

This item is available on the Apologetics Press Web site at: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2942> - it was originally published in *Reason & Revelation*, 26[6]41-47

## AP Content :: Reason & Revelation

### America, Christianity, and the Culture War (Part I)

by 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."]

You can find the second and third installments here: [Part II](#) & [Part III](#)

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, 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 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 time warp 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 Christian 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 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 America 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 18th century way to refer to the God Who created nature), "all men are **created** equal" and "endowed by their **Creator**," "appealing 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, multi-cultural, 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 constitutions, 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 "Christian 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** integrated 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 religion** 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 inaugural 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 that there is to be sole responsibility in the Executive for the America of tomorrow I 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 cherishes 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&rec Num= 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&docs=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&docs=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>.

---

Copyright © 2006 Apologetics Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

This document may be copied, on the condition that it will not be republished in print unless otherwise stated below, and will not be used for any commercial purpose, as long as the following stipulations are observed: (1) Apologetics Press must be designated as the original publisher; (2) the specific Apologetics Press Web site URL must be noted; (3) any references, footnotes, or endnotes that accompany the article must be included with any written reproduction of the article; (4) textual alterations of any kind are strictly forbidden; (5) Some illustrations (e.g., photographs, charts, graphics, etc.) are not the intellectual property of Apologetics Press and as such cannot be reproduced from our site without consent from the person or

organization that maintains those intellectual rights; **(6)** serialization of written material (e.g., running an article in several parts) is permitted, as long as the whole of the material is made available, without editing, in a reasonable length of time; **(7)** articles, in whole or in part, may not be offered for sale or included in items offered for sale; and **(8)** articles may be reproduced in electronic form for posting on Web sites pending they are not edited or altered from their original written content and that credit is given to Apologetics Press, including the web location from which the articles were taken. Further, documents may not be copied without source statements (title, author, journal title), and the address of the publisher and owner of rights, as listed below.

For catalog, samples, or further information, contact:

Apologetics Press  
230 Landmark Drive  
Montgomery, Alabama 36117  
U.S.A.  
Phone (334) 272-8558  
<http://www.apologeticspress.org>