Volume I: Issue 2

The BEACON OF LIBERTY

A Structured Curriculum of Constitutional Study

Clause Discussed:
• **Preamble**

Concept Discussed:
• **Ordain**

Ordain

The **Preamble** of the Constitution announces:

> "We the People of the United States…do *ordain* and *establish* this Constitution."

Establish means to firmly set up in permanent fashion. The verb *ordain* is derived from ecclesiastical origins (as in *ordained* minister) and means to proclaim approval and to order something be done.

Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution vests judicial power not only in the supreme Court, but also;

> "in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time *ordain* and establish" (according to Congress' enumerated power in Art. I:8:9).

The inclusion of the word *ordain* in the Preamble shows evidence of religious roots for the Constitution.

If the Framers had no desire to intone the Constitution with religious sentiment, they could have easily replaced *ordain* with another word without religious connotation in both the Preamble and in Article III.

It is fitting to review Thomas Jefferson's letter to the Danbury Baptist association (of Danbury, Connecticut), not only due to its pertinent subject matter, but in that this newsletter issue is being finalized on the 200th Anniversary of that letter.

It is in this letter of January 1, 1802 that Jefferson writes of "a wall of separation between Church and State". This wording (made popular by reference in court cases in 1878 and 1947) is used today as a catchphrase by various people who mandate that all reference to God be excised from all government-related activities.

Regarding constitutional matters, one must normally first consult the Constitution. Regarding principles and purposes of our government, the Declaration of Independence, as America's founding document, must be consulted. Laws made in pursuance of the Constitution are also given their due consideration. Conclusions given in a political letter would not normally add much to such a discussion, but given the stature of the author of the Danbury letter, should here at least be considered.

The **Declaration of Independence**, also written by Jefferson, pronounces:

> "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, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

The Republic which is the United States stands upon the cornerstone that men are *created* by their *Creator*. The fundamental organic document of our country declares this as a *self-evident truth* — a truth that is so basic that it doesn't need any support or attempt to justify it.

Furthermore, the Creator *endows* man with *unalienable Rights*. Unalienable (or *in*alienable) means, literally, "not foreign" (i.e., *inherent* or *inseparable*) to oneself. The fundamental organic document of our country declares that God (literally; *Nature's* God) bestows and bequeaths man with man's fundamental rights.

The next paragraph in the **Declaration** asserts:

> "That to Secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the consent of the governed."

This sentence specifies that the singular purpose and primary reason for the existence of government is to *secure our inalienable rights*. It is not to grant us rights, nor to make condition upon or subvert our rights.

Distributed by: Foundation For Liberty.org
1500 Highway 2
Leavenworth, WA 98826

www.FoundationForLiberty.org
Copyright 2002, 2005 by Beacon of Liberty, LLC.
www.BeaconofLiberty.org

The Declaration outlines the hierarchy of power to be strictly followed by governments later organizing under it. The Constitution therefore rests on this social structure: of God creating man; of God endowing man with inalienable rights; of government instituted among man to better secure man's God-given rights.

Our Constitution rests on the hierarchy declared by the Declaration of Independence: of God creating man; of God endowing man with inalienable rights; of government instituted among man to better secure man's God-given rights.

With profound thought and careful effort, Jefferson wrote the Declaration in 1776 to a world-wide audience ("let Facts be Submitted to a candid *world*…appealing to the Supreme Judge of the *world* for the rectitude of our intentions"). Jefferson expected the Declaration to be a highly venerated document consulted and examined through the ages.

The fact that it remained one of Jefferson's personal highlights unto his death is evident from Jefferson's directive as to content of the inscription on his tombstone (Jefferson died, as also did John Adams [second President of the United States], on July 4th, 1826; on the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence) which reads:

"Here was buried
THOMAS JEFFERSON,
Author of the Declaration of American Independence, of
The Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom,
and Father of the University of Virginia."

Jefferson's many other political accomplishments, including Governor of Virginia, Minister Plenipotentiary to France, (first) Secretary of State, (second) Vice-President of the United States, and (third) President of the United States were not even there mentioned.

That Jefferson meant in the Danbury letter to undermine the girder of the motto of his personal seal "*Ab eo libertas, a quo spiritus*" ("Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God") is highly suspect. That he meant to a contradict the words of the Declaration 25 years after it was written by a one-page political letter to a select audience is an absurdity few propose.

A brief passage from a short letter taken to extreme, if not illogical, limits surely cannot be expected to over-rule the fundamental organic document of our country.

The Constitution provides the form and framework for a structure of government capable of better securing our inalienable rights endowed by God.

To propose that the very government originated to secure man's God-given rights must remove all reference to God in its activities (if not to deny God's very existence) contradicts the very purpose of government.

That the government be strictly limited from showing any reference or reverence to the very Creator which it acknowledges as the Endower of these rights is a concept unsupported by the organic documents of this country, as well as its history.

Atheistic activists, in their attempt to remove the hierarchy of rights declared in the Declaration, leave themselves without suitable alternative to adequately protect even their own rights.

If our rights do not originate from an entity superior to government — God — then by default, the government becomes the sole guardian of such rights. As guardian, it will eventually assume the role to define those rights. Rights *defined* by government amount in time to mere *privileges*. The alternative to inalienable rights given by God becomes revocable privileges withdrawn at the whim of government.

The theory of natural law states that man, in his nature as man, is equal to every other man — neither superior or inferior. Therefore, in man's collective capacity of government, the government may not do what a collection of individuals cannot rightfully do.

This thought, although rationally consistent, falls short in all attempts at prolonged enforcement. The government assumes the role as the representative of the collective will of the people, there being no higher authority of man according to this doctrine. In such a scenario, the government is able to act with equivalent authority to natural rights and eventually, through cunning and artifice, transgresses those rights. *Might overcomes right* without a proper mechanism to check it.

The government assumes the role as the representative of the collective will of the people, there being no higher authority of man according to this doctrine.

In opposition, man's government is always subservient to God and His authority. Any law passed by government would always stand inferior to rights endowed by God — no amount of cunning and artifice (but one) by the government could hope to transgress rights which the government could not touch.

Jefferson's rough draft of the Danbury letter referred to the Church of England and the British King "as the legal head of its church".

The single route of overcoming the obstacle of government not being able to reach God's Law was taken by England in the 16th century to combine government with the concept of the *Divine Right of Kings*. This notion gave the government the moral authority to act not only as the government, but also as God's spokesman on earth.

Harsh and unjust laws were passed by the British Monarch under his dual authority as King and as the Head of the Church. It became increasingly difficult for the British Subjects to offer defense against such laws, for they could appeal to neither law nor morality because the King commanded both. It was not simply unlawful to break one of the King's commands, it was heresy.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion

The **First Article in Amendment** to the U.S. Constitution states, in part, that:

> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This wording prevented Congress from establishing a State Church, such as the Church of England, and cloaking it with functions of the State. The State was to take a hands-off approach with regards to religion; neither establishing, nor prohibiting religious practices.

The ratification of the First Amendment to the American Constitution forestalled any attempt of our government to transgress against all other rights. The one-two punch of first acknowledging that Citizens' rights were endowed by God, and then preventing the government from passing any law establishing a State religion, cut off the only effective route which the government could use to erode our inalienable rights.

It was this "wall of separation of Church and State" to which Jefferson was referring. The prevention of the establishment of a State Church prevented laws from being passed in the name of the church. Religion deals with the moral realm, using persuasive argument resting on love and compassion, as well as fear and even guilt to convince people to follow the ways of the Lord.

Combining law with religion gives religion the club to clobber followers into the path of righteousness. God gave man free will to allow man the ability to make the moral choice to follow Him. Government-mandated religion would remove free will; legislating religion and religiously legislating. Government-mandated religion, in effect, declares that God was wrong in allowing free will and seeks to correct His "error" by using government compulsion. Combining religion with law (by imperfect man) gives law an undeserved moral rectitude in matters dealing with life on earth and dishonors religion with the stains of compulsion.

No Religious Test

The Constitution, in **Article VI, Clause 3**, prohibits religious testing of officers. The clause states:

> "No religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States."

The wording in Article VI prevented the United States from requiring any executive or judicial officer from the necessity of professing any faith as a qualification to hold such office, holding that this was a personal matter outside the realm of government. This prohibition provides yet another strong method to distance government from religion.

It should be noted that *Offices* pertain only to the executive and judicial branches of government.

One can verify that persons within the executive branch hold *Offices*. **Article II, Section 1, Clause 1** acknowledges:

> "The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his *Office* during the Term of four Years."

Clause 5 of the above Article and Section gives qualifications for the:

> "*Office* of President."

Clause 6 gives the sequence of Presidential succession in case of "the Removal of the President from *Office*", or of his "inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said *Office*".

Clause 8 mandates that the President take an oath or affirmation that he will "faithfully execute the *Office* of President of the United States" before he "enter on the Execution of his *Office*."

Article I, Section 3, Clause 5 acknowledges that the Vice-President will, in succession of the President:

> "exercise the *Office* of President of the United States."

Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 acknowledges that other executive workers are *officers* and hold *offices*:

> "The President…may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal *Officer* in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective *Offices*."

Judges also hold *offices*. **Article III, Section 1** provides that:

> "The Judges…shall hold their *Offices* during good Behavior."

The said section also states:

> "The Judges…shall…receive…a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in *Office*."

The only *offices* (or *officers*) in the proper sense of the word in the Legislative branch are the Presiding Officers and those appointed officers who are not Senators or Representatives (Secretary, Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms (Doorkeeper), Chaplain, etc.).

The head of the House of Representatives, the Speaker, is the Presiding *Officer* of the House. The President of the Senate (the Vice-President of the United States) is the Presiding *Officer* of the Senate. The President *pro tempore*, the acting President of the Senate (in the absence of the Vice-President of the United States), is the acting Presiding *Officer* of the Senate.

As it is necessary that order be maintained within Congress, having someone other than one chosen by the States (other than a Senator, Representative, and/or Vice-President of the United States) preside over those bodies would be inconsistent with the authority of those Houses. Thus, one member of each House is chosen to preside over that House and is an *officer*. However, with that role comes certain limitations.

One can see, looking at the subscriptions at the end of the Constitution, that George Washington subscribed his name to the Constitution and put "Presidt. and deputy from Virginia". Washington was unanimously voted as President of the convention. His role was to maintain direction, order, and to issue rulings such as to whether or not a vote passed or failed when a critical State was divided in its vote. This prestigious capacity, however, kept him from engaging in the normal procedures of debate, offering insights, or voting.

Roger Sherman, a convention delegate from Connecticut, responded during the convention to the alleged impropriety of having the Vice-President of the United States as the "ex-officio President of the Senate".

Sherman maintained that since the President of the Senate would not engage in normal voting or Senatorial functions, it would free up all the Senators to perform their Senatorial duties, stating:

> "If the Vice-President (of the United States) were not to be President of the Senate, he would be without employment, and some *member* (of the Senate) by being made President (of the Senate) *must be deprived of his vote*, unless when an equal division of votes might happen."

The presiding *officers* of both Houses of Congress are not normal voting *members* — to the extent they are *Officers* is the extent they do not act as *Members* (therefore it is not a serious breach of the separation of powers doctrine to have the Vice-President act as presiding *officer* of the Senate).

Senators and Representative are referred to as *Members*, never *Officers* (other than as above), repeatedly in the Constitution.

Article I, Section 2, Clause 1 acknowledges that:

> "The House of Representatives shall be composed of *Members*."

Article I, Section 5, Clause 1 declares that:

> "Each House shall be the Judge…of its own *Members*, and…may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent *Members*."

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 declares similarly:

> "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its *Members* for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a *Member*."

Article I, Section 5, Clause 3 agrees:

> "Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings…and the Yeas and Nays of the *Members*…shall…be entered on the Journal."

Article II, Section 1, Clause 3 (as well as the 12th Amendment which modifies said clause) directs that a quorum of the House of Representatives consisting of a "*Member* or *Members* from two thirds of the States" shall elect the President when no one presidential candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes.

There is a stark difference between *Members* of the Legislative Branch who enact law and *Officers* of the Executive and Judicial Branches who merely administer law or adjudicate controversies according to law.

Members debate; officers standby. Members speak; officers listen (the President being able to offer suggestions). Members vote; officers follow orders. Members create law; officers merely carry it out. Officers march to the beat determined by Members within their powers.

Members create law;
Officers merely carry it out.

Members of the Legislative Branch are elected in each State to represent that State when the States assemble in Congress to pass legislation of common concern. This Legislative Branch is, in proper prospective, the head & body and the heart & soul of the collective government of the States, the federal government.

The Executive Branch is merely an appendage that puts the collective will of the States into motion. The Judicial Branch helps keep that will in motion as referee (because they issue rulings according to the rule book, they are prevented from writing the rule book).

The separate listing of the two parties in **Article VI, Clause 3** acknowledges a separation between Legislative *Members* and Executive and Judicial *Officers*, stating:

> "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the *Members* of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial *Officers*, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution."

The difference between *Officers* and *Members* is so important, in fact, that if one is an *Officer*, one is prevented from becoming a Senator or Representative until such time as he is no longer an *Officer*. **Article I, Section 6, Clause 2** states:

> "No Person holding *any Office* under the United States, shall be a *Member* of either House during his Continuance in *Office*."

Those who execute or enforce the law do not have the ability to make law. The very fact that one is an *Officer* precludes one from being a *Member*. The very fact that one executes or enforces law prevents that same one from making law.

> The very fact that one executes or enforces law prevents that one from making law.

Clause 2 above also prevents Congressmen who took part in creating new executive offices (or increasing the pay) from leaving Congress within the period for which they were elected and taking this new or modified office. The pertinent portion of the clause detailed:

> "No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil *Office* under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time."

Obviously, in that **every** person holding **any** *Office* under United States is prohibited from being a *Member* of either House during his continuance in *Office*, Senators and Representatives are not, nor can they (simultaneously) be, *Officers* holding *Offices*.

Article VI, Clause 3 prohibited religious testing of federal officers as a qualification to hold office. Members of Congress are not included within that Clause (nor did they need to be) because their qualifications had been previously detailed in the Constitution.

Article I, Section 2, Clause 2 lists the qualifications for Representatives and Article I, Section 3, Clause 3 details the qualifications necessary for Senators. In neither section was there any religious qualification for these members of Congress. In that the specific qualifications were listed within the Constitution, it was unnecessary to detail specific prohibitions. The mere absence of such a religious test within the list of minimum requirements for such members means there was no such direct testing (Representatives and especially Senators were often chosen from a pool of State legislators, who often faced religious tests at the State level, however).

Article VI, Clause 3 of the Constitution seeks to distance federal officers, while the First Amendment seeks to distance Congressmen, from religion for the purpose of keeping all such persons from usurping religious authority to blend with legislative, executive, or judicial authority. If Congressmen or government officials were able to usurp religious authority, they would have the inroads necessary to essentially, through artifice and cunning, subvert our inalienable rights and to establish a religious tyranny.

With the federal government having such a poor track record over many decades in many arenas (health care, education, etc.), creating more problems than solving, anyone holding such religious principles near and dear to one's heart should be thankful for such words in the Constitution. Separating the State from the Church to the extent necessary to prohibit the State from usurping unauthorized moral authority was a step adjudged necessary by man's history.

Religion, unfortunately, does not always necessarily equate with morality, honesty, integrity, or justness; especially when practiced by imperfect man. If immoral men were able to hi-jack both government and religion, they would be able to combine these authorities to a nearly unstoppable force (although most such tyrannies are eventually overthrown) causing great turmoil within and without their borders.

The corresponding Christian culture and heritage of people within such a nation can be remembered and memorialized with practices of thanksgiving and honor without running afoul with constitutional mandates preventing the establishment of a state religion.

Atheists living in the United States, if their purpose is to maintain their liberty with the full resources of their rights, should be careful that they do not throw out the very foundation of our rights while attempting to distance religion from government. It should be noted that freedoms in America do not only extend to the freedom to be *right*, but also to the freedom to be *wrong* (and to reap the repercussions).

People desiring to use the apparatus of government to transgress against other's rights for their own

advantage seek to remove God from the equation, to allow government (which they seek to control) the eventual means to transgress Citizen's rights for their own benefit.

Putting up a copy of the 10 Commandments in a government office, decorating a Christmas tree in a school classroom, or opening a session of Congress with a prayer does not parallel *an establishment of religion* nor do they involve *religious tests* as qualifications of office. Government officials have many items of a personal nature in their offices and on their walls. Removal of all personal items (including or even especially those with religious connotations) even if it didn't demoralize employees, would certainly remind one of a stark, utilitarian, fascist government.

Oath

The Constitution shows further evidence of its religious roots in discussing *Oaths*. An sworn *oath* represents a spoken pledge bearing responsibility to God, held to be the strongest tie on one's honor.

In mandating proper authority to act, all Legislative Members and Executive & Judicial Officers are called upon in Article VI of the Constitution to be "bound by *oath* or *affirmation* to support this Constitution".

As covered above, **Article VI, Clause 3** declares:

> "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by *Oath* or Affirmation, to support this Constitution."

An *affirmation* is used by officials who have no religious attachments or by those officials whose religious beliefs forbid the swearing of an oath (see Matthew 5:33-37, James 5:12, on it being of evil to swear an oath; that one's spoken word should always be of truth).

Article I, Section 3, Clause 6 vests the Power to try all Impeachments in the Senate, mandating that:

> "When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on *Oath* or Affirmation."

Oaths and affirmations fulfill contractual purposes. The Constitution sets up a structure for a collective government of the States. The delegates of the convention signed the proposed document in final form and sent it to the separate States for ratification. The individual conventions of the States ratified the Constitution and signed their names on resolutions attesting to that fact.

The signatures of the State convention delegates amounted to the contract being signed by the principals of the contract. The second party to a contract, the agent (government officials & Congressmen) do not sign any document agreeing to any terms. A contract requires confirmation of both parties to be binding.

The oath and affirmation substitute for the signature of the agent; they are verbally-binding promises made by the agents agreeing to the terms and the conditions of the constitutional contract, to make complete the proper delegation of authority.

The requirement that every legislative member and government official give an oath or affirmation is a legal imperative of the Constitution.

In **Article II, Section 1**, Clause 8, the President must take the following oath or affirmation before he enters on the execution of the office of the President. The President would not have any authority of the Office of the Presidency until he takes such oath or affirmation. **Clause 8** mandates:

> "*Before* he enter on the Execution of his Office, he **shall** take the following *Oath* or Affirmation: — 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States'."

Bound

As covered at left, **Article VI, Clause 3** declares:

> "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be *bound* by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution."

The significance of the mandate that all government officials and legislative members "shall be *bound*…to support this Constitution" must be understood.

A look elsewhere in the Constitution to where the term *bound* was used is helpful to understand the implications of that term.

Article I, Section 2, Clause 3 addresses *bound persons*, there proclaiming:

> "Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those *bound* to Service for a Term of Years."

Those *bound persons* being discussed in this clause were *indentured servants* who were *bound* to *service* to another person for a term of years. These bound persons were counted, for apportionment purposes, as *free Persons*, but they were not completely free. These people had voluntarily entered indentures which were

reciprocal obligations with another party; each party obligating themselves to specific duties.

Apprenticeship was a common indenture, where an apprentice (or his parents) *bound* himself to a *master* for a term of years (often seven) to learn a valuable trade. The master commanded over the life of the apprentice (hence the term *master*-craftsman) as he taught the apprentice some certain skill and provided room, board and the basic of necessities. The master received the output of the apprentice in exchange. After the apprenticeship period, the apprentice was considered a *master* in his own right, free to venture out on his own to create his own *master*pieces.

Another common indenture was entered into by penniless immigrants with men who provided them with travel to America. Not having money, these immigrants agreed to work for a period of years for the payment of passage. They were usually assured of room, board, and a place to work.

Indentured servants (those *bound* to *service*) were not slaves (those who were *bound* to *labour*), but neither were they completely free. In that they were destined to be free, they were considered as free persons for purposes of apportionment. It was simply that these servants owed a contractual legal duty to their master for the master's efforts on their behalf.

The concept of indentured servants being *bound* gives understanding of the significance and to the degree that the Legislators, Congressmen, and executive and judicial officers are *bound* to support the Constitution.

Government officials being *bound* to support the Constitution shows that in America, legislative members and government officers are really meant to be government *servants*. The government servant has obligations and duties of office; highest on the list being to uphold the Constitution. They have no discretion as to the extent of their power, they only have a degree of discretion on how they use the power which they have been delegated.

Understanding this obligation gives the indication of the inability of Congressmen and executive or judicial officers to overrule or ignore the Constitution — the sole source of their authority. Understanding this obligation gives the indication of the power a Citizen understanding the Constitution has over a government official who acts in a fashion greater than allowed. Understanding this obligation gives an indication of the importance of learning the Constitution. Understanding this obligation gives evidence why learning the Constitution is not overly encouraged in America by those in power who routinely ignore the bulk of its commands.

When one looks at governmental actions today, there is very little which appears to follow the constitutional commands and limitations as prescribed by the Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme Law of the land and cannot be trumped by mere congressional statute. The extent of actions which appear to violate the constitutional precepts therefore shows the extent of deception practiced by those in government; and those who use government to achieve what they are not able to achieve within the strict legal confines of the government operating under the entire Constitution.

An oath or affirmation for a government official, Senator, or Representative to become *bound* to uphold the Constitution gives but little room for such persons to wiggle around its mandates. Nevertheless, these persons, and those who use these persons to their economic advantage, have found that little wiggle room and have exploited it for all it is worth, almost subverting the entire Constitution and every precept upon which it was established in the process.

Government, being power and authority, necessarily draws those seeking power and authority. Therefore, checks and balances must be instituted to prevent abuse. The Constitution provides powerful checks and balances against abuse of that power, but the only people learning much about the Constitution are those seeking this power and authority. Without knowledgeable Citizens seeking to enforce **all** the constitutional limitations, these limitations have largely been ignored.

Even honest government, left to its own accord, will often digress to the purposes opposite its origin. Early American government rested on a foundation that government was instituted to secure man's inalienable rights endowed by God — the government of the 20th century sought to throw out God and the government was seen by many as the greatest transgressor of man's inalienable rights: Those destined to be mere servants of man sought to rule over him: Those meant to enforce the right to property attempted to destroy its very concept: Those meant to ensure equality brought eventual freedom to slaves — later officials sought equality by virtually enslaving all free men. Even the individual departments often end up instituting actions contrary to their original intentions — for example, the Department of Fish and Wildlife clubbing to death (hatchery) fish they were original assigned to protect.

Those destined to be mere servants of man sought to rule over him.

In the 1939 MGM movie *The Wizard of Oz* (based on L. Frank Baum's 1900 classic book *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*), Dorothy and friends were awestruck by

the magnified image bellowing thunderous, hot air in a forbidding, authoritative manner. They followed blindly the frivolous decrees which this image dictated. It was not until the dog Toto pulled back the curtain to expose the meek little man that they realized that they were deluded into thinking he was a wizard of unlimited powers by impressive buildings, pomp and circumstance and a spectacular sound and light show.

Once readers understand more of the Constitution, the curtain covering the men pulling the lever of deception within our government can be pulled back to expose them. It is not the identities of those men who come and go that is of concern, but the mechanisms they are using. Once the mechanisms are known and understood, they can be shut down to prevent all from using them.

Conspiracy-based doctrines are usually based on the misconception of groups of powerful and knowledgeable men meeting in secret to shape the world to their liking. Conspiracy theories are of little interest. Walking into any legislative or administrative hall in any State or in the District of Columbia will prove that there is no secret conspiracy and confirm that we have *the best democratic government money can buy*. Every special-interest group possible is seeking to influence legislation favorable for their cause (and often at other's detriment). Competence can often be questioned, but not usually persistence.

New laws do not necessarily need to be passed: the Constitution and the Bill of Right have been the supreme Law of the land for centuries and protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans.

It is not vital that only certain men or women be elected to office: no matter who is in office, the office-holder has only the limited power of that office which he or she is powerless to expand upon except by deception over an ignorant populace.

There is no need to spend vast sums of special-interest money to reclaim our freedom, the war for freedom was fought and won over 200 years ago.

There has simply been a great deal of legislation enacted over the last century which has been piled over the real Law.

Once one knows the Constitution, all that is needed to be known is the mechanism which allows Congress to pass laws outside of its normal Constitutional confines. It is best to first learn the basic knowledge of what the Constitution is and what it authorizes before getting caught up in its subversion. Just as a car mechanic must understand how an engine runs correctly before attempting to make one run which doesn't, so too must a person seeking to correct government-out-of-control learn what is right with government before learning what is wrong. There are few worthwhile shortcuts in life.

Sundays Excepted

Other clauses give evidence of religious leanings of the Constitution. **Article I, Section 7, Clause 2** prevents **Sundays** from being counted as one of the numbered days which the President has to return any legislative Bill before it automatically becomes a law without his signature. This is not due to union negotiation of a 40 (or 48) hour work week, but is in line with the biblical command for a day of rest for worship of the (Risen) Lord (see Exodus 20, verses 8-11).

anno Domini

The final example of the Constitution's evidence of religious sentiment shows the deepest embedding of such thought into our culture. **Article VII, Clause 2** of the Constitution reads:

> "Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September *in the Year of our Lord* one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven."

One Thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven Years gives the best evidence of how very long Christ's influence has been felt, not only America, but the world over. That we are currently (when this issue is being finalized) *in the Year of our Lord* two thousand and two shows His continued influence yet today.

Those years referred to more than twenty centuries ago use the postscript *B.C.* to denote *Before Christ*; those after the birth of Christ use *A.D.*, standing for *anno Domini* (Latin for *in the Year of our Lord*).

Using yearly dates for reckoning of time directly acknowledges Jesus as our Lord and Savior because He is the ultimate reference point for all such dates. That our government can reference a calendar year in any document concedes its acceptance of the existence of God by way of His Son, Jesus.

Putting up a calendar with the Year (of our Lord) written across it is no less a sign of faith than putting up a copy of the Ten Commandments.

Distributed by: Foundation For Liberty.org
1500 Highway 2
Leavenworth, WA 98826

www.FoundationForLiberty.org
Copyright 2002, 2005 by Beacon of Liberty, LLC.
www.BeaconofLiberty.org

