

The Supreme Court's Atheistic Interpretation of the Constitution and Its Consequence for the Destruction of America

By Charles Thomas Dennis, Ph.D.

December 1, 2015

—Part I—

The Constitution of the United States is the grand document upon which American liberty rests. Depending on how it is interpreted, especially by the Supreme Court is critical. As will be proven, any interpretation that is in variance with the understanding of the Founders and Framers is invalid. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison stated in a shared declaration: “as to the general principles of liberty and the rights of man, in nature and in society, the doctrines of [John] Locke, in his ‘Essay concerning the true original extent and end of civil government,’ and of [Algernon] Sidney in his ‘Discourses on government,’ may be considered as those generally approved by our fellow citizens of this [Virginia], and the United States . . .”¹

With this in mind, the following quote by Sidney could not be more apropos: “All human Constitutions are subject to corruption, and must perish, unless they are timely renewed, and reduced to their first principles.”² In addition, Sidney presented the *Primary Principle* concerning constitutions, which for a freedom loving people, can never be denied or altered: “[Constitutions] ought not to be followed, unless they are rightly made: They cannot be rightly made if they are contrary to the universal Law of God and Nature.”³ This is the exact understanding held by the great men who founded this nation and framed its government. Consider the preamble to the Constitution:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

In precisely what context are these statements, representing “We the People,” to be understood? The answer is found in why the Constitution exists in the first place, and the answer to this question is disclosed in the Declaration of Independence. Ignorance of the Declaration equates to ignorance of the Constitution. Edwin Meese, III, who served as United States Attorney General under President Ronald Reagan, states it this way:

Part of the reason for the Constitution’s enduring strength is that it is the complement of the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration provided the philosophical basis for a

government that exercises legitimate power by “the consent of the governed,” and it defined the conditions of a free people, whose rights and liberty were derived from their Creator. The Constitution delineated the structure of government and the rules for its operation, consistent with the creed of human liberty proclaimed in the Declaration.⁴

It needs to be emphasized that the Declaration “defined the conditions of a free people, whose rights and liberty were derived from their Creator,” which is called “the creed of human liberty.” And, “the structure of the government and the rules for its operation,” “delineated” in “the Constitution” must be “consistent with the creed of human liberty proclaimed in the Declaration.” The Federal Government’s official position agrees with Meese, as it asserts the necessity for all citizens to understand these two main documents that comprise the founding and establishment of America. This official position stated by the Director of U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services declares:

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are the two most important, and enduring documents in our Nation’s history. It has been said that “the Declaration of Independence was the promise; the Constitution was the fulfillment.”

More than 200 years ago, our Founding Fathers set out to establish a government based on individual rights and the rule of law. The Declaration of Independence, which officially broke all political ties between the American colonies and Great Britain, set forth the ideas and principles behind a just and fair government, and the Constitution outlined how this government would function. Our founding documents have withstood the test of time, rising to the challenge each time they were called upon.

Make no mistake, we have been presented with a timeless framework for self-government, but in order to preserve this wonderful gift, we must hold these principles close to our hearts. I encourage you to read and understand these documents. I promise you will be nothing short of inspired.⁵

There are no qualms regarding the above quote. The statement that “the Declaration of Independence was the promise; the Constitution was the fulfillment” is presented as a superb and correct approbation. It supports Meese’s contention that “the structure of government and the rules for its operation” as “delineated” in “the Constitution” must be understood as, “consistent with the creed of human liberty proclaimed in the Declaration.” Reading this assertion, it is difficult to understand the reasoning behind some of the absurd unconstitutional rulings concocted by the current and past Supreme Courts. It makes one wonder whether the Justices who established and defended these rulings were ever educated in these two most important documents. In any event, many of them are and were verifiably unqualified to sit on the Court. “Make no mistake,” the ignorance of, and contempt displayed for, the documents in question, by Justices of the Supreme Court, is inexcusable.

The *Primary Principle* of the Constitution is the basis for understanding the entirety of its content. In this regard, the Constitution is a presuppositional document; it is dependent upon truths that are antecedent to itself. Once these truths are understood the Constitution finds its foundation

and mission. Because of the misinformation, if not lies and deceit, propagated for generations by the adversaries of liberty, it is necessary to place the Declaration of Independence under examination to rediscover the immense treasure it contains.

We begin with the truth found in the main defense used by the Founders in their pleading against the tyranny of Great Britain. These gentlemen boldly stated: “We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men . . .” With these “Rights” being understood and confirmed by “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God,” (also designated as Natural Law).

There are four inseparable points of emphasis that are critical to understanding “the promise” and consequently “the fulfillment.” (1) “all Men are created equal.” (2) “they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights.” (3) “That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men.” (4) The relation of the first three points to point four, which is, “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.” Failure to understand the depth of meaning of each of these four points results in a complete misinterpretation, and thus misrepresentation, of the intent and application of the Constitution, which is so obviously apparent in our current, degenerate sociopolitical environment.

The first truth upon which these “Rights” are dependent is, “all Men are created equal.” There are only two claims for man’s existence: creation or evolution. Creation insists that God is, or as God Himself declared, “I Am.” (Exodus 3;14) As man is God’s creation, man is a dependent being subject to the One who created him. James Madison, referring to “Religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator,” stated the case:

This duty is precedent both in order of time and degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society. Before any man can be considered as a member of Civil Society, he must be considered as a subject of the governor of the Universe: And if a member of Civil Society, who enters into any subordinate Association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority; much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular Civil Society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign.⁶

Man’s allegiance to the State always remains secondary to his allegiance to God, that is to his “Creator.” The Supreme Court is in violation of the Constitution whenever it enacts a law that attempts to revoke, in any manner, man’s obedience to his “Creator.” The question begs, “who is God, the Creator?” This is the most crucial inquiry facing America today, as the extension of this article will prove. The answer contains the only solution without whom America, as it was founded, will continue its decline into a state of ultimate devastation. This sounds ominous, but consider how far she has already advanced towards the precipice of no return.

From a cursory view, there are two theological considerations to discovering the answer to “who is God the Creator?:” Christianity or Deism. However, with a deeper inspection Deism is quickly eliminated from the discussion. Fundamental to Deism is the rejection of revelation. Contrary

to Deism, the majority of the Continental Congress who signed the Declaration believed, unquestionably, in Biblical revelation.⁷ Divine Providence was confessed by the Congress to be “overruling” and “superintending.” What was sought by the Congress, from “Almighty God,” was not general in nature, which is the best Deism has to offer, but was particularly, “to beg the countenance and assistance of His Providence in the prosecution of the present just and necessary war.”⁸ In addition, “Providence” was directly associated with the revelatory knowledge of Jesus Christ and His salvific ministry.⁹ The theological naiveté and error of a few Unitarians and Deists in the Second Continental Congress did not hold sway in this matter.

The particular relationship of Christ as Creator has been a central doctrine of Christianity ever since the writing of the New Testament. This truth is no small concern, as it is one of the primary hallmarks confirming Christ’s Divinity—a truth that has been defended since the second century A.D.¹⁰ The syllogism from Scripture is: Christ is the Creator of all things; the Creator of all things is God; Christ is God. (The fact that Christ is the Creator of all things means He Himself was not created because it would have been impossible for Him to have created Himself.) The very first verse in the Holy Bible declares, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” (Genesis 1:1) Two passages of Scripture related to Genesis 1:1 that present this particular relationship should suffice in answering this question of who is the Creator. The first is found in the Gospel of John 1:1-3. Referring to Jesus, St. John wrote: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made.” Commenting on this passage, George Hutcheson (1618-1674), Minister of the Gospel at Edinburgh and one of the great Scottish Presbyterian expositors, wrote:

John having asserted the Godhead of Christ, as coeternal and coessential with the Father, he proceeds to prove the same yet further by effects of His Divine attributes manifested in time, . . . proof of His Godhead was in the creation of all things at the beginning, which is so universally ascribed to Christ, as nothing created is excepted from being His handy-work.¹¹ (Spelling updated)

The second passage is found in Apostle Paul’s Epistle to the Church at Colossae 1:16-18. Again, referring to Christ Jesus, Paul wrote:

For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all *things* He might have the preeminence.

Holy Scripture clearly presents Christ Jesus as preeminent in relation to creation, even though the Triune God, the Trinity: one God in three persons, is understood. (The truth of the Trinity is central to Christianity, however, going into the depths of this truth is not the focus of this article.) The point here is simply—in the context of the foundational documents upon which American liberty depends—when any discussion arises concerning creation and Creator, the preeminence of Christ Jesus is unequivocally central to the discourse. The truth of Jesus Christ as

Creator was understood by every denomination represented in the Second Continental Congress in 1776. Creation and Creator cannot be correctly understood in the abstract. They can only be understood in the context of Christianity and a Biblical worldview. Returning to Genesis, Chapter 1:26-27 we read:

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.

Man (male and female) created in the “image” of God and after His “likeness” means that man is a moral creature subject to the absolute moral law of his Creator. The “Rights” man has received from God can never be isolated from their intrinsic moral component. Since God cannot deny Himself, and He is immutable, whatever He endows can never be construed to support any notion contrary to His moral law, as delineated in His Word. The fact that the Declaration imports God into the argument means the Declaration is not just a political document, it is fundamentally a theological document. Without understanding its theological implications, its political assertions are nothing more than mere arbitrary opinions, lacking any merit or force.

The question immediately arises, “what about evolution?” Evolution (macro) is not based upon science. It finds its foundation in the religion of materialism, i.e., the idea of eternal, omnipotent matter. All is matter and whatever is not of matter does not exist. It is a theory held together by faith—claims that are self-refuting. Evolution not only cannot account for the very laws of science, (immaterial truths) upon which its advocates claim to draw authority for their position, but it also, by its very nature, denies the existence of these immaterial laws. The same is true concerning the laws of logic and absolute morality. Evolution is the antithesis of creation. If evolution were true the Declaration and the Constitution would be meaningless documents and America and liberty would not exist. (This topic is covered extensively in ***IRREFUTABLE: Why Christianity Is the Irrevocable Foundation of American Liberty***, a text that should be read by everyone who is concerned about America’s moral and cultural decay.)

Now that it is understood—without Christ Jesus there is no creation or Creator, and thus no “unalienable Rights,”—point 3 needs to be addressed: “That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men.” The Constitution represents the institutional operation of the government of the United States. It is the “Supreme Law of the Land,” and as such functions for the specific purpose of securing the “Rights” summarized in the Declaration; the “Rights” endowed by Christ the Creator. Stated again, the only legitimate “Rights” endowed by the Creator are those “Rights” that do not violate His nature as defined in His Word (the Holy Bible). This means no government has a legitimate right to authorize any invented “Rights” that violate God’s moral law. This is the exact context for understanding the true meaning of “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.” As John Locke stated:

The Law of Nature stands as an eternal Rule to all Men, *Legislators* as well as others. The *Rules* that they make for other Men[‘]s Actions, must, as well as their own, and other

Men[']s Actions, be conformable the Law of Nature, i.e. to the Will of God, of which that is a Declaration, and the *fundamental Law of Nature being the Preservation of Mankind*, no human Sanction can be good, or valid against it.¹² (Emphasis in original)

All government officials, “*Legislators* as well as others,” including Supreme Court Justices, are subject to “The Law of Nature.” Henry Campbell Black in his authoritative *A Law Dictionary* presented the unequivocal definition of Natural Law (“The Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” or “the universal Law of God and Nature”):

Natural Law. A rule of conduct arising out of the natural relations of human beings, established by the Creator, and existing prior to any positive precept. The foundation of this law is placed by the best writers in the will of God, discovered by right reason, *and aided by divine revelation*: and its principles when applicable, apply with equal obligation to individuals and nations.¹³ (Emphasis added.)

The first three points in relation to Point 4 is obvious. The Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God present another truth that is essential to the proper function of Constitutional jurisprudence; the nature of the only viable, objective legal method that supports God’s moral mandate. There is no other legal strategy permissible under the Constitution, as all other legal considerations contradict the “promise” and, thus, reject the “fulfillment.” They challenge rather than support the Constitution. Laws deduced from the Constitution of the United States can never be—legitimately—“contrary to the universal Law of God and Nature.” Therefore, every law established by the Supreme Court that violates “The Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” represents an invalid, atheistic interpretation of the Constitution, and annuls its mandate of fulfilling “the promise.” These unconstitutional laws either deny the reality of the “Creator” and “creation” or show complete disdain for His existence; and challenge His moral authority, which, whatever the case, reflects the height of judicial arrogance and incompetence. The following quote reveals the logical consequence of such unconstitutional jurisprudence:

It is a paradox that at a time when this country is beset with many fears, the most fearful thing of all is something of which the country is generally unaware. It is the fact that while this country is traditionally democratic, the prevailing teaching of its political and legal philosophers is essentially anti-democratic and totalitarian.

This is so because this teaching denies three essential elements of democracy and thereby affirms three essential elements of totalitarianism. It denies that there is a moral law which is inherent in human nature and which is therefore immutable and to which all man-made laws to be valid must conform. It denies that by virtue of this law man possesses certain rights which are inherent and inalienable and therefore superior to the authority of the state. It denies that the purpose of government is to secure these inherent and inalienable rights. It asserts that because there are no immutable principles of human conduct, there is no ultimate standard of justice and the lawmaker is responsible to nothing but his own unfettered will. It asserts that since there are no natural rights, all man’s rights come to him from the state, and what the state grants, the state may take away. It asserts that since man possesses no natural, inherent rights, the purpose of government is not to secure such

rights but rather the purpose of man is to serve the state.

This teaching nullifies the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It nullifies twenty-five hundred years of progress in political and legal theory and re-enacts in the present age some of the worst political and legal errors of ancient times. It is indistinguishable, in its origin and its logical effect, from philosophies which characterized lands against which we have just fought the bloodiest War in history.¹⁴

Except for the last statement concerning the particular “War” mentioned, one would think the above quote was written today. This declaration was delivered by Harold R. McKinnon before the Conference of Federal Judges of the Ninth Circuit, San Francisco, California, September 3, 1946, one year and one day after the formal end of World War II. The pathetic irony: today, the Ninth Circuit is the most liberal Circuit Court in America, and the Federal Court system has corrupted the law by transmuting it to incorporate “the prevailing teaching of [the] political and legal philosophers,” who are “essentially anti-democratic and totalitarian.”

Continued in Part II

Home | Introduction | Articles

Notes

1. Albert Ellery Bergh, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), 19.460-461.
2. Algernon Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, 2nd ed. (London: F. Darby, 1704), 103.
3. *Ibid*, 41.
4. *The Heritage Guide to the Constitution* (Washington: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2005), 1.
5. U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, M-654 (rev. 07/08).
6. Gaillard Hunt, ed., *The Writings of James Madison* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901), 2.184-185.
7. Charles Thomas Dennis, *IRREFUTABLE: Why Christianity Is the Irrevocable Foundation of American Liberty* (anApologetic, 2012), 76-88. The denial of Deism is fully established by the facts stated in the Declaration.
8. *Journals of the Continental Congress 1774-1789* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1906), 4.208-209, 5.1022.
9. *Ibid*, 4.208.
10. Irenaeus who studied under Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, defended this doctrine against Gnostic heresy: “For the Creator of the world is truly the Word of God.” *The Writings of Irenaeus*, Alexander Roberts and W. H. Rambaut, trans. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1869), 2.105.
11. George Hutcheson, *An Exposition of the Gospel of Jesus Christ According to John* (London: Ralph Smith, 1657), 3.
12. *The Works of John Locke*, 2nd ed. (London: Awnsham Churchill, 1722), 2.196
13. Henry Campbell Black, *A Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (St. Paul, MI: 1910), s.v., “Natural Law.”
14. Harold R. McKinnon, “The Higher Law: Prevailing Teaching Denies Moral Law,” *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (December, 1946): 101-102.