

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 V—

Why is the government so fixated on shaking its fist in the face of God and daring Him to do anything about it? The homosexual issue is a case in point. Anyone who sides with God concerning this issue is quickly labeled a bigot and a hate monger, which of course, makes God to be a bigot and a hate monger also. This is exhibited most forcefully in the Supreme Court's insistence on codifying homosexuality into law. (What the Supreme Court in the *Reynolds* case would have declared to be, "an offense against society.") The most glaring impact of the Court's biased opinion and indefensible position, which challenges thousands of years of documented history, is the clash it creates between State and Church. This clash is exacerbated by the additional idea of homosexual marriage.

For the Christian individually, and the true Church as a whole, there is no retreat from this conflict initiated by the State; the reason why is not complicated. In his First Epistle to Timothy, (Chapter 1:9-10), the Apostle Paul declared:

Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers [slave-dealers], for liars, for perjures, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

Among other acts of maleficence that contradict God's moral law, St. Paul stated that "them that defile themselves with mankind," that is, "one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite, homosexual,"¹ "is contrary to sound doctrine." Then, in his Second Epistle to Timothy (Chapter 4:2-4) Paul instructed with the imperative:

Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.

Here, we have the absolute command to "Preach the word," (being the Word of God), which is

“the truth” and as such constitutes “sound doctrine.” Sound doctrine of necessity exposes “fables” and rebukes that which “is contrary to sound doctrine,” including homosexual behavior. Again, St. Paul addressed this issue in his First Epistle to the Church in Corinth (1 Corinthians 6:9-11), this time with two particular, compelling points of emphasis:

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

The definitive, “abusers of themselves with mankind,” is from exactly the same underlying Greek used in 1 Timothy 1:10, “one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite, homosexual.” (See note 1) This time homosexual behavior is included with other “unrighteous” acts, all of which deny the participants any inheritance in “the kingdom of God.” However, the good news is also revealed; the outcome of what Jesus described as being “born again.” (John 3:3) That is the consequence of the power of God’s grace in transforming lives, “And such were some of you.”

The significance of the power revealed in the past tense is wonderful and its consequence indisputable. This was the outcome of preaching “sound doctrine,” and why the true Church will never cease its promulgation, no matter what the State says. If the particular act of same-sex sex were a biologically instilled orientation rather than a choice, then it could not be a sin, from which its participants were delivered, and God would be evil, by declaring the contrary, (and thus, not exist), the Holy Bible a farce, and Jesus Christ a liar. (The theocentric truth and consequence concerning homosexuality is dealt with fully in ***IRREFUTABLE***.)

God’s act of saving individuals out of their sins is the greatest manifestation of love mankind will ever experience: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John 3:16) Love is the central theme of Christianity, however, love can only be understood as defined by God. Jesus presented this understanding in Matthew 22:37-40 when he said, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”

Jesus explained the expression of love in two commandments, and then added the qualifier. The entirety of God’s moral law is encompassed within the understanding of love; and one of the principle truths found in the prophets is the consequences associated with the violation of God’s law. Man cannot make a legitimate claim for love of God while at the same time willfully and deliberately violating His moral law. Likewise, man does not truly love his neighbor while (1) treating him in a way that violates God’s moral law, or (2) encouraging and condoning in any way his violation of God’s moral law. Any action that is contrary to God’s moral law is a violation of God’s command to love.

The only way the definition of moral law can be falsely altered—from the truth stated above—is to redefine the nature of God, or supplant God by redefining the nature of man, which, in any regard, is nonsensical. It is troubling, then, when ostensibly intelligent individuals work to redefine the core principle of morality in order to fit a philosophy that is repugnant to the very nature of true morality itself. This is what we see today in much of the unsound reasoning found in the legal profession. For example, Michael J. Perry, Professor of Law at Ohio State University, states:

Our religious self-understanding has generally involved a commitment—though not necessarily a fully conscious commitment—to the notion of moral evolution, because in the main we have avoided the pretense that our current understanding of the moral universe—of ourselves, others, and the world we inhabit, and most fundamentally of the proper relationship among ourselves, others, and our world—was complete. Rather, we know that we are fallible and that we must struggle incessantly to achieve a better—a broader and deeper—understanding.²

Perry's thinking represents a segment of society that does not like the Christian moral position that has been the bulwark of American liberty for over two-hundred years; the "moral universe," as addressed by Jesus Christ, our Creator. Perry notes, "we know that our human fallibility necessitates an ongoing struggle to 'discover God's own true will.'"³ To the contrary, Jesus explained "God's own true will." The "struggle" that has ensued has not been a lack of discovery, but of acceptance. Perry, in trying to defend his position, does bring a very important point to the discussion:

Not even mainstream theistic theology—as opposed to fundamentalist ideology, which happily is a peripheral feature of the religious landscape—has supposed that the discovery of God's will is a closed or irreformable chapter. Hence, even a theistic understanding of the moral universe generally entails commitment to the notion of moral evolution rather than *stasis*.⁴ (Italics in original.)

The problem with Perry's argument is glaring. The label "mainstream theistic theology" is a canard. Even so, it is worthy of a response. The comparison of "mainstream" to "fundamentalist" is not the real issue; it is the creation of a "straw man" argument. The accurate comparison is between orthodox Christianity and heterodoxy. Heresy abounds today, and it is no more prevalent than in the false teachings of those who are trying to introduce decadence into God's moral law, which in essence is to question God's nature. *God's moral law does not evolve*. Justice Ward Hunt (1810-1886), of the New York Court of Appeals, stated the case correctly:

The "morals of the time" may be vicious; public sentiment may be depraved; the people may have gone astray so that not one good man can be found. Sound morals, as taught by the wise men of antiquity, as confirmed by the precepts of the Gospel, and explained by Paley and Horn, are unchanged. They are the same yesterday and today.⁵

The Court crosses the bounds of judicial propriety and intrudes into the legitimate domain of the Church when it challenges Biblical morality. In so doing it violates the First Amendment. The

Church is the moral compass of the State and not vice versa, as Samuel Adams, “the father of the American Revolution,” so eloquently stated in his clarion alarm:

Wherever Tyranny is established, Immorality of every Kind, comes in like a Torrent. It is the Interest of Tyrants to reduce the People to Ignorance and Vice, for they cannot live in any Country where Virtue and Knowledge prevail. The Religion and public Liberty of a People are intimately connected: their Interests are interwoven; they cannot subsist separately, and, therefore, they rise and fall together. For this Reason, it is always observable that those who are combined to destroy the People’s Liberties, practice every Art to poison their Morals. How greatly then does it concern us, at all Events, to put a Stop to the Progress of Tyranny. It has advanced already by far too many Strides. We are at this Moment upon a Precipice. The next Step may be fatal to us. Let us, then, act like wise Men, calmly look around us, and consider what is best to be done.⁶

Reading Samuel Adams’ quote, it is as though he were viewing America today through a forward-looking spyglass of history. How foolish the government is that will not listen to the sage wisdom of those brave patriots who forged our pathway to liberty. The further this nation strays from the course they laid, the closer she approaches the “Precipice” of no return.

There is the strange, if not disturbing and ludicrous, idea that because the Supreme Court has made a determination concerning a particular moral issue, that the decision is correct, or more importantly that it is legally binding, no matter how morally destitute and despicable the Court’s conclusion. That kind of thinking is what instituted the War of Independence. Appealing again to Henry Campbell Black: “Much that lies within the moral sphere does not lie within the jural sphere. But that which does lie within the jural sphere, and which is enforced by positive law, is Christian morality.”⁷

It can never be stated too frequently that “social issues are moral issues, and moral issues are God issues. God’s moral law, the haven where liberty resides, cannot be vacated without the complete collapse of our Constitutional Republic.”⁸ With this in mind, Robert Bork, who served as United States Solicitor General, under President Richard Nixon and on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, by appointment of President Ronald Reagan, affirmed the court’s engagement in moral issues: “all law is based upon moral judgments.”⁹ And, commenting on, “the common and wholly fallacious remark that ‘You can’t legislate morality:’ “Indeed,” he countered, “we legislate little else.”¹⁰ Bork was not the first to acknowledge that legislation and morality are forever intertwined. In 1896, Colonel Eli F. Ritter wrote, in his highly acclaimed, *Moral Law and Civil Law Parts of the Same Thing*:

Let it not be forgotten, let it be emphasized, repeated, emblazoned in the halls of every legislative body, that morality is a fundamental principle in legislation, and but for this principle, this law of nature, this law of God, this law of man, this good angel, popular government would fail. Morality cannot be disregarded by the Legislature; it must be regarded, or the action of the body is void. Moral law was not created by a legislative body. It was never enacted. It was not created by the Constitution of the State or of the nation. Neither the Constitution itself nor the Legislature can disregard it and the action be valid.¹¹

In the American legal system, law is immutably linked to morality. Without this connection: this sense of good and evil, law would quickly descend into the depths of depravity, which is what we are experiencing today. This is why religion, morality and education are so essential to a free democratic republic. However, religion in the abstract is unfit to serve the needs of an absolute moral standard; the standard found in true, Biblical Christianity alone. This is why Christianity, with its accompanying moral imperative, is requisite for the health and stability of our society.

John F. Dillon, in his Presidential Address at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association, (August 24, 1892), exhorted concerning the *Ethical Nature of Law*: “A most serious error it is for the lawyer to conceive or suppose that he has to do only with constitutions and statutes and decided cases, and that these constitute all there is of law.” Contending that there is nothing more important “to lawyers” than “the moral law” he continued:

This moral law holds its dominion by Divine ordination over us all, from which evasion or escape is impossible. This moral law is the eternal and indestructible sense of justice and of right, written by God on the living tablets of the human heart, and revealed in His Holy Word. It is considerations of justice and right that make up the web and woof and form the staple of a lawyer’s life and vocation. The lawyer’s work and business is, it is true, with human laws, but the lawyer makes a sad mistake who supposes law to be the mere equivalent of written enactments or judicial decisions. Theoretically, and, for many purposes, practically, we must discriminate law and morality, and define their respective provinces. But those provinces always adjoin each other, and ethical considerations can no more be excluded from the domain of law *in its every part* than one can exclude the vital air from his room and live.¹² (Italics in original.)

The government fails in its obligation to protect America, due to its fallacious understanding of the Church and State issue, when it intrudes into the education of young minds by banning nonsectarian Christian awareness and expression, including its symbols. Justice Stewart, in his dissenting opinion in *Abington School District v. Schempp*, (1963)¹³ correctly identified the purpose of the Establishment Clause in limiting Congress, to the effect, that it “would be powerless to establish a national church.” In this regard, he was in line with Jefferson and Madison. In addition, he recognized the proper understanding of the need for religious influence in public schools, as he stated:

It might also be argued that parents who want their children exposed to religious influences can adequately fulfill that wish off school property and outside school time. With all its surface persuasiveness, however, this argument seriously misconceives the basic constitutional justification for permitting the exercises at issue in these cases. For a compulsory state educational system so structures a child’s life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage. Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at the least, as government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private.

Secularism being a religion is not a misnomer. In 1983, Dr. Herbert Schlossberg, a Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, wrote an excellent book, *Idols for Destruction*, in which he asserts: “Of all the misleading interpretations of this complex age, few are more so than the common one that secularism means the replacement of a world view that is religious with one that is not.”¹⁴ Secularism is the faith system of those who have “changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator.” (Romans 1:25) The government, whether it admits it or not, continually involves itself in the domain of religion, in one fashion or another, and has done so while at the same time denying the reality that secularism is intrinsically religious. The true understanding of secularism conveys this fact:

Secularism may be described as a movement, intentionally ethical, negatively religious, with political and philosophical antecedents. Founded with the express intention of providing a certain theory of life and conduct, it follows that in its positive aspect it is ethical. Since it undertook to do this without reference to a deity or a future life, and thus proposed to fulfill a function of religion, apart from religious associations, it may be regarded as negatively religious.¹⁵

Secularism philosophically replaces Christianity with atheism; but what does atheism really mean? *Atheos*, (Greek: a: without + *theo*: God) the etymological parent of atheism and its derivatives, is used only once in the New Testament. It is found in Ephesians 2:12, which reads, “That at that time you [Gentiles] were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” In this instance atheism’s true theological understanding is revealed. Matthew Henry, in his *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, delivered the exact meaning of this verse, in which the Apostle Paul exposed the erroneous definition proffered by the Greeks and Romans. An error that continues to prevail in the uninitiated today. Henry explained:

They who are without Christ, and strangers from the covenant, can have no good hope; for Christ and the covenant are the ground and foundation of all the Christian’s hopes. They were in a state of distance and estrangement from God; Without God in the world; not without some general knowledge of a deity, for they worshiped idols; but living without any due regard to Him, any acknowledged dependence on Him, and any special interest in Him. The words are, *atheists in the world*; for, though they worshiped many gods, yet they were without *the true God*.¹⁶ (Italics in original.)

Simply put, “Those who are without Christ [our Creator],” even though they worship “*many gods*,” are, nonetheless, “*atheists in the world*.” The doctrinal dogmas of atheism is exactly what the Supreme Court has established to fill the void it self-consciously created. Rejecting Christianity and deifying man—and through man, the State. This is what we see in the Supreme Court’s insistence that religion in the public square must serve a “clear secular legislative purpose;”¹⁷ and that any governmental reference to the true God can only be understood in the context of “ceremonial deism,” (a formal government derogation of the Supreme Being to a level of Divine impotence, and as such, subject to the State).¹⁸

The crux of the issue is, someone’s religion is going to be taught. There is no such thing as a

religiously neutral State, including the educational arena. Religion as identified in the First Amendment to the Constitution acknowledges it will be nondenominational Christianity, with specific emphasis given to Christian morality. The Court, in unconstitutionally redefining morality to include immorality, in effect, denigrates morality to the level of the arbitrary whims of an oligarchy: humans playing God. The Supreme Court has embarked on a dangerous judicial path that ignores the obvious historical consequences. The Court insists that the law it creates is a higher law than what God has declared. However, Christianity remains the one immovable and indestructible obstacle that stands in the Court's way, current Court decisions notwithstanding.

Continued in Part VI

Home | Introduction | Articles

Notes

1. Joseph Henry Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1889), 75.
2. Michael J. Perry, *The Constitution, the Courts, and Human Rights* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 99. (Perry is now Robert W. Woodruff Professor of Law at Emory University.)
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Joel Tiffany, *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeals of the State of New York*, "Lyon v. Mitchell, 36 N.Y. 682 (N.Y. 1867)" (Albany: Weare C. Little, 1868), 9.235
6. *The Boston Gazette and Country Journal* (Monday, October 5, 1772): 2.
7. Henry Campbell Black, *Handbook of American Constitutional Law*, 3rd., ed. (St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company, 1910), 528.
8. Charles Thomas Dennis, *The Rise of Tyranny: America on the Brink*, Video on anApologetic.com.
9. Robert H. Bork, *The Tempting of America: The Political Seduction of the Law*, First Touchstone Edition (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 122.
10. Ibid, 246.
11. Eli F. Ritter, *Moral Law and Civil Law Parts of the Same Thing* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1896), 83. His book "had quite a large sale, and was highly commended by eminent judges and lawyers." (The Phi Gamma Delta, Vol. 36, No. 5 (March, 1914): 531.). It was also endorsed by the Vice President of the United States and the Governor of Indiana.
12. *Report of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association* (Philadelphia: Dando Printing and Publishing Company, 1892), 200-202.
13. *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963)
14. Herbert Schlossberg, *Idols for Destruction* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983), 273
15. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, James Hastings, ed (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 11.347.
16. Matthew Henry, *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament* (Philadelphia: Ed. Barrington & Geo. D. Haswell, 1828 [1706]), 6.545.
17. *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971)
18. *Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668 (1984)