

# Chapter 11

## Amendment 1: Government-Sanctioned Polytheism

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

### The Amendments

The Amendments to the United States Constitution would have been unnecessary had the late 18th-century Americans chosen the perfection of Yahweh's<sup>1</sup> law. The Bible's interdictions against amending Yahweh's law (Deuteronomy 4:1-2, etc.) do not, in themselves, prove His law is perfect. However, the Constitution has been amended twenty-seven times (as of 2012), which categorically proves its imperfection.

It is understandable that non-Christians, atheists, Jews, Muslims, and Hindus would choose the Constitution over the Christian Bible. However, for someone who believes in the perfection of the Bible to uphold the Constitution as the [supreme law of the land](#) makes no sense whatsoever. The Constitution has proven itself flawed, in need of amendment, and, worse, Biblically errant. Christians<sup>2</sup> who keep turning to it for inspiration, direction, and protection are as irrational as a wife who keeps returning to and defending an abusive husband.

### The Bill of Rights

The first Ten Amendments, commonly known as the Bill of Rights, were a compromise between the constitutional framers and the anti-federalists who opposed the Constitution as originally framed. In theory, the Bill of Rights protects, among other things, the "unalienable rights" of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But have life, liberty, and happiness been advanced or protected since their ratification?

One often hears that the Bill of Rights was based upon God-given rights. In 1954, Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren alleged the following comparison:

I believe the entire Bill of Rights came into being because of the knowledge our forefathers had of the Bible and their belief in it: freedom of belief, of expression, of assembly, of petition, the dignity of the individual, the sanctity of the home, equal justice under law, and the reservation of powers to the people...<sup>3</sup>

Except for home sanctity and equal justice, I would challenge the reader to find anything in the Bible that resembles Warren's list, let alone anything described as a right. How could the Bill of Rights have been based upon God-given rights when much of what is contained in the first ten Amendments is antithetical to Yahweh's morality? To declare that the Bill of Rights are God-given is another futile attempt to Christianize the Constitution.

The Scriptures provide no evidence of God-given (or unalienable) rights. Even life and liberty are not rights, but rather responsibilities delegated by Yahweh. Of course, rights are much more popular than responsibilities. Everyone, including homosexuals and infant murderers, demand their rights, but few are interested in fulfilling their responsibilities.

The Puritan idea of rights and liberty was quite different from what the framers had in mind:

John Winthrop [first governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony] ... reminded his fellow-citizens of Massachusetts that a doctrine of civil rights [as in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights] which looked to natural or sinful man as its source and guardian [as in the Preamble] was actually destructive of that very liberty which they were seeking to protect. True freedom can never be found in institutions which are under the direction of sinful men, but only in the redemption wrought for man by Jesus Christ. Christ, not man, is the sole source and guarantee of true liberty.<sup>4</sup>

R.J. Rushdoony pointed out the sophistry of governments based upon freedom:

...[A] society which makes freedom its primary goal will lose it, because it has made, not responsibility, but freedom from responsibility, its purpose. When freedom is the basic emphasis, it is not responsible speech which is fostered but irresponsible speech. If freedom of press is absolutized, libel will be defended finally as a privilege of freedom, and if free speech is absolutized, slander finally becomes a right. Religious liberty becomes a triumph of irreligion. Tyranny and anarchy take over. Freedom of speech, press, and religion all give way to controls, totalitarian controls. The goal must be God's law-order, in which alone is true liberty.<sup>5</sup>

True liberty is found only in Yahweh's perfect law of liberty:

But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

(James 1:25)<sup>6</sup>

James was not describing some New Covenant law that freed us to do whatever we wish. That kind of freedom is nothing more than baptized humanism, which eventually leads to anarchism, one of the quickest paths to legal slavery. Instead, James described the same perfect law of liberty – Yahweh's commandments, statutes, and judgments – as did King David:

So shall I keep thy law continually for ever and ever. And I will walk at liberty....

(Psalm 119:44-45)

Liberty is not the same as license, from which the English word licentiousness is derived. Licentiousness is the consequence of antinomianism, which was prevalent in Jude's day and even more so today:

For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness [licentiousness, NASB], and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. (Jude 1:4)

Because Yahweh's moral laws are a reflection of His divine nature, to deny His laws is to deny Him.

Forgiveness (liberty from our personal sins) is realized through Jesus'<sup>7</sup> blood-atoning sacrifice and resurrection from the grave.<sup>8</sup> All other liberty is found in the implementation and enforcement of Yahweh's perfect law of liberty – never in the hollow promises of man-made covenants. Yahweh's grace on the personal level and Yahweh's law on the community level are our only means to true freedom. When either of these is abused, freedom is also abused:

Whenever freedom is made into the absolute, the result is not freedom but anarchism. Freedom must be under law, or it is not freedom.... Only a law-order which holds to the primacy of God's law can bring forth true freedom, freedom for justice, truth, and godly life. Freedom as an absolute is simply an assertion of man's "right" to be his own god; this means a radical denial of God's law-order. "Freedom" thus is another name for the claim by man to divinity and autonomy. It means that man becomes his own absolute.<sup>9</sup>

There is no such thing as *unalienable rights*; there are only *God-required responsibilities*. In many instances, the framers ignored or completely subverted these responsibilities, beginning with their rejection of the First and Second Commandments. The first two Commandments were contravened by the First Amendment's Establishment Clause (an endorsement of polytheism) and breached throughout the remainder of the Constitution, since the First and Second Commandments disallow any law incompatible with Yahweh's. As Rushdoony put it: To have none other gods, means to have no other law than God's law....<sup>10</sup>

[Because] His law is the expression of His unchanging nature and righteousness, then to abandon the Biblical law for another law-system is to change gods.<sup>11</sup>

It is regrettable Rushdoony could not see how this applies to the Constitution. Unfounded assertions similar to Archie Jones' are all too common:

...the Bill of Rights did not constitute an abandonment of the Christian view of God, men, law, and politics upon which the Constitution was framed.... The fact that the framers and ratifiers were neither pietists, nor intellectual schizophrenics, but, rather, traditional Christians, indicates an intention to have the Constitution conform to traditional American thinking about civil government and law and an intention to make the document consistent with the political and legal implications of the Christianity they professed.<sup>12</sup>

How would Jones identify Amendment 1's provision for First and Second Commandment violations, if not as an abandonment of the Christian view of God? His attempt to defend the framers qualifies for intellectual or spiritual schizophrenia. Christian responsibility is not found in conforming our beliefs, lives, and government to "traditional American thinking" or "the political and legal implications of the Christianity [as professed at any given time]...." rather to Yahweh's will as found in His perfect law. Like the Pharisees of old, the framers and ratifiers should have been less driven by tradition and more authentic in their Christianity.

### The Freedom of Religion

Real Christianity is never tolerated when all religions are tolerated for it is too rigid. True Christians cannot have any other God before them, and they will be judged for endorsing a supposed equality of other gods with the true God. Thus Christians who believe in the freedom of all religions believe in their own termination.<sup>13</sup>

The First Amendment's Establishment Clause ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion") was a compromise by late 18th-century Christians. In order to keep the government out of their churches (so they believed), they allowed the government to authorize any and all religions. George Mason, the "Father of the Bill of Rights," was one of the principal proponents of the "unalienable right" to religious expression, regardless whether such expression was Christian, non-Christian, or even anti-Christian:

...all men have an equal, natural and unalienable right to the free exercise of religion....<sup>14</sup>

Federalist James Madison's sentiment was the same:

The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established.<sup>15</sup>

...the door of this part [the House of Representatives] of the federal government is open to merit of every description, whether native or adoptive, whether young or old, and without regard to poverty or wealth or to any particular profession of religious faith.<sup>16</sup>

George Washington, true to his Masonic tenets, told the Virginia Baptists:

If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed in the convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it.<sup>17</sup>

While serving as President of the United States, Washington declared the United States "government protects all in their religious rights."<sup>18</sup> This does not sound all that different from what President Barack Obama wrote after declaring that America is no longer an exclusively Christian nation:

...when we're formulating policies from state house to the Senate floor to the White House, we've got to work to translate our reasoning into values that are accessible to every one of our citizens, not just members of our own faith community.<sup>19</sup>

Christian Constitutionals claim the word "religion" in the Establishment Clause was exclusive to Christian denominations. At best, this is wishful thinking, the result of exploiting the historical record. The framers, while perhaps not rejecting Christianity (and in some instances even seeming to prefer it), rejected a Christian state in favor of a polytheistic one. In reference to the Virginia Act for Religious Freedom, enacted one year before the federal Constitutional Convention, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

Where the preamble [of the Virginia Act for Religious Freedom] declares, that coercion is a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, an amendment was proposed, by inserting the word [*sic*] "Jesus Christ," so that it should read, "A departure from the plan of Jesus Christ, the holy author of our religion;" the insertion was rejected by a great majority, in proof that they meant to comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian and the Mahometan, the Hindoo, and the Infidel of every denomination.<sup>20</sup>

Jefferson employed the word "denomination," not for the various Christian denominations, but for any religion or non-religion. United States Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren E. Burger declared, "our system encourages pluralism, both political and religious."<sup>21</sup> In *Zorach v. Clausen* (1952), Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas wrote, "We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary."<sup>22</sup> Christians laud such seditious decisions because they are under the spell of the Constitution and their antinomian preachers. Although modern courts sometimes abuse certain aspects of the original intent of the constitutional framers (as documented in David

Barton's *Original Intent*<sup>23</sup>), the statements of Justices Burger and Douglas are in perfect accord with the framers' intent.

Today's secularism is not simply the product of Chief Justice Earl Warren and his court.... It was implicit from 1788. It was made official in February, 1860, when the House of Representatives invited the first rabbi [Dr. Morris J. Raphall of New York City] to give the invocation....<sup>24</sup>

Constitutionalists and Christians alike often quote Supreme Court Justice David J. Brewer as one of their favorite witnesses to the allegations that the Constitution was a Christian document, which produced a Christian government:

This republic is classified among the Christian nations of the world. It was so formally declared by the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of *Holy Trinity Church v. United States*, 143 U.S. 471, that court ... added ... "a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation."<sup>25</sup>

What immediately follows Brewer's often quoted opinion is rarely cited:

But in what sense can America be called a Christian nation? Not in the sense that Christianity is the established religion.... On the contrary, the Constitution specifically provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Neither is it Christian in the sense that all its citizens are either in fact or name Christians. On the contrary, all religions have free scope within our borders.<sup>26</sup>

How can the United States of America be a Christian nation when "all religions have free scope within our borders," in violation of the First Commandment?

Many Christians were outraged with President Obama's endorsement of a mosque proposed to be built mere blocks from where the Twin Towers stood. On August 13, 2010, Obama celebrated the Muslim holiday Ramadan with a White House dinner, at which he declared that "as a citizen, and as President, I believe that Muslims have the same right to practice their religion as anyone else in this country. That includes the right to build a place of worship and a community center on private property in lower Manhattan...."<sup>27</sup> Christians should not be angry with Obama for telling the truth. Instead, they ought to be angered at the origin of Obama's statements – Amendment 1 of the Constitution.

Barton definitively proves that the original intent of the Establishment Clause has been abused by modern courts. But he completely ignores the much more consequential abuse Amendment 1 dealt to the First and Second Commandments. Had late 18th-century Americans demanded the law of Yahweh instead of the Constitution, the courts' abuse would have never occurred. America's courts would have been Christian, governed exclusively by Yahweh's law. Constitutionalists, like Barton, disprove their claim that they are only interested in the original intent of the framers when they insist on reading God and Christianity into the Constitution, even though the framers explicitly avoided both in the Constitution itself and in the Federalist Papers. Barton argues from a flawed paradigm. His desire to return to the original intent of Amendment 1 is an argument *against* Yahweh and His Word, not for it. If we are truly interested in restoring the Bible and its morality to our courts, schools, and society, we must demand that Yahweh's perfect law replace the Constitution. Otherwise, we must resign ourselves to more of the same immorality we have experienced since the ratification of the Constitution:

The modern concept [since 1787] of total toleration is not a valid legal principle but an advocacy of anarchism. Shall all religions be tolerated? But, as we have seen, every religion is a concept of law-order. Total toleration means total permissiveness for every kind of practice: idolatry, adultery, cannibalism, human sacrifice, perversion, and all things else. Such total toleration is neither possible nor desirable.... *To tolerate subversion is itself a subversive activity.*<sup>28</sup>

### Authorizing Religion

Although the First Amendment does not allow for establishing *one* religion over another, by eliminating Christianity as the federal government's religion of choice (achieved by [Article 6's](#) interdiction against Christian test oaths), Amendment 1 authorized equality for all non-Christian and even antichristian religions. When the Constitution failed to recognize Christian monotheism, it allowed Amendment 1 to fill the void by authorizing pagan polytheism.

Amendment 1 did exactly what the framers proclaimed it could not do: it prohibited the exercise of monotheistic Christianity (except within the confines of its church buildings) and established polytheism in its place. This explains the government's double standard regarding Christian and non-Christian religions. For example, court participants entering the United States District Court of Appeals for the Middle District of Alabama must walk by a statue of Themis, the Greek goddess of justice. And yet, on November 18, 2002, this very court ruled that Judge Roy Moore's Ten Commandments Monument violated the First Amendment's Establishment Clause. Despite many Christians' protests against this hypocrisy, it was in keeping with the inevitable repercussions of the First Amendment.

In response to the U.S. Supreme Court's verdict in *Engle v. Vitale*, which barred school-sponsored prayer, Dr. Billy Graham declared, "This is another step towards the secularization of the United States.... The framers of our Constitution meant we were to have freedom of religion, not freedom from religion."<sup>29</sup> Tragically, Graham's latter statement has become a mantra. Christians hang their religious hat on Amendment 1, as if some great moral principle is carved therein. They have gotten so caught up in the battle over the misuse of the Establishment Clause – the freedom *from* religion – that they have overlooked the ungodliness intrinsic in the Free Exercise Clause – the freedom *of* religion. Nothing better depicts this paradoxical tendency than 19th-century Pastor Benjamin F. Morris' claim:

By an act of the [Virginia] Assembly in 1705, it was declared, that if any person brought up in the Christian religion denies the being of a God or the Trinity, or asserts that there are more Gods than one, or denies the Christian religion to be true, or the Scriptures to be of divine authority, he is punishable, on the first offence by incapacity to hold office or employment, ecclesiastical, civil, or military.... This law, opposed to the spirit of Christianity ... was abolished in 1786 by the following – "Act for Establishing Religious Freedom: ...all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."<sup>30</sup>

Morris' (and the framers') tolerance of religious freedom was *not* the spirit of Christianity. It was the spirit of pluralistic polytheism and, thus, the spirit of anti-Christianity. Morris' assertion that Virginia's Organic Charter's intolerance toward non-Christians' holding office was "opposed to the spirit of Christianity" is a classic case of calling "evil good, and good evil" (Isaiah 5:20). Had America held to Virginia's charter, the November 5, 2009, Fort Hood massacre (in which thirteen people were killed and thirty others wounded at the hands of Muslim Major Nidal Malik Hasan) would have never occurred. Amendment 1 was the origin

of what occurred that fateful day. Had the farmers established a government based upon Yahweh's law, Islam would not be tolerated and its proponents would not be in America's military.

The true spirit of Christian monotheism is perhaps best depicted in the instructions to the delegates of Mecklenburg County on September 1, 1775, during the first session of the Provincial Congress of North Carolina:

You are instructed to assent and consent to the establishment of the Christian religion, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to be the religion of the state, to the utter exclusion forever of all and every other (falsely so called) religion, whether pagan or papal ... and that a confession and profession of the religion so established shall be necessary in qualifying any person for public trust in the state.<sup>31</sup>

It was this Christian monotheism that Article 6 and Amendment 1 terminated. What Amendment 1 is really saying is that the United States government is no respecter of religions or gods. Whereas Amendment 1 welcomes all religions and therefore all gods with open arms, Yahweh's law demands that people who advocate violating His First and Second Commandments are to be put to death:

If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer ... saying, Let us go after other gods ... and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for YHWH<sup>32</sup> your God proveth you, to know whether ye love YHWH your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after YHWH your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you away from YHWH your God ... to thrust thee out of the way which YHWH thy God commanded thee to walk in. So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee. If thy brother ... thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife ... or thy friend ... entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods ... thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him.... (Deuteronomy 13:1-9)

In view of Yahweh's zeal for Himself as depicted in this and many other passages, what do you suppose He thinks of the framers and their constitutional provision for polytheism? What does He think of anyone today who lauds and supports their actions? If you are inclined to protest that this was meant only for Old Covenant times, consider the following New Covenant directive:

But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me. (Luke 19:27)

The New Covenant is built upon the same moral laws (commandments, statutes, and judgments) as the Old Covenant:

For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel<sup>33</sup> after those days, saith YHWH; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. (Hebrews 8:10)

After enumerating many of the consequences of choosing or allowing other gods, the Apostle Paul prescribed the death penalty for those who would substitute other gods for Yahweh:



Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man.... Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.... And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge [as with the godless Constitution], God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them. (Romans 1:22-32)

The debauchery described by Paul, which is rife in America today, is not the consequence of the courts' *departure* from the original intent of Amendment 1, as some Constitutionalists would have us believe. It is the consequence of the courts' *adherence* to that intent, which provided for worshiping gods other than Yahweh.

Yahweh's civil law does require that everyone be a Christian. His law does not legislate private faith, but it does pass judgment on those who openly worship or propagate faith in other gods. Suppression of non-Christian religions does not mean suppression of the non-Christian individual. Under Yahweh's law, strangers (whether Christians or not) are afforded special protection along with widows and orphans, provided they abide by the same laws (Exodus 12:49; Leviticus 18:26, 24:22; Numbers 15:15-16; Deuteronomy 27:19, 31:12).

Amendment 1 has conditioned contemporary Christians to believe that putting someone to death because they promote another god than Yahweh is abhorrent. Early American colonies, such as New Haven, Connecticut, based their government upon Yahweh's law instead of man's and required this very judgment for idolaters:

Whoever shall worship any other God than the Lord shall be put to death.<sup>34</sup>

Instead of promoting this righteous judgment prescribed by Yahweh and recognized by America's 17th-century founders, the late 18th-century usurpers obviously considered their "morality" more righteous than Yahweh's. If only the late 18th-century Christians had been as jealous for Yahweh as was Elijah on Mt. Carmel when he slew 850 prophets of Baal. If only today's Christians were as jealous for Yahweh as the Israelites in Joshua 22 who were stirred to action against the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh for a mere appearance of impropriety against Yahweh. Instead, thanks to the framers, America has become the most pluralistic, polytheistic, multicultural nation in the entire world. With the help of men like Barton and other Constitutionalists, it will continue as such.

#### Ancient Rome Revisited

The Constitution's allowance for every religion but Christianity sounds more like ancient Rome than Biblical Christianity. Rome's republican form of government strongly influenced the framers.

...the Founders relied somewhat on classical (mainly Roman) jurisprudence, even more so than an inherited Puritan ethic, and did not fashion a specifically biblonomic (Bible-based) state....<sup>35</sup>



Although Christians often point out the parallels between ancient Rome and modern America as it pertains to its decline and downfall, they seldom call attention to the initial and most important parallel: the pluralistic and polytheistic foundations of both nations. When this affinity is acknowledged, Christian Constitutionalists are often found defending it. For example, Pastor Chuck Baldwin is “absolutely dedicated to preserving religious liberty. Religious tyranny is as evil as political or social tyranny.”<sup>36</sup> This is a promotion of polytheism and foolishly identifies Yahweh’s religious, political, and social exclusivity as tyrannous and evil.

Bishop T.D. Jakes, in his denunciation of theocracies, also depicted Yahweh’s exclusivity as tyranny:

A country that has one national religion as its only compass is much more of a theocracy than a democracy. That kind of tyranny leads to [all kinds of evil].... I love democracy....<sup>37</sup>

Rick Scarborough (head of Vision America) claims the following on his website, under the heading “Religious Freedom”:

We believe that freedom of religion is the foundation of America’s liberty. We oppose any and every attempt to suppress or to marginalize the free expression of religion in America.<sup>38</sup>

Had Scarborough exchanged the word “religion” for “Christianity,” his statement would have been Biblically acceptable. As it is, the freedom of religion produces precisely the opposite result: the foundation of spiritual slavery and the door to moral decadence. Baldwin, Jakes, Scarborough, and anyone else who promotes Amendment 1’s freedom of religion rather than Christian exclusivity, propagates pluralism and polytheism and therefore sedition and treason against Yahweh.

So-called Christians’ propensity for defending polytheism is not a modern phenomenon. It was prevalent immediately before, during, and soon after the ratification of the Constitution, as evidenced in many early legislative declarations and judicial decisions. Some judges went so far as to *attribute* the freedom of religion, or polytheism, to Christianity:

What gave to us this noble safeguard of religious toleration? It was Christianity.

*City of Charleston v. S.A. Benjamin* (1846)<sup>39</sup>

Barton appeared to relish and even promote this heresy:

...Christian principles had produced America’s toleration for other religions; and while America 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 these stipulations, America granted broad religious toleration to other religions not in spite of, but because of its Christian beliefs.<sup>40</sup>

If Congress were legislating and the judiciary were adjudicating according to Christian standards, they would have never tolerated other religions. Barton continued:

The court [*Lindenmuller v. the People*, 1860] further explained that maintaining an official respect for Christianity did not infringe upon the free exercise of religion for others; instead, it provided an umbrella of protection: “Religious tolerance is entirely consistent with a

recognized religion. Christianity may be conceded to be [the] established religion to the qualified extent mentioned, while perfect civil and political equality with freedom of conscience and religious preference is secured to individuals of every other creed and profession....”<sup>41</sup>

If Barton is correct, he is obliged to produce Scripture that validates his claims. William J. Federer posited three reasons why he believes “Non-Christian Religions are Tolerated in America”:

Given that America’s population was predominately Christian at the time of the nation’s founding gives rise to the question: What would motivate a predominantly Christian populace to promote tolerance of non-Christians? Three reasons can be identified: sharing the Gospel, Christian teaching on tolerance, and Jesus’ example.<sup>42</sup>

None of these reasons stand the Biblical test. In sharing the gospel, we require people to repent of their non-Christian religions; we do *not* tolerate them. Nowhere does the Bible tolerate any religion that does not teach exclusive fealty to Yahweh. As we have already seen in Luke 19:27, Jesus declared that anyone who defiantly refused Him to reign over them should be slain, in perfect accord with the judgment for First Commandment violation. If we are to tolerate people who subscribe to other gods so we can share the gospel with their proponents then we are equally obliged to tolerate thieves, adulterers, sodomites, pedophiles, and infant murderers for the same reason.

Stephen McDowell demonstrates how far a person can stray from Yahweh’s law in trying to defend the Constitution as a Christian document:

To define a Christian nation, we must first state what it is not. A *Christian nation* is not one where Christianity is the established religion.... At Independence, 8 of the 13 colonies had a specific denomination as the established religion, and 4 others had general Protestant Christianity receiving preference. The national government under the United States Constitution had no such establishment. State establishments were gradually ended due to the advancement of Christian ideas of religious liberty....<sup>43</sup>

Ironically, McDowell later provided the correct answer to his own query regarding what it takes to be a Christian nation, which, in turn, proves that America ceased being a Christian nation when the Constitution was ratified:

A Christian nation is a nation that is founded upon Biblical principles, where Biblical truth and law [including the First Commandment and its judgment] are the standard for public life, law, and societal institutions.<sup>44</sup>

Where did Barton, Federer, and McDowell come up with the sophistic and heretical idea of attributing polytheism to Christianity? Not from the Bible, but from Amendment 1 of the Constitution.

Barton argues that “the records ... clearly document that the Founders’ purpose for the First Amendment is not compatible with the interpretation given it by contemporary courts. The Founders intended only to prevent the establishment of a single national denomination....” But Barton also argues for pluralistic polytheism when he continues that they had no intention to “restrain public religious expressions.”<sup>45</sup> He elaborated:

Numerous religions *did* exist in America at the time of the Founders; and the Founders understood the potential value of *any* major religion to a society; but they specifically preferred Christianity.... Yet, even though the Founders openly acknowledged their veneration for [the antichristian religion of] Judaism,<sup>46</sup> nonetheless believed that the teachings of Christ provided the greatest benefit for civil society.... Does this mean that the Founders opposed pluralism? No – as long as the beliefs of other religions did not manifest in violent or deviant behavior which might threaten the stability of civil society. In fact, the Founders believed that pluralism survived only within the concept of religious liberty espoused by American Christianity. Indeed, both modern and ancient history demonstrate that most, if not all other religious nations (whether Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, monarchical Christian, etc.) rarely allow pluralism. However, independent America was different; it allowed the “free exercise” of other religions. In fact, early courts openly acknowledged that America was pluralistic and tolerant of other religions *only* because it was a Christian nation.<sup>47</sup>

I think the Apostle Paul would take exception to Barton, who appears to believe the First Commandment is no longer valid under the New Covenant. Amendment 1 is a return to Mars Hill, where Paul found the polytheistic “city [of Athens] wholly given to idolatry.” Paul’s Christianity did not require tolerance of the idolaters. Instead, he demanded they repent or face Yahweh’s judgment (Acts 17:16-31).

The Republic, which was provided by the Constitution, is essentially ancient Rome revisited. Just like Rome, America is ruled by humanism or statism, in which WE THE PEOPLE is the mother of a pantheon of gods:

Two centuries before the birth of Christ, the Dea Roma cult in Smyrna had elevated the people of Rome and the city to divine status. The Roman Empire later elevated the “genius of the Emperor” to the status of divinity. In the Emperor was the personification of the divine State.<sup>48</sup>

The conflict of Christianity with Rome was thus political from the Roman perspective, although religious from the Christian perspective. The Christians were never asked to worship Rome’s pagan gods; they were merely asked to recognize the religious primacy of the state.... The issue, then, was this: should the emperor’s law, state law, govern both the state and the church, or were both state and church, emperor and bishop alike, under God’s law? Who represented true and ultimate order, God or Rome, eternity or time? The Roman answer was Rome and time, and hence Christianity constituted a treasonable faith and a menace to political order.<sup>49</sup>

Like Rome, post-1791 America is tolerant of all religions that remain subservient to the mother god WE THE PEOPLE. Unlike post-1791 America, 1st-century Christendom stood opposed to Rome and her polytheistic predisposition:

...they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also ... and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus. (Acts 17:6-7)

Genuine Christians stand opposed to the Constitution for the same reason.

Additional Consequences

Political pluralism has consequences. It leads directly to polytheism: many moral law-orders; therefore, many gods. Polytheism (all gods are equal) leads to relativism (all moral codes are equal); relativism leads to humanism (man makes his own laws); and humanism leads to statism (the State best represents mankind as the pinnacle of power).<sup>50</sup>

Government sanction of non-Christian religions eventually led to citizenship for those who worshipped gods other than Yahweh, and citizenship led to a right to vote, which eventually led to antichrists and non-Christians ruling over Christians in contradiction to Deuteronomy 17:15, 2 Corinthians 6:14-18, etc. (See [Chapter 23](#) “Amendment 14: First-Birth vs. Second-Birth Citizenship” and [Chapter 24](#) “Colorblind Voting” for additional information regarding leadership consequences resulting from Amendment 1’s provision for polytheism.) In a letter to Joseph Simpson, a prominent Baltimore Jew, President John Tyler made it clear that this is precisely what Amendment 1 provided:

No religious establishment by law exists among us. The conscience is left free from all restraint and each is permitted to worship his Maker after his own judgment. The offices of government are open alike to all.... The Mohammedan, if he will to come among us would have the privilege guaranteed to him by the constitution to worship according to the Koran; and the East Indian might erect a shrine to Brahma if so pleased him.<sup>51</sup>

Anti-Christian Jews have been in Congress since 1845 when Lewis Charles Levin became the first Jewish member of Congress. In 1851, John Milton Bernhisel – the first representative of the Utah Territory – became the first Mormon in Congress. In 1956, Dalip Singh Saund became the first Sikh elected to the House. In 1972, Pete Stark became the first publicly atheistic congressman. In 2006, Mazie Hirono became the first elected Buddhist. And in 2006, Keith Ellison became the first Muslim elected to the United States Congress.

Without a common faith, and, therefore, a common law, it is impossible for people of diverse religions (particularly those of Christian and non-Christian religions) to walk in agreement. Yahweh explicitly forbids His people from even attempting to do so:

Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves: For thou shalt worship no other god: for YHWH, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God. (Exodus 34:12-14)

The First Amendment is a covenant of the type expressly forbidden by Yahweh. His jealousy has not changed from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant:

Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house [including the White House, the House of Representatives, and the Senate] neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds. (2 John 1:9-11)

Anyone claiming the Constitution is harmonious with Yahweh and His Word should consider the Prophet Jehu’s question:

Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate YHWH? Therefore is wrath upon thee from before YHWH. (2 Chronicles 19:2)

Constitutionalists have made themselves accomplices in the evil deeds of antichrists. To laud Amendment 1 and, therefore, the Constitution, is tantamount to promoting non-Christian and even antichristian supremacy over Christians.

### Separation of Church *From* State

Constitutional attorney Leo Pfeffer provided an interesting perspective on the Free Exercise Clause:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” But these words added nothing in substance to the Constitution as written four years earlier, nor were they intended to. Instead, they made explicit what was implicit in the original document, namely, that Caesar was to have no traffic with God or, as Madison phrased it, that there should be “a separation between religion and government”....<sup>52</sup>

This is an obvious departure from nearly every form of American government that preceded the Constitution and is an unequivocal exodus from Biblical protocol:

The doctrine of separation of church and state is a modern development. In primitive society, the patriarch was both priest and temporal ruler. And “in most ancient communities, the priest was also king and judge.” Theocracy ... was a government of priests.... In the American colonies, church and state were closely related, but the founders of the federal and most of the state governments were careful “to distinguish exactly the business of civil government from that of religion, and to settle the just bounds that lie between the one and the other.”

Formerly it was not considered improper that the three basic functions of government – those of making the law, enforcing the law, and interpreting the law in the settlement of controversies – should be exercised by one supreme authority.... Thus it will be seen that Moses not only made or promulgated the law, but also that he was leader or king, and that he sat as judge.<sup>53</sup>

Americans, non-Christians and Christians alike, have been well trained to believe this is inappropriate. In *Engel v. Vitale* (1962), the landmark case regarding prayer in public schools, Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black argued on behalf of separation of church from state:

[Its] most immediate purpose rested on the belief that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and degrade religion.<sup>54</sup>

Any religion *other* than Yahweh’s degrades government because only Yahweh’s perfect law provides for a perfect government. The strict separation of church and state did not exist prior to the age of enlightenment. It is, however, a mainstay of Freemasonry:

...separation of church and state ... is a Masonic goal that dates back to the Framers of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.... Freemasons have defended this concept throughout American history....<sup>55</sup>

### The Two-Kingdom Fallacy

Joseph Priestley, the founder of Unitarianism and a close friend and correspondent with Jefferson and Franklin, explained separation of church from state:

The state, according to Priestley, has no authority to legislate tests of religious correctness. It deals only with “things that relate to this life,” while the church deals only with “those that relate to the life to come.”<sup>56</sup>

This was very similar to Jefferson’s sentiments regarding political sermons:

On one question only I differ from him [Pastor McLeod], and it is ... the right of discussing public affairs *in the pulpit*. ...I suppose there is not an instance of a single congregation which has employed their preacher for the mixed purposes of lecturing them from the pulpit in Chemistry, in medicine, in Law, in the science and principles of Government, or in anything but Religion exclusively. Whenever, therefore, preachers, instead of a lesson in religion, put them off with a discourse on the Copernican system, on chemical affinities, on the construction of government, or the characters or conduct of those administering it, it is a breach of contract, depriving their audience of the kind of service for which they are salaried, and giving them, instead of it, what they did not want....<sup>57</sup>

It is probable Jefferson would have been in favor of today’s 501(c)(3) tax exempt status that allegedly restricts pastors by prohibiting them from speaking on political issues. What he said is not that far removed from the regrettable theology of some of the great religious reformers who, undoubtedly, influenced many of the framers of the United States Constitutional Republic:

...God has ordained the two governments, the spiritual which fashions true Christians and just persons through the Holy Spirit under Christ, and the secular government which holds the Unchristian and wicked in check and forces them to keep the peace outwardly.... Therefore care must be taken to keep these two governments distinct....

Martin Luther<sup>58</sup>

We have established that there are two governments to which mankind is subject. ...the spiritual kingdom of Christ and civil government are things far removed from one another. ... [Secular] government and the spiritual and internal kingdom of Christ are quite distinct.

John Calvin<sup>59</sup>

This is precisely how today’s non-Christians want it. Those who hold earthly authority control life and everything related to it. Ultimately, the secularists could not keep their hands off even the church itself, as evidenced by, among other things, their tax exempt 501(c)(3) licensing of most churches. Despite what the courts would have us believe, secularism is not religiously neutral. Secularists may *proclaim* separation of church from state, but they *promote* the integration and supremacy of the state *over* the church. The two-kingdom fallacy was the position of even Christian apologist Francis Schaeffer:

In the Old Testament there was a theocracy commanded by God. In the New Testament ... the church was its own entity. There is no New Testament basis for a linking of church and state until Christ the King returns.<sup>60</sup>

Schaeffer’s position inevitably leads to the do-nothingism (what Gary North identified as “passive waiting” versus “active service”<sup>61</sup>) prevalent in contemporary Christianity. *Everything* in this life is a moral issue, if only because Yahweh remains involved

in every aspect of this life. Everything is under His sovereign oversight and control. There is, therefore, no such thing as separation of church from state as it is usually thought of:

If the past proves anything, it proves that religious affiliation can affect voter's attitudes on a broad range of issues that seemingly have nothing to do with religion.... Politics in a secular state means that there is no Christian position on whether tax cuts are a good or a bad idea, on whether the terms of congressmen ought to be limited, and whether the capital gains tax ought to be lowered.<sup>62</sup>

Most Christians (particularly antinomians) would agree. However, tax cuts, term limits, and capital gain taxes are all moral issues addressed by Yahweh's law. (See [Chapter 4](#) "Article 1: Legislative Usurpation" and [Chapter 5](#) "Article 2: Executive Usurpation" for additional information regarding what Yahweh's law says about taxation and term limits.) This fatalistic theology is also taught by Edward Gaffney, Jr., professor of constitutional law at the Catholic Valparaiso University School of Law and editor of *The Journal of Law and Religion*:

First, I assume that the Bible is not a detailed historical blueprint for American society, and that it does not contain much concrete guidance for the resolution of specific political conflicts or constitutional difficulties such as slavery and racism, sexism and equal opportunity to participate in society. The biblical traditions are not to be viewed as an arsenal of prooftexts for contemporary disputes.<sup>63</sup>

If the Bible and Yahweh's law does not hold the blueprint for modern society, *what does?* North's conclusion is inescapable:

If Christians as citizens are not required by God to bring their Bible-based views to bear on politics, and to pass legislation that conforms to God's revealed case laws, then anti-Christians inherit all civil governments by default.<sup>64</sup>

Regrettably, even many dominion-minded Christians have been hoodwinked not only into believing Amendment 1's Establishment Clause is somehow Christian, but also into attempting to adopt it into their Christian worldview. A more correct view to understanding the Christian role in Christian civil government was articulated by British statesman Edmund Burke (1729-1797):

...in a Christian commonwealth the church and state are one and the same thing, being different integral parts of the same whole.<sup>65</sup>

European Christianity abused this concept, but when one understands the full meaning of the Greek word *ekklesia* (a called-out body politic), the veracity of Burke's explanation becomes apparent. The *ekklesia* is composed of both the Christian church and the Christian state. This is also demonstrated in that the priests and Levites often served as judges<sup>66</sup> and Moses and Samuel held positions of priest, judge, and prophet simultaneously. Although kings were not allowed to function as priests, priests could be judges:

The presence of the priests and Levites did not mean a confusion of church and state: it meant the total permeation of church and state, as well as every other institution, by the authority of God's word.<sup>67</sup>

It is unfortunate that many dominion-oriented Christians teach the non-Biblical two-kingdom concept:



God has established two kingdoms on this earth, the church and the state. He has given certain authority to each, and he has also placed certain limitations upon each.<sup>68</sup>

...the First Amendment is an excellent expression of the “two Kingdoms” concept and an excellent means of preserving the religious liberty God has given us.<sup>69</sup>

The First Amendment’s “excellent expression” of the two-kingdom concept only further proves it is *not* Biblical. As a consequence of this Biblically errant doctrine and in defense of the Constitution, Christian attorney Herb Titus believes the Bible should not be applied to civil government:

While it would be appropriate to apply the Bible as a church covenant, it would not be so in the formation of a civil government.<sup>70</sup>

At the same time, Titus inadvertently condemned the Constitution as tyrannous:

The very nature of legislative power presupposes that it is vesting only that power that conforms to God’s law. If Congress enacts a bill into law that is in violation of God’s law, it is not, by definition, exercising legislative power, but has become a tyranny.<sup>71</sup>

The two-kingdom concept is an impossibility. One realm inevitably rules over the other:

It may appear strange that the church, which after all is an institution of God, should itself be an arena of conflict between Him and Caesar. ...[B]oth claim sovereignty and do not take kindly to rivals, particularly when both claim jurisdiction over the same domain.<sup>72</sup>

Either non-Christians will be ruled by Christians, or Christians will be ruled by non-Christians. Thanks to the Constitution, most American Christians have adopted the two-kingdom concept and relegated civil authority to the non-Christians. Consequently, the non-Christians’ judiciary determines conflicts between the two. No wonder the tide has turned against Christianity under constitutional government.

The Bible teaches only one kingdom – one in which Yahweh expects His laws to be exclusive and therefore Christians to rule. A government based upon Yahweh’s law promotes exclusive worship of Yahweh and punishes overt acts of idolatry or polytheism. These two pillars identify a government as Biblical and Christian. The Constitutional Republic is disqualified on both counts.

### The Freedom of Speech and of the Press

Amendment 1 goes on to condemn the prohibition of speech, whether spoken or written. Does the Bible provide for free speech or does it limit speech? If you believe in unqualified freedom of speech and freedom of the press, you have probably never had your name sullied by individuals with whom you have little recourse under today’s juridical system. Neither have you been libeled by the press, whose editors often care more about titillating headlines than they do a person’s reputation. Although freedom of speech and the press was not intended to allow these violations, the Constitution’s lack of parameters allows the freedoms enumerated in Amendment 1 to be interpreted by the prevailing morality or immorality of the American courts at any given time.

In developing a truly free press, newspapers found they had a powerful ally in the supreme court, which turned a single phrase, “or of the press,” (contained in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) into a potent shield for press freedom.<sup>73</sup>

The average citizen today has virtually no recourse against the media’s calumny. Ironically, “You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free” (John 8:32) is inscribed across the masthead of many American newspapers. Freedom of speech and of the press has also been used to provide protection for those who promote false religions, infanticide, sodomy, pornography, drug abuse, violence, obscenities, and other abuses condemned by Yahweh. What about freedom of speech and freedom of the press as it concerns Yahweh Himself? Does He allow us freedom to curse Him or profane or blaspheme His name?

And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he that blasphemeth the name of YHWH, he ... as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of YHWH, shall be put to death. (Leviticus 24:15-16)

Exodus 23:13 admonishes us to not even mention of the name of other gods, neither let them be heard out of our mouths. The Bible condemns any favorable or casual promotion of other gods, while Amendment 1 protects the “right” of those who do so. The Bible is full of admonitions limiting speech, including what cannot be said about a ruler and, by extension, the government he represents. Only leaders who rule in the fear of Yahweh qualify:

You shall not curse God, nor curse a ruler of your people. (Exodus 22:28, NASB)

To curse, defame, or attack a God-ordained authority is, by extension, to attack Yahweh Himself.

Some early United States courts are to be commended for adjudicating against blasphemers and other abusers of freedom of speech, even though nothing in the Constitution requires such decisions. These decisions are not evidence that the Constitution is Biblical but are instead a residual effect of 17th-century Puritanism’s adherence to the Bible. Over time, as the government has become more constitutional, it and the people serving in it have inevitably adhered less and less to Yahweh’s commandments, statutes, and judgments. Today such rulings are unheard of.

### The Right to Peaceably Assemble

The provision in Amendment 1 for United States citizens to assemble peaceably appears innocuous. But is it harmless to give sodomites, infanticide advocates, and Satanists the right to assemble peaceably? If you are a proponent of the Constitution and a defender of Amendment 1, you must also defend the rights of such criminals and anti-Christians to assemble and promote their wicked agendas.

Homosexuals and infant assassins claim freedom of speech and the right to assemble to combat Christians who speak out or assemble against these heinous people and their blatant immorality. By labeling what Christians do as hate crimes, these immoral people are able to employ Amendment 1 *against* the rights of Christians to freely speak and assemble. According to the Bill of Rights, it is the *religious* right of these sodomites, baby killers, and Satanists to use Amendment 1 against Christians. Because Amendment 1 provides for the freedom of “all” religious and non-religious expression (including humanism, which was declared a religion in 1961, in *Torcaso v. Watkins*<sup>74</sup>), exclusive religions such as Christianity are not afforded the

same protection. Only non-Christian religions, particularly those that are inclusive or tolerant, are afforded full freedom of speech and public assembly.

## Conclusion

What gold is to money, the law of God is to liberty.<sup>75</sup>

Without Yahweh's perfect law of liberty, the personal responsibilities that must accompany it, and Yahweh's judgments executed upon violators, Amendment 1's guarantee of liberties is anything but guaranteed. Genuine freedom has been progressively eroded since the inclusion of the Bill of Rights.

### Four Generation Impact

Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I YHWH thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. (Exodus 20:3-6)

In 2011, nearly seven and a half generations (using thirty years for a generation) have passed since the ratification of the Constitution. As each generation passes, we witness more and more of Deuteronomy 28's curses and judgments upon this nation. Isn't it time we break this cycle on behalf of our posterity? This will only occur if we return to Yahweh and His law, as described in Psalm 78. Note the four generations:

Give ear, O my people, to my law: incline your ears to the words of my mouth.... Which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us. We will not hide them from their children, shewing to the generation to come.... For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers [generation #1], that they should make them known to their children [generation #2]: That the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born [generation #3]; who should arise and declare them to their children [generation #4]: That they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments: And might not be as their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not stedfast with God. (Psalm 78:1-8)

Had the framers heeded this admonition, America would not be where she finds herself today. When Christians finally accept their dominion mandate, they will realize that the separation of church from state, as usually understood today, is completely foreign to the Bible, if for no other reason than Yahweh intends His government to function under Biblically qualified Christian men. (See [Chapter 5](#) "Article 2: Executive Usurpation" for the Biblical qualification of such leaders.) We are at the same crossroads as were the Israelites of old on Mt. Carmel, when Elijah charged them to "choose ye this day whom you will serve." This time, the choice is not between Yahweh and Baal, but between Yahweh and WE THE PEOPLE. Because you cannot serve two masters, you will hold to one and despise the other, as proven by Barton, Baldwin, Scarborough, Jakes, and other Constitutionals who promote constitutional polytheism. You cannot serve both Yahweh and the Constitution: they are incompatible.

Click to order the *[Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution](#)* CDs:

- The e-book (on CD) *A Christian Perspective on the U.S. Constitution*

- The audio CD *The Bible vs. The U.S. Constitution* (Pts. 1 & 2)

## End Notes

1. YHWH (most often pronounced Yahweh) is the English transliteration of the Tetragrammaton, the principal Hebrew name of the God of the Bible. For a more thorough explanation concerning the sacred names of God, "[The Third Commandment](#)" may be read online, or the book *Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain* may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*
2. Not everyone claiming to be a Christian has been properly instructed in the Biblical plan of salvation. Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:36-41, 22:1-16; Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:26-27; Colossians 2:11-13; and 1 Peter 3:21 should be studied to understand what is required to be covered by the blood of Jesus and forgiven of your sins. For a more thorough explanation concerning baptism and its relationship to salvation, the book *Baptism: All You Wanted to Know and More* may be requested from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for free.
3. Earl Warren, quoted in Jim Nelson Black, *When Nations Die: Ten Warning Signs of a Culture in Crisis* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1994) p. 253.
4. C. Gregg Singer, *A Theological Interpretation of American History* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1964) p. 19.
5. Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1973) p. 581.
6. All Scripture is quoted from the King James Version, unless otherwise noted. Portions of Scripture have been omitted for brevity. If you have questions regarding any passage, please study the text to ensure it has been properly used.
7. Yeshua is the English transliteration of our Savior's given Hebrew name, with which He introduced Himself to Paul in Acts 26:14-15. (Jesus is the English transliteration of the Greek Iesous, which is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew Yeshua.) Because many people are unfamiliar or uncomfortable with Yeshua, I have chosen to use the more familiar Jesus in this book in order to remove what might otherwise be a stumbling block. For a more thorough explanation concerning the sacred names of God, "[The Third Commandment](#)" may be read online, or the book *Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain* may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*
8. Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:36-41, 22:1-16; Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:26-27; Colossians 2:11-13; and 1 Peter 3:21 should be studied to understand what is required to be covered by the blood of Jesus and forgiven of your sins. For a more thorough explanation concerning baptism and its relationship to salvation, *Baptism: All You Wanted to Know and More* may be requested from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for free.
9. Rushdoony, p. 583.
10. Rushdoony, p. 47.
11. Ibid., p. 20.

12. Archie P. Jones, *The Influence of Historic Christianity on Early America*, Archie P. Jones (Vallecito, CA: 1998) pp. 65-66.
13. Dr. H. Rondel Rumburg, Foreword (21 February 1998) to Dr. Robert L. Dabney, *Anti-Biblical Theories of Rights*, which first appeared in the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, July 1888, (Hueytown, AL: Society for Biblical and Southern Studies, 1998) p. 6.
14. George Mason, quoted in Kate Mason Rowland, *The Life of George Mason* (New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1892) vol. 1, p. 244.
15. James Madison, 8 June 1789, *The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Gales and Seaton, 1834) vol. 1, p. 541.
16. James Madison, *The Federalist* #52 (New York, NY : The Colonial Press, 1788) p. 209.
17. George Washington, Jared Sparks, ed., *The Writings of George Washington*, 10 May 1789, 37 vols. (Boston, MA: Ferdinand Andrews, 1838) vol. 30, p. 321.
18. Ibid., "Letter to the Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church of North America," October 1789, vol. 12, p. 167.
19. Barack Obama, quoted in Aaron Klein, "Obama: America 'no longer Christian': Democrat says nation also for Muslims, nonbelievers," *WorldNetDaily*, 24 June 2008, <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index/php?pageId=67735>.
20. Thomas Jefferson, Albert Ellery Bergh, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 19 vols. (Washington, DC: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907) vol. 1, p. 67.
21. Warren E. Burger, Foreword, Arlin M. Adams, Charles J. Emmerich, *A Nation Dedicated to Religious Liberty: The Constitutional Heritage of the Religion Clauses* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. xiv.
22. William O. Douglas, *Zorach v. Clausen*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952).
23. David Barton, *Original Intent: The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 4th Edition, 1st Printing, February 2005).
24. Gary North, *Conspiracy in Philadelphia: The Broken Covenant of the U.S. Constitution* (Draper, VA: Nicene Council.com, 2004) p. 361.
25. David J. Brewer, *The United States: A Christian Nation* (Philadelphia, PA: The John C. Winston Co., 1905) p. 11.
26. Ibid., p. 12.
27. Barack Obama, quoted in Abby Phillip, "Obama defends Ground Zero Mosque," 14 August 2010, Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0810/41060.html>.
28. Rushdoony, p. 89.
29. Dr. Billy Graham, quoted in Leo Pfeffer, *God, Caesar, and The Constitution: The Court as Referee of Church-State Confrontation* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1975) p. 40.
30. Benjamin F. Morris, *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States* (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, Inc., 2009, originally published 1864) pp. 274-75.
31. Ibid., p. 127.



32. Where the Tetragrammaton (YHWH) – the four Hebrew characters that represent the personal name of God – has been unlawfully rendered the LORD or GOD in English translations, I have taken the liberty to correct this error by inserting YHWH where appropriate. For a more thorough explanation concerning the names of God, “[The Third Commandment](#)” may be read online, or the book *Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain* may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska, 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*

33. *God’s Covenant People: Yesterday, Today and Forever* provides a documented dissertation contrasting today’s Jews with today’s genetic Israelites, the Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Scandinavian, Celtic, and kindred peoples. *God’s Covenant People: Yesterday, Today and Forever* may be read online, or the [book](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$14 donation.\*

34. [New Haven’s Fundamental Agreement](#)

35. Andrew Sandlin, quoted in Archie P. Jones, *The Influence of Historic Christianity on Early America* (Vallecito, CA: 1998) p. 1.

36. Chuck Baldwin, “Thank You, Dr. Ron Paul,” 23 September 2008, Chuck-Wagon Email Commentary, [http://www.chuckbaldwinlive.com/c2008/cbarchive\\_20080923\\_2.html](http://www.chuckbaldwinlive.com/c2008/cbarchive_20080923_2.html).

37. T. D. Jakes, “Is God Going Out of Style?,” *Bishop’s Blog*, <http://www.tdjenterpreses.com/blog/?p=85>.

38. Rick Scarborough, “We Believe in Religious Freedom,” <http://www.visionamerica.us/about-us/who-we-are/>.

39. *City of Charleston v. S.A. Benjamin*, 2 Strob. 521-524 (1846). South Carolina Supreme Court.

40. Barton, p. 70.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

42. William J. Federer, “Why Non-Christian Religions are Tolerated in America,” *Biblical Worldview*(Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, August 2005) vol. 21, num. 8, p. 7.

43. Stephen McDowell, *America, a Christian Nation? Examining the Evidence of the Christian Foundation of America* (Charlottesville, VA: Providence Foundation, 2004/2009) pp. 1-2.

44. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

45. Barton, p. 24.

46. For documentation regarding the antichrist nature of the Babylonian Talmud, Judaism’s book of faith and law, *God’s Covenant People: Yesterday, Today and Forever* may be read online, or the [book](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$14 donation.\*

47. Barton, pp. 32-33.

48. Gary North, *Political Polytheism: The Myth of Pluralism* (Tyler, TX: The Institute for Christian Economics, 1989) p. 77.

49. Rousas John Rushdoony, *The One and the Many: Studies in the Philosophy of Order and Ultimacy*, p. 94, quoted in Gary North, *Political Polytheism: The Myth of Pluralism* (Tyler, TX: The Institute for Christian Economics, 1989) p. 77.
50. North, p. 158.
51. John Tyler, "Correspondence of President Tyler, Religious Freedom, to Joseph Simpson, Washington, July 10, 1843," *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (Richmond, VA: Whittet and Shepperson, General Printers) vol. xiii, July 1904, no. 1, p. 2.
52. Leo Pfeffer, *God, Caesar, and The Constitution: The Court as Referee of Church-State Confrontation* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1975) pp. 28-29.
53. H. B. Clark, *Clark's Biblical Law* (Portland, OR: Binfords & Mort, 1943) pp. 57-58.
54. *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962).
55. Henry C. Clausen, *Masons Who Helped Shape Our Nation* (San Diego, CA: Neyenesch Printers, 1976) pp. 67-71.
56. Isaac Kramnick and R. Laurence Moore, *The Godless Constitution: The Case Against Religious Correctness* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 1966) p. 81.
57. Thomas Jefferson, H. A. Washington, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 19 vols. (New York, NY: Riker, Thorne, and Co., 1855) vol. 6, pp. 445-47.
58. Martin Luther, *On Secular Authority: how far does the Obedience owed to it extend?*, Harro Hopfl, trans., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 1993) pp. 10-12.
59. John Calvin, *Calvin On Civil Government*, Book IV, Chapter 20, Harro Hopfl, trans., *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 1993) pp. 47-49.
60. Francis Schaeffer, *A Christian Manifesto* (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1981) p. 121.
61. North, p. 611.
62. Kramnick, Moore, pp. 127-28.
63. Edward McGlynn Gaffney, Jr., "Of Covenants Ancient and New: The Influence of Secular Law on Biblical Religion," *Journal of Law and Religion* (St. Paul, MN: Hamline University School of Law, 1984) vol. 2, pp. 117-18.
64. North, p. 181.
65. Edmund Burke, *The Works of the Right Honorable Edmund Burke*, 12 vols. (London, UK: John C. Nimmo, 1887) vol. 7, p. 43.
66. Deuteronomy 17:9-12, 21:5; 1 Chronicles 23:4, 26:20, 29; 2 Chronicles 19:5-8; Ezekiel 44:24.
67. Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, pp. 617-18.
68. John Eidsmoe, *God & Caesar: Christian Faith & Political Action* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1984) p. 9.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 24.



70. Herb Titus, Interview by Dennis Woods, <http://www.america-betrayed-1787.com/herb-titus-responds-to-constitutional-challenges.html>.

71. Ibid.

72. Pfeffer, p. 40.

73. International Information Programs, USINFO.STATE.GOV, "Freedom of the Press," *Rights of the People: Individual Freedom and the Bill of Rights*, <http://usinfo.org/enus/government/overview/press.html>.

74. *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488, 495 n. 11 (1961).

75. Frederick Nymeyer, *Progressive Calvinism* (South Holland, IL: Libertarian Press, 1957) vol. 3, p. 209.

\*We are admonished in Matthew 10:8 "freely ye have received, freely give." Although we have a suggested a price for our books, we do not sell them. In keeping with 2 Corinthians 9:7, this ministry is supported by freewill offerings. If you cannot afford the suggested price, inform us of your situation, and we will be pleased to provide you with whatever you need for whatever you can send.