

The Constitution Is—Unconstitutional?

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

“It is unconstitutional for the government and the public schools to include endorsements of the Christian religion.” So goes the conventional propaganda that has gradually permeated much of the judiciary of the United States in the last half century. The result is an ongoing and systematic elimination of allusions to God, Christ, and the Bible in the public life of America. In order to see the falsity of this contention, all one need do is spend a little time examining the utterances of the Founders themselves. The indications of the Founders’ attachment to Christianity, and the necessary inclusion of its moral principles as the platform on which the Republic was deliberately situated, are voluminous, extensive, decisive, and undeniable (e.g., Miller, 2006).

Another way to ascertain the inaccuracy of the allegation that the Founders intended America’s civil institutions to be religiously neutral, is to examine the founding documents of both the federal and state governments. For example, immediately after Article VII, the federal *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.... (*The United States...*, emp. added).

The Framers’ declared that 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 religiously neutral designations “C.E.,” Common Era, and “B.C.E.,” Before the Common Era—which already were in use (see “Common Era,” 2007; Hooper and Biel-feld, 1770, 3:105). 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 for the commencement of 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—Jesus Christ. Make no mistake: **the Constitution of the United States contains an explicit reference**

to Jesus Christ—not Allah, Buddha, Muhammad, or the gods of Hinduism or Native American religion. Observe that the *Constitution* does not read “Year of **the** Lord”; it reads “Year of **our** Lord.” The Founders considered Jesus Christ to be **their Lord**—a concept flatly rejected by Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, and atheists. Any attempt to soften the import of this inclusion is merely sidestepping this fact. Therefore, the Framers could **not** have believed that references to God or Christ should be excluded from the *Constitution*—**since they did not do so!** Yet, incredibly, on the basis of **current** judicial interpretation, **their action was unconstitutional!**

The same may be said for the constitutions of the respective states. The initial state constitutions contained many references to the essentiality and importance of the God of the Bible to civil society. Most of these allusions have since been expunged. Nevertheless, some remain. Consider, for example, the Preamble to the state constitution of Maine:

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 (emp. added).

The constitution of Massachusetts reads, in part:

We, therefore, the people of Massachusetts, **acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the goodness of the great Legislator of the universe, in affording us, in the course of His providence, an opportunity, deliberately and peaceably, without fraud, violence or surprise, of entering into an original, explicit, and solemn compact with each other; and of forming a new constitution of civil government, for ourselves and posterity; and devoutly imploring His direction** in so interesting a design, do agree upon, ordain and establish the following Declaration of Rights, and Frame of Government... (emp. added).

The Missouri Preamble reads:

We the people of Missouri, **with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and grateful for His goodness**, do establish this Constitution for the better government of the State (emp. added).

(continued on 48-R)



New Jersey's Preamble 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 (emp. added).

North Carolina's Preamble reads:

We, the people of the State of North Carolina, **grateful to Almighty God, the Sovereign Ruler of Nations**, for the preservation of the American Union and the existence of our civil, political and religious liberties, and **acknowledging our dependence upon Him for the continuance of those blessings to us and our posterity**, do, for the more certain security thereof and for the better government of this State, ordain and establish this Constitution (emp. added).

Many others could be cited ("State Constitutions," n.d.). In fact, of the 46 state constitutions that contain Preambles, only Oregon has no reference to God. Hence, 45 of the 50 state constitutions refer to the God of the Bible. But wait! On the basis of today's ludicrous, inane standard, 45

of the state constitutions are unconstitutional. So, according to the thinking of the ACLU and a host of liberal educators, politicians, and judges, **the Constitution is unconstitutional!** Go figure.

REFERENCES

- "Common Era" (2007), *Answers.com*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.answers.com/topic/common-era>.
- Hooper, William and Jacob Friedrich Bielfeld (1770), *The Elements of Universal Erudition* (London: G. Scott), [On-line], URL: http://books.google.com/books?id=gBETAAAAIAAJ&pg=PA105&dq=%22Common+Era%22+date:1-1800&as_brr=0&ei=aMzPqz0Moz06gK06NFh.
- Miller, Dave (2006), "America, Christianity, and the Culture War," *Reason & Revelation*, 26[6]41-47, June, [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2942>.
- "State Constitutions" (no date), The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, [On-line], URL: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/states/stateco.htm>.
- The United States Constitution*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Constitution.html>.

A "Great Book" Full of Lies?

Some time ago, I read an article by a college professor who stated that "the best thing that could happen to the New Testament has happened to it.... Within the University, at least, the Bible has become simply another 'great book.'" Many in the world today consider the Bible to be a "good book" containing moral teachings written by noble men, yet reject the idea that the Bible was "given by inspiration of God" (2 Timothy 3:16). Many college professors today teach that the Bible simply is a "good book" that is no more inspired than Homer's *Odyssey* or Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. It is the mere result of natural genius characteristic of men of unusual ability.

Common sense, however, compels the honest person to reject such illogical notions. If the Bible is a "great book," but not inspired of God, it makes either liars or lunatics of the biblical writers, who claimed the Holy Spirit as the ultimate source of their writings. The honest person surely will admit that the Bible—a book that has been studied and examined more than any other book in human history—definitely is not a product of insane men. Its unity, fulfilled prophecy, historical accuracy, and scientific foreknowledge testify to an intelligent source. Thus, the Bible was written either by the honest or the dishonest. Logically, no other choices exist.

Moses either lied or was truthful when he recorded: "And **God spoke all these words**, saying: 'I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods before me'" (Ex-

odus 20:1-3, emp. added). Moses claimed such inspiration literally hundreds of times. Was he a liar, or did he tell the truth? In the New Testament, Peter wrote that "prophecy never came by the will of man, but **holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit**" (2 Peter 1:21, emp. added). Did Peter tell the truth, or was he lying? This same question can be asked of all the writers of the Bible who claimed inspiration. To say that the Bible is simply a "great book" written by "good men" makes liars of the biblical writers who repeatedly claimed that God was the ultimate source of their documents (cf. 2 Samuel 23:2; Acts 1:16).

The Bible is either a product of God or a product of liars. There are no other options. If these men were liars, then they "insanely" pronounced their own destruction, for they claimed that lying was wrong and that all impenitent liars would burn in hell (cf. Exodus 20:16; Colossians 3:9; Revelation 21:8). If these men were liars, it leaves as inexplicable the mystery of why modern man, with all his accumulated learning, has not been able to produce a comparable book to make the Bible obsolete. Finally, if these men were compulsive liars who filled an alleged historical work with thousands of lies, pray tell, why do so many unbelievers still call it a "great book"? Non-Christians who profess an admiration for the Bible should consider the foolishness of their position.

Eric Lyons

