

# FOUNDING FATHERS QUOTATIONS:

## **“WERE THE UNITED STATES FOUNDED AS A ‘CHRISTIAN’ NATION?”**

Source: Paul Mitchell, [PaulMitchl@aol.com](mailto:PaulMitchl@aol.com)

1. This file is a compilation of (mostly) Founding Fathers quotations, with the purpose to prove the United States WAS founded as a “Christian nation.”
2. The author can be contacted at [Paulmitchl@aol.com](mailto:Paulmitchl@aol.com).
3. If you have similar documented quotations, please send them to me!
4. DIRECTIONS: Read Question Q1 through Q12. To find the related quotations for each question, go to your computer’s “Find” function and search for Q1 through Q12.
5. The author desires for you to use AND DISSEMINATE this work. There is no charge to you and you may copy this work as often as you like, but you cannot sell it nor charge fees of any kind.
6. This work is useful in schoolwork, or corresponding with your elected officials and school board.
7. NOTE: All court decisions are the **FINAL** decisions.

**“If a judge can interpret the Constitution or laws to mean something obviously not intended by the original makers...then the nation’s Constitution and laws are meaningless.”**  
*(Lawrence Patton MacDonald, US Congress, “We Hold These Truths”)*

## QUESTIONS:

- Q1:** Does colonial American history point to a religious foundation for the United States?
- Q2:** Was the US founded as a Christian nation?
- Q3:** What was the religious and political background of the participants of the original Constitutional Convention?
- Q4:** Was Biblical law, especially Christian law, the foundation and source for early US law, upheld by US court decisions?
- Q5:** What is the meaning and history of Jefferson’s words, “separation of church and state” (a phrase not found in the Constitution)?
- Q6:** Is “separation of church and state” an early American belief?
- Q7:** What is the original context of the First Amendment (“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...”) in the minds of the authors?
- Q8:** Did the early American states have religious qualifications in order to hold office?
- Q9:** How did the Fathers define and use the word ‘religion’ for purposes of law and national policy?
- Q10:** What did the Fathers intend as to religion in public schools?
- Q11:** Is the Supreme Court a dangerous, if necessary, branch of government?

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ISAIAH 1:26: "...restore your judges as at the first, and your counselors as at the beginning; after that you will be called the city of righteousness, a faithful city."

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

EZRA 7:25: "...according to the wisdom of your God which is in your hand, appoint magistrates and judges...who know the laws of your God..."

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

COTTON MATHER: "These pious people finding that their brethren and neighbors in the Church of England, as then established by law, took offence at these their endeavours after a scriptural reformation; and being loth to live in the continual vexations which they felt arising from their non-conformity to things which their consciences accounted superstitious and unwarrantable, they peaceably and willingly embraced a banishment into the Netherlands..." (Magnalia Christi Americana (The Great Works of Christ in America), first published in 1702. Reprinted by the Banner of Truth Trust). Vol. 1, p. 47

*(Translation: The Pilgrims were at odds with the Church of England and were being persecuted, so they left for religious freedom, not for gold or commerce).*

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

COTTON MATHER: "The English Church had not been very long at Leyden, before they found themselves encountered with many inconveniences. They felt that they were neither for health, nor purse, nor language well accommodated; but the concern which they most of all had was for their posterity. They saw, that whatever banks [barriers] the Dutch had against the inroads of the sea, they had not sufficient ones against a flood of manifold profaneness. They could not with ten years' endeavour bring their neighbours particularly to any suitable observation of the Lord's Day; without which they knew that all practical Religion must wither miserably... Moreover, they were very loth to lose their interest in the English nation; but were desirous rather to enlarge their King's dominions. They found themselves also under a very strong disposition of zeal, to attempt the establishment of Congregational Churches in the remote parts of the world; where they hoped they should be reached by the Royal influence of the Prince, in whose allegiance they chose to live and die; at the same time likewise hoping that the Ecclesiasticks, who had thus driven them out of the kingdom into a New World, for nothing in the world but their non-conformity to certain rites, by the imposers confessed indifferent, would be ashamed ever to persecute them with any further molestations, at the distance of a thousand leagues. These reasons were deeply considered by the Church; and after many deliberations, accompanied with the most solemn humiliations and supplications before the God of Heaven, they took up a resolution, under the conduct of Heaven, to remove into America..."

These good people were now satisfied, they had as plain a command of Heaven to attempt a removal, as ever their father Abraham had for his leaving the Caldean territories; and it was nothing but such a satisfaction that could have carried them through such, otherwise insuperable difficulties, as they met withal. (Magnalia Christi Americana (The Great Works of Christ in America), first published in 1702. Reprinted by the Banner of Truth Trust). Vol. 1, p. 47-48.

*(Translation: The Pilgrims did not find their Dutch neighbors compatible with their own religious beliefs and did not see a ripe future for those reasons, in the Netherlands. They were English and desired to stay so, and so they decided to emigrate to America. Again, emigration was for the express purposes of maintaining and spreading their brand of Christianity, not for commercial opportunities).*

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

COTTON MATHER: [Why the Puritans left Holland] "They beheld some of their children, by the temptations of the place, were especially given in the licentious ways...many young people, drawn into dangerous extravagancies." (Kevin Swanson, The Second Mayflower, (p. unk) 1993

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

VIRGINIA CHARTER, 1606: [Issued by King James I] “To make Habitation...and to deduce a colony of sundry of our People into that part of America commonly called Virginia...in propagating of Christian religion to such People, as yet live in Darkness...[to] bring...a settled and quiet Government.” (Historical Collections: Consisting of State Papers and other Authentic Documents: Intended as Materials for an History of the United States of America, Ebenezer Hazard, ed. Philadelphia: T.Dobson, 1792, Vol. 1, p.50-51; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.80, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

VIRGINIA CHARTER, 1609: “Because the principal Effect which we can desire or expect of the Action, is the Conversion...of the people in those Parts unto the true Worship of God and Christian Religion.” (Historical Collections: Consisting of State Papers and other Authentic Documents: Intended as Materials for an History of the United States of America, Ebenezer Hazard, ed. Philadelphia: T.Dobson, 1792, Vol. 1, p.50-51; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.85, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

MAYFLOWER COMPACT, 1620: “In the name of God, Amen, We whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign lord King James, by the grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, king, defender of the faith, etc., having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith and the honor of our king and country, a Voyage to plant the first colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; do by the presents, solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick, for our better ordering and preservation and Furtherance of other Ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof do enact, constitute and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most [suitable] and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.” (God and Government, Gary Demar, Vol. 1; see also *Church of the Holy Trinity v. US*; 143 US 457, 466 (1892); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.85, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005))

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

PURITAN JOHN WINTHROP, c. 1628: “Wee are a Company profession our selues fellow members of Christ...knitt together by this bond of loue...Wee are entered into Covenant with him for this worke.” (Democracy, Liberty, and Property: Readings in the American Political Tradition, FW Coker, Ed. NY: The Macmillan Co., 1942, p. 18-19; quoting from John Winthrop’s ‘Model of Christian Charity’; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.85, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

PURITAN JOHN WINTHROP, c. 1628: “For wee must consider that wee shall be as a Citty vpon a Hill, the eies of all people are vpon vs; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke [*colonization*] wee haue vndertaken and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from vs, wee shall be made a story and a by-word through the world.” (Democracy, Liberty, and Property: Readings in the American Political Tradition, FW Coker, Ed. NY: The Macmillan Co., 1942, p. 20; quoting from John Winthrop’s ‘Model of Christian Charity’; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.85, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

PURITAN JOHN WINTHROP: “All other churches in Europe are brought to desolation,...and who knows but that God hath provided this place [America] to be a refuge for many whom he means to save out of the general calamity, and seeing the Church hath no place left to flee into but the wilderness... The fountains of Learning and Religion are so corrupted as...most children...are perverted, corrupted, and utterly overthrown by the multitude of evil examples and the licentious government of those Seminaries...” [*Even Winthrop watched his son Henry degenerate into the profigate culture of the day.*] (Kevin Swanson, *The Second Mayflower*, (p. unk) 1993)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

MASSACHUSETTS CHARTER, 1629: "Our said People...may be soe religiously, peaceable, and civilly governed, as their good Life and orderlie Conversacon maie wynn and incite the Natives of [that] Country, to the Knowledge and Obedience of the onlie true god and Sauior of Mankinde, and the Christian fayth, which in our Royall Intencon...is the principall Ende of this Plantacon." (Church of the Holy Trinity v. US; 143 US 457, 466 (1892), see also note 3 at Vol I, p.119; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.85, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

MARYLAND CHARTER, 1632: [Issued by King Charles to Lord Baltimore] "Our well beloved and right trusty subject Coecilius Calvert, Baron of Baltimore...being animated with a laudable, and pious Zeal for extending the Christian Religion...hath humbly besought Leave of Us that he may transport...a numerous Colony of the English Nation, to a certain Region...having no Knowledge of the Divine Being." (Documentary source *Book of American History, 1606-1889*, Wm McDonald, ed. NY: Macmillan, 1909, p. 32; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.86, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

EARLY AMERICAN CHRISTIAN-UNIVERSITY FACT: "One hundred and six of the first one hundred and eight colleges in America were founded on the Christian faith. By the time of the Civil War, non-religious universities could be counted on one hand. College presidents were almost always clergymen until around 1900. A study entitled 'An appraisal of Church and Four-year Colleges' (1955) stated that 'nearly all of those institutions which have exerted a decided influence, even in our literary and political history, were established by evangelical Christians.'" (*America's Providential History*, p. 109, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.92, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

HARVARD STUDENT PAMPHLET, c. 1635: "2. Let every Student be plainly instructed, and earnestly pressed to consider well the maine end of his life and studies is, to know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life, Joh.17.3, and therefore to lay Christ in the bottome, as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and Learning.

And seeing the Lord only giveth wisdom, Let every one seriously set himselfe by prayer in secret to seeke it of him. Prov 2,3.

3. Every one shall so exercise himselfe in reading the Scriptures twice a day, that he shall be ready to give such an account of his proficiency therein." (In 1796, according to David Barton, a Harvard student who doubted the inspiration of Scripture was to be expelled). (Peter Mode, *Sourcebook and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*, Menasha, WI: George Banta Pub. Co., 1921, p.74-75; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.91, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

HARVARD OFFICIAL MOTTO, c. 1635: "For Christ and the Church"

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

YALE STUDENT REQUIREMENTS, c. 1635: "Seeing God is the giver of all wisdom, every scholar, besides private or secret prayer, where all we are bound to ask wisdom, shall be present morning and evening at public prayer in the hall at the accustomed hour..." (*America's Providential History*, p. 90, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.91, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

YALE STUDENT REQUIREMENTS, c. 1635: "The Scriptures...morning and Evening [are] to be read by the Students at the times of prayer in the School...studiously Indeavor[ing] in the Education of [said] students to promote the power and Purity of Religion." (*Documentary History of Yale University*, Franklin Dexter, ed., NY: Arno Press & The NY Times, 1969, p.32; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.91, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

CONNECTICUT GOVERNMENT, 1639: [Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the first-ever American constitution] “For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence so to order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the River of Connectecotte and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one Public State or Commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, as also, the discipline of the Churches, which according to the truth of the said Gospel is now practiced amongst us; as also in our civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such Laws, Rules, Orders and Decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed as followeth:

1. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that [public officials shall be] chosen and sworn according to an Oath recorded for that purpose, shall have the power to administer justice according to the Laws here established, and for want thereof, according to the Rule of the Word of God...”

4. It is Ordered, sentenced, and decreed, that no person be chosen Governor above once in two years, and that the Governor be always a member of some approved [church] Congregation...” (FUNDODRS.TXT, Project Gutenberg, P. O. Box 2782, Champaign, IL 61825)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

NEW HAMPSHIRE GOVERNMENT, 1639: “Considering with ourselves the holy Will of God and our own Necessity that we should not live without wholesome Lawes and Civil Government among us of which we are altogether destitute; do in the name of Christ and in the Sight of God combine ourselves together to erect and set up among us such Government as shall be to our best discerning agreeable to the Will of God.” (The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.88, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

MASSACHUSETTS CRIME CODE, 1641: (Thoroughly debated by the citizenry and General Court (colony legislature) before it was ratified , this document, “Body of Liberties,” was Massachusetts’ first legal code. It was written by the Rev. Nathaniel Ward, pastor of Ipswich, a lawyer and minister from London. All scripture references appear in the original charter. The spelling has been modernized):

**1. Deut 13:6, 10; Ex. 22:20.** If any man after legal conviction shall have or worship any other god, but the Lord God, he shall be put to death.

**2. Ex 22:18; Lev. 20:27; Deut 18:10.** If any man or woman be a witch (that is, has or consults with a familiar spirit), they shall be put to death.

**3. Lev 25:15, 16.** If any man shall blaspheme the name of God the Father Son, or Holy Ghost, with direct, express, presumptuous, or high handed blasphemy, or shall curse God in the like manner, he shall be put to death.

**4. Ex. 21:12 .** If any person commits any willful murder, which is man-slaughter, committed upon premeditated malice, hatred or cruelty, not in a man’s necessary and just defense, nor by mere casualty against his will, he shall be put to death.

**5. Num. 25 [35]: 20, 21; Lev. 24:17.** If any person slays another suddenly in his anger or cruelty of passion, he shall be put to death.

**6. Ex. 21:14.** If any person shall slay another through guile, either by poisoning or other such devilish practice, he shall be put to death.

**7. Lev. 20:15,16.** If any man or woman shall lie with any beast or brute creature by carnal copulation, they shall surely be put to death. And the beast shall be slain and buried, and not eaten.

**8. Lev. 20: 13.** If any man lies with mankind as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed abomination, they both shall surely be put to death.

**9. Lev. 20:19, and 18,20; Deut. 22:23,24.** If any person commits adultery with a married or espoused wife, the adulterer and adulteress shall surely be put to death.

**10. Ex. 21:16.** If any person steals a man or mankind, he shall surely be put to death.

**11. Deut. 19:16, 18, 19.** If any man rises up by false witness, wittingly and of purpose to take away any man's life, he shall be put to death.

**12.** If any man shall conspire and attempt any invasion, insurrection, or public rebellion against our commonwealth, or shall endeavor to surprise any town or towns, fort or forts therein, or shall treacherously and perfidiously attempt the alteration and subversion of our frame of polity of government fundamentally, he shall be put to death.

(The complete document is reproduced in Edmund S. Morgan, ed. *Puritan Political Ideas* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965), pp. 178-203. "Capital Laws" were listed in section 94 of the *Body of Liberties*.)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

NEW ENGLAND CONFEDERATION, 1643: [Composed of Mass., Conn., New Plymouth, and New Haven] "We all came into these parts of America, with one and the same end and aim, namely, to advance the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Documentary source *Book of American History, 1606-1889*, Wm McDonald, ed. NY: Macmillan, 1909, p. 32; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.88, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

NEW HAVEN COLONY LAW, 1644: "The judicial laws of God as they were delivered by Moses...[are to] be a rule to all the courts in this jurisdiction." (Russ Walton, *Biblical Principles of Importance to Godly Christians*, NH: Plymouth Rock Foundation, 1984, p.356; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.88, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

CONNECTICUT EDUCATION, 1647: [Mass. enacted the same law, same year. Known as "Old Deluder Satan Law"] "It being one chiefe project of that old deluder, Sathan, to keepe men from the knowledge of the scriptures, as in former time...It is therefore ordered...[that] after the Lord hath increased [the settlement] to the number of fifty howsholders [*householders*], [they] shall then forthwith appointe one with theire towne, to teach all such children as shall resorte to him, to write and read...And it is further ordered, That where any towne shall increase to the number of one hundred families or housholders, they shall sett up a grammar schoole...to instruct youths, so farr as they may ben fitted for the university." (The Code of 1650, Being a compilation of the earliest Laws and Orders of the General Court of Connecticut, Hartford: Silus Andrus, 1822, p.92-93; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.90, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

PILGRIM WILLIAM BRADFORD, 1647: [Referring to original Pilgrim intents] "[A] great hope & inward zeall they had of laying some good foundation, or at least to make some way therunto, for ye propagating & advancing ye gospell of ye kingdom of Christ in those remote parts of ye world." (Wm Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1856, p.24; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.86, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

NORTH CAROLINA CHARTER, 1662 (QUAKER): "Excited with a laudable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Christian faith...in the parts of America not yet cultivated or planted, and only inhabited by...people, who have no knowledge of Almighty God." (North Carolina History, Hugh Talmage Lefler, ed., Chapel Hill: Univ. of NC Press, 1934, 1956, p.16; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.86, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

RHODE ISLAND CHARTER, 1663: [Granted by King Charles II] "That they pursuing with peace and loyal mindes, their sober, serious and religious intentions...in the holy Christian faith...a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained grounded upon gospel principles." (The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.87, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

NEW YORK LEGISLATURE, 1665: [An act was passed to uphold] “the public worship of God” and instruction of “the people in the true religion.” (Peter Mode, sourcebook and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History, Menasha, WI: George Banta Pub. Co., 1921, p.133; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.89, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

NEW JERSEY SEAL, 1665: “Righteousness exalteth a nation.” --Prov. 14:34

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONS OF CAROLINA, 1669: [Required citizens to believe in the existence of God; in court, recognize Divine justice and human responsibility; be a church member in order to be a freeman of the colony]. (Peter Mode, sourcebook and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History, Menasha, WI: George Banta Pub. Co., 1921, p.194; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.88, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

QUAKER WILLIAM PENN, 1681: [Upon receiving the land grant now called Pennsylvania] “God that has given it me...will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of a nation.” (Wm Buck, *Wm Penn in America*, Philadelphia: Wm Buck, 1888, p.20; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.89, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

PENNSYLVANIA GOVERNMENT, 1682: “...Make and establish such laws as shall best preserve true Christian and civil liberty, in all opposition to all unchristian...practices.” (Peter Mode, *Sourcebook and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*, Menasha, WI: George Banta Pub. Co., 1921, p.163; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.89, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

QUAKER WILLIAM PENN: (To Czar Peter the Great) “If thou wouldst rule well, thou must rule for God, and to do that, thou must be ruled by him....Those who will not be governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.” (*America’s Providential History*, p. 90, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.89, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

QUAKER WILLIAM PENN: “It was his (Wm Penn) wish that every man who believed in God should partake of the rights of a citizen; and that every man who adored Him as a Christian, of whatever sect he might be, should be a partaker in authority.” (i.e., Penn wanted Christians as rulers) (*Biographical Review*, London, 1819; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.34, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM & MARY CHARTER, 1692: “The youth may be piously enacted in good letters and manners, and that the Christian faith may be propagated...to the glory of God.” (Russ Walton, *Biblical Principles of Importance to Godly Christians*, NH: Plymouth Rock Foundation, 1984, p.356; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.91, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

YALE CHARTER, 1701: “To plant, and under ye Divine blessing to propagate in this Wilderness, the blessed Reformed, Protestant religion.” (Peter Mode, *Sourcebook and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*, Menasha, WI: George Banta Pub. Co., 1921, p.109; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.91, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

GEORGIA SETTLERS, 1731: “When they touched shore, [they] kneeled in thanks to God. They said, ‘our end in leaving our native country is not to gain riches and honor, but singly this: to live

wholly to the glory of God.' The object...was 'to make Georgia a religious colony' and so...they invited John and Charles Wesley and Rev. George Whitefield over to serve as chaplains, oversee Indian affairs and build orphanages, etc." (America's Providential History, p. 82, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.87, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

PRINCETON MOTTO, 1746: "Under God's Power She Flourishes."

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

JONATHAN DICKINSON, FIRST PRINCETON PRESIDENT, 1746: "Cursed be all that learning that is contrary to the cross of Christ!" (America's Providential History, p. 111, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.92, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q2,**

POLITICAL SCIENCE RESEARCH: Where did our Founding Fathers acquire the ideas that produced such constitutional longevity by which no other nation has come close to equaling? Political science professors at the University of Houston set out to find the wellsprings of Founding Father thought (1). They gathered 15,000 documents over ten years. The results:

Baron Charles de Montesquieu was the most quoted man of the Fathers, at 8.3%.

Sir Wm Blackstone came in at 7.9%. (2)

John Locke was third with 2.9%. (2)

The Bible was quoted 4 times more than Montesquieu, 4 times more than Blackstone, 12 times more than Locke. 34% of the Founders' quotes came DIRECTLY from the Bible.(3) Another 60% of their quotes were from men like the above, who had used the Bible to formulate the original conclusion. Thus 94% were based on the Bible.(4)

(1, 2, 3: *The Origins of American Constitutionalism*, p.141-143, Donald Lutz, Louisiana St. Univ. Press, 1988; cited by David Barton, *America's Godly Heritage*, p.8-10, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

(4: *America's Providential History*, p. 156, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited by David Barton, *America's Godly Heritage*, p.8-10, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q2, Q3,**

JOHN ADAMS (1735-1826), FEBRUARY 22, 1756: "Suppose a nation in some distant region should take the Bible for their only law book, and every member should regulate his conduct by the precepts there exhibited! Every member would be obliged in conscience, to temperance, frugality, and industry; to justice, kindness, and charity towards his fellow men; and to piety, love, and reverence toward Almighty God...What a Eutopia, what a Paradise would this region be."( L.H. Butterfield, ed., *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard Press, 1961), Vol. III, p. 9. David Barton, *The Myth of Separation* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1991), pp. 123,150. *Life and Works of John Adams*, Vol. XI, pp. 6-7. Stephen Abbot Northrop, D.D., *A Cloud of Witnesses* (Portland, Oregon: American Heritage Ministries, 1987), p. 2; As cited in, *America's God and Country Encyclopedia of Quotations* by William J. Federer (Coppell, TX: FAME Publishing Co. 1994), p. 4.

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY MOTTO, 1766: "Son of Righteousness, Shine upon the West also."

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

COLONIAL BRITISH GOVERNOR: [to the English Board of Trade] "If you ask an American, who is his master? He will tell you he has none, nor any governor but Jesus Christ." (H.Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution in America*, Baltimore: Wm. Niles, 1822, p.418; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.96, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

SAMUEL ADAMS, 1772: ["The Rights of the Colonists," from the pre-Revolutionary 'Committees of Correspondence'] "These may be best understood by reading and carefully studying the institutes of the great Law Giver and Head of the Christian Church, which are to be found clearly written and promulgated in the New Testament." (American Patriotism: Speeches, Letters, and Other Papers Which Illustrate the Foundation, the Development, the Preservation of the United States of America, S.H.Peabody, ed., NY: American Book Exchange, 1880, p.34; , cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.94, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

REVOLUTIONARY 'COMMITTEES OF CORRESPONDENCE': "No King but King Jesus!" (Cushing Strout, The New Heavens and the New Earth (NY: Harper & Row, 1974, p.59; cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.97, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q2, Q3,**

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, 1774: "He who shall introduce into public affairs the principles of primitive Christianity will change the face of the world." (This Nation Under God, p. 83, CE Kistler, Boston: Richard Badger, The Gorham Press, 1924; cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.249, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q2, Q3,**

JOHN ADAMS, 1774: "It is the duty of the clergy to accommodate their discourses to the times, to preach against such sins as are most prevalent, and recommend such virtues as are most wanted. For example, if exorbitant ambition and venality are predominant, ought they not to warn their hearers against those vices? If public spirit is much wanted, should they not inculcate this great virtue? If the rights and duties of Christian magistrates and subjects are disputed, should they not explain them, show their nature, ends, limitations, and restrictions, how much soever it may move the gall of Massachusetts." (Norman Cousins, ed., 'In God We Trust': The Religious Beliefs and Ideas of the American Founding Fathers (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), pp. 89-90. Gary DeMar, The Untold Story (Atlanta, GA: American Vision, Inc., 1993), pp. 96-97; as cited in, America's God and Country Encyclopedia of Quotations by William J. Federer (Coppell, TX: FAME Publishing Co. 1994), pp. 7-8.)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, 1774: [Very first act, first meeting, Sept. 6] "Resolved, That the Revd. Mr. Duche' be desired to open the Congress tomorrow morning with prayers, at the Carpenter's Hall, at 9 o'clock." (Journals of the Continental Congress at Vol.1, 1774, p.26; cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.100, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, 1774: [Response to Duche's prayer, according to assorted members in attendance] "Washington was kneeling there, and Henry, Randolph, and Rutledge, and Lee, and Jay; and by their side there stood, bowed down in deference, the Puritan Patriots of New England, who at that moment had reason to believe that an armed soldiery was wasting their humble households...It was enough to melt a heart of stone. I saw the tears gush into the eyes of the old, grave, pacific Quakers of Philadelphia." (Thomas Y. Rhoads, The Battlefields of the Revolution, Philadelphia: JW Bradley, 1860, pp.36-37; cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.102, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

PRE-REVOLUTIONARY PROVINCIAL CONGRESS: "You...are placed by Providence in the post of honor, because it is the post of danger...The eyes not only of North America and the whole British Empire, but of all Europe, are upon you. Let us be, therefore, altogether solicitous that no disorderly behavior, nothing unbecoming our characters as Americans, as citizens and Christians, be justly chargeable to us." (Richard Frothingham, Rise of the Republic of the United States, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1872, p. 393; cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.95, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

JOHN HANCOCK, 1775: [a proclamation for fasting, public humiliation and prayer, as president of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress] “In circumstances dark as these, it becomes us, as men and christians...[that] all confidence must be withheld from the [military] means we use, and reposed only on that God, who rules in the armies of heaven...” (Proclamation of John Hancock from concord, Apr 15, 1775, from an original in the Evans collection, #14220, by the American Antiquarian Soc., cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.102, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

GEN. GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1775: [He called on] “Every officer and man...to live, and act, as becomes a Christian Soldier defending the dearest Rights and Liberties of his country.” [Lincoln quoted Washington Nov 15, 1862, in his order to troops to observe sabbath observances] (Washington, *The Writings of Washington*, vol. V, p.245, July 9, 1776; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.98, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2**

DECLARATION OF THE CAUSES AND NECESSITY OF TAKING UP ARMS, 1775: (Continental Congress) “...We gratefully acknowledge, as signal instances of the Divine favour towards us, that his Providence would not permit us to be called into this severe controversy, until we were grown up to our present strength...With an humble confidence in the mercies of the supreme and impartial Judge and Ruler of the Universe, we most devoutly implore his divine goodness to protect us happily through this great conflict, to dispose our adversaries to reconciliation on reasonable terms, and thereby to relieve the empire from the calamities of civil war.

**INDEX KEY: Q1**

DECLARATION OF THE CAUSES AND NECESSITY OF TAKING UP ARMS, 1775: (Continental Congress) “Our forefathers, inhabitants of the island of Great-Britain, left their native land, to seek on these shores a residence for civil and religious freedom.”

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

EARLY AMERICAN CHRISTIAN-UNIVERSITY FACT: “[John] Witherspoon [Princeton president] signed the Declaration of Independence, he served on over 100 committees in Congress. He also trained many of the nation’s leaders while at Princeton, including: 1 President, 1 Vice-President, 3 Supreme Court Justices, 10 Cabinet members, 12 Governors, ...21 Senators and 39 Representatives, plus many members of the Constitutional convention and many state congressmen. And each of these men had been trained in the college which had declared ‘Cursed be all learning that is contrary to the cross of Christ! And this is only one example from one college! Christian education trained our statesmen and patriots; to it we owe the form of government that established this nation as a world leader.’” (David Barton, *The Myth of Separation*, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005, p. 92-93)

**INDEX KEY: Q1,**

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, 1776: [May 16, anticipating full-scale war with Britain] “The Congress...Desirous...to have people of all ranks and degrees duly impressed with a solemn sense of God’s superintending providence, and of their duty, devoutly to rely...on his aid and direction...Do earnestly recommend...a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer; that we may, with united hearts, confess and bewail our manifold sins and transgressions, and, by a sincere repentance and amendment of life...and, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, obtain his pardon and forgiveness.” (Journals of the Continental Congress at Vol 2, 1775, p.192; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.103, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776: “...For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other...”

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q7, Q11**

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE: “In a corporation, the Charter is higher than the By-laws and the By-laws must be interpreted to be in agreement with the Charter. Therefore, the Constitution of the United States must be in agreement with the Declaration of the United States (more commonly know as the Declaration of Independence). The most important statement in our Declaration is that we want to operate under the laws of God.

Why is all of this so important? Because today, when the courts are deciding what the Constitution means, they should remember our Charter -- the Declaration of the United States. The Constitution doesn't specifically mention God, but then it doesn't have to because the Declaration is a higher document.

The Declaration says that we are a nation under God's laws. Therefore, all other laws of our country should be consistent with the law of God or they violate our national charter.” (Tim LaHaye, *Faith of Our Founding Fathers*, Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, Pub., 1987; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.219, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q7, Q11**

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE: “Contemporary Americans simply do not realize the magnitude of the statement “the laws of nature and of nature's God.” That eight-word phrase, commonly used and well-understood at the time of the founding, encompasses an entire legal and political system. Today, however, most of those in the legal profession would be hard-pressed to offer an acceptable definition of Divine or natural law; it simply is missing from current legal training! Why is it important to understand natural law today? Because [the American Republic was founded upon the natural law].” (*The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.219, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q7, Q11**

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE: “The Declaration of Independence...stated clearly the purpose of the government of this nation, which was to preserve and protect certain God-given rights for every citizen...eleven years later...the Constitution of the United States...stated the plan by which government would carry out its purpose...The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution must be seen as one. Each is incomplete without the other. This nation stands strong and free today, two hundred years later, because one foot stands on the Declaration of Independence; the other, on the Constitution. Remove either document and the nation will not stand at all. (P. Robertson, *America's Dates With Destiny*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1986, p.88; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.220, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776: “While reviewing Thomas Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration, the committee assigned to the task added the words, “they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.” Then, when the Declaration was debated before Congress, they added the phrase, ‘appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World, for the rectitude of our intentions,’ as well as the words ‘with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence.’” (*America's Providential History*, p. 149, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.97, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2**

JOHN JAY: “With equal pleasure I have as often taken notice that Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people--a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs, and who, by their joint counsels, arms, and efforts, fighting side by side throughout a long and bloody war, have nobly established general liberty and independence.” (John Jay, *Federalist Paper # 2*)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

SAMUEL ADAMS, 1776: [As the Declaration of Independence was being signed] “We have this day restored the Sovereign to whom alone men ought to be obedient...From the rising to the setting sun may his kingdom come.” (Wm Wells, *The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams*, Boston:

Little, Brown & Co., 1865, Vol 3, p.408, cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.98, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

JOHN ADAMS, 1776: "Statesmen, my dear Sir, may plan and speculate for liberty, but it is Religion and Morality alone, which can establish the Principles upon which Freedom can securely stand. The only foundation of a free Constitution is pure Virtue, and if this cannot be inspired into our People in a greater Measure, than they have it now, they may change their Rulers and the forms of Government, but they will not obtain a lasting liberty." (Charles Francis Adams, ed., *The Works of John Adams--Second President of the United States* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1854), Vol. IX, p. 401; as cited in, *America's God and Country Encyclopedia of Quotations* by William J. Federer (Coppell, TX: FAME Publishing Co. 1994), p. 8)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q8,**

ROGER SHERMAN, FEB. 1776: "You [ambassador to Canada] are further to declare that we hold sacred the rights of conscience, and may promise to the whole people, solemnly in our name, the free and undisturbed exercise of their religion." And...that all civil rights and the right to hold office were to be extended to persons of any CHRISTIAN denomination." (emphasis added) (*The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.35, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q8,**

DELAWARE, 1776: "I, (newly elected office-holder), do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." (*Church of the Holy Trinity v. US*, 143 US 457, 469-470 (1892); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.33, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q8,**

MARYLAND, 1776: "Article XXXV. That no other test or qualification ought to be required...than such oath of support and fidelity to this state...and a declaration of a belief in the Christian religion." (*Church of the Holy Trinity v. US*, 143 US 457, 469-470, note 4 at 108, (1892); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.34, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2**

THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION, 1777: "And Whereas it hath pleased the Great Governor of the World to incline the hearts of the legislatures we respectively represent in Congress, to approve of, and to authorize us to ratify the said Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union."

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, 1777: [Calling for a day of thanksgiving and prayer for the victory at Saratoga] "Forasmuch as it is the indispensable duty of all men to adore the superintending providence of Almighty God; to acknowledge with gratitude their obligation to him for benefits received...[to offer] humble and earnest supplication that it may please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, mercifully to forgive and blot [our sins] out of remembrance...and to prosper the means of religion for the promotion and enlargement of that kingdom which consisteth 'in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.'" (*Journals of the Continental Congress at Vol 18*, p.950; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.105, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q8,**

SOUTH CAROLINA, 1778: Article XXXVIII. That all persons and religious societies, who acknowledge that there is one God, and a future state of rewards and punishments, and that God is publicly to be worshipped, shall be freely tolerated...That all denominations of Christian[s]...in this State, demeaning themselves peaceably and faithfully, shall enjoy equal religious and civil privileges.

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1778: “To the distinguished character of Patriot, it should be our highest Glory to add the more distinguished Character of Christian.” (Washington, *The Writings of Washington*, vol. 9, p.343, May 2, 1778; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.95, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q10**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1779: [To three Indian youths to be educated in American schools] “You do well to wish to learn our arts and ways of life, and above all, the religion of Jesus Christ. These will make you a greater and happier people than you are. congress will do every thing they can to assist you in this wise intention.” (Geo. Washington, *The Writings of George Washington*, JC Fitzpatrick, ed., Wash. DC: US Govt Printing Office, 1932, Vol 15, p.55, from speech to the Delaware Indian Chiefs on May 12, 1779; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.92, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1780: [Concerning the discovery of Benedict Arnold as a traitor] “The providential train of circumstances which led to it affords the most convincing proof that the Liberties of America are the object of divine protection.” (Washington, *The Writings of Washington*, vol. 20, p.94, Sep 26, 1780; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.105, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, 1780: [Concerning the discovery of Benedict Arnold as a traitor] “It is therefore recommended to the several states...a day of public thanksgiving and prayer...to offer our fervent supplications to the God of grace...[and] to cause the knowledge of Christianity to spread over all the earth.” (*Journals of the Continental Congress at Vol.18*, p.950-951; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.106, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7, Q9**

MASSACHUSETTS, 1780. “Part I, Article II. It is the right, as well as the duty, of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe. And no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshiping God in the manner and season, most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience.

Article III. And every denomination of Christians demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good subjects of the commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law: And no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another, shall ever be established by law.” (Supra)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, FRENCH HISTORIAN: “The Americans combine the notions of Christianity and of liberty so intimately in their minds, that it is impossible to make them conceive the one without the other...In the United States, if a political character attacks a sect [denomination], this may not prevent even the partisans of that very sect, from supporting him; but if he attacks all the sects together [Christianity], every one abandons him and he remains alone. (*The Republic of the United States of America and Its Political Institutions, Reviewed and Examined*, Henry Reeves, trans., p. 334-335, Garden City, NY: AS Barnes & Co., 1851, Vol. I, p.335; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.32, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY:**

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE: [Concerning democracies and despots] “I do not expect their leaders to be tyrants, but rather schoolmasters...it would degrade men without tormenting them...As for the rest of (one’s) fellow citizens, he is close to them, but he does not see them; he touches them, but he does not feel them; he exists only in himself and for himself alone...Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent...It provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their

industry...After having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform...The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided...It does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd...It is vain to summon a people who have been rendered so dependent on the central power to choose from time to time the representatives of that power; this rare and brief exercise of their free choice...will not prevent them from gradually losing the faculties of thinking, feeling, and acting for themselves, and thus gradually falling below the level of humanity.” (CHRONOLOGY OF EDUCATION, Dennis Laurence Cuddy, Pro Family Forum, Inc.; P.O. Box 1059; Highland City, Florida 33846; 1994] p. 6.

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1783: [End of the war, to all state governors] “I now make it my earnest prayer, that God would have you, and the State over which you preside, in his holy protection...that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind, which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy nation.” (George Washington, *The Writings of Washington*, Jared Sparks, ed. Boston: American Stationers’ Co., 1838, Vol 18, p.452, cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.99, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

JOHN HANCOCK, 1783: [Massachusetts governor, proclaiming a day of thanksgiving for the war’s end] “I do by and with the Advice of the Council appoint [11 Dec. 1783] to be religiously observed as a Day of Thanksgiving and Prayer, that all the People may then assemble to celebrate...that he hath been pleased to continue to us the Light of the blessed Gospel; ...That we also offer up fervent Supplications...to cause pure Religion and Virtue to flourish...and to fill the World with his glory.” (Proclamation of John Hancock from Boston, November 8, 1783, from an original in the Evans collection, #18025, by the American Antiquarian Soc., cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.107, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: [while emissary to France] “Bad examples to youth are more rare in America, which must be a comfortable consideration to parents. To this may be truly added, that serious religion, under its various denominations, is not only tolerated, but respected and practised. Atheism is unknown there; infidelity rare and secret; so that persons may live to a great age in that country without having their piety shocked by meeting with either an Atheist or an Infidel. (Benjamin Franklin, *Works of the Late Doctor Benjamin Franklin Consisting of His Life, Written by Himself, Together with Essays, Humorous, Moral & Literary, Chiefly in the Manner of the Spectator*, Richard Price, Ed., Dublin: P.Wogan, P.Byrne, J.Moore, and W.Jones, 1793, p.289; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.100, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7**

NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1783, 1792: “Part One, Article I, Section V. Every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and reason... Article I, Section VI. And every denomination of Christians demeaning themselves quietly, and as good subjects of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the law: And no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another, shall ever be established by law.

**INDEX KEY: Q10**

JEDEDIAH MORSE, 1784: [Educator, Father of American Geography] “To the kindly influence of Christianity we owe that degree of civil freedom, and political and social happiness which mankind now enjoys. In proportion as the genuine effects of Christianity are diminished in any nation...in the same proportion will the people of that nation recede from the blessings of genuine freedom...All efforts to destroy the foundations of our holy religion, ultimately tend to the subversion also of our

political freedom and happiness. Whenever the pillars of Christianity shall be overthrown, our present republican forms of government, and all the blessings which flow from them, must fall with them.” (Jedediah Morse’s Election Sermon given at Chareston, Mass., April 25, 1799, taken from an original in the Evans collection compiled by the American Antiquarian Society; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.129, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

JAMES MADISON, 1785: “Before any man can be considered as a member of Civil Society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governour of the Universe...Religion...[is] the basis and foundation of government.” (The Papers of James Madison, Robert Rutland, ed., Chicago: Univ of Chicago Press, 1973, Vol 8, pp. 299, 304, June 20, 1785; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.120, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

JAMES MADISON, 1785: “The preservation of a free Government requires not merely, that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained; but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great Barrier which defends the rights of the people. The Rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are Tyrants. The People who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves nor by an authority derived from them, and are slaves.” (The Papers of James Madison, Robert Rutland, ed., Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1973, Vol VIII, pp. 299-300; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.178, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q8,**

DELAWARE, 1785: “Article 22. Every person, who shall be chosen a member of either house, or appointed to any office or place of trust...shall...make and subscribe the following declaration, to wit: “I, \_\_\_\_\_, do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration.” (The Constitutions of the Several Independent States of America, Published by Order of Congress, Boston: Norman & Bowen, 1785, p. 99-100; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 23, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

PENNSYLVANIA, 1785: “Frame of Government, Section 10. And each member [of the legislature] before he takes his seat, shall make and subscribe the following declaration, viz: “I do believe in one God, the creator and governour of the universe, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked, and I do acknowledge the scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration.” (The Constitutions of the Several Independent States of America, Published by Order of Congress, Boston: Norman & Bowen, 1785, p. 81; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 23, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

MASSACHUSETTS, 1785: “Chapter VI, Article I. [All state elected officials must] make and subscribe the following declaration, viz. ‘I, \_\_\_\_\_, do declare, that I believe the Christian religion, and have firm persuasion of its truth.’” (The Constitutions of the Several Independent States of America, Published by Order of Congress, Boston: Norman & Bowen, 1785, p. v; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 24, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

NORTH CAROLINA, 1785: “Article XXXII. No person, who shall deny the being of God, or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the state, shall be capable of holding any office, or place of trust or profit in the civil department, within this state.” (The Constitutions of the Several Independent States of America, Published by Order of Congress, Boston: Norman & Bowen, 1785, p. 138; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 24, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

MARYLAND, 1785: "Article XXXV. That no other test or qualification ought to be required...than such oath of support and fidelity to this state...and a declaration of a belief in the Christian religion." (The Constitutions of the Several Independent States of America, Published by Order of Congress, Boston: Norman & Bowen, 1785, p. 108; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 24, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

VERMONT, 1786: "Frame of Government, Section 9. And each member [of the legislature], before he takes his seat shall make and subscribe the following declaration, viz: 'I do believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the scriptures of the old and new testament to be given by divine inspiration, and own and profess the [Christian] religion.' And no further or other religious test shall ever, hereafter, be required of any civil officer or magistrate in this State." (Edwin Gaustad, *Faith of Our Fathers*, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987, p. 173-174; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.34, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

LUTHER MARTIN (CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION DELEGATE, MD), 1787: "A knowledge of Mankind, and of Legislative affairs cannot be presumed to belong in a higher degree to the Judges than to the Legislature...It is necessary that the Supreme Judiciary should have the confidence of the people. This will soon be lost, if they are employed in the task of remonstrating against popular measures of the Legislature." (James Madison, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, Max Farrand, ed., New Have: Yale Univ. Press, 1911, note 11, Vol 2, p.76, July 21, 1787; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.224, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ELBRIDGE GERRY (CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION DELEGATE, MA), 1787: (It had been proposed to set up a Council of Revision composed of executive and judicial branch members to rule on the constitutionality of proposed legislation before it became law). "[The Council of Revision] was making Statesmen of the judges; and setting them up as guardians of the Rights of the people. It was making the [judges into] Legislators, which ought never to be done." (James Madison, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, Max Farrand, ed., New Have: Yale Univ. Press, 1911, Vol.2, p.75, July 21, 1787; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.224, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

JAMES MADISON, 1787: "[Some contend] that wherever [the Constitution's] meaning is doubtful, you must leave it to take its course, until the judiciary is called upon to declare its meaning...But I beg to know upon what principle it can be contended that any one department draws from the Constitution greater powers than another...I do not see that any one of these independent departments has more right than another to declare their sentiments on that point." (The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, Washington: Jonathan Elliot, 1836, Vol. 4, pp.382-383; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.239, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, 1787: [Constitutional Convention, asking why they had abandoned opening prayer] "In this situation of this Assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, [Chairman George Washington] that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the Contest with G. Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. --Our prayers, Sir, were heard, & they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our

future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? --or do we imagine we no longer need his assistance?

I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth - THAT GOD GOVERNS IN THE AFFAIRS OF MEN. [no emphasis added] And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings, that 'except the Lord build the House, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better, than the Builders of Babel: We shall be divided by our partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and by word down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing Governments by Human wisdom and leave it to chance, war and conquest." [The Convention thereafter opened with prayer, the first session with THREE HOURS, and even attended church en masse] (James Madison, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, Max Farrand, ed., New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1911, Vol.1, p.450-452, June 28, 1787; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.108, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q6,**

ARTICLE VI, US CONSTITUTION: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

VIRGINIA LAW, 1788: "It is a significant fact that on the 8th of December, 1788, after the passage of the act establishing religious freedom, and after the convention of Virginia had recommended as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States the declaration in a bill of rights that 'all men have an equal, natural, and unalienable right to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience,' the legislature of that State substantially enacted the ...death penalty...[for bigamy/polygamy]." (Reynolds v. US, 98 US 145, 165 (1878); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.72, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

JAMES MADISON, 1788: "As the courts are generally the last in making the decision [on laws], it results to them, by refusing or not refusing to execute a law, to stamp it with its final character. This makes the Judiciary dept paramount in fact to the Legislature, which was never intended, and can never be proper." (The Papers of James Madison, Vol XI, pp. 293; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.178, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1789: "[The three branches of government must] confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and this to create...a real despotism...Let there be no change by usurpation...it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed." (James Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, Published by Authority of Congress, 1899, Vol. 1, pp.52-53, April 30, 1789; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.227, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

US SENATE, 1789: "Resolved. That after the oath shall have been administered to the President, he, attended by the Vice President, and members of the Senate, and House of Representatives, proceed to St. Paul's Chapel, to hear divine service, to be performed by the Chaplain of Congress already appointed." [The House approved, and the President, V-Pres., House and Senate all attended] (*Annals of Congress, 1789-1791*, Washington, DC: Gales & Seaton, 1834, Vol 1, p.25; , cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.112, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1789: "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 [denomination], certainly I would never have placed my signature to it." (George Washington, *The Writings of Washington*, Jared Sparks, ed. Boston: American Stationers' Co., 1838, Vol 30, p.321n., cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.113, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1789: "It is impossible to rightly govern...without God and the Bible." (Henry Halley, *Halley's Bible handbook*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1927, 1965, p.18; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.113, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1789: [Acting upon a resolution of both Houses] "Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor...And beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions...to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue..." (JD Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (Published by Authority of Congress, 1899, Vol 1, p.52; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.114, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q9,**

INITIAL FIRST AMENDMENT PROPOSALS OF JAMES MADISON, JUNE 8, 1789: "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." (*Annals of the Congress of the United States - First Congress*, Washington DC: Gales & Seaton, 1834, Vol I, p. 434; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 27, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q9,**

FIRST AMENDMENT PROPOSALS OF HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE, AUGUST 15, 1789: "No [national] religion shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed." (*Annals of the Congress of the United States - First Congress*, Washington DC: Gales & Seaton, 1834, Vol I, p. 729-731; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 27, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q9,**

FIRST AMENDMENT PROPOSALS OF NH REP. SAMUEL LIVERMORE, AUGUST 15, 1789: "Congress shall make no laws touching religion, or infringing the rights of conscience." (*Annals of the Congress of the United States - First Congress*, Washington DC: Gales & Seaton, 1834, Vol I, p. 729-731; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 27, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q9,**

HOUSE ADOPTS FIRST AMENDMENT PROPOSAL, AUGUST 20, 1789: "Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience." (*Annals of the Congress of the United States - First Congress*, Washington DC: Gales & Seaton, 1834, Vol I, p. 766; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 27, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q9,**

SENATE FIRST AMENDMENT PROPOSALS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1789:  
"Congress shall not make any law infringing the rights of conscience, or establishing any religious sect or society."  
"Congress shall make no law establishing any particular denomination of religion in preference to another, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the rights of conscience be infringed."

“Congress shall make no law establishing one religious society in preference to others, or to infringe on the rights of conscience.”

“Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

SEPTEMBER 9, 1789:

“Congress shall make no law establishing articles of faith or a mode of worship, or prohibiting the free exercise of religion.”

The Conference Committee composed of House and Senate members then sat down to work out the differences and finally proposed what is now the First Amendment: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” (Sources and Documents Illustrating the American Revolution, 1764-1788, and the Formation of the Federal Constitution, SE Morrison, ed., NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1923, p. 158; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 27, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q9,**

JAMES MADISON, drafter of 1st Amendment: “[Religion is] . . .the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it.” (“A Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man,” cited in “Neither Sacred Nor Profane,” Donald Manzullo, p.71; as quoted in “The Second American Revolution,” pg. 104, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

SAMUEL ADAMS, 1790: [To John Adams, who wrote back: “You and I agree.”] “Let divines and philosophers, statesmen and patriots, unite their endeavors to renovate the age, by impressing the minds of men with the importance of educating their little boys and girls, of inculcating in the minds of youth the fear and love of the Deity...and, in subordination to these great principles, the love of their country...In short, of leading them in the study and practice of the exalted virtues of the Christian system.” (Wm. V Wells, *The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1865), Vol III, p.301; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.117, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JAMES WILSON, 1791: [Decision, citing Wilson] “The late Judge Wilson, of the Supreme Court of the United States...was appointed in 1791, unanimously, by the House of Representatives of this state...for our present form of government we are greatly indebted to his exertions and influence. With his fresh recollections of both constitutions, in his *Course of Lectures* (3d vol. of his Works, 122), he states that...Christianity is part of the common-law.” (*Updegraph v. The Commonwealth*; 11 Serg. & R. 393, 403, (1824); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.79, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7, Q9,**

NATURALIZATION, 1795: “Thomas M’Creery, in order to become...naturalized according to the Act of Assembly ...on the 30th of September, 1795, took the oath...before the Honorable Samuel Chase, Esquire, then being the Chief Judge of the State of Maryland...and did then and there receive from the Chief Judge, a certificate thereof...: ‘Maryland; I, Samuel Chase, Chief Judge of the State of Maryland, do hereby certify all whom it may concern, that...personally appeared before Thomas M’Creery, and did repeat and subscribe a declaration of his belief in the Christian Religion, and take the oath required by the Act of Assembly of this State, entitled, ‘An Act for Naturalization.’” (*M’Creery’s Lessee v. Allender*; 4H. & Mett. 259 (1799); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.64, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7, Q9,**

TENNESSEE, 1796: “Article VIII, Section II. No person who denies the being of God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, shall hold any office in the civil department of this State....Article XI, Section IV. That no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this state.” [Thus “religious test” meant denominational differences, but their demand for belief in Jehovah-God was NOT a test.] (*The Constitutions of the United States of America with the Latest Amendments*, Trenton: Moore & Lake, 1813, p. 342, 344; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.33, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1796: [Farewell Address] “Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness...The mere politician...ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert...? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds...reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail, in exclusion of religious principle.” (JD Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (Pub. by Authority of Congress, 1899), Vol 1, p.220, Sep 17, 1796; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.116, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

GEORGE WASHINGTON, 1796: “Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds...reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.” (*A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, Vol 1, p.220, Sept 17, 1796; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.116, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3, Q7,**

JOHN ADAMS, 1798: “We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion...Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” (*The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States*, CF Adams, ed., Vol. 9, p. 229, Oct. 11, 1798, Boston: Little, Brown, 1854; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.123, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7, Q9,**

MARYLAND SUPREME COURT, 1799: “Religion is of general and public concern, and on its support depend, in great measure, the peace and good order of government, the safety and happiness of the people. By our form of government, the Christian religion is the established religion; and all sects and denominations of Christians are placed upon the same equal footing, and are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty. (*Runkel v. Winemiller*; 4 Harris and McHenry 276, 288 (Sup. Ct. Md. 1799); cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 64, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX

**INDEX KEY: Q3**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1800: “Let my neighbor once persuade himself that there is no God, and he will soon pick my pocket, and break not only my LEG but my NECK. If there be no God, there is no law, no future account; government then is the ordinance of man only, and we cannot be subject for conscience sake.” (Thomas Jefferson, *Jefferson’s Extracts from the Gospels*, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1983, p.11; cited by Wm. Linn, *Serious Considerations on the Election of a President: Addressed to the Citizens of the United States*, NY, 1800, p.19; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.254, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY:**

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE: “In 1801 the Danbury Baptist Association of Danbury, Connecticut, heard a rumor that the Congregationalist denomination was about to be made the national denomination. The rumor distressed the Danbury Baptists, as it should have. Consequently, they fired off a letter to President Thomas Jefferson voicing their concern. On January 1, 1802, Jefferson wrote the Danbury Baptists, assuring them that “the First Amendment has erected a wall of separation between church and state.” His letter explained that they need not fear the establishment of a national denomination -- and that while the wall of the First Amendment

would protect the church from government control -- there always would be open and free religious expression of all orthodox religious practices, for true religious duties would never threaten the purpose of government. The government would interfere with a religious activity only if that activity was a direct menace to the government or to the overall peace and good order of society. (Later Supreme Courts identified potential "religious" activities in which the government might interfere: things like human sacrifice, bigamy or polygamy, the advocacy of immorality or licentiousness, etc. If any of these activities were to occur in the name of 'religion,' then the government WOULD interfere, for these were activities which threatened public peace and safety; but with orthodox religious practices, the government would NOT interfere)...

...In the case *Reynolds v. United States* [98 US 145 (1878)], the plaintiffs resurrected Jefferson's letter, hoping to use it to their advantage. In that case, the Court printed lengthy segment of Jefferson's letter and then used his letter on 'separation of church and state' to again prove that is WAS permissible to maintain Christian values, principles, and practices in official policy. For the next 15 years during that legal controversy, the Supreme court utilized Jefferson's letter to ensure that Christian principles REMAINED a part of government. Following this controversy, Jefferson's letter again fell into disuse. It then remained silent for the next 70 years until 1947, when, in *Everson v. Board of Education* [330 US 1 (1947)], the Court, for the first time, did NOT cite Jefferson's entire letter, but selected only eight words from it. The court now announced: "The First Amendment has erected 'a wall of separation between church and state.' That wall must be kept high and impregnable."...The Court began regularly to speak of a "separation of church and state," broadly explaining that, "This is what the Founders wanted -- separation of church and state. This is their great intent." The Court failed to quote the Founders; it just generically asserted that this is what the Founders wanted....The Court continued to talk about separation until June 25th, 1962, when, in the case *Engel v. Vitale* [370 US 421 (1962)], the Court delivered its first ever ruling which completely separated Christian principles from education; the case struck down school prayer...Recall that the 1892 Supreme Court case offered 87 precedents to maintain the inclusion of Christian principles in our laws and institutions. This 1962 case which removed school prayer was just the opposite; it was the first case in Court history to use zero precedents -- court quoted "zero" previous legal cases. Without any historical or legal base, the Court simply made an announcement: "We'll not have prayers in schools anymore; that violates the Constitution." (David Barton, *America's Godly Heritage*, p.13-16, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON: "The Constitution on which our Union rests shall be administered by me according to the safe and honest meaning contemplated by the plain understanding of the people of the United States at the time of its adoption -- a meaning to be found in the explanations of those who advocated..." (Cited by John McManus, *The New American*, Jan 9, 1995, p.26, Appleton, WI, 54913)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q5, Q10**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1803: "In 1803 President Jefferson recommended that Congress pass a treaty with the Kaskaskia Indians which provided, among other things, a stipend of \$100 annually for seven years from the Federal treasury for the support of a Catholic priest to minister to the Kaskaskia Indians. This and two similar treaties were enacted during Jefferson's administration -- one with the Wyandotte Indians and other tribes in 1806, and one with the Cherokees in 1807. In 1787, another act of Congress ordained special lands 'for the sole use of Christian Indians' and reserved lands for the Moravian Brethren 'for civilizing the Indians and promoting Christianity' ...Congress extended this act three time during Jefferson's administration and each time [Jefferson] signed the extension into law." (Daniel Driesback, *Real Threat and Mere Shadow: Religious Liberty and the First Amendment*, Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1987, p. 127; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.176, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1804: "Nothing in the Constitution has given them [the federal judges] a right to decided for the Executive, more than to the Executive to decide for them...But the opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional, and what no, not only for themselves in their own sphere of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres,

would make the judiciary a despotic branch.” (Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol XI, p.50-51; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.177, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

JOHN WITHERSPOON: “...he is the best friend to American liberty, who is most sincere and active in promoting true and undefiled religion, and who sets himself with the greatest firmness to bear down profanity and immorality of every kind. Whoever is an avowed enemy of God, I scruple not [would not hesitate] to call him an enemy to his country.” (John Witherspoon, *The Works of the Rev. John Witherspoon* (Philadelphia: Wm Woodard, 1802, Vol 3, p.46; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.118, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

GOUVERNEUR MORRIS: “Religion is the only solid basis of good morals; therefore education should teach the precepts of religion, and the duties of man towards God.” (Jared Sparks, *The Life of Gouverneur Morris*, Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1832, Vol 8, p.483; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.121, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

US SUPREME COURT CHIEF JUSTICE ROGER TANEY: “[The Constitution] speaks not only in the same words, but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hand of its framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Any other rule of construction would abrogate the judicial character of the Court and make it the mere reflect of the popular opinion or passion of the day.” (Cited by John McManus, *The New American*, Jan 9, 1995, p.26, Appleton, WI, 54913)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q5,**

OHIO CONSTITUTION, 1802: “Article VIII, Section 3. Religion, morality, and knowledge being essentially necessary to the good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of instruction shall forever be encouraged by legislative provision.” (*The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.38, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q10**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1808: “I consider the government of the United States as interdicted [prohibited] by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises. This results not only from the provision that no law shall be made respecting the establishment or free exercise of religion, but from that also which reserves to the States the powers not delegated to the United States [10th Amendment]. Certainly, no power to prescribe any religious exercise, or to assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the General Government. It must then rest with the States, as far as it can be in any human authority.” (*The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Albert Bergh, ed., Washington DC: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Assoc., 1904, Vol XI, p. 428; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.42, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7, Q9,**

CHARLES FINNEY: “The Church must take right ground in regard to politics...Politics are a part of a religion in such a country as this, and Christians must do their duty to the country as part of their duty to God...[God] will bless or curse this nation, according to the course [Christians] take [in politics].” (*Revival Lectures*, Lecture 15, p. 336-337, Reprinted Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming Revel Co, 1970; cited by David Barton, *America’s Godly Heritage*, p.28, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q5**

THOMAS JEFFERSON: “[Religion is] deemed in other countries incompatible with good government and yet proved by our experience to be its best support.” (*America’s Providential History*, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1989, p. 178; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.176, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

JAMES MADISON: “Nothing has yet been offered to invalidate the doctrine that the meaning of the Constitution may as well be ascertained by the legislature as by the judicial authority.” (The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, Washington: Jonathan Elliot, 1836, Vol. 4, p.399; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.242, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

THOMAS JEFFERSON: “And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis -- a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that His justice cannot sleep forever.” (Thomas Jefferson, *Jefferson’s Writings*, p. 289, NY: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc., 1984, cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.176, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3, Q7, Q9,**

PATRICK HENRY: “It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians, not on religions but on the gospel of Jesus Christ! For this very reason people of other faiths have been afforded asylum, prosperity, and freedom of worship here.” (God’s Providence in America’s History, Steve Dawson, pg. 9:6, Rancho Cordova, CA; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 25, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

WM. WIRT HENRY: [on his grandfather Patrick Henry] “[Patrick Henry] looked to the restraining and elevating principles of Christianity as the hope of his country’s institutions.” (Wm Wirt, *The Life and Character of Patrick Henry* (Philadelphia: James Webster, 1818), p.402; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.118, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

JOHN ADAMS, AUGUST 28, 1811: “Religion and virtue are the only foundations, not only of republicanism and of all free government, but of social felicity under all governments and in all the combinations of human society.” (Charles Francis Adams, ed., *The Works of John Adams--Second President of the United States* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1854), Vol. IX, p. 636. David Barton, *The Myth of Separation* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 1991), p. 123; As cited in, *America’s God and Country Encyclopedia of Quotations* by William J. Federer (Coppell, TX: FAME Publishing Co. 1994), p. 12.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4**

NEW YORK SUPREME COURT, 1811: [INDICTMENT] “The defendant was indicted ...in December, 1810, for that he did, on the 2nd day of September, 1810...wickedly, maliciously, and blasphemously, utter, and with a loud voice publish, in the presence and hearing of divers good and Christian people, of and concerning the Christian religion, and of and concerning Jesus Christ, the false, scandalous, malicious, wicked and blasphemous words following: ‘Jesus Christ was a bastard, and his mother must be a whore,’ in contempt of the Christian religion...The defendant was tried and found guilty, and was sentenced by the court to be imprisoned for three months, and to pay a fine of \$500.”

[DEFENSE STATEMENT] “There are no statutes concerning religion...The constitution allows a free toleration to all religions and all kinds of worship...Judaism and Mahometanism may be preached here, without any legal animadversion...There prisoner may have been a Jew, a Mahometan, or a Socinian: and if so, he had a right, by the constitution, to declare his opinions.”

[PROSECUTION STATEMENT] “While the constitution of the State has saved the rights of conscience, and allowed a free and fair discussion of all points of controversy among religious sects, it has left the principal engrafted on the body of our common law, that Christianity is part of the laws of the State, untouched and unimpaired.”

[DECISION, CHIEF JUSTICE CHANCELLOR JAMES KENT] “Such words uttered with such a disposition were an offense at common law. In ‘Taylor’s’ case the defendant was convicted upon information of speaking similar words, and the Court...said that Christianity was parcel of the law, and to cast contumelious reproaches upon it, tended to weaken the foundation of moral obligation,

and the efficacy of oaths. And in the case of 'Rex v. Woolston,' on a like conviction, the court said...that whatever strikes at the root of Christianity tends manifestly to the dissolution of civil government...The authorities show that blasphemy against God and...profane ridicule of Christ or the Holy Scriptures (which are equally treated as blasphemy), are offenses punishable at common law, whether uttered by words or writings...because it tends to corrupt the morals of the people, and to destroy good order. such offenses have always been considered independent of any religious establishment or the rights of the church. They are treated as affecting the essential interests of civil society...

We stand equally in need, now as formerly, of all the moral discipline, and of those principle of virtue, which help to bind society together. The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice; and to scandalize the author of these doctrines is no only impious, but...is a gross violation of decency and good order. Nothing could be more offensive to the virtuous part of the community, or more injurious to the tender morals of the young, than to declare such profanity lawful...

The free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and free and decent discussions on any religious subject, is granted and secured; but to revile...the religion professed by almost the whole community, is an abuse of that right...We are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors [other religions]...[We are] people whose manners...and whose morals have been elevated and inspired...by means of the Christian religion.

Though the constitution has discarded religious establishments, it does not forbid judicial cognizance of those offenses against religion and morality which have no reference to any such establishment...This [constitutional] declaration (noble and magnanimous as it is, when duly understood) never meant to withdraw religion in general, and with it the best sanctions of moral and social obligation from all consideration and notice of the law...To construe it as breaking down the common law barriers against licentious, wanton, and impious attacks upon Christianity itself, would be an enormous perversion of its meaning...

Christianity, in its enlarged sense, as a religion revealed and taught in the Bible, is not unknown to our law...

The Court are accordingly of opinion that the judgment below must be affirmed: [that blasphemy against God, and contumelious reproaches, and profane ridicule of Christ or the Holy Scripture, are offenses punishable at the common law, whether uttered by words or writings]." (People v. Ruggles; 8 Johns 545-547 (1811); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.55-58, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JOSEPH STORY (1811-1845): "It yet remains a problem to be solved in human affairs, whether any free government can be permanent, where the public worship of God, and the support of religion, constitute no part of the policy or duty of the state in any assignable shape." (Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, Vol 3, 700, 989; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.80, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q6, Q7**

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JOSEPH STORY (1811-1845): "Thus the whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusive to the state governments, to be acted up according to their own sense of justice, and the state constitutions." (Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 2:666-67; cited by Cleon Skousen, *The Making of America*, p 681, National Center for Constitutional Studies).

Seven of the states had officially established religions or actual denominations at the time the Constitution was adopted. These included: Connecticut (Congregational), New Hampshire (Protestant), Delaware (Christian), New Jersey (Protestant), Maryland (Christian), South Carolina (Protestant), Massachusetts (Congregational).

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q5, Q7,**

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE (1811-45) AND UNITARIAN JOSEPH STORY: "We are not to attribute this prohibition of a national religious establishment to an indifference to religion in

general, and especially to Christianity (which none could hold in more reverence, than the framers of the Constitution...Probably at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the first amendment to it. ...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 amendment was not to countenance, much less to advance, Mahometanism, or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but exclude all rivalry among Christian sects, and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.” (Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 2:593-95; cited in *The Second American Revolution*, pg. 96, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co. Also cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.32, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005 (references overlap)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

JOHN ADAMS TO THOMAS JEFFERSON, JUNE 28, 1813: “The general principles, on which the Fathers achieved independence, were the only Principles in which that beautiful Assembly of young Gentlemen could Unite...And what were these general Principles? I answer, the general Principles of Christianity, in which all these Sects were United: And the general Principles of English and American Liberty, in which all those young Men United, and which had United all Parties in America, in Majorities sufficient to assert and maintain her Independence. Now I will avow, that I then believe, and now believe, that those general Principles of Christianity, are as eternal and immutable, as the Existence and Attributes of God; and that those Principles of Liberty, are as unalterable as human Nature and our terrestrial, mundane System.” (Lester J. Capon, ed., *The Adams-Jefferson Letters* 2 vols. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 2:339-40; As cited in, *America’s God and Country Encyclopedia of Quotations* by William J. Federer (Coppell, TX: FAME Publishing Co. 1994), pp. 12-13.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q7,**

JOHN JAY, 1816: “Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty - - as well as the privilege and interest -- of our Christian nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers.” (The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay, 1794-1826, Vol IV, p. 393, Oct. 12, 1816; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.119, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q5, Q10**

MISSISSIPPI CONSTITUTION, 1817: “Article IX, Section 16. Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged in this state.” (The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.39, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4**

PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT, 1817: [Defense was Jewish and argued against enforcement of the ‘Christian Sabbath’] “Laws cannot be administered in any civilized government unless the people are taught to revere the sanctity of an oath, and look to a future state of rewards and punishments for the deeds of this life. It is of the utmost moment, therefore, that they should be reminded of their religious duties at stated periods...A wise policy would naturally lead to the formation of laws calculated to subserve those salutary purposes. The invaluable privilege of the rights of conscience secured to us by the constitution of the commonwealth, was never intended to shelter those persons, who, out of mere caprice, would directly oppose those laws for the pleasure of showing their contempt and abhorrence of the religious opinions of the great mass of the citizens. (Commonwealth v. Wolf, 3 Serg. & R. 48, 50 (1817); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.76, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1819: “The Constitution...is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary, which they may twist and shape into any form they please.” (Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Washington: Jonathan Elliot, 1836, Vol.XV, p.213, a letter to Judge Spencer Roane on

September 6, 1819; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.236, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1820: "The Judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric."

--Thomas Jefferson (1820) (source unknown)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

DANIEL WEBSTER, 1820: "Cultivated mind was to act on uncultivated nature; and more than all, a government and a country were to commence, with the very first foundations laid under the divine light of the Christian religion. Happy Auspices of a happy futurity! Who would wish that his country's existence had otherwise begun? ...Our fathers were brought hither by their high veneration for the Christian religion. They journeyed by its light, and labored in its hope. They sought to incorporate its principles with the elements of their society, and to diffuse its influence through all their institutions, civil, political, or literary." (The Works of Daniel Webster, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1853, Vol 1, p.22; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.134, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US COURT, 1820's: "Court decisions sometimes cited biblical law where civil law did not entirely fit the case. In many areas, laws against unbelief were on the statute books. A man could be imprisoned for atheism. Warren Chase complained of it as an example of 'slavery' and 'barbarism' that in the 1820's 'an old man was imprisoned sixty days, in Boston, for publishing in his own paper that fact that he did not believe in their orthodox God.' The laws were premised on the fact that the respective states were Christian, and anti-Christianity constituted treasonable activity or belief." (The Nature of the American System. Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1965 by R. J. Rushdoony, p. 4)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1820: [In a letter to Wm Jarvis] "You seem...to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions; a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men, and not more so...and their power [is] the more dangerous as they are in office for life, and not responsible, as the other functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal." (Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol XV, p.277; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.177, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1821: "It has however been my opinion...that the germ of dissolution of our federal government is in the constitution of the federal judiciary; an irresponsible body, (for impeachment is scarcely a scare-crow), working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all will be consolidated into one. To this I am opposed; because when all government shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided...and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated." (Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol XV, p.331-332; cited by John McManus, *The New American*, Jan 9, 1995, p.26, Appleton, WI, 54913; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.177, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1823: (Shortly after he and James Madison ignored the Supreme Court decision in *Marbury v. Madison*; Jefferson also ignored their command to appear at Vice-President Aaron Burr's conspiracy trial) "Nothing in the Constitution has given to them [the Supreme Court] a right to decide for the Executive, more than to the Executive to decide for them...[The] opinion

which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional, and what not...for the legislature and the executive...would make the judiciary a despotic branch.” (Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Washington: Jonathan Elliot, 1836, Vol.XV, p.447, June 12, 1823; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.239, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q7,**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1823: “On every question of construction (of the Constitution) let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed.” (Letter to William Johnson, June 12, 1823, *The Complete Jefferson*, page 322.

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q5, Q10**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1824: “When he established the University of Virginia, he encouraged the teaching of religion and set apart space in the Rotunda for chapel services. He also praised the use of the local courthouse in his home town for religious services.” (*America’s Providential History*, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1989, p. 183; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.175, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1824: “As founder of the University of Virginia he [Thos. Jefferson] recommended that students be allowed to meet on the campus to pray and worship together, or, if need be, to meet and pray with their professors on campus. He was the author of the first plan of public education adopted for the city of Washington which included the Bible and the Isaac Watts Hymnal as the principal books to teach reading to students. Obviously some of the founding fathers’ religious views have been distorted.” (JW Whitehead, citing “Regulation of the University of Virginia,” 4 October, 1824, Chp. 2, Sec. 1; and J.O.Wilson, “Public Schools of Washington, Vol. 1, (Washington, DC, Columbia Historical Society, 1897, pg. 5; *The Second American Revolution*, pg. 100, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1824: “When he established the University of Virginia, he encouraged the teaching of religion and set apart space in the Rotunda for chapel services. He also praised the use of the local courthouse in his home town for religious services.” (*America’s Providential History*, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1989, p. 183; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.175, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT, 1824: [INDICTMENT] “Abner Updegraph...on the 12th day of December [1821]...not having the fear of God before his eyes...contriving and intending to scandalize, and bring into disrepute, and vilify the Christian religion and the scriptures of truth, in the presence and hearing of several persons...did unlawfully, wickedly and premeditatively, despitefully and blasphemously say...: ‘That the Holy Scriptures were a mere fable: that they were a contradiction, and that although they contained a number of good things, yet they contained a great many lies.’ To the great dishonor of Almighty God, to the great scandal of the profession of the Christian religion.”

[DECISION] [Citing Sir Wm. Blackstone] “Blasphemy against the Almighty is denying His being or providence, or uttering contumelious reproaches on our Savior Christ. It is punished, at common law by fine and imprisonment, for Christianity is part of the laws of the land.”

[DECISION] [Responding to defense’s claim that freedom of speech nullifies the charge of blasphemy against Christianity] “It was the out-pouring of an invective, so vulgarly shocking and insulting, that the lowest grade of civil authority ought not to be subject to it, but when spoken in a Christian land, and to a Christian audience, the highest offence ‘contra bonos mores’; and even if Christianity was not part of the law of the land, it is the popular religion of the country, and insult on which would be indictable.” [DECISION] [Responding to defense’s claim that Christianity was not made part of American common law, and that if it was, it was repealed by the US Constitution and the constitution of Pennsylvania] “The assertion is once more made, that Christianity never was

received as part of the common law of this Christian land; and it is added, that if it was, it was virtually repealed by the constitution of the United States, and of this state...If the argument be worth anything, all the laws which have Christianity for their object -- all would be carried away at one fell swoop -- the act against cursing and swearing, and breach of the Lord's day; the act forbidding incestuous marriages, perjury by taking a false oath upon the book, fornication and adultery... --for all these are founded on Christianity -- for all these are restraints upon civil liberty... We will first dispose of what is considered the grand objection -- the constitutionality of Christianity -- for, in effect, that is the question. Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been a part of the common law...not Christianity founded on any particular religious tenets; not Christianity with an established church...but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men.

Thus this wise legislature framed this great body of laws, for a Christian country and Christian people. This is the Christianity of the common law...and thus, it is irrefragably proved, that the laws and institutions of this state are built on the foundation of reverence for Christianity...In this the constitution of the United States has made no alteration, nor in the great body of the laws which was an incorporation of the common-law doctrine of Christianity...without which no free government can long exist.

To prohibit the open, public and explicit denial of the popular religion of a country is a necessary measure to preserve the tranquillity of a government. Of this, no person in a Christian country can complain...In the Supreme Court of New York it was solemnly determined, that Christianity was part of the law of the land, and that to revile the Holy Scriptures was an indictable offence. The case assumes, says Chief Justice Kent, that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted on Christianity. *The People v. Ruggles*.

No society can tolerate a wilful and despicable attempt to subvert its religion, no more than it would to break down its laws -- a general, malicious and deliberate intent to overthrow Christianity, general Christianity.

Without these restraints no free government could long exist. It is liberty run mad to declaim against the punishment of these offences, or to assert that the punishment is hostile to the spirit and genius of our government. They are far from being true friends to liberty who support this doctrine, and the promulgation of such opinions, and general receipt of them among the people, would be the sure forerunners of anarchy, and finally, of despotism.

No free government now exists in the world unless where Christianity is acknowledged, and is the religion of the country...Its foundations are broad and strong, and deep...it is the purest system of morality, the firmest auxiliary, and only stable support of all human laws...

Christianity is part of the common law; the act against blasphemy is neither obsolete nor virtually repealed; nor is Christianity inconsistent with our free governments or the genius of the people.

While our own free constitution secures liberty of conscience and freedom of religious worship to all, it is not necessary to maintain that any man should have the right publicly to vilify the religion of his neighbors and of the country; these two privileges are directly opposed." (*Updegraph v. The Commonwealth*; 11 Serg. & R. 399, 402-403, 404-407 (1824); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.52-55, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q9,**

WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY, 1828: "RELIGION. Includes a belief in the being and perfections of God, in the revelation of his will to man, and in man's obligation to obey his commands, in a state of reward and punishment, and in man's accountableness to God; and also true godliness or piety of life, with the practice of all moral duties...the practice of moral duties without a belief in a divine lawgiver, and without reference to his will or commands, is not religion. (Noah Webster, *American Dictionary of the English Language*, 1828 (San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1967)

(Note: Compare this 1828 definition as understood by America, to 1977, when atheism was legally defined as a religion. (*Therault v. Silber*; 453 F.Supp.254 [W.D.Tex. 1978]; also *Malnak v. Yogi*; 440 F.Supp.1285 [D.C.N.J. 1977]) In 1828, atheism would not have been protected.

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

NOAH WEBSTER, 1828: "In my view, the Christian religion is the most important and one of the first things in which all children, under a free government, ought to be instructed...No truth is more evident to my mind than that the Christian religion must be the basis of any government intended to

secure the rights and privileges of a free people.” (American Dictionary of the English Language, 1828, San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1967, preface, p.12; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.126, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

NOAH WEBSTER, 1828: [As Massachusetts legislator, promoting an educational system that would:] “Discipline our youth in early life in sound maxims of moral, political, and religious duties.” (American Dictionary of the English Language, 1828, San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1967, preface, p.22; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.127, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

NOAH WEBSTER: “The brief exposition of the constitution of the United States will unfold to young persons the principles of republican government; and it is the sincere desire of the writer that our citizens should early understand that the genuine source of correct republican principles is the Bible, particularly the New Testament or the Christian religion.” (Verna Hall and Rosalie Slater, *The Bible and the Constitution*, San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1976, p.21; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.127, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

NOAH WEBSTER: “It is extremely important to our nation, in a political as well as religious view, that all possible authority and influence should be given to the scriptures, for these furnish the best principles of civil liberty, and the most effectual support of republican government. The principles of all genuine liberty, and of wise laws and administrations are to be drawn from the Bible and sustained by its authority. The man therefore who weakens or destroys the divine authority of that book may be accessory to all the public disorders which society is doomed to suffer.” (Verna Hall, *The Christian History of the American Revolution*, San Francisco: Foundation for American Christian Education, 1976, p.21; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.127, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JOSEPH STORY, 1829: “There never has been a period of history, in which the Common Law did not recognize Christianity as lying at its foundation.” (*The Second American Revolution*, pg. 197, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

JAMES MADISON: “We have staked the whole future of the American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future...upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves, according to the Ten Commandments of God.” (cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.155, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

BARON CHARLES DE MONTESQUIEU: “Again there is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers. Were it [the power of judging] joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would then be the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with all the violence of an oppressor. There would be an end of every thing were the same man, or the same body...to exercise those three powers.” (Charles Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*, Worcester: Isaiah Thomas, 1802, Vol.1, p.185; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.227, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, 1830's: “The President, who exercises a limited power, may err without causing great mischief in the state. Congress may decide amiss without destroying the Union...But if the supreme court is ever composed of imprudent men or bad citizens, the Union may be plunged into anarchy or civil war.” (*The Republic of the United States of America and Its*

Political Institutions, Reviewed and Examined, Henry Reeves, trans., Vol 1, pp.160-161, Garden City, NY: AS Barnes & Co., 1851; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.236, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q10**

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, 1830's: "Almost all [American] education is entrusted to the clergy." (*The Republic of the United States of America and Its Political Institutions, Reviewed and Examined*, Henry Reeves, trans., Vol 1, p.337, Garden City, NY: AS Barnes & Co., 1851; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.130, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, 1830's: "Upon my arrival in the United States, the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention; and the longer I stayed there, the more did I perceive the great political consequences resulting from this state of things, to which I was unaccustomed. In France I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom pursuing courses diametrically opposed to each other; but in America I found that they were intimately united, and that they reigned in common over the same country. p.337

---The Americans combine the notions of Christianity and of liberty so intimately in their minds, that it is impossible to make them conceive the one without the other. p.335

---Religion in America...must nevertheless be regarded as the foremost of the political institutions of that country. p.334

---They brought with them...a form of Christianity, which I cannot better describe, than by styling it a democratic and republican religion...From the earliest settlement of the emigrants, politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved. p.328

---I do not know whether all the Americans have a sincere faith in their religion; for who can search the human heart? but I am certain that they hold it to be indispensable to the maintenance of republican institutions. This opinion is not peculiar to a class of citizens or to a party, but it belongs to the whole nation, and to every rank of society. p.334

---Christianity, therefore, reigns without any obstacle, by universal consent." p.333 (*The Republic of the United States of America and Its Political Institutions, Reviewed and Examined*, Henry Reeves, trans., Vol 1, pages as listed above, Garden City, NY: AS Barnes & Co., 1851; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.135, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2**

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, 1830's: "There is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America and there can be no greater proof of its utility, and of its conformity to human nature, than that its influence is most powerfully felt over the most enlightened and free nation on earth." (*The Republic of the United States of America and Its Political Institutions, Reviewed and Examined*, Henry Reeves, trans., Vol 1, p.332, Garden City, NY: AS Barnes & Co., 1851; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.131, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

NOAH WEBSTER, 1832: [Founding Father, educator]"[The] religion which has introduced civil liberty, is the religion of Christ and his apostles, which enjoins humility, piety and benevolence; which acknowledges in every person a brother, or a sister, and a citizen with equal rights. This is genuine Christianity, and to this we owe our free constitutions of government." (*History of the United States*, New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1832, p.300, para. 578; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.125, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

NOAH WEBSTER, 1832: "The moral principles and precepts contained in the Scriptures ought to form the basis of all our civil constitutions and laws...All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery, and war, proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible." (*History of the United States*, New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1832, p.339, para. 53; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.125, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ANDREW JACKSON, 1832: [The Court had decreed Georgia law usurping Cherokee lands unconstitutional] “[Chief Justice] John Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it!” (Albert Beveridge, *The Life of John Marshall*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1919, Vol. 3, p.158; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.241, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ANDREW JACKSON, 1832: “Each public officer who takes an oath to support the Constitution swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others...The opinion of the judges has no more authority over the Congress than the opinion of Congress has over the judges, and on that point the President is independent of both. The authority of the Supreme Court must not, therefore, be permitted to control the Congress or the Executive.” (James Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, Published by Authority of Congress, 1899, Vol. 2, p582, Jan.10, 1832; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.241, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q10**

WM. HOLMES MCGUFFEY, 1848: [American educator, (McGuffey Readers), 1836] “From no source has the author drawn more copiously than from the Sacred Scriptures. For this [I] certainly apprehend no censure. In a Christian country, that man is to be pitied, who, at this day, can honestly object to imbuing the minds of youth with the language and spirit of the Word of God.” (Wm McGuffey, *McGuffey’s Eclectic Third Reader*, Cincinnati: Winthrop Smith & Co., 1848, p.5, preface; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.129, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q3,**

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, 1837: “Why is it that, next to the birthday of the Savior of the World, your most joyous and most venerated festival returns on this day? [4th of July]...Is it not that, in the chain of human events, the birthday of the nation is indissolubly linked with the birthday of the Savior? That it forms a leading event in the progress of the gospel dispensation? Is it not that the Declaration of Independence first organized the social compact on the foundation of the Redeemer’s mission upon earth? That it laid the cornerstone of human government upon the first precepts of Christianity?” (An Oration Delivered Before the Inhabitants of the Town of Newburyport at their Request on the Sixty-First Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1837; Newburyport: Charles Whipple, 1837, pg 5-6; cited by David Barton, *America’s Godly Heritage*, p.6-7, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, 1837: “The only assurance of our nation’s safety is to lay our foundation in morality and religion...At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide.” (*America’s Providential History*, McDowell & Beliles, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1989, p. 179; and, *Letters and Addresses of Abraham Lincoln* (NY: Unit book Publishing Co., 1907, p.8, Jan. 27, 1837; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.71, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7, Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1838: [The First Amendment] embraces all who believe in the existence of God, as well...as Christians of every denomination...This provision does not extend to atheists, because they do not believe in god or religion; and therefore...their sentiments and professions, whatever they may be, cannot be called religious sentiments and professions.” (*Commonwealth v. Abner Kneeland*; 37 Mass. (Pick) 206-219 (1838) cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.182, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q4, Q5, Q7,**

MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME COURT, 1838: [INDICTMENT] “[The accused published statements which read]...’The Universalists believe in a god which I do not; ;but believe that their god, with all his moral attributes...is nothing more than a chimera of their own imagination’; ‘Universalists believe in Christ, which I do not; but believe that the whole story concerning him is...a fable and a fiction...’; ...the language was...a willfull denial of the existence of God...so as to bring it within the statute...The defendant admitted the writing and publishing of the libel [against God].”

[DEFENSE STATEMENT] (Defendant was a pantheist who claimed Massachusetts law was superseded by the US Constitution’s guarantee of religious freedom and freedom of the press). “[The US Constitution] guarantees to me the strict right of propagating my sentiments, by way of argument or discussion, on religion or any other subject.”

[DECISION, addressing the defense’s first argument, that he had broken no law.] “The statute, on which the question arises is as follows: ‘That if any person shall willfully blaspheme the holy name of God, by denying, cursing, or contumeliously reproaching God, his creation, government, or final judging of the world,’ &c...

In general, blasphemy [that is, libel against God] may be described, as consisting in speaking evil of the Deity...to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God. It is purposely using words concerning God...to impair and destroy the reverence, respect, and confidence due to him...It is a wilful and malicious attempt to lessen men’s reverence of God by denying his existence, or his attributes as an intelligent creator, governor and judge of men, and to prevent their having confidence in him.”

[DECISION, addressing the constitutionality of the law.] “But another ground for arresting the judgment, and one apparently most relied on and urged by the defendant, is, that this statute itself is repugnant to the constitution...and therefore wholly void...

[This law] was passed very soon after the adoption of the constitution, and no doubt, many members of the convention which framed the constitution, were members of the legislature which passed this law...

In New Hampshire, the constitution of which State has a similar declaration of [religious] rights, the open denial of the being and existence of God or of the Supreme Being is prohibited by statute, and declared to be blasphemy.

In Vermont, with a similar declaration of rights, a statute was passed 1797, by which it was enacted, that if any person shall publicly deny the being and existence of God or the Supreme Being, or shall contumeliously reproach his providence and government, he shall be deemed a disturber of the peace and tranquility of the State, and an offender against the good morals and manners of society, and shall be punishable by fine...

The State of Maine also, having adopted the same constitutional provision with that of Massachusetts, in her declaration of rights, in respect to religious freedom, immediately after the adoption of the constitution reenacted, the Massachusetts statute against blasphemy...

In New York the universal toleration of all religious professions and sentiments, is secured in the most ample manner. It is declared in the constitution...that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious worship, without discrimination or preference, shall for ever be allowed in this State to all mankind...Notwithstanding this constitutional declaration carrying the doctrine of unlimited toleration as far as the peace and safety of any community will allow, the courts have decided that blasphemy was a crime at common law and was not abrogated by the constitution (*People v. Ruggles*).

[DECISION, concerning defense’s argument of “freedom of the press.”] “According to the argument...every act, however injurious or criminal, which can be committed by the use of language, may be committed...if such language is printed. Not only therefore would the article in question become a general license for scandal, calumny and falsehood against individuals, institutions and governments, in the form of publication...but all incitation to treason, assassination, and all other crimes however atrocious, if conveyed in printed language, would be dispunishable.” (*Commonwealth v. Abner Kneeland*; 37 Mass. (Pick) 206-219 (1838) cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.58, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7, Q10**

US SUPREME COURT, 1844: [Stephen Girard’s will, bequeathing \$7 million to Philadelphia stipulated] “I enjoin and require that no ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatsoever,

shall ever hold or exercise any station or duty whatever in the said college [to be built with the money]; nor shall any such person ever be admitted for any purpose, or as a visitor, within the premises...My desire is, that all the instructors and teachers in the college shall take pains to instill into the minds of the scholars the purest principles of morality.”

[PLAINTIFF COMPLAINT, by the heirs, attempting to void the will] “The plan of education proposed is anti-christian, and therefore repugnant to the law.”

[CITY ATTORNEY RESPONSE] “[The plaintiffs should have] Joined with us in asking the state to cut off the obnoxious clause [prohibiting teaching religion].”

[CITY ATTORNEY, AGAINST THE “OBNOXIOUS CLAUSE”] “Bother in the Old and New Testaments [religious instruction’s] importance is recognized. In the Old it is said, ‘Thou shalt diligently teach them to they children,’ and in the New, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not...’ No fault can be found with Girard for wishing a marble college to bear his name for ever, but it is not valuable unless it has a fragrance of Christianity about it.”

[UNANIMOUS COURT DECISION, BY JUSTICE JOSEPH STORY] “Christianity...is not to be maliciously and openly reviled and blasphemed against, to the annoyance of believers or the injury of the public...It is unnecessary for us, however, to consider the establishment of a school or college, for the propagation of...Deism, or any other form of infidelity. Such a case in not to be presumed to exist in a Christian country...

...Why may not laymen instruct in the general principles of Christianity as well as ecclesiastics...And we cannot overlook the blessings, which such [lay]ment by their conduct, as well as their instructions, may, nay must impart to their youthful pupils. Why may not the Bible and especially the New Testament, without note or comment, be read and taught as a divine revelation in the [school] -- its general precepts expounded, its evidences explained and its glorious principles of morality inculcated?...Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly or so perfectly as from the New Testament?” (Vidal v. Girard’s Executors; 43 US 126-206 (1844); cited by David Barton, cited in *The Myth of Separation*, p.61-63, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7, Q9,**

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, 1846: [Jewish defendant sold goods on Sunday against city ordinance, argued it an infringement on his religious rights]

[PROSECUTION STATEMENT] “Christianity is a part of the common law of the land, with liberty of conscience to all. It has always been so recognized...If Christianity is a part of the common law, its disturbance is punishable at common law. The US Constitution allows it as a part of the common law. The President is allowed ten days [to sign a bill], with the exception of Sunday. The Legislature does not sit, public offices are closed, and the Government recognized the day in all things...The observance of Sunday is one of the usages of the common law, recognized by our US and State Governments...The Sabbath is still to be supported; Christianity is part and parcel of the common law...Christianity has reference to the principles of right and wrong...it is the foundation of those morals and manners upon which our society is formed; it is their basis. Remove this and they would fall...[Morality] has grown upon the basis of Christianity.”

[DECISION, concerning defense’s contention all religions are to be treated equally under the Constitution] “The Lord’s day, the day of the Resurrection, is to us, who are called Christians, the day of rest after finishing a new creation. It is the day of the first visible triumph over death, hell and the grave? It was the birth day of the believer in Christ, to whom and through whom it opened up the way which, by repentance and faith, leads unto everlasting life and eternal happiness! On that day we rest, and to us it is the Sabbath of the Lord -- its decent observance, in a Christian community, is that which ought to be expected...

What gave to us this noble safeguard of religious toleration...? It was Christianity...But this toleration, thus granted, is a religious toleration; it is the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, with two provisos, one of which, that which guards against acts of licentiousness, testifies to the Christian construction, which this section should receive! What are acts “of licentiousness” within the meaning of this section? Must they not be such public acts, as are calculated to shock the moral sense of the community where they take place? The orgies of Bacchus, among the ancients, were not offensive! At a later day, the Carnivals of Venice went off without note or observation. Such could not be allowed now! Why? Public opinion, based on Christian morality, would not suffer it!

What constitutes the standard of good morals? Is it not Christianity? There certainly is none other. Say that cannot be appealed to, and I don't know what would be good morals. The day of moral virtue in which we live would, in an instant, if that standard were abolished, lapse into the dark and murky night of Pagan immorality.

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

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

[DECISION, concerning defense's contention of violation of free exercise of religion] "It is said [that a Sunday law] violates the free exercise and enjoyment of the religious profession and worship of the Israelite. Why? It does not require him to desecrate his own Sabbath. It does not say, 'you must worship God on the Christian Sabbath.' On the contrary, it leaves him free on all these matters. His evening sacrifice and his morning worship, constituting the 7th day, he publicly and freely offers up, and there is none to make him afraid. His Sundays are spent as he pleases, so far as religion is concerned.

It is however fancied that in some way this law is in derogation of the Hebrew's religion, inasmuch as by his faith and this statute, he is compelled to keep two Sabbaths. There is the mistake. He has his own, free and undiminished! Sunday is to us our day of rest. We say to him, simply, respect us, by ceasing on this day from the pursuit of that trade and business in which you, by the security and protection given to you by our [Christian] laws, make great gain...

There is therefore no violation of the Hebrew's religion, in requiring him to cease from labor on another day than his Sabbath, if he be left free to observe the latter according to his religion." (*City of Charleston v. S.A. Benjamin*; 2 Strob. 508-529 (1846); cited by David Barton, cited in *The Myth of Separation*, p.73-75, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q6, Q7, Q10**

US SENATE, 1853: [Petitioners sought to dismiss military and congressional chaplains. The courts and House had already rejected them] "The [First Amendment] clause speaks of 'an establishment of religion.' What is meant by that expression? It referred, without doubt, to that establishment which existed in the mother-country, and its meaning is to be ascertained by ascertaining what that establishment was. It was the connection, with the state, of a particular religious society [denomination]...

We are a Christian people...not because the law demands it, not to gain exclusive benefits or to avoid legal disabilities, but from choice and education; and in a land thus universally Christian, what is to be expected, what desired, but that we shall pay a due regard to Christianity?

The whole view of the petitioners seems founded upon mistaken conceptions of the meaning of the Constitution...They [Founding Fathers] intended, by this amendment, to prohibit "an establishment of religion" such as the English Church presented, or any thing like it. But they had no fear or jealousy of religion itself, nor did they wish to see us an irreligious people...They did not intend to spread over all the public authorities and the whole public action of the nation the dead and revolting spectacle of atheistic apathy. Not so had the battles of the Revolution been fought and the deliberations of the Revolutionary Congress been conducted." (BF Morris, *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*; Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1864, p 324, 326, 327; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.133, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7**

US SENATE, 1853: [re: Constitution Article 1, Section 7, Paragraph 2] "In the law, Sunday is a "dies non;" ...The executive departments, the public establishments, are all closed on Sundays; on that day neither House of Congress sits...Here is a recognition by law, and by universal usage, not only of a Sabbath, but of the Christian Sabbath, in exclusion of the Jewish or Mohammedan Sabbath...The recognition of the Christian Sabbath [by the Constitution] is complete and perfect."

(BF Morris, *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*, Philadelphia: GW Childs, 1864, p.65-68; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.111, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q6, Q7, Q9,**

US HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1854: [Petitioners sought to dismiss military and congressional chaplains. The courts and House had already rejected them] “At the adoption of the Constitution, we believe every State -- certainly ten of the thirteen -- provided as regularly for the support of the Church as for the support of the Government...Had the people, during the Revolution, had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that Revolution would have been strangled in its cradle. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged, but not any one sect...It [Christianity] ...must be considered as the foundation on which the whole structure rests. Laws will not have permanence or power without the sanction of religious sentiment, --without a firm belief that there is a Power above us that will reward our virtues and punish our vices. In this age, there is no substitute for Christianity: that, in its general principles, is the great conservative element on which we must rely for the purity and permanence of free institutions. That was the religion of the founders of the republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of their descendants. There is a great and very prevalent error on this subject in the opinion that those who organized this Government did not legislate on religion.” (BF Morris, *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*; Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1864, p 317-323; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.133, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2**

US HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1854: “The great vital and conservative element in our system is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ.” (BF Morris, *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*; Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1864, p 328; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.133, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2**

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, 1863 GETTYSBURG ADDRESS: “...that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.”

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: “Do not gentlemen here remember the case of that same Supreme Court...deciding that a national bank was constitutional? ...[see *McCulloch v. Maryland*; 4 *Wheaton* 316 (1819); *Osborn v. United States Bank*; 9 *Wheaton* 738 (1824)] ...[Andrew Jackson] denied the constitutionality of the bank that the Supreme Court had decided was constitutional...[saying] that the Supreme Court had no right to lay down a rule to govern a coordinate branch of the Government, the members of which had sworn to support the Constitution -- that each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it.” (JG Holland, *The Life of Abraham Lincoln*, Springfield, MA: Gurdon Bill, 1866, p.175; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.242, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: “I do not forget the position assumed by some that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court...At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made...the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having...resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.” (Albert Beveridge, *The Life of John Marshall*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1919, Vol. 6, p.9; cited by David Barton, *Myth of Separation*, p.242, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

DAVID BARTON: "Recall that in the Dred Scott decision of 1857, the Supreme Court had declared that Congress could not prohibit slavery and that slaves were only property, not persons eligible to receive any rights of a citizen. President Lincoln disregarded that decision and declared freedom for the slaves in the Emancipation Proclamation; Congress, too, rejected the Court's ruling when it PROHIBITED the extension of slavery into the free territories on June 9, 1862. Had Lincoln allowed the Court's ruling to be binding upon the executive branch -- had he not been guided by his own understanding of the Constitution -- he could not have declared freedom for slaves. A foreign observer of this nation today likely would conclude that the President and Congress had taken oaths not to uphold the Constitution, but to uphold the COURT'S OPINION of the Constitution." (The Debates and Proceedings of the Second Session of the Thirty-Seventh Congress, John Rives, ed., Washington, DC: Congressional Globe Office, 1862, Vol. 3, p.2618, June 9, 1962; referenced in Myth of Separation, p.242, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2,**

B.F. MORRIS, HISTORIAN, 1864: "This is a Christian nation, first in name, and secondly because of the many and mighty elements of a pure Christianity which have given it character and shaped its destiny from the beginning. It is pre-eminently the land of the Bible, of the Christian Church, and of the Christian Sabbath...The chief security and glory of the United States of America has been, is now, and will be forever, the prevalence and domination of the Christian Faith." (BF Morris, *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*; Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1864, p 11; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.136, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q10**

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, 1867: "The American government and Constitution is the most precious possession which the world holds, or which the future can inherit. This is true -- true because the American system is the political expression of Christian ideas." (Steve McDowell & Mark Beliles, *The Spirit of the Constitution*, Charlottesville, VA: Providence Press, 1989; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.136, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q10**

NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION, 1875: Article I, Section 4: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the legislature to pass suitable laws...to encourage schools and the means of instruction." (cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.39, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4,**

'RELIGION' & THE SUPREME COURT, 1878: "Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they [govt. actions] cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice. . .So here, as a law. . .of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself. Government could exist only in name under such circumstances." (Reynolds v. United States, 98 US 145, 166-67 (1878); as quoted in "The Second American Revolution," pg. 102-3, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

(NOTE: The Court in "Reynolds" presupposed that the US, and its legal structure, was Christian in character, hence could not tolerate polygamy. It was 'other' religions reduced to mere opinionating on unacceptable practices. But, see 'Religion and the US Courts, 1943.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4**

US SUPREME COURT, 1885: "Certainly no legislation can be supposed more wholesome and necessary in the founding of a free, self-governing commonwealth...than that which seeks to establish it on the basis of the idea of the family, as consisting in and springing from the union for life of one man and one woman in the holy estate of matrimony; [the family is] the sure foundation

of all that is stable and noble in our civilization; the best guarantee of that reverent morality which is the source of all beneficent progress in social and political improvement.” (Murphy v. Ramsey; 144 US 15, 45 (1885); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.71, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q7,**

ALFRED HOLT COLQUITT (1824-1894) , U.S. Senator, Georgia Governor, December 7, 1887: “I believe it is the mission of the ministers today, and of Christian laymen in this land, to go out into the fields and highways and meet the enemies that are seeking to place barriers in the way of Christian civilization--to meet the foe as he comes. Religion and politics ought to be wedded like a loving pair. The spirit of our Master, who preached peace, should preside at our diplomatic councils. The love of our neighbor and of our friends--these should be the bases, not only of our Christianity and our patriotism, but of our daily politics. I like to hear learned sermons and magnificent discourses--appeals purely to the intellect--abstract and abstruse ideas, and all that. But looking at the masses of mankind, and reviewing from the standpoint which I occupy, it is clear to me that there is a mission given to every lover of Christ to stand forth as the propagator of that religion which tempers the politics and statesmanship of this country.” (Stephen Abbot Northrop, D.D., *A Cloud of Witnesses* (Portland, Oregon: American Heritage Ministries, 1987), p. 93; cited by *America’s God and Country Encyclopedia of Quotations* by William J. Federer (Coppell, TX: FAME Publishing Co. 1994), p. 112

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1889: [Indictment was against a Mormon for bigamy and polygamy. Defense argued violation of the 1st amendment, freedom of religion; 14th Amendment, state interference with rights of citizens].

[DECISION, ‘FREEDOM OF RELIGION,’ by Justice Stephen Field]: “Bigamy and polygamy are crimes by the laws of all civilized and Christian countries. They are crimes by the laws of the United States, and they are crimes by the laws of Idaho. They tend to destroy the purity of the marriage relation, to disturb the peace of families, to degrade woman and to debase man...To extend exemption from punishment for such crimes would be to shock the moral judgment of the community. To call their advocacy a tenet of religion is to offend the common sense of mankind.

There have been sects which denied as a part of their religious tenets that there should be any marriage tie, and advocated promiscuous intercourse of the sexes as prompted by the passions of its members...Should a sect of either of these kinds ever find its way into this country, swift punishment would follow the carrying into effect of its doctrines, and no heed would be given to the pretence that...their supporters could be protected in their exercise by the constitution of the United States. Probably never before in the history of this country has it been seriously contended that the whole punitive power of the government for acts, recognized by the general consent of the Christian world...must be suspended in order that the tenets of a religious sect...may be carried out without hindrance.

The constitutions of several States, in providing for religious freedom, have declared expressly that such freedom shall not be construed to excuse acts of licentiousness...The constitution of New York in 1777 provided: ‘The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever hereafter be allowed, within this State, to all mankind: Provided, That the liberty of conscience, hereby granted, shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness...The constitutions of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada and South Carolina contain a similar declaration.

[Should a group advocate sexual promiscuity]...Swift punishment would follow the carrying into effect of its doctrines, and no heed would be given to the pretence that...their supporters could be protected in their exercise by the Constitution of the United States.” (Davis v. Beason; 133 US 333, 341-343, 348 (1890); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.39, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q7,**

‘RELIGION’ & THE SUPREME COURT, 1890: “The term ‘religion’ has reference to one’s view of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose for reverence for his being and

character, and of obedience to his will. It is often confused with the cultus or form of worship of a particular sect, but it is distinguishable from the latter. . .It was never intended or supposed that the [first] amendment could be invoked as a protection against the legislation for the punishment of acts inimicable to the peace, good order and morals of society. . .However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the criminal laws of the country passed with reference to actions regarded by general consent as properly the subjects of punitive legislation. . .Probably never in the history of this country has it been seriously contended that the whole punitive power of the government for acts, recognized by the general consent of the Christian world in modern times as proper matters for prohibitory legislation, must be suspended in order that the tenets of a religious sect encouraging crime may be carried out without hindrance.” (Davis v. Beason, 133 US 33, 341-42 (1890); as quoted in “The Second American Revolution,” pg. 221-3, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

NOTE: The Court equated ‘religion’ with Christianity, and based on Christian standard ruled for absolute monogamy.

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1892: “Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. In this sense and to this extent, our civilizations and our institutions are emphatically Christian.” (Church of the Holy Trinity v. US; 143 US 457 (1892); cited by David Barton, America’s Godly Heritage, p.10-11, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

David Barton on the preceding quote: “...At the end of 87 precedents the court explained that it could continue to cite many additional precedents, but that certainly 87 was sufficient to conclude that our laws and our institutions must be based on and must include the teachings of Christ.” (David Barton, America’s Godly Heritage, p.10-11, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1892: “No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state or national, because this is a religious people...This is a Christian nation.” (Church of the Holy Trinity v. US; 143 US 457 (1892); cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.48, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q1, Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1892: “This is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation. The commission to Christopher Columbus[recited] that ‘it is hoped that by God’s assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered...’ The first colonial grant made to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584...and the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony provided that ‘they be not against the true Christian faith...’ The first charter of Virginia, granted by King James I in 1606...commenced the grant in these words: ‘...in propagating of Christian Religion to such People as yet live in Darkness...’

Language of similar import may be found in the subsequent charters of that colony...in 1609 and 1611; and the same is true of the various charters granted to the other colonies. In language more or less emphatic is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant. The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the Mayflower, 1620, recites: ‘Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith...a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia...’

The fundamental orders of Connecticut, under which a provisional government was instituted in 1638-39, commence with this declaration: ‘...And well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union...there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God...to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess...of the said gospel [which] is now practiced amongst us.’

In the charter of privileges granted by William Penn to the province of Pennsylvania, in 1701, it is recited: ‘...no people can be truly happy, though under the greatest enjoyment of civil liberties, if abridged of...their religious profession and worship...’

Coming nearer to the present time, the Declaration of Independence recognizes the presence of the Divine in human affairs in these words: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights...’; ‘appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions...’; ‘And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.’ (Church of the Holy Trinity v. US; 143 US 457 (1892); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.48-49, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1892: “There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private person: they are organic [*fundamental*] utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people. While because of a general recognition of this truth the question has seldom been presented to the courts, yet we find that in *Updegraph v. The Commonwealth* [Pennsylvania Supreme Court, 1826], it was decided that, ‘Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law...not Christianity with an established church...but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men.’ And in *The People v. Ruggles* [NY Supreme Court, 1811], Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said: ‘The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice...We are a Christian people and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those other imposters [other religions].’ And in the famous case of *Vidal v. Girard’s Executors* [US Supreme Court, 1844], this Court...observed: ‘It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law...’ These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation.” (Church of the Holy Trinity v. US; 143 US 457 (1892); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.50, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4, Q7,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1892, 1931, 1952: “In 1892 the United States Supreme Court made an exhaustive study of the supposed connection between Christianity and the government of the United States. After reviewing hundreds of volumes of historical documents, the Court asserted, ‘These references...add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a religious people...a Christian nation.’ Likewise, in 1931 Supreme Court Justice George Sutherland reviewed the 1892 decision in reference to another case and reiterated that Americans are a ‘Christian people.’ And in 1952 Justice William O. Douglas affirmed that ‘we are a religious people and our institutions presuppose a Supreme Being.’” (John W. Whitehead, *The Separation Illusion*, p. 18).

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

ROSCOE POUND, Harvard Law School Dean: “We have...the same task in jurisprudence that has been achieved in philosophy, in the natural sciences and in politics. We have to rid ourselves of this sort of legality and to attain a pragmatic [evolutionary], a sociological legal science.” (Cited in *The WallBuilder Report*, Fall, 1994, Aledo, TX 76008, p.2)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, JR, 1902: “The justification of a law for us cannot be found in the fact that our fathers always have followed it. It must be found in some help which the law brings toward reaching a social end.” (Cited in *The WallBuilder Report*, Fall, 1994, Aledo, TX 76008, p.2-3)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, JR, 1902: “The felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, ...even the prejudices which judges share with their fellow-men, have had a good deal more to do than the syllogism in determining the rules

by which men should be governed.” (Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., *The Common Law*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1963, p.5; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.204, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE LOUIS BRANDEIS, 1916: “If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold.” (Cited in *The WallBuilder Report*, Fall, 1994, Aledo, TX 76008, p.2-3)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, 1930-41: “We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is.” (*The Autobiographical Notes of Charles Evans Hughes*, p.143, Danelski and Tulchin, 1907, as quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q4, Q9,**

‘RELIGION’ & THE SUPREME COURT, 1931: “The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation. . .One cannot speak of religious liberty, with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God.” (US v. Macintosh, 283 US 605, 633-34 (1931), overruled, *Girouard v. US*, 328 US 61 (1946); as quoted in “*The Second American Revolution*,” pg. 104, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q2, Q4**

‘RELIGION’ & THE SUPREME COURT, 1931: “We are a Christian people...according to one another the equal right of religious freedom, and acknowledging with reverence the duty of obedience to the will of God.” (US v. Macintosh, 283 US 605, 625)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE BENJAMIN CARDOZO, 1932: “I take judge-made law as one of the existing realities of life.” (Cited in *The WallBuilder Report*, Fall, 1994, Aledo, TX 76008, p.2-3)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE BENJAMIN CARDOZO, 1932: “If there is any [natural, unchangeable, divine] law which is back of the sovereignty of the state, and superior thereto, it is not law in such a sense as to concern the judge or lawyer, however much it concerns the statesman or moralist.” (Benjamin Cardozo, *The Growth of the Law*, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1924, p.49; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.204, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

‘RELIGION’ & THE U.S. COURTS, 1943: [A Mr. Kauten sought exemption from the military as a conscientious objector, although he admitted it was not based on a belief in Deity]. “Religious belief arises from a sense of the inadequacy of reason as a means of relating the individual to his fellow men and to his universe - a sense common to men in the most primitive and the most highly civilized societies. . .It is a belief finding expression in a conscience which categorically requires the believer to disregard elementary self-interest and to accept martyrdom in preference to transgressing its tenets. . .[Conscientious objection] may justly be regarded as a response of the individual to an inward mentor, call it conscience or God, that is for many persons at the present time the equivalent of what has always been thought a religious impulse.” (US v. Kauten, 133 F. 2d 703, 708 (2d Cir. 1943); as quoted in “*The Second American Revolution*,” pg. 105, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

NOTE: Thus US law abandoned God for the humanistic centrality of man. This was soon to be enhanced by US v. Ballard, 1944, in which the Supreme Court said the truth of a person’s beliefs could not be considered without running afoul of the First Amendment. . .exactly the opposite of what it said in 1878.

**INDEX KEY: Q6,**

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE UNKNOWN, 1947: "The Establishment Clause [of the First Amendment] was not incorporated in the Fourteenth Amendment until *Everson v. Board of Education* was decided in 1947...The meaning of the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause [has been] made applicable to the States for only a few decades at best." (*Walz v. Tax Commission*; 397 US 664, 702, 703 (1970), cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 14, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER, 1948: "[Deciding cases involves a] judgment that reflects deep, even if inarticulate, feelings of our society. Judges must divine that feeling as best they can." {Decisions not based on law and precedent, but on the opinions of the majority!} (*Haley v. Ohio*, 332 US 596, 603 (1948); cited in *The Second American Revolution*, pg. 210, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER, 1949: "Our right to pass on the validity of legislation is now too much part of our constitutional system to be brought into question." (*American Federation of Labor v. American Sash & Door Co*, 335 us 538, 556-557, 1949; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.237, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER: "It is they [Supreme Court Justices] who speak and not the Constitution." ("Roosevelt and Frankfurter," p.383, Max Freedman, 1958; as quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q10, Q11**

US SUPREME COURT, 1952: "The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State...Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other -- hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly..."

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being...When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe...We find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts widen the effective scope of religious influence. (*Zorach v. Clauson*; 343 US 306, 312-314 (1952); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.77, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q10**

US SUPREME COURT, 1952: [Deciding 'separation of church and state' did not mean religion could not be taught to students during school hours] "Unless separation of Church and State means that public institutions can make no adjustments of their schedules to accommodate the religious needs of the people. We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion." (*Zorach v. Clauson*; 343 US 306, 315 (1952); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.77, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11, Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE EARL WARREN, 1958: "The Constitution must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society." (*Trop v. Dulles*, cited in *The WallBuilder Report*, Fall, 1994, Aledo, TX 76008, p.2-3)

**INDEX KEY: Q6,**

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE UNKNOWN, 1962: "The significance of the decision regarding this [school] prayer was enormous, for the whole thorny problem of religion in public

education was inevitably raised.” Lawrence A. Cremin, 1963 World Book Encyclopedia Yearbook, p. 38; cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 14, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY: Q6,**

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE UNKNOWN, 1962: “It was, for example, not until 1962 that...prayers were held to violate the Establishment Clause.” (*Walz v. Tax Commission*; 397 US 664, 702 (1970), cited in *The Myth of Separation* by David Barton, pg. 14, 1992, Wallbuilder Press, Aledo, TX)

**INDEX KEY:**

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE HUGO BLACK, 1962: “Indeed, as late as the time of the Revolutionary War, there were established churches in at least eight of the thirteen former colonies and established religions in at least four of the other five.” (*Engel v Vitale*, 370 US 421, 427-428 (1962); as quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, pg. 96, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.) (Massachusetts paid the salaries of the Congregational ministers in that state until 1833.)

**INDEX KEY: Q7, Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1963: “The [First] Amendment’s purpose was not to strike merely at the official establishment of a single sect...It was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority.” *Abington v. Schempp*; 374 US 203, 217 (1963); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.150, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

‘RELIGION’ & THE SUPREME COURT, 1965: “In *US v. Seeger*, the Court expanded the definition of an already liberalized ‘religion’ and ‘conscience.’ A case of conscientious objector status, the Court favorably accepted from modernist theologian Paul Tillich the definition of essential religion as an “ultimate concern.” In his book “*The Shaking of the Foundations*,” Tillich wrote, “The name of this infinite inexhaustible depth and ground of all being is God. That depth is what the word God means. And if that word has not much meaning for you, translate it, and speak of the depth of your life, of the source of your being, of your ultimate concern, of what you take seriously without any reservation. Perhaps, in order to do so, you must forget everything traditional that you have learned about God, perhaps even that word itself.” (Paul Tillich, *The Shaking of the Foundations*, NY: Charles Scribner, 1972, p.63-64; cited by “*The Second American Revolution*,” pg. 106, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

NOTE: This definition of “ultimate concern” in one’s life would include atheism and agnosticism as religion. In other words, belief or disbelief in the Christian view of God is no longer relevant in defining religion under the First Amendment.

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

RE: US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE EARL WARREN, 1966: “Law professor Fred Rodell of Yale lauded Warren in a 1966 article in *The New York Times Magazine* for being a Supreme Court justice who “brush[ed] off pedantic impediments to the results he felt were right.” He was not a “look-it-up-in-the-library” intellectual, and was “almost unique” in his “off-hand dismissal of legal and historical research from both sides and in [his] pragmatic dependence on the present day results. . .” In fact, Rodell concludes, “Warren was quite unworried that legislative history, dug from a library, might not support his reading.” This was the judicial mentality that viewed, analyzed, and “interpreted” the religion clauses of the First Amendment.”(Fred Rodell, “It is the Warren Court,” *The New York Times Magazine*, 13 March 1966, as quoted by Leonard Levy, “The Supreme Court Under Earl Warren,” pp.137-139, 142; as quoted in “*The Second American Revolution*,” pg. 102, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co.)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE BLACKMUN, 1973: “Maternity, or additional offspring, may force upon the woman a distressful life and future. Psychological harm may be imminent. Mental and physical health may be taxed by child care. There is also the distress, for all concerned, associated

with the unwanted child, and there is the problem of bringing a child into a family already unable, psychologically and otherwise, to care for it. In other cases, as in this one, the additional difficulties and continuing stigma of unwed motherhood may be involved. All these are factors the woman and her responsible physician necessarily will consider in consultation.” (Roe v. Wade, 410 US at 153; as quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, pp. 128-29, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

RE: US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE BLACKMUN: “Justice Blackmun ...made it abundantly clear that if any religion was to be a guide to him it would be paganism. He alluded to the practice of the Persians, the Greeks, and of the Romans, but he ignored Christianity. The Hippocratic Oath, which has been taken by physicians for the past 2,000 years, specifically prohibits abortion and the suggestion of it. Justice Blackmun laid this aside as having no relevance today.” (US Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, “Right to Live,” p.38; s quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, pp. 126, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

RE: US SUPREME COURT JUSTICE BLACKMUN, 1973: “The clerks in most chambers were surprised to see the [Supreme Court] Justices, particularly Blackmun, so openly brokering their decision like a group of legislators. There was a certain reasonableness to the draft [opinion], some of them thought. But it derived more from medical and social policy than from constitutional law. There was something embarrassing and dishonest about this whole process. It left the Court claiming that the Constitution drew certain lines at trimesters and viability. The Court was going to make medical policy and force it on the states. As a practical matter, it was not a bad solution. As a constitutional matter, it was absurd. The draft was referred to by some clerks as Harry’s abortion.” (Bob Woodward & Scott Armstrong, “The Brethren,” p.233, as quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, pp. 67, JW Whitehead, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US SUPREME COURT, 1977: “Atheism may be a religion under the establishment clause.” (Malnak v. Yogi, 440 F.Supp. 1285, 1287 (DCNJ 1977); cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.182, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

HARVARD LAW PROFESSOR ARCHIBALD COX: “Like a set of hospital rules and regulations, whose validity is good enough this week but will be destroyed with new statistics upon the medical risks of childbirth and abortion or new advances in providing for the separate existence of a foetus...Constitutional rights ought not be created...unless they can be stated in principles sufficiently absolute to give them roots throughout the community and continuity over significant periods of time, and to lift them above the level of the pragmatic political judgments of a particular time and place.” (“The Role of the Supreme Court in American Govt.,” pp.113-14; as quoted in *The Second American Revolution*, pp. 126, 1982, David C. Cook Publishing Co)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

DAVID BARTON: “...if Congress were to pass a law prohibiting youth below the age of 18 from praying, it immediately would be declared unconstitutional in any court. If a legislature should make it illegal for an adolescent to read the Bible, it would also be declared unconstitutional. These types of laws would never be tolerated.

However, the Court now prohibits the very acts impossible to prohibit by law. Laws and legislators cannot ban voluntary Bible reading by youth; the Court can. Laws and legislators cannot prohibit adolescents from seeing and reading the Ten Commandments; the Court can. Laws and legislators cannot prohibit the free exercise of Christianity; however, the Court can. A Congress, constitutionally elected by the people and responsible to them -- the heart and soul of a democratic-republic -- cannot do these things; the Court, in an insult to our Constitutional form of government, HAS done it. The Court routinely enacts ‘legislation’ that would be unconstitutional for the people’s representatives even to consider!” (*The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.184-185, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

LAWRENCE MACDONALD: “If a judge can interpret the Constitution or laws to mean something obviously not intended by the original makers...then the nation’s Constitution and laws are meaningless.” (Lawrence Patton MacDonald, *We Hold These Truths*, Seal Beach, CA: ‘76 Press, 1976, p.32; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.205, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

DAVID BARTON: “The question still remains: how could such an absurd decision occur -- a decision which declared voluntary prayer unconstitutional? Perhaps the answer rests in the fact that of the 1962-63 Supreme Court Justices, eight of the nine had arrived on the Court with an extended history of POLITICAL and NOT judicial experience.

For example, Chief Justice Earl Warren had been the Governor of California for ten years prior to his appointment to the Court; Justice Hugo Black had been a US Senator for ten years preceding his appointment; Justice Felix Frankfurter had been an assistant to the Secretary of Labor and a founding member of the ACLU; Justice Arthur Goldberg had been the Secretary of Labor and Ambassador to the United Nations; Justice William Douglas was chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission prior to his appointment; all the Justices except Potter Stewart had similar POLITICAL backgrounds.

Justice Potter Stewart, having been a FEDERAL judge for four years prior to his appointment, was the ONLY member of the Court with extended Constitutional experience BEFORE his appointment. Interestingly, Justice Potter Stewart was also the only Justice who objected to the removal of prayer on the basis of precedent. He alone acted as a judge; the rest acted as politicians.” (The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.148, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

DAVID BARTON: “An examination of [US Supreme] Court decisions relating to matters of religion and government since the ratification of the Constitution and the First Amendment identifies three discernible eras. The first and third eras are very distinct and easily identifiable; the second is less distinct and serves as a transition between the other two. The first era can be described as pro-Christian, the middle era as Christian-tolerant, and the last era as anti-Christian.” [Barton shows statistics in this chapter that the Court seldom uses precedent cases from before 1947, which always demonstrate the earlier union of Christianity and government] (The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.165, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q11**

DAVID BARTON: “In the pro-Christian years [1776-1931], the [US Supreme] Court, relying heavily on the intent of laws, would methodically search historical records and frequently quote from a wide representation of Founders. In both the neutral [1931-1952]and anti-Christian [1952-today] years, the only Founders quoted to show “intent” are James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, which is amazing when considering that Jefferson neither attended the Constitutional Convention nor participated in its framing or ratification. As noted earlier, had the enlightenment ideas in which Jefferson was tutored in France become part of our Constitution, we might have had the same results as France: seven different forms of government during the same period that we have had only one.

Since earlier history books identified nearly 250 Founders (56 who signed the Declaration, 55 who framed the Constitution, 90 in the first Congress which formed the First Amendment and the Bill of Rights, etc), it is quite a significant commentary on the historical shallowness of the contemporary Court’s arguments that it cites only two Founding Fathers. Why not quote from other Founders to sustain what the Court calls its “universally recognized” policy [of ‘separation of church and state’]? Because most of the Founding Fathers never made a statement which could even be misconstrued into the policy which the Court upholds today!” (The Myth of Separation, p.166, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q5, Q11**

DAVID BARTON: “The fourth maneuver effectively employed by the [US Supreme] Court is that of omission. Not only does the Court regularly omit cases prior to 1947 from its discussions,

equally absent are quotes from George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, John Jay, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, John Hancock, Roger Sherman, or other prominent Founders. The Court's omission of these Founders implies that either they were not qualified to address First Amendment issues or that there exist no recorded statements from these Founders pertinent to the separation question. Since numerous writings of these Founders do exist on the relationship of religion to government and schools, one must conclude that the Court is unwilling to accept their testimony -- even that of George Washington, the President of the Constitutional Convention and the President under whom the First Amendment was framed and ratified!" (The Myth of Separation, p.174-175, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11,**

US COURT, 1985: "Secular humanism may be a religion for purposes of First Amendment." (Grove v. Mead School District, 753 f.2d 1528, 1534 (9th Cir. 1985), cert denied, 474 US 826 (1985); cited in The Myth of Separation, David Barton, p.182, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

LINO GRAGLIA, 1985: "Judicial usurpation of legislative power has become so common and so complete that the Supreme Court has become our most powerful...instrument of government in terms of determining the nature and quality of American life. Questions literally of life and death (abortion and capital punishment), of public morality (control of pornography, prayer in the schools, and government aid to religious schools), and of public safety (criminal procedure and street demonstrations), are all, now, in the hands of judges in the guise of questions of constitutional law. The fact that the Constitution says nothing of, say, abortion, and indeed, explicitly and repeatedly recognizes the capital punishment the Court has come close to prohibiting, has made no difference. The result is that the central truth of constitutional law today is that it has nothing to do with the Constitution. Constitutional law has become a fraud, a cover for a system of government by the majority vote of a nine-person committee of lawyers, unelected and holding office for life." (Lino Graglia, Judicial Review on the Basis of 'Regime Principles': A Prescription for Government by Judges, South Texas Law Journal, Vol.26, No.3, Fall 1985, pp.435-452, at 441; cited by David Barton, Myth of Separation, p.234, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

DORNAN & VEDLIK, 1986: "The spectacle of even ONE unelected judge...successfully thwarting the will of a majority of the duly elected representatives of an entire nation, representatives who have sworn to uphold the Constitution, reveals the very essence of judicial supremacy...It is government by judiciary in place of government of, by, and for the people." (Robert Dornan & Casaba Vedlik, Judicial Supremacy: The Supreme Court on Trial, MA: Plymouth Rock Foundation, 1986, pp.1-2; cited by David Barton, Myth of Separation, p.233, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

DORNAN & VEDLIK, 1986: "The problem is that ...where the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution is considered final and binding upon all other authorities, the philosophical predilections of the Justices become, in effect, part of the Constitution. This allows the Supreme Court to act as somewhat of a continuous constitutional convention, continually amending the written document by interpretation, so that the Constitution means whatever five members of the Supreme Court decide it should mean." (Robert Dornan & Casaba Vedlik, Judicial Supremacy: The Supreme Court on Trial, MA: Plymouth Rock Foundation, 1986, p.3; cited by David Barton, Myth of Separation, p.236, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

**INDEX KEY: Q11**

JUDGE ROBERT BORK, 1988: [Nominated for the Supreme Court by Pres. Reagan, Bork's confirmation was rejected by a liberal-dominated Congress] "When the ultra-liberals lose elections, they fight all the more desperately for control of our third branch, the courts. Why? Because the courts control the Constitution and the Constitution is the 'trump card' in politics. That's why this war is crucial. Now, there are only two sides really in the struggle. Either the Constitution controls

the judges, or the judges rewrite the Constitution.” (From an address, April 23, 1988; cited in *The Myth of Separation*, David Barton, p.236, Wallbuilders: Aledo, TX 76005)

DOWNLOADED FROM:

***Family Guardian Website***

<http://famguardian.org/>

Download our free book:

[\*The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don't Owe Income Tax\*](#)