essential in the eyes of our early American leaders. This is why we bear the moniker *The United States of America*, and not just *America*. The national government was constructed in order to protect and maintain the states united, but the **states** were to remain **essentially self-governed**.

STATE CONSTITUTIONS ARE CHRISTIAN IN NATURE

Every one of the states ultimately followed suit with the Federal precedent, in **not** establishing official State Christian denominations, although the temptation and the opportunity was there to do so, as many of them were populated largely by one sect. The **state's Constitutions**, however, were filled with rhetoric that conveyed reverence toward the **Christian God**, and with obvious deference to the importance of establishing and honoring **Biblical based statutes in the State laws and education**. By no means were they indifferent or unresponsive when it came to religion playing a large part in public policy and practices. The fact is ...they strongly **encouraged** it. The following language of some of the **states' Preambles to their Constitutions** is just one example of how strongly they felt about **Christianity** remaining a vital part of their public policy:

Alabama 1901, Preamble. ***We the people of the State of Alabama, ... invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God, do ordain and establish the following Constitution ...*** ⁵⁸

Alaska 1956, Preamble. ***We, the people of Alaska, grateful to God and to those who founded our nation and pioneered this great land...*** ⁵⁹

Arizona 1911, Preamble. ***We, the people of the State of Arizona, grateful to Almighty God for our liberties, do ordain this Constitution...*** ⁶⁰

Arkansas 1874, Preamble. ***We, the people of the State of Arkansas, grateful to Almighty God for the privilege of choosing our own form of government...*** ⁶¹

California 1879, Preamble. ***We, the People of the State of California, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom.*** ⁶²

Every one of the 50 states' Preambles has similar religious language.

In addition, there were even more **overt Christian directives** written in the states' Constitutions:

"Every person appointed to public office shall say 'I _____, do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His only Son, and the Holy Ghost, on God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration.'" --Constitution of Delaware ⁶³

"And each member (of the legislature), before he takes his seat, shall make and subscribe the following declaration: 'I do believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked.'" --Constitutions of Pennsylvania and Vermont ⁶⁴

Again, **all of the states constitutions had similar language.**

SO WHEN WAS "SEPARATION" FIRST INVOKED?

The phrase "**separation of church and state**" had actually appeared in less than a dozen cases in U.S. courts, up until the time that it was first invoked in the case of ***Everson v. Board of Education in 1947***. Throughout America's first 150 years, no court decision had ever supported the separation ideology. But this 1947 decision was instrumental in the advent of our nation's corrosion from within that has followed in subsequent court decisions for the last 58 years. **After 1947**, this **Jefferson phrase** has appeared in courts in literally **thousands of cases**.

The 1947 Supreme Court forfeited the **original intent of the Constitution** (of which they were sworn to uphold, and **Jefferson**, himself had supported) to their own political and personal philosophies. Study of the original intentions of the whole of the original statesmen was thrown aside, and **Jefferson's warning was not heeded**:

"On every question of construction, carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed."⁶⁵

The Court's **1947 *Everson*** decision coupled the **First Amendment** with the **Fourteenth Amendment**, an amendment that was implemented in 1868 in order to guarantee state citizenship to former slaves. Strangely enough, the ***Everson*** Court combined these two amendments to **remove the states' autonomy** with regard to **religious practices** and subvert them to the jurisdiction of the **Federal Government**. (Neither the **First** or **Fourteenth Amendments** original intent was to *generally* embolden the power of Federal Government and/or subvert states' rights.)

Nevertheless, at the same time, the Court **discarded the historical case law, constitutional law**, and common understanding of the **First Amendment (which was to protect free expression of religion from Federal government tampering)** and rather interpreted it, without precedent, to separate government and religion, stating that ...

...The First Amendment has erected a wall between Church and State. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach."⁶⁶

And yet there had been **breaches** by the hundreds and thousands for the previous 150 years, if this new interpretation was in any way correct! This Court decision created a quagmire in which **thousands of previously legal religious practices** were now in question. And while many court decisions after 1947 continued to uphold and even encourage the original intent of the **First Amendment**, a few decisions began to invoke the separation idiom, including the **1962 *Engel v. Vitale*** case, which, **without citing a single precedent**, removed **voluntary prayer** from schools, claiming that a simple nondenominational prayer in New York schools established "**an official state religion**", breaching the "**constitutional wall of separation of church and state**".⁶⁷ In this case, **Justice Potter Stewart** was the beacon of common sense when he proposed his **dissent**:

"The Court today says that the State and federal governments are without constitutional power to prescribe any particular form of words to be recited by any group of the American people on any subject touching religion. One of the stanzas of "The Star-Spangled Banner," made our National Anthem by Act of Congress in 1931, contains these verses:

'Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued land Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation! Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, And this be our motto 'in God is our Trust.'

In 1954, Congress added a phrase to the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag so that it now contains the words "one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all" Since 1865 the words "In God We Trust" have been impressed on our coins. Countless similar examples could be listed, but there is no need to belabor the obvious ...I do not believe that this Court, or the Congress, or the President has by the actions and practices I have mentioned established an "official religion" in violation of the Constitution. And I do not believe the State of New York has done so in this case. What each has done has been to recognize and to follow the deeply entrenched and highly cherished spiritual traditions of our Nation - traditions which come down to us from those who almost two hundred years ago avowed their "firm reliance on the Protection of divine Providence."

In addition, he added ...

"With all respect, I think the court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an "official religion" is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these school children to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our NationFor we deal here not with the establishment of a state church, which would, of course, be constitutionally impermissible, but with whether school children who want to begin their day by joining in prayer must be prohibited from doing so."⁶⁸

Then came the **1963 *School District of Abington Township v. Schempp*** case, which **abolished volunteer Bible** reading in Pennsylvania schools, claiming that religious activities must remain home or in private schools. Again, **Justice Potter's dissent**:

"It might be argued here that parents who wanted their children to be exposed to religious influences in school could ... send their children to private or parochial schools. But the

consideration which renders this contention too facile (simplistic) to be determinative (a factor) has already been recognized by the Court: "Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion are available to all, not merely to those who can pay their own way." *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, 111. It might also be argued that parents who want their children exposed to religious influences can adequately fulfill that wish off school property and outside school time. With all its surface persuasiveness, however, this argument seriously misconceives the basic constitutional justification for permitting the exercises at issue in these cases. For a compulsory state educational system SO STRUCTURES A CHILD'S LIFE that if religious exercises are held to an impermissible activity in schools, , religion is placed at an artificial and state-created DISADVANTAGE. Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are TRULY TO BE NEUTRAL in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the ESTABLISHMENT OF A RELIGION OF SECULARISM." 69 (emphasis added)

Indeed, it IS a regrettable fact that removing **God, prayer, and Christian principles** from American governmental institutions is, by default, an **establishment of Atheism and/or Secular Humanism as national policy** ... not by word, perhaps, but certainly by deed! Most every group, essentially, is permitted free speech in public schools (within reason) ... **except traditional religionists, and especially, Christians.** For a nation who has prided itself in its promotion of free speech and an unprecedented free flow of ideas ... our government, and it's liberal proponents have become masterful at censoring the one idea that they (curiously) find repellant that is, the idea of **Christianity.**

THE "RELIGION" OF SECULAR HUMANISM

Believe it or not, **Secular Humanism** has officially been **granted status as a religion** in and of itself, by the **Supreme Court, in *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 1961,**⁷⁰ as well as the U.S. Appellate case of ***Washington Ethical Society V. District of Columbia*, 1957.**⁷¹ Thus, our nation has **forbidden the traditional religion of Christianity,** and simply substituted another "new" **religion of Secular Humanism/Atheism** in its place. The **Secular Humanists,** themselves, however, have happily assumed the religious status with regard to the "free exercise" clause, but not with regard to the "establishment" clause. They have, in essence, taken on two identities in order to manipulate the courts and the system. This is how they manage to retain the benefits of a full-fledged religion, as Christianity does (such as tax exempt status), and yet, unlike Christians, are allowed to continually propagate their beliefs (such as **evolution**) throughout public schools **on an unequal playing field.** In other words, **Christianity** now has **little to no voice** within the walls of our **public schools, or public square,** but the religion of **secular humanism** has carte blanche, according to the courts. These legal discrepancies have been disingenuous, at best. As a result, and as **Justice Stewart** brilliantly predicted ...the **Christian religion** has been **"placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage".**⁷²

Christianity and **Secular Humanism/Atheism** are **both belief systems.** And a person's beliefs are what he lives by, what he follows. **Secular Humanism** is in fact not a true religion however, because religion, by definition, must include the respect and veneration of a higher power (God). However, since the Supreme Court has recently declared **Secular Humanism** a religion, then **why should it be afforded special status above the teachings of any other religion** ... that is, the religion of Christianity in the **Public Schools?** Remarkably, this **judicial inequality** has been allowed to flourish for the last 34 years or so even though we boast a **large majority of Christians** in this nation. **The Christian majority simply does not rule.** This begs the question: Since when does a system based upon **democracy** rule according to the **minority?** Much less, a very small minority?

THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS NEUTRALITY

Still, despite this **Christian majority,** there are those who feel it is not harmful but actually helpful to secularize government, and that **"neutralizing"** government is more equitable to all people represented in the U.S. But, as stated before, **"neutrality"** in our public system does not translate into **equality,** or an equal playing field. Quite the contrary. It has simply put Christians under a complete disadvantage to Secular/Humanists/Atheists. Their beliefs (or non-beliefs, if you will) have become state mandated, and Christian tenets have been thrown aside. **THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS NEUTRALITY.** There never will be.

The fact is ... if we do not choose to base our policies, belief systems, or school teachings upon **Christian morals,** we WILL most assuredly be basing them upon **SOMEONE'S** morals. All of law, all science, and even history (to a degree) is based upon **SOMEONE'S** beliefs, perspective, or point of view, whether they

be religious or not. So whose morals or standards do we choose? Where will they come from, if not from Holy Scripture?

Jesus Christ made it very clear when He asserted that ...**"He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters."** ... Matthew 12:30, Luke 11:23, NIV

The Lord also stated that ...**"So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."** --Revelation 3:16, KJV

He gave no room for playing both sides, no support for sitting on the fence. In essence, He was saying ... **THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS NEUTRALITY.**

AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY ... THE MOST TOLERANT

What secularists fail to recognize is that **Christianity in America** has been the most **gracious, tolerant religion** when it comes to **allowing other religions to coexist**. America has been the champion of unprecedented tolerance toward other religions (or the lack thereof). **The United States has allowed other religions to worship freely** since the signing of the Constitution, **while yet retaining our Christian culture, society, and laws**. It is **because** we are **Christian** that we have reasonable, protective laws. NO nation can be completely neutral on ANY issue (because personal beliefs will always come into play). So **why not retain a benevolent moral scripture to be the basis for law and public policy** ... just as our founding fathers did? Why are the political actions of our forefathers **deemed brilliant, except in the case of their support for the Christian religion?** Why do secularists feel the need to "fix" what wasn't broken to begin with? **The founding fathers' formula for liberty, based upon Christianity**, created the most free, prosperous, productive nation in history. With such unprecedented success, **why on earth has this formula been abandoned?**

What practicing Christians know to be true is that **American Christianity** and its proclamation is precisely **WHY** we have prospered for our first 185 years as a nation. God is very real, and very much in the business of corporately blessing those nations who honor Him. And once **Christianity is completely taken out of our government creeds, currency, schools, laws and monuments ... religious tolerance will be gone with it**, not to mention the removal of the hand and blessing of God this nation has enjoyed without precedent for over 200 years. The **South Carolina Supreme Court** agreed with this notion in the case of the **City of Charleston v. Benjamin (1846)**. The court wrote:

What gave to us this noble safeguard of religious toleration ...? It was Christianity But this toleration, thus granted, is a religious toleration; it is the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, with two provisos, one of which, that which guards against acts of licentiousness (immorality), testifies to the Christian construction...

What constitutes the standard of good morals? Is it not Christianity? There certainly is none other ... The day of moral virtue in which we live would, in an instant, if that standard were abolished, lapse into the dark and murky night of Pagan immorality...

In the Courts over which we preside, we daily acknowledge Christianity as the most solemn part of our administration. A Christian witness, having no religious scruples about placing his hand upon the book, is sworn upon the holy Evangelists – the books of the New Testament which testify of our Savior's birth, life, death, and resurrection; this is so common a matter that it is little thought of as an evidence of the part which Christianity has in the common law ...

I agree fully to what is beautifully and appropriately said in (the case) Updegraph v. The Commonwealth (1824) ... ---Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law: "not Christianity founded on any particular religious tenets; not Christianity with an established church ... but Christianity with liberty of the conscience to all men."⁷³

David Barton, in his book *Original Intent* states it this way:

"In the view of the Charleston court, Christian principles had produced America's toleration for other religions; and while American did legislate according to Christian standards of conduct for social behavior, it did not tell other religions how, where, when, or even whether to worship. The only restraints placed on those religions were that their religious practices not be licentious or subversive of public morality or safety. Aside from those stipulations, America granted broad religious toleration to other religions NOT IN SPITE OF, but BECAUSE of its Christian beliefs."⁷⁴

This distinctly **American Christian identity, with a grace toward other religions**, is what has set us apart from any other nation before us. We have proven that a Christian nation (with a holy, yet benevolent God) can govern and flourish **without banishing those present who do not believe**. The **freedoms** we have enjoyed can exist **only amongst a moral people**. These liberties will eventually dissipate without a moral compass, or a Moral God. Without the **Absolutes of Christianity**, all reason is cast aside. Right becomes wrong, and wrong becomes right ... and people become lost within their own philosophies.

Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.

-Isaiah 5:20, NIV

If we do not work to turn back the deception that has slowly crept into our nation's corporate mindset about the "**neutrality**" of **secularism** ... we are doomed to lose this great nation that our forefathers so courageously and selflessly fought for. **America became free** because it was **first Christian** ... not Christian because it was first free.

"When a well-packaged web of lies has been sold gradually to the masses over generations, the truth will seem utterly preposterous and its speaker a raving lunatic."⁷⁵

- Dresden James

"There is nothing so absurd but if you repeat it often enough people will believe it."⁷⁶ --Dr. William James, Father of Modern Psychology

"Make the lie big, make it simple, keep saying it, and eventually they will believe it."⁷⁷ -Adolf Hitler

"How fortunate for leaders that men do not think."⁷⁸ -Adolf Hitler

"All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."⁷⁹ -Edmund Burke

ENDNOTES

¹ David Barton, *Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion*, (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 2000), p. 6.

² David Barton, *Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion*, (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 2000), p. 203.

³ *The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States* (Washington: Gales & Seaton, 1853), Twelfth Congress, Second Session, p. 1325: "An Act for the relief of the Bible Society of Philadelphia. Be it enacted, &c., That the duties arising and due to the United States upon certain stereotype plates, imported during the last year into the port of Philadelphia, on board the ship Brilliant, by the Bible Society of Philadelphia, for the purpose of printing editions of the Holy Bible, be and the same are hereby remitted, on behalf of the United States, to the said society: and any bond or security given for the securing of the payment of the said duties shall be cancelled. Approved February 2, 1813."

⁴ James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (Published by Authority of Congress, 1899), Vol. I, pp. 512-513, June 19, 1812; pp. 532-533, July 23, 1813; p. 558, November 16, 1814; pp. 560-561, March 4, 1815.

⁵ James Madison, *The Papers of James Madison*, Robert A Rutland, editor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), Vol. VIII, pp. 396.

⁶ Henry S. Randall, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1858), Vol. III, pp. 451-452. For an alternative view of the purpose of this book, see Jefferson's Extracts from the Gospel's, Dickinson W. Adams, editor (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), p. 28, n. 87.

⁷ *American State Papers*, Walter Lowrie and Matthew St. Claire Clarke, editors (Washington, D. C.: Gales and Seaton, 1832), Vol. IV, p. 687.

⁸ *Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, Seventh Congress* (Washington, D. C.: Gales and Seaton, 1851), p. 1332, “An Act in Addition to An Act, Entitled, ‘An Act in Addition to an Act Regulating the Grants of Land Appropriated for Military Services, and for the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel Among the Heathen’ ”; Seventh Congress, Second Session, p. 1602, “An Act to Revive and Continue in Force An Act in Addition to An Act, Entitled, ‘An Act in Addition to an Act Regulating the Grants of Land Appropriated for Military Services, and for the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel Among the Heathen,’ and for Other Purposes”; and Eighth Congress, p. 1279, “An Act Granting Further Time for Locating Military Land Warrants, and for Other Purposes.”

⁹ Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Albert E. Bergh, editor (Washington D. C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XVI, p. 19, to Judge Augustus B. Woodward on March 24, 1824.

¹⁰ March 23, 1801, in a letter from Washington, D.C., to Moses Robinson. Barnes Mayo, ed., *Jefferson Himself--the personal narrative of a many-sided American* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942), p. 231. Catherine Millard, *The Rewriting of America's History* (Camp Hill, PA: Horizon House Publishers, 1991), p. 92.

¹¹ Jefferson, *Memoir*, Vol. III, p. 509, from his “*Syllabus of an estimate of the Merits of the doctrines of Jesus, Compared with Those of others*” sent with a letter to Benjamin Rush on April 21, 1803.

¹² 1813, in a letter to John Adams. Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, Vol. XIII, p. 389. Douglas Lurton, “Foreword,” *The Jefferson Bible* (Cleveland, OH: The Word Publishing Company, 1942), p. ix. Burton Stevenson, *The Home Book of Quotations—Classical and Modern* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1967), p. 266. Gary DeMar, *The Untold Story* (Atlanta, GA: American Vision, Inc., 1993), p. 91.

¹³ April 21, 1803, in a letter to Dr. Benjamin Rush. Writings, Vol. X, p. 379. Burton Stevenson, *The Home Book of Quotations—Classical & Modern* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1967), pp. 265-266. Barnes Mayo, ed., *Jefferson Himself--the personal narrative of a many-sided American* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942) pp. 231, 235. Catherine Millard, *The Rewriting of America's History* (Camp Hill, PA: Horizon House Publishers, 1991), p. 92. *Library of American Literature*, Vol. III, p. 277. Stephen Abbott Northrop, D.D., *A Cloud of Witnesses* (Portland, OR: American Heritage Ministries, 1987), p. 252.

¹⁴ November 4, 1820, in a letter to Jared Sparks. Compiled for Senator A. Willis Robertson, *Letters of Thomas Jefferson* (Williamsburg, VA: The Williamsburg Foundation, April 27, 1960) Catherine Millard, *The Rewriting of America's History* (Camp Hill, PA: Horizon House Publishers, 1991), p. 96.

¹⁵ Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1794), Query XVIII, pp. 236-237.

¹⁶ Thomas Jefferson, *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, From the Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, editor (Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1830), Vol. IV, p. 317, to Judge Spencer Roane on September 6, 1819.

¹⁷ Thomas Jefferson, *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Albert Ellery Bergh, editor (Washington D. C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XV, p. 277, to William Charles Jarvis on September 28, 1820.

¹⁸ James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (Published by Authority of Congress, 1899), Vol. VI, p. 9, “Inaugural Address” on March 4, 1861.

¹⁹ David Barton, *Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion*, (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 2000), p. 48.

²⁰ David Barton, *Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion*, (WallBuilder Press, 2000), p. 13.

²¹ David Barton, *The Truth About Thomas Jefferson and the First Amendment*, (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1992).

²² See *The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States* (Washington, D. C.: Gales and Seaton, 1834), Vol. I, pp. 440-948, June 8- September 24, 1789.

-
- ²³ *Debates and Proceedings* (1834), Vol. I, p. 451, June 8, 1789.
- ²⁴ George Washington, *Address of George Washington, President of the United States ... Preparatory to His Declination* (Baltimore: George and Henry S. Keating, 1796), pp. 22-23.
- ²⁵ Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Memorial Edition (Washington, D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904) Vol. XV, p. 40, to Samuel Kercheval, 1816.
- ²⁶ Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and Company, 1833), Vol. III, p. 383, §400.
- ²⁷ James Wilson, *The Works of the Honourable James Wilson*, Bird Wilson, editor (Philadelphia: Bronson and Chauncey, 1804), Vol. I, p. 14, from “Lectures on Law Delivered in the College of Philadelphia; Introductory Lecture: Of the Study of the Law in the United States.”
- ²⁸ Noah Webster, *The Holy Bible . . . With Amendments of the Language* (New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1833), p. iii.
- ²⁹ Letter of October 7, 1801, from Danbury (CT) Baptist Association to Thomas Jefferson, from the Thomas Jefferson Papers Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.
- ³⁰ Jefferson, *Writings*, Vol. XVI, pp. 281-282, to the Danbury Baptist Association on January 1, 1802.
- ³¹ Letter of October 7, 1801, from Danbury (CT) Baptist Association to Thomas Jefferson, from the Thomas Jefferson Papers Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.
- ³² David Barton, *Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion*, (Wallbuilders Press, 2000), p. 48.
- ³³ George Washington, *Address of George Washington, President of the United States . . . Preparatory to His Declination* (Baltimore: George and Henry S. Keating, 1796), pp. 22-23.
- ³⁴ Id.
- ³⁵ *The Daily Advertiser* (New York), May 1, 1789, p. 2; see also *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States* (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1833), Vol. I, pp. 9-10, April 30, 1789.
- ³⁶ John Quincy Adams, *An Oration Delivered Before the Inhabitants of the Town of Newburyport at Their Request on the Sixty-First Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1837* (Newburyport: Charles Whipple, 1837), pp. 5-6.
- ³⁷ Alfred Armand Montapert, *Distilled Wisdom* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965) p. 36. Also Henry Halley, *Halley's Bible Handbook*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1927, 1965), p. 18. “Our Christian Heritage”, *Letter from Plymouth Rock* (Marlborough, NH: The Plymouth Rock Foundation), p. 5. George Sivan, *The Bible and Civilization* (New York: Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co., 1973), p. 178. Gary DeMar, *The Untold Story* (Atlanta, GA: American Vision, Inc., 1993), p. 59.
- ³⁸ James Madison, *The Papers of James Madison*, Henry D. Gilpin, editor (Washington: Langtree and O'Sullivan, 1840), Vol. II, pp. 984-986, June 28, 1787.
- ³⁹ Benjamin Franklin, *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, Jared Sparks, editor (Boston: Tappan, Whittemore and Mason, 1840), Vol. X, p. 297, to Messrs. The Abbes Chalut and Arnaud on April 17, 1787.
- ⁴⁰ John Adams, *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States*, Charles Frances Adams, editor (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1854), Vol. IX, p. 229, to the Officers of the First Brigade of the Third Division of the Militia of Massachusetts on October 11, 1798.
- ⁴¹ Moses Coit Tyler, *Patrick Henry* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1897), p. 409, to Archibald Blair on January 8, 1799.

⁴² Joseph Story, *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*, William W. Story, editor (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1851), Vol. II, pp. 8, 92.

⁴³ James Wilson, *The Works of the Honourable James Wilson*, Bird Wilson, editor (Philadelphia: Bronson and Chauncey, 1804), Vol. I, pp. 104-106, "Of the General Principles of Law and Obligation."

⁴⁴ Elias Boudinot, *The Life, Public Services, Addresses, and Letters of Elias Boudinot, LL. D., President of the Continental Congress*, J. J. Boudinot, editor (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1896), Vol. I, p. 19, speech in the First Provincial Congress of New Jersey.

⁴⁵ Daniel Webster, *Mr. Webster's Speech in Defence of the Christian Ministry and in Favor of the Religious Instruction of the Young. Delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States, February 10, 1844, in the Case of Stephen Girard's Will* (Washington: Printed by Gales and Seaton, 1844), p. 41.

⁴⁶ Noah Webster, *History of the United States* (New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1832), p. 339, ¶53.

⁴⁷ March 30, 1863. James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (Published by Authority of Congress, 1899), vol. VI, p. 164. Gary DeMar, *God and Government, A Biblical and Historical Study* (Atlanta, GA: American Vision Press, 1984), p. 128-29. Also David Barton, *The Myth of Separation* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1991), p. 259. Also Benjamin Weiss, *God in American History: A Documentation of America's Religious Heritage* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1966), p. 92. Willard Cantelon, *Money Master of the World* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1976), p. 120. "Our Christian Heritage," *Letter from Plymouth Rock* (Marlborough, NH: The Plymouth Rock Foundation), p. 6. Gary DeMar, *The Untold Story* (Atlanta, GA: American Vision, Inc., 1993), pp. 53, 99.

⁴⁸ *Church of the Holy Trinity v. U.S.*, 465, 471 (1892).

⁴⁹ *People v. Ruggles*, 8 Johns 546 (Sup. Ct. NY. 1811).

⁵⁰ December, 1984, address given on the occasion of the enactment of the Equal Access Bill of 1984. *The Speech that Shook the Nation* (Forerunner, December 1984), p. 12. David Barton, *The Myth of Separation* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1991), pp. 17, 249.

⁵¹ Joseph Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1854), p. 259-261, §441, 444; see also Story, *Commentaries*, Vol. III, p. 726, §1868.

⁵² *Reports of Committees of the House of Representatives Made During the First Session of the Thirty-Third Congress* (Washington: A. O. P. Nicholson, 1854), pp. 1, 6, 8-9.

⁵³ *The Reports of Committees of the Senate of the United States for the Second Session of the Thirty-Second Congress, 1852-53* (Washington: Robert Armstrong, 1853), pp. 1-4.

⁵⁴ Benjamin Rush, *Essays, Literary, Moral and Philosophical* (Philadelphia: Thomas & Samuel F. Bradford, 1798), p. 8, "Of the Mode of Education Proper in a Republic."

⁵⁵ Jared Sparks, *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, (Boston: Tappan, Whittemore, and Mason, 1840), Vol. X, pp. 281-2.

⁵⁶ Thomas Jefferson, *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, From the Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, editor (Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1830), Vol. IV, p. 104, to the Rev. Samuel Millar on January 23, 1808.

⁵⁷ Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and Company, 1833), Vol. III, p. 731, §1873.

⁵⁸<http://www.legislature.state.al.us/misc/History/constitutions/1868/1868preamble.html>

⁵⁹ <http://www.alaska.edu/creatingalaska/constitution/>

⁶⁰ <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/const/const.htm>

⁶¹ http://www.usconstitution.net/states_god.html

⁶² <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/const/preamble>

⁶³ *Constitutions* (1785), pp. 99-100, Delaware, 1776, Article 22.

⁶⁴ *Constitutions* (1785), pp. 99-100, Delaware, 1776, Article 22. *The Constitutions of the Sixteen States* (Boston: Manning and Loring, 1797), p. 257, Vermont, 1792, Chapter II, Section XII.

⁶⁵ Thomas Jefferson, *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, From the Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, editor (Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1830), Vol. IV, p. 373, to Judge William Johnson on June 12, 1823.

⁶⁶ *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U. S. 1, 18 (1947).

⁶⁷ *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U. S. 430, 425 (1962).

⁶⁸ *Engel* at 445, Stewart, J. (dissenting).

⁶⁹ *Abington v. Schempp*, 374 U. S. 312-313, Stewart, J. (dissenting).

⁷⁰ *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 367 U. S. 488, 495, n. 11.

⁷¹ http://members.aol.com/patriarchy/definitions/humanism_religion.htm

⁷² *Abington* at 312-313, Stewart, J. (dissenting).

⁷³ *City Council of Charleston v. S.A. Benjamin*, 2 *Strob.* 522-524 (Sup Ct. S.C. 1846).

⁷⁴ David Barton, *Original Intent, The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion*, (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 2000), p. 70.

⁷⁵ <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/d/dresdenjam136280.html>

⁷⁶ David Barton, *The Myth of Separation* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1991), p. 46.

⁷⁷ http://en.thinkexist.com/quotes/adolf_hitler/

⁷⁸ *Id.*

⁷⁹ January 9, 1795, in a letter to William Smith. John Bartlett, *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1863, 1980), p. 374. David Barton, *The Myth of Separation* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1991), p. 262. Carroll E. Simcox, comp., *4400 Quotations for Christian Communicators* (Grand Rapids, MI: Bake Book House, 1991), p. 124.