

# REASON & REVELATION

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES

JUNE 2006  
Vol. 26, No. 6

## AMERICA, CHRISTIANITY, AND THE CULTURE WAR (PART I)

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

[Editors' Note: This article is the first installment in a three-part series based on a seminar that Dr. Miller conducts in his speaking travels—*"The Silencing of God: The Dismantling of America's Christian Heritage."*]

For 185 years, American culture was friendly toward Christianity. America was, in fact, considered a "Christian nation." After all, America has **never** been considered an Islamic, Buddhist, or Hindu nation, even as it has never been a religionless nation. But for the last 50 years, sinister forces—from humanism, atheism, and evolution to social liberalism, pluralism, and "political correctness"—have been aggressive in their assault on the Christian religion. They have succeeded in gradually dismantling many of the moral and spiritual principles that once characterized society. America's religious, moral, and spiritual underpinnings are literally disintegrating.

Indeed, **America is at war!** This war is far more serious and deadly than any physical conflict (like the Iraq war). America is fighting a spiritual culture war. Regardless of the surface issues, **the central issue is—God.** Make no mistake: *America is in the throes of a life-and-death struggle over whether the God of the Bible will continue to be acknowledged as the one true God, and Christianity as the one true religion.*

Now more than ever before, social and political liberals—from Hollywood to the University to the nation's Capitol—are openly hostile toward God. Those who profess Christianity are facing the most perilous times ever faced in America. Every effort is being made to expunge references to God and Christianity from public life. Revisionist historians, liberal politicians, secularist educators, morally

bankrupt entertainers, and activist judges, prodded by socialistic organizations like the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union), AUSCS (Americans United for Separation of Church and State), and the NEA (National Educational Association), are feverishly reshaping our history, laws, and traditional way of life. [NOTE: The politically and socially liberal orientation of the NEA was demonstrated at its 2005 national convention with "its usual favoritism toward the gays and the feminists, hostility to parents, and support of liberal causes" (Schlafly, 2005).]

These sinister forces have mounted a massive, full-scale assault on traditional moral values. They are endeavoring to sanitize our society, cleansing it of its Christian connections. This conspiracy parades itself under the guise that the Founding Fathers and the *Constitution* advocated a "separation of church and state." The clever ploy goes something like this: "The Founders intended for our political institutions and public schools to be **religiously neutral**; a strict **church-state separation** must be observed, with religion completely excluded from the public sector; any such religious references would constitute an **illegal endorsement of religion by the government.**" Thus, no references to God or Christianity in public settings must be allowed—whether in the government, the community, or the public school. This conspiratorial departure from the nation's origins, which has been spouted incessantly for some 50 years, has thoroughly permeated the American population and will surely go down in history as one of the big myths perpetrated on a people. For all practical purposes, America has become an atheistic, secularized, pluralistic state. Even the

pagan monarchies of world history at least allowed their polytheistic beliefs to be incorporated into public life.

For the last 50 years, in their orchestrated conspiracy to gain sanction for abortion, pornography, homosexuality, atheistic evolution, and a host of other evil, morally-bankrupt behaviors and beliefs, "first amendment rights," "free speech," "intolerance!," and "censorship!" have been the whips that social liberals have used to beat, bully, and berate their opponents into silent submission. But let one person utter even one peep of disagreement, and suddenly the "compassionate" liberals begin spewing **hate-speech** and,

### CONTENTS

#### ARTICLES

- America, Christianity, and the Culture War (Part 1)*  
Dave Miller, Ph.D. . . . . 41

#### DEPARTMENTS

- Speaking Schedules . . . . . 46  
Note from the Editors  
*More Children's Books!*  
Brad Harrub & Dave Miller . . . . . 48

#### RESOURCES

- Schoolbooks, Easter Eggs,  
and Homosexuality* . . . . . 21-R  
Question & Answer . . . . . 24-R  
In the News . . . . . 24-R

[www.ApologeticsPress.org](http://www.ApologeticsPress.org)

ironically, become completely intolerant, mean-spirited, and insensitive!

Prior to the 1960s, when the Christian worldview thoroughly permeated American civilization, the anti-Christian forces demanded “equal time” and clamored for “freedom to express dissenting, alternative views.” They derided the moral majority by accusing them of using “Gestapo tactics” to suppress ideological opposition. But now that they, to a great extent, have had their way, free speech and open discussion in the free market of ideas is out the window and opposing views are swiftly squelched. Talk about Gestapo tactics. The anti-Christian forces in American society now exhibit the same intolerant mindset that has characterized totalitarian and communist regimes throughout history.

Undoubtedly, during the social ferment of the turbulent 1950s and 1960s, when subversive moral and religious ideologies began to assert themselves, one of the strategic mistakes made was permitting the instigators to redefine the historical terms and concepts as originally articulated by the architects of American civilization. “Free speech” was redefined to mean the right to practice and promote any and every idea or behavior that contradicted Christianity—no matter how immoral or depraved. Everything from burning or urinating on the flag to hardcore pornography came to be classified as “free speech,” while Christian resistance was considered “censorship.” The minority within America who has exhibited hostility toward God, the Bible, and Christianity have literally intimidated and coerced the majority into



Image courtesy of Rich Hobson of the Foundation for Moral Law

accepting, as justification for their outrageous stance, the backing of the *Constitution*. Yet, the historical evidence demonstrates that the Founders and Framers never would have countenanced the notion that “free speech” encompassed speech and behavior deemed immoral by Christian standards (see “Religion and the Founding...,” 2003).

We live in a timewarp far removed from America’s origins. The Founders clearly believed that the initial existence and future survival of the Republic was heavily, if not exclusively, dependent on a perpetuated diffusion of the Bible and Christianity throughout society. Yet, for half a century, Americans have been pounded and prodded with the propaganda that public expressions of Christianity should not be allowed lest we “offend” those who do not share our Christian beliefs. Who could have ever imagined that the day could come that the practice of the Chris-

tian religion in a Christian nation would be deemed “insensitive”?

To illustrate the extent to which America has plummeted from its original heights, while a Federal judge was demanding that the Chief Justice of the Alabama State Supreme Court remove a Ten Commandments monument in Montgomery, Alabama (“Chief Justice...,” 2003), guess what was happening in California? A small marker was unveiled in Sacramento, California (Capitol Park) along the walkway of the California Veterans Memorial that reads: “In Honor of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Veterans Killed in Action” (Sanders, 2003). Gay-rights advocates hailed the memorial as the first such **state-sanctioned** landmark honoring homosexual war veterans.

Incredible! Honoring “gays” is praiseworthy, while honoring God is repugnant and unconstitutional. This scenario is a microcosm of what is happening all over the nation. Allusions to the God of the



Bible are being systematically stripped from public life—from Christian symbols in city and county seals, to pre-game prayers after school, to the use of the Bible in jury deliberation rooms (see Palm and Krannawitter, 2004; Hume, 2005; Johnson, 2005).

Never mind the fact that the phrase “separation of church and state” is not even found in the *Constitution!* (Thomas Jefferson used the term in a private letter to reassure the Baptists that the government would not interfere in the free exercise of their religious beliefs [Jefferson, 1802]). In fact, labeling the phrase a “misguided analytical concept,” and noting “the absence of a historical basis for this theory of rigid separation,” the late U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist insightfully observed:

It is impossible to build sound constitutional doctrine upon a mistaken understanding of constitutional history, but unfortunately the Establishment Clause has been expressly freighted with **Jefferson’s misleading metaphor** for nearly 40 years.... The “wall of separation between church and State” is a **metaphor based on bad history**, a metaphor which has proved **useless** as a guide to

**Reason & Revelation** is published monthly by Apologetics Press, Inc., 230 Landmark Dr., Montgomery, AL 36117. Pending Periodicals postage paid at Montgomery, AL. **POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to **Reason & Revelation, 230 Landmark Dr., Montgomery, AL 36117.**

**Reason & Revelation** is a non-profit, tax-exempt work dedicated to the defense of New Testament Christianity. Copyright © 2006. All rights reserved.

**Editors:**

Brad Harrub, Ph.D.\*  
(\*Neurobiology, University of Tennessee)  
Dave Miller, Ph.D.\*  
(\*Communication, Southern Illinois University)

**Orders:**

Phone: (800) 234-8558  
Fax: (800) 234-2882

**On-line** Web store/catalog, subscription order/renewal form, current issues, archives, and other information (all orders processed on a secure server):

**URL:** www.ApologeticsPress.org  
**E-mail:** mail@ApologeticsPress.org

**Annual Subscription Rates:**

\$10.00 Domestic  
\$ 8.00 Domestic Bulk  
(5+ to same address)  
\$16.00 Canada & Overseas Airmail

**General inquiries, changes of address, or international callers:**

Phone: (334) 272-8558  
Fax: (334) 270-2002

**Discovery—Scripture & Science for Kids** is a sister publication for children. For more information, please contact our offices or visit the *Discovery* Web site at:

**URL:** www.DiscoveryMagazine.com

judging. It should be **frankly and explicitly abandoned** (*Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38 [1985], 92, 106-107, emp. added).

Is it true that the Founding Fathers and the *Constitution* intended for Christianity to be kept out of the public sector? Did they desire that references to God, Christ, and the Bible be excluded from public life? Or were they, in fact, actually more concerned with preventing the government from **interfering** with public expressions of the Christian religion? Did they, themselves, appeal frequently to God in political and public settings? Did they (and their descendants for the first 180+ years), in fact, recognize and subscribe to the critical principle: “Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord” (Psalm 33:12)? Indeed, they did. I invite you to consider but a small portion of the massive amount of available evidence from the withered roots of America’s forgotten heritage.

## PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS OF GOD

### Political Documents

#### The Declaration

The *Declaration of Independence* is the premiere document that launched Amer-



ica as a new nation. Here is a quintessentially **political** document—a public expression of national concerns intended to articulate justification for declaring a separation from England. If the Founders intended to keep God out of national life, here was the perfect opportunity to manifest that intention. However, in this relatively brief document, they used the following phrases: “Nature’s God” (i.e., an 18<sup>th</sup> century way to refer to the God Who created nature), “all men are **created** equal” and “endowed by their **Creator**,” “appeal-

ing to the **Supreme Judge** of the world,” and “with a firm reliance on the protection of **divine Providence**” (*The Declaration...*). Astounding!

The 56 signers of the *Declaration of Independence*, in risking their very lives, put their signatures to a **political** document that **acknowledged and appealed to the God of the Bible four times!** So much for their alleged insistence on “separation of church and state.”

#### The Federal Constitution

It is evident that the federal *Constitution* refrains from giving specific directives regarding Christianity. Why? The popular propaganda since the 1960s has been that “the irreligious Framers did not want the nation to retain any attachment to the Christian religion.” Such an assertion is a monstrous perversion of historical fact. The truth of the matter is that they were fearful of the potential interference by the federal government in its ability to place restrictions on the free exercise of the Christian religion. Consequently, they desired that the specifics of religion be left up to the discretion of the several states. However, we must not think for a moment that the federal Framers did not sanction the nation’s intimate affiliation with Christianity, or that they attempted to keep religion out of the *Constitution*. On the contrary, **the Christian religion is inherently assumed and implicitly present in the Constitution.** In fact, the *United States Constitution* contains a **direct reference to Jesus Christ!** Consider three proofs for these contentions (*The United...*).

First, consider the meaning of the First Amendment to the *Constitution*: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” “We have been told that by “establishment of religion,” the Framers meant for the government to maintain complete religious neutrality and that pluralism ought to prevail, i.e., that all religions (whether Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, or Hinduism), though equally tolerated, must not be given any acknowledgement in the public sector. **But such**

**an outlandish claim is absolutely false.** All one has to do is to go directly to the delegate discussions pertaining to the wording of the First Amendment in order to ascertain the context and original intent of the final wording (*Annals of Congress*, 1789, pp. 440ff.). The facts of the matter are that by their use of the term “religion,” the Framers had in mind the several Protestant denominations. Their concern was to prevent any single Christian denomination from being elevated above the others and made the State religion—a circumstance that the Founders had endured under British rule when the Anglican Church was the state religion of the thirteen colonies. They further sought to leave the individual States free to make their own determinations with regard to religious (i.e., Christian) matters (cf. Story, 1833, 3.1873:730-731). The “Father of the Bill of Rights,” George Mason, actually proposed the following wording for the First Amendment, which demonstrates the context of their wording:

[A]ll men have an equal, natural and unalienable right to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that **no particular sect or society of Christians** ought to be favored or established by law in preference to others (Rowland, 1892, 1:244, emp. added).


By “prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” the Framers intended to convey that the federal government was not to interfere with the free and public practice of the **Christian** religion—the very thing that Christians are now experiencing.

Second, consider the wording of a sentence from Article 1, Section 7 of the *Constitution*: “If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it...” “Sundays excepted”? Oh, you mean that the government shuts down and does not transact business on Sunday? Why? If this provision had been made in respect of Jews, the *Constitution* would have read “Saturdays excepted.” If provision had been made for Muslims, the *Constitution* would have read “Fridays excepted.” If the Founders had intended to encourage a day of inactivity for the government without regard to any one religion, they could have chosen Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. Instead, the federal *Constitution* reads “Sundays excepted”—proving conclusively that America was **Christian** in its orientation

and that the Framers themselves shared the Christian worldview and gave **political** recognition to and accommodation of that fact.

Third, if these two allusions to Christianity are not enough, consider yet another. Immediately after Article VII, the *Constitution* closes with the following words:

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 and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth....



Did you catch it? Their work was done “in the Year of our Lord.” The Christian world dates all of human history in terms of the birth of Christ. “B.C.” means “before Christ,” and “A.D.” is the abbreviation for the Latin words “*anno Domini*,” meaning “year of our Lord.” If the Framers were interested in being pluralistic, multicultural, and politically correct, they would have refrained from using the B.C./A.D. designation. Or they would have used the religionless designations “C.E.,” Common Era, and “B.C.E.,” Before the Common Era (see “Common Era,” 2006). In so doing, they would have avoided offending Jews, atheists, agnostics, and humanists. Or they could have used “A.H.” (*anno hegirae*—which means “in the year of the Hijrah” and refers to Muhammad’s flight from Mecca in A.D. 622), the date used by Muslims as the commencement date for the Islamic calendar. Instead, the Framers chose to utilize the dating method that indicated the worldview they shared. What’s more, their reference to “our Lord” does not refer to a generic deity, nor does it refer even to God the Father. It refers to God the Son—an explicit reference to

**Jesus Christ.** Make no mistake: the *Constitution of the United States* contains an explicit reference to Jesus Christ—not Allah, Buddha, Muhammad, nor the gods of Hinduism or Native Americans!

#### Original State Constitutions

If the Framers wanted more direct references to Christianity to be left up to the several states, we ought to expect to see the framers of the state constitutions reflecting that intention. And, indeed, they did. Once the Founders declared independence from England, each state commenced to hammer out their respective state consti-

tutions, with the exception of Connecticut which chose to continue to operate under its founding charter until eventually formulating its own state constitution in 1818 (Horton, 1988). If one will take the time to examine the original state constitutions, one will be absolutely overwhelmed by the fact that those framers (many of whom were also involved in working on the federal *Constitution*), were intimately attached to the God of the Bible and deliberately reflected that attachment in their political pronouncements. The state constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, much of which is believed to be the product of John Adams, provides just one sample. In “Part the First,” the constitution reads:

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 worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not disturb the public

peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship.

Article III. As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community, but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily (*Constitution of the Commonwealth...*, emp. added).

In “Part the Second,” the constitution enumerated the civil officers of the state:

Article I. There shall be a supreme executive magistrate, who shall be styled, The Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and whose title shall be—His Excellency.


Article II. The governor shall be chosen [annually]; and no person shall be eligible to this office, unless at the time of his election, he shall have been an inhabitant of this commonwealth for seven years next preceding; and unless he shall at the same time, be seised in his own right, of a freehold within the commonwealth of the value of one thousand pounds; and unless he shall declare himself to be of the Christian religion (*Constitution of the Commonwealth...*, emp. added).

Further, the “Oath of Office” that was to be taken by anyone who wished to serve as “governor, lieutenant governor, councillor, senator or representative” began with the declaration: “I, A.B., do declare, that I believe the Christian religion, and have a firm persuasion of its truth.”

Massachusetts was typical. The average American would be startled to know that of the original eleven state constitutions (omitting Connecticut), seven explicitly required office holders to be of the Protestant religion (i.e., Vermont, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia). Maryland’s constitution required a belief in the Christian religion. The constitutions of Delaware and Pennsylvania required a belief in the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments. While the Virginia and New York constitutions did not mandate an oath, they spoke of “Chris-

## Schoolbooks, Easter Eggs, and Homosexuality

Dave Miller, Ph.D.



The vigorous culture war being waged in America over homosexuality and same-sex marriage is escalating. One by one, the dominoes continue to fall, softening attitudes and creating more acceptance for behavior that the Founders and the bulk of the

American population once deemed morally deplorable. Two cases in point: dozens of homosexual and lesbian couples with children crashed the annual White House Easter egg hunt—a tradition held each year on the White House lawn since 1878. To identify themselves, the couples wore rainbow colored leis around their necks. Their stated purpose was “to make their presence felt in American society” (“Gay Parents...,” 2006). The organizing entity, Family Pride Coalition, explained that they were helping the President to “understand that gay families exist in this country and deserve the rights and protections that all families need” (“White House...,” 2006).

Another case in point: A second grade teacher at Estabrook Elementary in Lexington, Massachusetts recently read a fairytale book to her class. The fairytale book was not the Grimm brothers’ *Cinderella* or *Hansel and Gretel*. Nor was it Hans Christian Andersen’s *The Emperor’s New Clothes* or *The Princess and the Pea*. No, not hardly. It was *King and King*—a book about two princes who marry each other, acquire children, and are shown kissing on the last page. The book targets children ages six and older. The Lexington Superintendent of Schools boasts that the school system is committed to “diversity and tolerance” and maintains that he has no legal obligation to notify parents when children are being exposed to such material since same-sex marriage is now legal in Massachusetts (Jan, 2006). Of course, the Left Coast 9th Circuit Court of Appeals had already ruled that parents do not have a fundamental right to control when, where, and how their children are taught about sex (Parker, 2005).

Most Americans are unaware that the public school system is being inundated with educational materials that promote the homosexual agenda, materials that are specifically designed to prepare the next generation to embrace homosexuality. The public school system is being systematically rearranged to eliminate parents from the loop so that they will cease “interfering” with educators who seek to indoctrinate children with their anti-Christian values. The books appearing in various school libraries around the country are legion, including *And Tango Makes Three*; *Heather Has Two Mommies*; *Daddy’s Roommate*; *Jack and Jim: Picture Book*; *One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dad, Blue Dads*; *The Sissy Duckling*; *Who’s in a Family?*; *Molly’s Family*; *It’s Perfectly Normal*; *Best, Best Colors*; and *My Two Undes*. Imagine what America is going to be like 10 to 15 years from now when the children nurtured by such books are adults. (Parents may

want to give more consideration to home-schooling).

Christians and others who continue to oppose homosexuality will remain the objects of abuse, ridiculed as “homophobic,” “intolerant,” and “judgmental.” But “we ought to obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29). The Bible is still the inspired Word of God. The Creator has said that same-sex relations are sinful (Romans 1:24-28). The spread of such behavior will result in national destruction, as recognized by the great English jurist, William Blackstone (who exerted a profound influence on the Founding Fathers and American jurisprudence):

[T]he infamous crime against nature...is an offence of so dark a nature... THIS the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God, determine to be capital. Of which we have a signal instance, long before the Jewish dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven: so that this is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept (1769, 4.15.215-216).

[NOTE: As soon as funds are available, Apologetics Press plans to publish an outstanding children’s book that counters the onslaught of the homosexual’s war on America’s youth titled: *Does God Love Michael’s Two Daddies?*]

### REFERENCES

- Blackstone, William (1769), *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/blackstone/bk4ch15.htm>.
- “Gay Parents Quietly Crash White House Easter Party” (2006), *Yahoo News*, April 17, [On-line], URL: [http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20060417/ts\\_alt\\_afp/uspoliticseaster\\_060417200009](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20060417/ts_alt_afp/uspoliticseaster_060417200009).
- Jan, Tracy (2006), “Parents Rip School Over Gay Storybook,” *Boston Globe*, April 20, [On-line], URL: [http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2006/04/20/parents\\_rip\\_school\\_over\\_gay\\_storybook/](http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2006/04/20/parents_rip_school_over_gay_storybook/).
- Parker, Kathleen (2005), “Parents Take Another Hit in the Culture Wars,” *Orlando Sentinel*, G3, November 6, [On-line], URL: <http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/orlandosentinel/access/922392231.html?dids=922392231:922392231&FMT=ABS&FMTS=ABS:FT&date=Nov+6%2C+2005&author=Kathleen+Parker%2C+Sentinel+Columnist&pub=Orlando+Sentinel&edition=&startpage=G.3&desc=Parents+take+another+hit+in+the+culture+wars>.
- “White House Easter: Gay Friendly?” (2006), *CBS News*, April 13, [On-line], URL: <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/04/13/national/main1496408.shtml>.



# R E S O U R C E S

**Q** Does the phrase “no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation” (2 Peter 1:20) mean that we can’t understand the Bible for ourselves?

**A** A casual reading of 2 Peter 1:20—with little concern for the context in which the passage is found—might very well lead one to understand the verse in such a manner. However, a closer examination of this passage reveals that it has no reference at all to those who **read** the Scriptures, but refers instead to those who **wrote** the Scriptures. By studying the context of the passage, one learns that the passage is discussing how the Scriptures came into existence, not how they are to be “interpreted.”

Continuing the thought from verse 20 to verse 21, we read: “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, **for** prophecy never came by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit” (emp. added). That little word “for” in verse 21 connects the two thoughts. The English word “for” derives from the Greek conjunction *gar*. *Strong’s Greek-Hebrew Dictionary* (1994) indicates that this word is a “primary particle” that assigns “a reason” and is used in argument for “explanation” or “intensification.” The reason that “no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation” is **because** “prophecy never came by the will of man, but **holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit**” (emp. added). The

word “for” connects the two thoughts. Peter is saying that the prophets did not invent what they wrote; rather, they were guided by the Holy Spirit (cf. 2 Timothy 3:16-17). No doubt this is



why the NIV reads: “No prophecy of Scripture came about **by the prophet’s own interpretation**” (2 Peter 1:20, emp. added)—not the reader’s interpretation.

Furthermore, according to Mounce’s *Analytical Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (1993), the Greek word *epilusis* (translated “interpretation” in 2 Peter 1:20) means primarily “a loosing” or “liberation.” The stem of *epilusis* is *luo*, and means literally “to loosen, unbind, unfasten” (p. 305). Therefore, “no prophecy of Scripture” ever was released, loosed, or given out by the prophets’ own inventions. They did not put their own “interpretation” on God’s message; instead, the Holy Spirit guided them. Thus, this passage has no reference to present-day interpreters of the text, but rather to those who wrote it—i.e., the prophets or apostles (cf. Ephesians 3:5).

**Eric Lyons**

## IN THE NEWS

A recent chance conversation with a homosexual activist revealed a wicked and terrifying undercurrent below the surface of our society. He commented that many homosexuals were no longer battling for same-sex marriage in the courtrooms or at the polls, because they know it will be a “non-issue” in ten years. When I asked what he meant, he informed me that rather than fighting to have laws changed, activists have changed tactics, and are now focusing the battle in the public school classroom. He noted that if they could teach tolerance and acceptance in the schoolroom, then it would be a piece of cake to have the laws overturned in a decade or so, once those students were of voting age.

This gentleman’s words reminded me of the quote that is attributed to Adolf Hitler: “Let me control the textbooks, and I will control the state.” During a speech he delivered on November 6, 1939, Hitler stated: “When an opponent declares, ‘I will not come over to your side,’ I calmly say, ‘Your child belongs to us already.... What are you? You will pass on. Your descendants, however, now stand in the new camp. In a short time they will know nothing else but this new community.’” Chilling words—given the recent change in tactics by militant homosexuals who are teaching our children to accept everything and everyone, and that the only real sin is the sin of intolerance.



Consider also that within the past few years the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) has been formed in an effort to normalize homosexuality in public classrooms. Kindergarten students are now being taught about “human differences” while activists establish youth homosexuality clubs on campuses so that kids can be “initiated” into alternative lifestyles. With each passing day our children are being methodically trained to reject the moral beliefs of their parents and God.

**Brad Harrub**

tian forbearance” and “no one denomination of Christians” above another (“State Constitutions,” n.d.).

#### Current State Constitution Preambles

Many more references to God and Christianity in governmental documents could be cited. In time, the state constitutions have gradually been amended to exclude such forthright religious allusions. Nevertheless, despite this erosion, of the present fifty state constitutions, forty-six have “preambles.” And **forty-five of those preambles make explicit appeals to the God of the Bible** (“U.S. State...,” 2003)! Consider two samples. The preamble for Maine’s constitution reads:

We the people of Maine, in order to establish justice, insure tranquility, provide for our mutual defense, promote our common welfare, and secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty, **acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe in affording us an opportunity, so favorable to the design; and, imploring God’s aid and direction in its accomplishment,** do agree to form ourselves into a free and independent State, by the style and title of the State of Maine and do ordain and establish the following Constitution for the government of the same (*Constitution of the State...*, emp. added).

The preamble for New Jersey reads:

We, the people of the State of New Jersey, **grateful to Almighty God** for the civil and religious liberty **which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to Him for a blessing upon our endeavors** to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do ordain and establish this Constitution (*New Jersey State...*, emp. added).

The objective observer is forced to conclude that the original framers of each of the state constitutions shared the same belief in and reliance on the same God that the national Framers possessed. If the notion of “separation of church and state” were correct, why did the framers of the state constitutions unashamedly include acknowledgements of God? And why have those allusions remained to this day?

#### Presidential Inaugural Addresses

Immediately after taking the oath of office, Presidents of the United States deliver to the nation an inaugural address. Few people are probably aware of the fact that, in doing so, **every single president of the United States has alluded to the God of the Bible!** The further back in history one goes, the more extensive the allusions. For example, on Thursday, April 30, 1789, the first President of our country,



George Washington, made the following remarks:

Such being the impressions under which I have, in obedience to the public summons, repaired to the present station, it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to **that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect,** that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge. In tendering this homage to the **Great Author of every public and private good,** I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own, nor those of my fellow-citizens at large less than either. No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the **Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men** more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of **providential agency;** since we ought to be no less persuaded that **the propitious smiles of Heaven** can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which **Heaven itself** has ordained.... Having thus imparted to you my sentiments as they have been awakened by the occasion which brings us together, I shall take my present leave; but not without resorting once more to **the benign Parent of the Human Race** in humble supplication that, since **He** has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquility,... so **His divine blessing** may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this Government must depend (1789, emp. added).

Such remarks not only reflect a deep sense of dependency on and intimacy with the God of the Bible, they demonstrate the extent to which **the entire nation** inte-

grated this conviction into national, public life.

The second President of the United States, John Adams, made the following remarks in his inaugural speech on Saturday, March 4, 1797:

Relying, however, on the purity of their intentions, the justice of their cause, and the integrity and intelligence of the people, **under an overruling Providence which had so signally protected this country from the first,** the representatives of this nation, then consisting of little more than half its present number, not only broke to pieces the chains which were forging and the rod of iron that was lifted up, but frankly cut asunder the ties



which had bound them, and launched into an ocean of uncertainty.... And **may that Being who is supreme over all, the Patron of Order, the Fountain of Justice, and the Protector in all ages of the world of virtuous liberty,** continue His blessing upon this nation and its Government and give it all possible success and duration consistent with the ends of His providence (1797, emp. added).

Thomas Jefferson’s first inaugural on March 4, 1801 included the following words:



...acknowledging and adoring **an overruling Providence,** which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people?.... And may that **Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe** lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity (1801, emp. added).

In his second inaugural address on March 4, 1805, Jefferson announced:

...I shall need, too, the favor of **that Being in whose hands we are**, who led our forefathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with **his providence**, and our riper years with **his wisdom and power**; and to whose goodness I ask you to **join with me in supplications**, that he will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures, that whatsoever they do, shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations (1805, emp. added).

Such remarks by one of the least religious of the Founders hardly sounds like the anti-Christian “deist” that he has been represented to be. He believed in the God of the Bible—the same One Who had guided the Israelites as reported in the Old Testament—and believed that He had guided the founding of America and was **actively influencing** America and her leaders.

Moving further along in American history, on March 4, 1841, William Henry Harrison’s inaugural address included these astounding remarks:

I deem the present occasion sufficiently important and solemn to justify me in expressing to my fellow-citizens a **profound reverence for the Christian reli-**



**gion** and a thorough conviction that **sound morals, religious liberty, and a just sense of religious responsibility** are essentially connected with all true and lasting happiness; and to **that good Being who has blessed us** by the gifts of civil and religious freedom, **who watched over and prospered** the labors of our fathers and **has hitherto preserved to us** institutions far exceeding in excellence those of any other people, let us unite in fervently commending every interest of our beloved country in all future time (1841, emp. added).

Like his presidential predecessors, not to mention the Founders themselves, here was a President who would be deemed by today’s standards to be wholly and unequivocally politically incorrect. Observe carefully his forthright contentions: (1) being inaugurated as President of the United States is sufficiently significant to express to the entire nation and the world profound respect for **Christianity**—not Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, Judaism, or atheism; (2) all true and lasting happiness **depend** on Christian morality, freedom to practice Christianity, and a proper/just sense of **religious** (not social or political) responsibility; (3) the civil and religious freedom enjoyed by Americans **came from God**; (4) America’s political institutions are **superior** to all other countries; and (5) America’s future is dependant on God. Illegal endorsement of religion by government?

On Monday, March 4, 1861, when Abraham Lincoln became President, the nation was standing on the brink of imminent civil war. If you had been in that crucial position on that momentous occasion, what would you have said? In his inaugu-



ral address, it is evident that the God of the Bible and the Christian religion weighed heavily on his mind:

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it;...If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, **Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land** are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty (1861, emp. added).

Imagine that! Abraham Lincoln used as the central rationale to avert the War Between the States the fact that they all shared the same God and the same religion!

Moving into the 20th century, on March 4, 1921, fresh out of World War I, Warren G. Harding delivered his inaugural speech:



One cannot stand in this presence and be unmindful of the tremendous responsibility. The world upheaval has added heavily to our tasks. But with the realization comes the surge of high resolve, and there is reassurance in belief in **the God-given destiny of our Republic**. If I felt

## SPEAKING SCHEDULES

### Brad Harrub

June 7	Murfreesboro, TN	(615) 893-7532
June 11-14	Tyler, TX	(903) 592-0809
June 21	Murfreesboro, TN	(615) 459-6627
June 23-25	Freeport, IL	(815) 235-1008

### Dave Miller

June 2-4	East Gadsden, AL	(505) 250-4099
June 5	Grady, AL	(334) 488-5535
June 11, 18, 25	Columbiana, AL	(205) 669-0244

### Kyle Butt

June 14	Gulf Shores, AL	(251) 968-7769
June 21	Montgomery, AL	(334) 272-2561

### Eric Lyons

June 12-14	Brandon, MS	(601) 825-6497
June 19-20, 22	Montgomery, AL	(334) 272-2561
June 21	Gulf Shores, AL	(251) 968-7769



that there is to be sole responsibility in the Executive for the America of tomorrow should shrink from the burden. But here are a hundred millions, with common concern and shared responsibility, **answerable to God** and country. The Republic summons them to their duty, and I invite co-operation. I accept my part with single-mindedness of purpose and humility of spirit, and implore **the favor and guidance of God in His Heaven**. With these I am unafraid, and confidently face the future. I have taken the solemn oath of office on that **passage of Holy Writ** wherein it is asked: “**What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?**” [Micah 6:8—DM]. This I plight to God and country (1921, emp. added).

Who was viewed as directing the destiny of America? God! To whom was the president answerable? To God! To Whom did he appeal for guidance? To God! On what object did he take the oath of office? The Word of God! To Whom did he “plight” (i.e., solemnly pledge) himself? To God! Such words certainly conflict with the current alleged restriction between church and state.

Four years later, on Wednesday, March 4, 1925, Calvin Coolidge commenced his presidency with the following words:



Here stands our country, an example of tranquility at home, a patron of tranquility abroad. Here stands its Government, **aware of its might but obedient to its conscience**. Here it will continue to stand, seeking peace and prosperity,... attentive to the intuitive counsel of womanhood, encouraging education, desiring **the advancement of religion**, supporting the cause of justice and honor among the nations. America seeks no earthly empire built on blood and force. No ambition, no temptation, lures her to thought of foreign dominions. The legions which she sends forth are armed, not with the sword, but with **the cross**. The higher state to which she seeks the allegiance of all mankind is not of human, but of **divine origin**. She cherish-

**es no purpose save to merit the favor of Almighty God** (1925, emp. added).

This President claimed that America may not be justly styled an aggressor nation—since the nation embraces Christianity. Indeed, he insisted that America’s **only purpose** is to please God and to urge all nations to do the same by giving their allegiance to Him.

This examination of presidential inaugural addresses could be greatly expanded. Don’t miss the point: In direct contradiction to the attempt to expel God from the government and public life, every single President of the United States has referred to the God of the Bible at one or more of his inaugurations.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, John (1797), “Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/adams.htm>.
- Annals of Congress* (1789), “Amendments to the Constitution,” June 8, [On-line], URL: <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=001/llac001.db&recNum=221>.
- “Chief Justice Roy Moore” (2003), [On-line], URL: [http://www.retakingamerica.com/great\\_amer\\_ten\\_moore\\_001.html](http://www.retakingamerica.com/great_amer_ten_moore_001.html).
- “Common Era” (2006), *Wikipedia*, [On-line], URL: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BCE>.
- Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.mass.gov/legis/const.htm>.
- Constitution of the State of Maine*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.state.me.us/sos/arc/general/constit/conspre.htm>.
- Coolidge, Calvin (1925), “Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/coolidge.htm>.
- The Declaration of Independence*, National Archives, [On-line], URL: [http://www.archives.gov/national\\_archives\\_experience/charters/declaration.html](http://www.archives.gov/national_archives_experience/charters/declaration.html).
- Harding, Warren G. (1921), “Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/harding.htm>.
- Harrison, William Henry (1841), “Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/harrison.htm>.
- Horton, Wesley (1988), “Connecticut Constitutional History: 1776-1988,” Connecticut State Library, [On-line], URL: <http://www.cslib.org/cts4ch.htm#1>.
- Hume, Brent (2005), “Prayer Punishment,” *Fox News Special Report*, April 7, [On-line], URL: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,152684,00.html>.
- Jefferson, Thomas (1801), “First Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/jefinau1.htm>.
- Jefferson, Thomas (1802), “Thomas Jefferson to Danbury, Connecticut, Baptist Association,” Library of Congress: *The Thomas Jefferson Papers Series 1. General Correspondence*, January 1, [On-line], URL: [http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mtj1&fileName=mtj1page025.db&recNum=557&itemLink=/ammem/mtjhtml/mtjser1.html&linkText=7&tempFile=~/temp/~ammem\\_RsNQ&filecode=mtj&next\\_filecode=mtj&prev\\_filecode=mtj&itemnum=2&ndocs=22](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mtj1&fileName=mtj1page025.db&recNum=557&itemLink=/ammem/mtjhtml/mtjser1.html&linkText=7&tempFile=~/temp/~ammem_RsNQ&filecode=mtj&next_filecode=mtj&prev_filecode=mtj&itemnum=2&ndocs=22).
- Jefferson, Thomas (1805), “Second Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/jefinau2.htm>.
- Johnson, Kirk (2005), “Colorado Court Bars Execution Because Jurors Consulted Bible,” *New York Times*, A[5]:1, March 25.
- Lincoln, Abraham (1861), “First Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/lincoln1.htm>.
- New Jersey State Constitution*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/lawsconstitution/constitution.asp>.
- Palm, Daniel C. and Thomas L. Krannawitter (2004), “L.A. County’s Seal and the Real Agenda of the ACLU,” The Claremont Institute, [On-line], URL: [http://www.claremont.org/writings/040609palm\\_kran.html](http://www.claremont.org/writings/040609palm_kran.html).
- “Religion and the Founding of the American Republic” (2003), Library of Congress, [On-line], URL: <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/religion/rel06.html>.
- Rowland, Kate (1892), *The Life of George Mason* (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam’s Sons).
- Sanders, Jim (2003), “Controversy Erupts Over Landmark For Gay, Lesbian Soldiers,” *Sacramento Bee*, Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military, University of California, Santa Barbara, [On-line], URL: [http://www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/PressClips/03\\_0829\\_SacBee.htm](http://www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/PressClips/03_0829_SacBee.htm).
- Schlafly, Phyllis (2005), “Follies and Failures of the National Education Assn.,” *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, 39[1]:1, August, [On-line], URL: <http://www.eagleforum.org/psr/2005/aug05/psraug05.html>.
- “State Constitutions” (no date), The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/states/stateco.htm>.
- Story, Joseph (1833), *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (Boston, MA: Hilliard, Gray, & Co.), [On-line], URL: [http://www.constitution.org/js/js\\_344.htm](http://www.constitution.org/js/js_344.htm).
- The United States Constitution*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Constitution.html>.
- “U.S. State Constitutions and Web Sites” (2003), [On-line], URL: <http://www.constitution.org/cons/usstcons.htm>.
- Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38 (1985), [On-line], URL: <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/ff1#ff1>.
- Washington, George (1789), “First Inaugural Address,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/wash1.htm>.

## NOTE FROM THE EDITORS



### MORE CHILDREN'S BOOKS!

The talented staff at Apologetics Press continues its prolific production level in providing outstanding products for all ages. We are happy to announce the publication of three more volumes in the A.P. "Early Reader" Series. You will remember that this series is one level beyond our "Learn to Read" series and is aimed at children in kindergarten through second grade. Depending on the age of your children, this series is flexible enough to allow parents to read to their children, read along with their children, or they can listen while their children read aloud to them.

The titles of the newest volumes in the "Early Reader" series are: *God Made Fish* (written by Brad Harrub), *God Made Insects* (written by Eric Lyons), and *God Made Plants* (written by Kyle Butt). These three may be added to the previous three books, released last year, titled *God Made Animals*, *God Made Dinosaurs*, and *God Made the World*. All six volumes in this series are filled with beautiful full-color pictures and wonderful information about God and His creation. These books are written on a level that early readers will enjoy. What better way to experience reading than to read about God and His creation? Not only will your children or grandchildren read about the sky, the trees, and the bumblebees, they will also learn about the Designer who made them. With interesting, understandable text and captivating pictures, kids will fall in love with reading and with their Creator.



But there's more. How many times have you purchased Bible storybooks or tapes that claim to be "biblical," only to be disappointed because they did not live up to their claim? (You've seen those pictures of Noah's ark with multiple windows). In reality, probably most religious children's books on the market have scriptural flaws that require the conscientious parent to screen, edit, or make corrections before passing them along to their children. If you can relate to what we are saying, then you will be pleased with our first volume in a series of volumes on

Bible characters written by our most talented staff writer Kyle Butt. The first entry in this series is *The Patient Man from Uz*. Here is a book that achieves three critical objectives seldom seen in a single volume. First, it portrays the text of the Bible (the book of Job) **accurately**, genuinely capturing the central theme of the book. Second, it demonstrates a masterful use of **rhyme** that will thrill a child. Third, it conveys the message of Job on a **child's level**. Rarely does a book blend all three of these objectives in such a masterful way. You must secure a copy to see for yourself. We are confident that you will be as elated as we are with the results, and that you will want to get copies for the children and grandchildren in your life.

See the Center  
Spread for Pricing  
& Order Details

Brad Harrub  
Dave Miller