

The Marketing of Evil

David Kupelian

2 Buying the Big Lie The Myth of Church-
State Separation

Buying the Big Lie

- How is it that the Ten Commandments, the spiritual basis for America's laws, can get banished from a judicial building as they were in Alabama?
- Those who are marketing the separation of church and state made it possible. However, the idea of separation is one of the biggest lies of our generation.
- Christianity permeated the original American government as witnessed in countless practices and examples.
- Our founding fathers never intended for government to be neutral on religion.
- This lie stems from the establishment clause in the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights stating that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.
- The intent was to keep the government from creating a single national denomination and nothing more.
- The term 'separation of church and state' actually comes from an out-of-context phrase written in a letter by Thomas Jefferson in 1802.

BUYING THE BIG LIE The Myth of Church-State Separation

- The spectacular fifty-three-hundred-pound monument of the Ten Commandments, installed in the courthouse's rotunda by then-Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice Roy O. Moore, was being kicked out.
- Exactly why did the Ten Commandments—the spiritual basis for America's laws, which are also carved into the U.S. Supreme Court building in Washington DC—have to be banished from the Alabama Judicial Building?
 - Judge Thompson had determined that the monument violated the First Amendment's establishment clause, which says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."
- Thompson never explained how a granite display of the Ten Commandments in a courthouse constituted Congress "making a law."
- Somehow, though the vast majority of Americans are repulsed by it, a virulent and increasingly pervasive legal theory of the First Amendment holds that Christmas manger scenes must be eliminated from public places, commencement exercises conducted without a prayer, and kids must refrain from saying "Merry Christmas" at school.
- How far can this judicial assault on the nation's religious and traditional values—a jihad waged most prominently and notoriously by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)—possibly go before someone stops it?
- The truth is, the notion of "the constitutional separation of church and state" that underlies all of these cases, indeed, that underlies the legal transformation of America into a de facto atheistic, secular state, is a lie. **It is one of the truly outrageous, malignant—and provably false—"Big Lies" of our generation.**

FANTASY

- You probably remember being taught that America was founded by a lively assortment of slaveholding Christians, deists, and freethinkers who insisted on instituting a “constitutional separation of church and state.” Thomas Jefferson, you were reminded, had famously affirmed this “wall of separation” in his 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptists.
- You could be forgiven for inferring from all this “education” that, back in the good old days at least, government scrupulously kept religion at arm’s length. But that would be a truly deluded secularist fantasy. In reality, throughout the late 1700s—the era of the Revolutionary War and the subsequent adoption of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, including the First Amendment—Christianity permeated America from top to bottom.
- In 1777, with the Revolutionary War threatening the flow of Bibles from England, Congress approved the purchase of twenty thousand Bibles from Holland to give to the states.
 - No fewer than six of the thirteen original states had official, state-supported churches—“establishments of religion”! I’ll bet you didn’t know that. In fact, these states—Connecticut, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and South Carolina—refused to ratify the new national Constitution unless it included a prohibition of federal meddling with their existing state “establishments of religion.”
 - Other states required those seeking elected office to be Christians.
 - The Continental Congress routinely designated days of fasting and prayer and other religious observances, appointed government-funded chaplains, and appropriated money to pay for Christian missionaries to convert the Indians.
- In other words, the original American government under the Constitution would have driven the ACLU stark, raving mad.

FANTASY

- Today, for every big case that makes the evening news—like the banishment of the Ten Commandments from the Alabama courthouse or the judicial ban on the “Under God” phrase from the Pledge of Allegiance—there are countless other smaller cases, every bit as mind-boggling:
 - A federal court ruled that a schoolteacher couldn’t be seen in school with his own personal Bible and later ruled that a classroom library containing 237 books must remove the 2 titles dealing with Christianity.
 - A criminal, convicted and sentenced by a jury for brutally clubbing to death a seventy-one-year-old woman with an axe handle so he could steal her Social Security check, had his sentence overturned. Why? The prosecuting attorney, in a statement lasting less than five seconds, mentioned a Bible verse in the courtroom.
 - A public cemetery, ruled a federal court, couldn’t have a planter in the shape of a cross, since, as the court explained, the mere sight of it could cause “emotional distress” to a passerby and thus constitute “injury-in-fact.”
- “Injury-in-fact”? From looking at a planter? Isn’t it about time we face the painful truth—that we Americans have had our Constitution, and therefore the very reins of power, stolen from us while we were busy going to work, raising our kids, paying the bills, and living our daily lives.

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- FIRST A quick civics lesson.
- The section of the Constitution that deals with religion is the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights—the first sixteen words of it, anyway.
 - There’s the establishment clause (“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion”)
 - and the free exercise clause (“or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”)
- The establishment clause—that’s the one today’s courts almost always focus on—simply prohibits the federal government from “establishing” a national church or from interfering with the established churches in the states!
 - (Remember, several states already had state-supported “establishments of religion.”)
- Possibly you wonder whether the issue is really this cut-and-dried. After all, for the last half-century, judicial activists on the Supreme Court and lower courts, ACLU lawyers, the press, and the secular culture in general have embraced “the constitutional separation of church and state” as though it actually existed somewhere in the Constitution. Of course, none of these words—“church,” or “state”—are in the First Amendment.

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- Let’s go back in time and witness the conversation among those who debated and approved the wording of the Bill of Rights and find out what they really meant.
- The date is June 8, 1789. James Madison—key architect of the Constitution and a leading member of the First Congress—is proposing the following wording for what ultimately will become the religion clauses of the First Amendment:
 - “The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext, infringed.”
- The representatives debate this for a bit and then turn it over to a committee consisting of Madison and ten other House members, which comes up with a new version:
 - “No religion shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed.”
- More debate. Madison explains that “he apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience.
- Rep. Benjamin Huntington complains the proposed wording might “be taken in such latitude as to be extremely hurtful to the cause of religion.” So Madison suggests inserting the word national before the word religion to assuage the fears of those concerned over the establishment of a national religion—and of being compelled to conform to it.
- (After all, wasn’t that precisely the reason the Puritans had come to America in the first place—to escape the tyranny of England’s compulsory state religion?)

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- But Representative Eldridge Gerry balks at the word “national,” because, he argues, the Constitution created a federal government, not a national one. So Madison withdraws his latest proposal but assures Congress his reference to a “national religion” had to do with a national religious establishment, not a national government.
- A week later, the House again alters the wording this way: “Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience.
- Meanwhile, the Senate debates other versions of the same amendment and on September 3, 1789, comes up with this wording: “Congress shall make no law establishing articles of faith or a mode of worship, or prohibiting the free exercise of religion.
- The House doesn’t like the Senate’s changes and calls for a conference, from which emerges—finally—the wording ultimately included in the Bill of Rights: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- Now that we’ve “witnessed” the debate over the First Amendment, do you really believe the Founding Fathers wanted to make kids into criminals for saying “Merry Christmas” at school? Did they intend for the Supreme Court to outlaw prayer in the nation’s learning institutions when all of their own congressional sessions to this very day open with a prayer?
- In fact, Joseph Story, appointed by President James Madison to the Supreme Court in 1811, where he served for the next thirty-three years until his death, explained exactly how the high court regarded the First Amendment in his celebrated Commentary on the Constitution of the United States:
 - “Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it now under consideration [First Amendment], the general if not the universal sentiment in America was, that Christianity ought to receive encouragement from the State so far as was not incompatible with the private rights of conscience and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation. The real object of the [First Amendment] was, not to countenance, much less to advance Mahometanism [Islam], or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.”

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- Even today Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist, in reviewing the same 1789 First Amendment deliberations you just “witnessed,” comes to the same conclusion as Story:
 - “On the basis of the record of these proceedings in the House of Representatives, James Madison was undoubtedly the most important architect among the Members of the House of the Amendments which became the Bill of Rights.... His original language, “nor shall any national religion be established,” obviously does not conform to the “wall of separation” between church and State idea which latter-day commentators have ascribed to him. His explanation on the floor of the meaning of his language—“that Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observance of it by law” is of the same ilk.... It seems indisputable from these glimpses of Madison’s thinking, as reflected by actions on the floor of the House in 1789, that he saw the Amendment as designed to prohibit the establishment of a national religion, and perhaps to prevent discrimination among sects. He did not see it as requiring neutrality on the part of government between religion and irreligion.”
- Rehnquist adds tellingly,
 - “None of the other Members of Congress who spoke during the August 15th debate expressed the slightest indication that they thought the language before them ... would require that the Government be absolutely neutral as between religion and irreligion. The evil to be aimed at, so far as those who spoke were concerned, appears to have been the establishment of a national church, and perhaps the preference of one religious sect over another; but it was definitely not concerned about whether the Government might aid all religions evenhandedly.”

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- The very day after the House of Representatives adopted the First Amendment’s religion clauses, Rep. Elias Boudinot proposed a resolution asking President George Washington to issue a national Thanksgiving Day Proclamation.
- Boudinot said he “could not think of letting the session pass over without offering an opportunity to all the citizens of the United States of joining with one voice, in returning to Almighty God their sincere thanks for the many blessings he had poured down upon them.”

WHAT “WALL OF SEPARATION

- On September 25, 1789, Boudinot’s resolution was passed, and within two weeks Washington responded with the following proclamation. Read it carefully:
 - “Now, therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday, the 26th day of November next, to be devoted by the people of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be; that we may then all unite in rendering unto Him our sincere and humble thanks for His kind care and protection of the people of this country previous to their becoming a nation; for the signal and manifold mercies and the favorable interpositions of His providence in the course and conclusion of the late war; for the great degree of tranquility, union, and plenty which we have since enjoyed; for the peaceable and rational manner in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted; for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed, and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and, in general, for all the great and various favors which He has been pleased to confer upon us. And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions; to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually; to render our National Government a blessing to all the people by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed; to protect and guide all sovereigns and nations (especially such as have shown kindness to us), and to bless them with good governments, peace, and concord; to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us; and, generally, to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.”

What Happened To God?

- So how did we go from preventing a government religion to making criminals out of children who say “Merry Christmas” in public schools?
- It all began in 1947 with the landmark Supreme Court case of Everson v. Board of Education where Justice Hugo Black announced a new principle of the First Amendment representing a wall between church and state.
- Since then, activist judges have played a major role in creating legislation that goes against what the majority of Americans believe, usurping their power and convincing us the Constitution is a long, mystical document open to conflicting interpretation.
- This was helped by the 1960s religious malaise and uncertainty of mainstream Christianity where even religious leaders were expressing doubt about their faith. A spiritual vacuum took over in America and the government came whooshing down to fill it back up, leaving the door open for religion to be replaced with science.

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- THE next 150 years or so, America's judiciary interpreted the First Amendment in accord with what you have just read—as prohibiting the establishment of a single national denomination.
- Halfway through the last century, something happened that changed all that.
- This 'something' first showed its face in 1947, in the landmark Supreme Court case *Everson v. Board of Education*
- Speaking for the majority, Justice Hugo Black announced a new and previously unknown legal principle: “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.
- Ever since then, the high court's rulings have progressively and relentlessly aimed at removing every vestige of Christian language, imagery, or symbolism from public property.

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- Today's judiciary interprets that First Amendment in a radically different way than did its predecessors during America's first one and a half centuries.
- When they creates legislation through judicial fiat as the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court did in November 2003 when it mandated same-sex marriage in that state—do these judges realize what they're doing? Do they understand that they're flouting the U.S. and state constitutions, violating their oaths of office, betraying the trust of current and future generations of Americans, and usurping power that's not legally theirs?
- The Constitution is not long, mystical, and transcendent like the Bible, open to all sorts of conflicting interpretations. Rather, it is a short, clear, relatively recent, English-language contract that was written for the average person. Its original intent is an open book and therefore beyond reasonable dispute.

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- How can Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, sworn to uphold the U.S. Constitution, proclaim that she and her fellow justices are now looking to international law to guide their decisions, as she did in a 2003 speech to the American Constitution Society?
- Similarly, how could Justice Stephen Breyer, on ABC News's This Week, question whether the Constitution will be sufficient to govern America in the future?
- What happened to the Constitution being the "supreme law of the land"?
- How does the Supreme Court justify mountains of federal gun control laws when justices know very well the original intent of the Second Amendment was to guarantee to the individual an unfettered ("shall not be infringed") right to use firearms to defend himself and his family?
- How did Justice Harry Blackmun, who wrote the majority opinion in the most controversial Supreme Court decision in history, Roe v. Wade, divine the right to abortion from the Fourteenth Amendment's supposed "right to privacy," when there simply is no right to privacy in the Fourteenth Amendment or anywhere else in the Constitution?

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- In March 2004, when Blackmun's private papers were finally released to the public decades after the momentous 1973 Roe decision, his daughter, Sally Blackmun, revealed something remarkable. Talking to Women's eNews, she disclosed for the first time that her father consulted with members of his family after being assigned responsibility for writing the majority opinion on Roe v. Wade.
- The obvious question: Did Justice Blackmun's passion for championing abortion rights have anything at all to do with his daughter's out-of-wedlock pregnancy experience and the pain, embarrassment, and trauma it caused the Blackmun family? Do we need to guess what sort of advice Sally—who later became an attorney and chairwoman of Planned Parenthood of Greater Orlando—might have given her father? And is this how a Supreme Court decision, especially one responsible for more than a million abortions every year for three decades, is supposed to be made?
- Is this what we've come to? Judges make rulings based on their personal whims, emotions, and family traumas, oblivious to the fact that they're changing the course of history in profound and destructive ways?

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- Do you really want to know what happened in the mid-twentieth century that caused the Supreme Court to lose its prior allegiance to higher principles? The answer is as obvious as it is unsettling: America as a whole was drifting away from its prior allegiance to higher principles.
- Want to know how the Supreme Court could crank out its revolutionary 1962 ruling that outlawed school prayer and its 1963 decision banning Bible reading, religious classes, and religious instruction in the nation's schools? Just look at what was going on in America at the same time.

IS GOD DEAD?

- COVER of the April 8, 1966, issue of Time magazine—perhaps its most controversial edition ever—said it all. On a black background, giant red letters trumpeted the scandalous question: “Is God Dead?”
- “There is an acute feeling that the churches on Sunday are preaching the existence of a God who is nowhere visible in their daily lives,” wrote Time reporter John T. Elson, surveying the religious malaise and uncertainty of mainstream Christianity during the 1960s.
- Even Francis B. Sayre, then Episcopal dean of Washington’s famed National Cathedral, admitted, “I’m confused as to what God is—but so is the rest of America.
- In light of the nation’s identity crisis during the 1960s, is it so shocking that the Supreme Court would lose its moorings and drift into uncharted legal waters?

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- Read a little more of what Time had to say:
- Lutheran Church historian Martin Marty argues that all too many pews are filled on Sunday with practical atheists—disguised nonbelievers who behave during the rest of the week as if God did not exist.... “I love God,” cries one anguished teenager, “but I hate the church.” Theologian Langdon Gilkey says that “belief is the area in the modern Protestant church where one finds blankness, silence, people not knowing what to say or merely repeating what their preachers say.” ...
- Rev. Nathan Scott, who is also rector of St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in Hyde Park: “I look out at the faces of my people and I’m not sure what meaning these words, gestures and rituals have for them.
- Philosopher Michael Novak of Stanford writes: “I do not understand God, nor the way in which he works. If, occasionally, I raise my heart in prayer, it is to no God I can see, or hear, or feel. It is to a God in as cold and obscure a polar night as any non-believer has known.
- With shepherds like this, no wonder the 1960s flock was scattered and befuddled. It’s no wonder government, especially the judiciary, became intoxicated with the idea that it could create a more perfect world by enlarging its scope and power.

WHAT HAPPENED TO GOD?

- Time's analysis went on to explain that faith in America was being replaced by a new source of wisdom and truth—namely, science.
 - “The rebellion against this God of faith is best summed up by the word secularization,” wrote Elson, who noted that the prestige of science had become so great that it had come to dominate other areas of life.
- Faith was out as a basis for governing our lives or country. In light of this zeitgeist among America's elite—and believe me, Supreme Court justices live among the elite—is it any wonder that genuine respect for a Constitution and Bill of Rights that were largely the result of a Christian world view would drastically diminish?

What's in a Slogan?

- Marketers have also been successful with another slogan, 'living document,' which they have used to excuse different and changing interpretations of the Constitution based on their political objectives.
- Living is the opposite of dead and there are obvious positive and negative attributes to each word.
- But the Constitution is a contract with America and the living quality of every contract is its integrity and its unchanging nature.
- What kills a contract are attempts to change, twist or reinterpret it.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH LIVING AND BREATHING?

- The world has been radically transformed by technology.
- The idea of a “living” Constitution is very different; it means the contract between America and its government is to be “interpreted” anew by each generation.
- Here’s the problem. Though our technology, knowledge base, and culture have all changed dramatically over the centuries, human nature and human character weaknesses haven’t changed a bit.
- Objective reality—“the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” as the Declaration of Independence puts it—hasn’t changed. The Bible and the Ten Commandments haven’t changed. The universal appeals to personal pride—ambition, greed, lust, envy, power—haven’t changed. Specifically, the tendency for too much power to corrupt those entrusted with it has most definitely not changed.
- Thus the need for strictly constitutional government with clearly defined and limited powers is still necessary, because, despite our advances, absolute power still corrupts absolutely.
- Far too many see themselves, not as humble servants and guardians of a sacred, two-hundred-plus-year-old contract between Americans and the government they created, but rather as high priests of a new order, chosen to chart the path of civilization in the new, globalist, more enlightened world.
- It’s their job—their destiny, or so they think—to help us lesser folk make the transition from the old days of wooden ships, muskets, and Indians to today’s world of microchips, speed-of-light communications, and the long march of man.
- The illogic in all this is that if the Constitution—meant to be the standard by which we measure all other laws—can be changed on the whim of the current court, then we really have no Constitution.

HOW A SLOGAN CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

- NOW WE understand who sold us big, secular government and why they did it. But how did they pull it off?
- Through what sleight of hand did the establishment clause—“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion”—become transformed into a total ban on religious expression in the public square? It’s a fascinating bit of linguistic agility.
- In **1940, in the Supreme Court case of *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, the justices decided—citing a mysterious legal principle called “incorporation”—that the First Amendment applied not just to Congress, but to state governments too.**
- So now the federal government could force the states to follow its dictates in regards to prohibiting the “establishment” or prohibiting the “free exercise” of religion.
- This is **obviously something the original thirteen states would have rejected outright, given that half of them had state establishments of religion.**
- Today establishment of religion means the mere public mention of God, Christ, the Bible, the Ten Commandments, prayer, and so on.
- But ***to make this seduction even more powerful*, the **First Amendment religion clauses have been morphed into the phrase “a wall of separation between Church and State”—eight words taken out of context from an incidental letter written by Thomas Jefferson in 1802.****

HOW A SLOGAN CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

- You rarely hear the actual wording of the First Amendment anymore. Most of us assume it's in the Constitution.
- One of the justices on the New York Supreme Court, back in a 1958 First Amendment case called *Baer v. Kolmorgen*, made this very point when he commented:
 - “Much has been written in recent years concerning Thomas Jefferson’s reference in 1802 to ‘a wall of separation between church and State.’ ... Jefferson’s figure of speech has received so much attention that one would almost think at times that it is to be found somewhere in our Constitution.
- But there’s a method to this constant repetition, as **marketers well know: repeat something enough times, and people come to believe it.**
- Indeed, there are very few phrases more familiar to Americans than the separation of church and state.
- If Jefferson’s wall of separation has come to mean that any reference to God must be eliminated from government, schools, and anything else the government funds, then what did the phrase originally mean, as Jefferson used it?

What's in a Slogan?

- **Despite the term 'separation of church and state' not even being in the Constitution**, it has been used so often by those marketing to remove God from the public arena that to many, it has replaced the First Amendment.
- Whether it's judges, lawyers or journalists, the intention of constant repetition is a tried and true marketing strategy. If you say something enough, it becomes the truth and it becomes right.

HOW A SLOGAN CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

- Ironically, **Jefferson intended for his letter to the Danbury Baptists to reassure them that the new federal government would not endanger the free expression of their religion.** This is widely known.
- But what is not well known is that Jefferson did not actually coin the phrase “separation of church and state.” Rather, he borrowed the metaphor from the sermon, “The Garden and the Wilderness, which was very familiar to Baptists of the time.
- As Jim Henderson, senior counsel for the American Center for Law and Justice, explains it:
 - That sermon, rendered by Roger Williams (the founder of the Rhode Island Plantation colony, and a Baptist), depicted the church as a garden, the world as a wilderness, and the wall as a device of the Creator’s invention that protected the garden from being overrun by the wilderness. Williams explained that, from time to time, for the purpose of disciplining sin in the church, “it hath pleased” the Almighty to break down the wall. Thomas Jefferson, ever the politician, knew when he communicated with the Baptists that “The Garden and The Wilderness” was well known and widely read nearly two generations later. He appealed to them in the terms of their own great man’s idiom.

HOW A SLOGAN CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

- There you have it. The wall of separation was meant to protect “the garden” of the church from being overrun by “the wilderness” of government. No wonder Chief Justice Rehnquist has said, “The metaphor of a ‘wall of separation’ is bad history and worse law. It has made a positive chaos out of court rulings. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned.”
- **In other words, it’s a lie.**
- Such lies collapse and self-destruct when examined closely, such as the slogan that asserts “the Constitution is a living document.
- **The “living” quality of any contract, including the Constitution, is its integrity, its unchanging nature.** What kills a contract are attempts to change, twist, or reinterpret it. So in reality, the secularist’s “living” Constitution is dead, while the document, interpreted according to its original intent, is full of life and value.

A QUIET AMERICAN REVOLUTION

- COMMON SENSE provides ample proof to a rational person that the First Amendment's religion clauses couldn't possibly mean what the ACLU and many of today's judges say they mean, **since there is simply no evidence of it in history.**
- Think about it. It's the first and most important right enshrined in the Bill of Rights, and yet there are no examples of this modern, radical, anti-Christian interpretation being applied during our nation's first 150 years?
- We seem to have forgotten that the Supreme Court is "supreme" only over lower federal courts; it is not supreme over the other branches of government.
- **We are deluding ourselves into believing there is some neutral ground between good and evil, and that this is where the government is supposed to be.**
- But such a neutral ground, if such can even be said to exist, is in itself evil. When Jews are being gassed and cremated down the street, "neutrality" is not neutral—it's collaboration.

What's in a Slogan?

- There are solutions to judicial tyranny.
- Abusive judges can be impeached, the Constitution can be amended, and Congress has the constitutional authority to limit the purview of the courts.
- Even the Supreme Court has jurisdiction only over lower courts, not over the other branches of government.
- We can elect congressmen who will work hard to pass amendments, such as the federal marriage amendment, which the courts will not be able to trump.

A QUIET AMERICAN REVOLUTION

- **When we realize that the Creator has stationed us on this earth in a battleground between a good kingdom and an evil one, and that our real choice in life is between obedience to divine love or disobedience, between honesty and dishonesty, nobility and shallowness, selflessness and selfishness, courage and cowardice, we see there really is no neutral ground.**
- **Without having a real relationship with the Living God, men automatically become their own miserable “gods.” That pathetic, false god in turn owes his allegiance to dark forces he doesn’t recognize or comprehend—and if he’s in a position of power, he is compelled to become a demagogue or a tyrant.**
- If we really have been convinced that our Constitution—conceived, written, believed in, fought for, and died for overwhelmingly by Christians and God-fearing people—requires that the Christian faith be taken out of government, then there’s really no hope for us as a nation.