

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 VI—

Regrettably, Christians, as a body of believers in America, have become a sleeping giant. If Christians, over the past sixty-five years, had been engaged, as a cohesive force—as the heart and soul of liberty—as they were in the formative years of our Republic, America would not be in the sorry state in which she finds herself today. It is impossible for liberty to prevail without Christianity as its bulwark. Tyranny cannot survive where religion and morality prevail, nor can it gain an initial foothold.

There is a convincing empirical argument for the pervasive influence of Christianity in every area in American culture. This argument was made, coincidentally, by Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is to be noted that Jackson served on the Court during the *Everson* hearing and decision. Previous to the *Everson* case, he took a hiatus from the Supreme Court when he was appointed by President Harry Truman to be United States Chief Prosecutor at the trial of the major war criminals before the International Military Tribunal held at Nuremberg.

No adjectives are sufficient to describe the horrors perpetrated by the Nazi regime as revealed by the prosecution in the Nuremberg court proceedings. Speaking of these atrocities, Jackson declared them to be such, “as the world has not witnessed since pre-Christian ages.”¹ It should not be surprising, then, as to the initial restraint that stood in the way of the Third Reich’s repugnant ambitions; a restraint Hitler was determined to eliminate. Jackson explained:

Of course, any such program must reckon with the opposition of the Christian Church. This was recognized from the very beginning. Defendant [Martin] Bormann wrote all Gauleiters [heads of regional districts of the Nazi party] in 1941 that “National Socialism and Christian concepts are irreconcilable,” and that the people must be separated from the churches and the influence of the churches totally removed.²

Sir Harley Shawcross, Chief Prosecutor for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, added that one of the main problems facing the Third Reich was “the moral standards of the German people, and the churches which fostered them.”³ The solution to overcoming these “moral standards” would be, “by systematic discouragement and persecution of religion, by

replacing the ethics of Christianity with the idolatry of the Fuhrer and the cult of the blood and by rigidly controlling education and youth.”⁴

Totalitarianism and Christian morality are bitter enemies. Evil does everything it can to displace Christian morality. Consider again, “the solution” to overcoming “moral standards” by “replacing the ethics of Christianity with idolatry,” and “rigidly controlling education and youth.” If that does not sound astonishingly familiar to the judicial mindset of many of our Supreme Court Justices both past and present then Americans are deaf. The State’s orchestrated effort to mimic Nazi Germany by perverting the minds and morals of American youth by “replacing the ethics of Christianity with idolatry” could not be more evident. Just look at what is being taught in our “compulsory state education system” today, compared to public schools in past generations.

The underlying judicial philosophy employed by the Nazis to accomplish their goal was Legal Positivism, which is: “The theory that legal rules are valid only because they are enacted by an existing political authority or accepted as binding in a given society, not because they are grounded in morality or in natural law.”⁵ The defense used by those charged with war crimes by the Nuremberg Tribunal was, “I was just obeying the law.” With no absolute moral standard as a guide no one could be found guilty.

Jackson countered: “The Charter of this Tribunal evidences a faith that the law is not only to govern the conduct of little men, but that even rulers are, as Lord Chief Justice Coke put it to King James, ‘under God and the law.’”⁶ Jackson also stated: “As an International Military Tribunal, it rises above the provincial and transient and seeks guidance not only from international law but also from the basic principles of jurisprudence which are assumptions of civilization and which long have found embodiment in the codes of all nations.”⁷

Obviously, Jackson’s consideration of “international law” and the “codes of all nations,” referred to those nations whose “basic principles of jurisprudence” did not belie “the ethics of Christianity;” otherwise, he would have contradicted himself by relegating “international law” and the “codes of all nations” to “pre-Christian ages.” Samuel Adams gave the most accurate explanation of “the basic principles of jurisprudence” in his remonstrance against the tyranny of Great Britain:

“Just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty” in matters spiritual and temporal, is a thing that all Men are clearly entitled to by the eternal and immutable laws Of God and nature, as well as by the law of Nations & all well-grounded municipal laws, which must have their foundation in the former.⁸

It was necessary for the prosecution to appeal to a “Higher Law;” that law, which forever stands—resolutely—as “the eternal and immutable laws Of God and nature,” in order to secure a guilty verdict against the accused. Void of these “eternal and immutable laws,” any nation is vulnerable to totalitarianism and places its citizens at risk; a risk that becomes more apparent every day. The Founders and Framers were keenly aware of this possibility and as a consequence produced The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, with its Bill of Rights.

The world almost collapsed under the weight of the political theory of a demoniac, the foundation

of which Jackson described: “The Nazi Party always was predominantly anti-Christian in its ideology.”⁹ To a greater or lesser degree this “ideology” is still practiced in many nations of the world. The most troubling concern is when this “anti-Christian ideology” is embraced by various segments of American society, being energetically fostered by the Supreme Court. Under the pretense of interpreting the Constitution, the Court, using the deceptive practice of incrementalism, has systemically replaced “the ethics of Christianity with the idolatry” of an unconstitutional, oligarchical established religion of secularism, with its underlying atheistic doctrines. Void of an absolute moral component this secularistic religion is responsible for the ungodly, reprobate laws that have only one outcome: God’s righteous judgment on America. Thus, the greatest threat to America liberty is the Supreme Court’s debased, atheistic interpretation of the Constitution.

For those who may think this concern is overly dramatized, there is another comparison of contemporary America with Hitler’s ideology: the Holocaust. This comparison is not with the Holocaust being Hitler’s “final solution” with regard to his satanic hatred of Jews. Rather, the comparison is with the similar idea of government authorized killings of human beings who are declared to be less worthy to live than others. In this case it is the grisly practice of abortion. While not an argument of moral equivalence, in every sense of the word, abortion is no less an evil. Most people have never seen the aftermath of an abortion. If they were to do so it would shock them into the reality of the diabolical wickedness of the act. Compound that single horror by 56 million abortions and the Holocaust is not an inaccurate description.

The Supreme Court, by replacing God as the voice of reason, considers those 56 million human beings to be nothing more than encumbrances on the private lives of their mothers, who for whatever reason became pregnant. The Court has determined that the womb is no longer a God created safe haven for human development, but a potential execution chamber. The depraved thinking that approves of such macabre behavior is another sign of the decline and fall of this once great nation. God has declared, *in no uncertain terms*, that life begins at conception.¹⁰ In rebuttal, America’s oligarchy has declared that God does not know what He is talking about. To support this idiocy, the Court is obsessed with negating “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.”

In 1950, three years after the folly of the Everson decision regarding the separation of Church and State, and four and one half years after the end of “the bloodiest War in history,” President Harry Truman, delivered an “Address before the Attorney General’s Conference on Law.” This address has proven to be prophetic, and is a warning that, if not heeded, will seal America’s demise as “the land of the free.”

The most important business in this Nation—or any other nation, for that matter—is raising and training children. If those children have the proper environment at home, and educationally, very, very few of them ever turn out wrong. I don’t think we put enough stress on the necessity of implanting in the child’s mind the moral code under which we live.

The fundamental basis of this Nation's law was given to Moses on the Mount. The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings which we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don't think we emphasize that enough these days.

If we don't have the proper fundamental moral background, we will finally wind up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the state.¹¹

Truman's address was a confirmation of John Adams' declaration: "It is religion [Christianity] and morality alone, which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand."¹² Adams also warned: "We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. . . . Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."¹³ Yet, just 30 years after Truman's address, Supreme Court Justice William Brennan, in a screed against children being taught morality in government controlled schools stated:

Posting of religious texts on the wall serves no such [secular] educational function. If the posted copies of the Ten Commandments are to have any effect at all, it will be to induce the schoolchildren to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey, the Commandments. However desirable this might be as a matter of private devotion, it is not a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause.¹⁴

Brennan was as unlearned about the truth of the First Amendment as most of his contemporaries and predecessors. God forbid that the Ten Commandments might be read by children who then might actually obey them. This "is not a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause." However, it is "a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause" to corrupt the minds and morals of children to the greatest extent possible. Brennan's assertion that moral teaching, "however desirable this might be," must be relegated to "a matter of private devotion" was naive at best. The real outcome has proven to be no different than that of Nazi Germany; "replacing the ethics of Christianity with idolatry." This, "by rigidly controlling education and youth."

Brennan did not stop with his diatribe against Christian awareness being expressed in government controlled schools. He was determined that any reference to Christianity by any government sanctioned event, even a city celebrating Christmas, was a violation of the First Amendment. In his dissent in *Lynch v. Donnelly* (1983), he stated, concerning Pawtucket Road Island's annual Christmas display that included a crèche: "By insisting that such a distinctively sectarian message is merely an unobjectionable part of our 'religious heritage,' the Court takes a long step backwards to the days when Justice Brewer could arrogantly declare for the Court that 'this is a Christian nation.' Those days, I had thought, were forever put behind us"¹⁵

To a great extent, Justice Brennan's desire has been accomplished. Through a litany of successive decisions, the Supreme Court of the United States of America has "arrogantly" declared that ours is anything but a Christian nation. The fulfillment of this self-proclaimed prophecy was to be executed through the dedicated use of its oligarchical power. It is as though someone within the

government has “posted the text,” of Bormann’s letter, “on the wall” of the Supreme Court, “to induce” some of the Justices “to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey” his edict; for “however [undesirable] this might be,” this is the outcome of the Court’s debased, atheistic interpretation of the Constitution.

Where does this leave us as a nation? The answer depends on a number of factors. During the debates in the Constitutional Convention (1787), over the formulation of the grand document that would become “the Supreme Law of the Land,” a deadlock arose that brought the deliberations to a standstill. At that juncture, the venerable Benjamin Franklin, at the age of 81, addressed the Convention, with due respect for its President, George Washington. The excerpt below reveals wisdom far beyond the capability of those Supreme Court Justices who are enemies of liberty. In that moment, shedding all vestiges of the folly of Deism, Franklin proclaimed:

I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, *That God governs in the affairs of men!* And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?—We have been assured, Sir, in the Sacred Writings, that “except the Lord build the House they labor in vain that build it.” I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: we shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and bye-word down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing Governments by human wisdom, and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.¹⁶ (Italics in original)

Franklin presented the grand contest of establishing a government. His dichotomy was exceptionally keen. Any repudiation of the truth that “except the Lord build the House they labor in vain that build it” is representative of a government that is “no better than the builders of Babel.” A political scheme that fails to recognize God will inevitably incur His judgment. Jonathan Edwards wrote of Babel: “this city and tower had their foundation laid in the pride and vanity of men, and the haughtiness of their minds.”¹⁷ Could there be a better insight into the thinking behind the wickedness of America’s current “political building” than Franklin’s expression? Consider Proverbs 16:18: “Pride *goeth* before destruction and an haughty spirit before a fall.” Franklin wrote another speech that was delivered at the end of the Constitutional Convention from which the following extract deserves special attention. It also speaks directly to the diabolical reasoning of many political and judicial operatives today.

I agree to this Constitution with all its faults,—if they are such; because I think a general Government necessary for us, and there is no *form* of Government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered, and believe further that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic Government, being incapable of any other.¹⁸ (Italics in original)

The Court’s negative influence on the morals of the people, if not stopped, will inevitably produce

this desired consequence: “the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic Government, being incapable of any other.” Recent Supreme Court decisions are startling confirmations to this outcome. One has to be careful even where there seems to be a bright light. Less than ten months before the *Everson* lunacy, Justice William O. Douglas, delivering the opinion of the Court, in *Girouard v. United States*, and mimicking Madison, stated:

The struggle for religious liberty has, through the centuries, been an effort to accommodate the demands of the State to the conscience of the individual. The victory for freedom of thought recorded in our Bill of Rights recognizes that, in the domain of conscience, there is a moral power higher than the State. Throughout the ages, men have suffered death rather than subordinate their allegiance to God to the authority of the State.¹⁹

While this sounds good, the fact is, Douglas had no problem with the interpretation of religion as defined in *Everson*, even though that decision contained a repudiation of “a moral power higher than the State.” The *Everson* conclusion is the cornerstone of corruption that supports “despotic Government” by redefining the First Amendment. Douglas spoke the truth, but seemingly did not understand the comprehensiveness of the truth he spoke. Five months prior to the *Everson* decision, McKinnon considering Douglas’ quote in relation to “Higher Law,” declared:

This gentleman, is our birthright. This is what is at stake in America today. And in this matter we are in the most unyielding dilemma. For if there is no higher law, there is no basis for saying that any man-made law is unjust, and if an act of Congress, benign in purpose and content and enacted within the limits of the Constitution, is called a law, by the same token the most vicious enactment of the late Nazi government must be called a law; and in such case, the ultimate reason for things, as Justice Homes himself conceded, is force. If there is no natural law, there are no natural rights; and if there are no natural rights, the Bill of Rights is a delusion, and everything which a man possesses—his life, his liberty and his property—are held by sufferance of government, and in that case it is inevitable that government will some day find it expedient to take away what is held by a title such as that. And if there are no eternal truths, if everything changes, everything, then we may not complain when the standard of citizenship changes from freedom to servility and when democracy relapses into tyranny.²⁰

The crux of the real issue is this, if America is not a Christian nation then she is a post-Christian nation, which is nothing more than a pre-Christian nation, which means, for all intents and purposes, she is a neopagan nation where “democracy relapses into tyranny.” The alternative is a nation influenced by an unfettered Christian morality where the Constitution remains intact and qualified Justices are seated on the Supreme Court; that is, Justices who do not applaud what Alexander Hamilton warned against: “the ordinary depravity of human nature.”²¹ This is the only solution for a secured freedom under “the Supreme Law of the Land.” A need much easier desired than achieved.

On November 11, 1620 William Bradford wrote the Mayflower Compact, in which he declared “for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian Faith.”²² Following Bradford, ten years later, John Winthrop, the first Governor of Massachusetts, sailing on the flagship *Arbella*, (one of

eleven ships carrying about 700 Puritans to Massachusetts), set the moral compass for the new world. It was both an encouragement and a warning. While in today's political economy and mindset it may seem antiquated, his message is no less important to our current generation:

For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken and so cause Him to withdraw His present help from us, we shall be made a story and a byword throughout the world. We shall open the mouths of enemies to speak evil of the way of God and all professors for God's sake. We shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into curses upon us till we be consumed out of the good land whether we are going.²³ (Spelling updated.)

Reject Winthrop's warning if you will; you cannot separate a fool from his folly. Anyone who thinks it is acceptable to "deal falsely with our God" and to "cause Him to withdraw His present help from us," is truly mentally askew and morally bankrupt. When America was preparing for war with Great Britain—against all odds—a plea was made by the Continental Congress to "people of all ranks and degrees duly impressed with a solemn sense of God's superintending providence, and of their duty, devoutly to rely, in all their lawful enterprises, on His aid and direction." This appeal was specifically made to Christians, as the Congress added, "that we may, with united hearts, confess and bewail our manifold sins and transgressions, and, by a sincere repentance and amendment of life, appease His righteous displeasure, and, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, obtain His pardon and forgiveness."²⁴ The Congress knew that without God's intervention all would be lost. The fact that America exists is the direct consequence of those prayers. It bodes well for all Americans to heed Samuel Adams' sage truth:

No People will tamely surrender their Liberties, nor can any be easily subdued, when Knowledge is diffused and Virtue is preserved. On the Contrary, when people are universally ignorant, and debauched in their Manners, they will sink under their own Weight without the Aid of foreign invaders.²⁵

The sociopolitical collapse, with its moral decadence, that we are experiencing today is the culmination of what has been in the works for generations, and it has finally come home to roost. America is again in a battle for her existence as *the Land of the Free*. A battle of no less consequence than that which the Founders faced. If America does not experience a new "great awakening," the epitaph of her destruction will be a recital of her embracing paganism, and its accompanying evils. A dynamic Christian renewal is the only answer. There can be no freedom without God's blessings and God *will not* bless a nation that shakes its fist in His face by calling good evil and evil good. The advancement of Christian morality requires Christian leaders. John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, asserted this necessity emphatically: "Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty, as well as the privilege and interest, of our Christian nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers."²⁶

For those who are concerned about the "no religious test shall ever be required" clause in Article VI of the United States Constitution, it was inserted for exactly the same reason as the religion clauses in the First Amendment. Story explained: "It is designed to cut off every pretense of any

alliance between the Church and the State in the administration of the National Government.”²⁷
(See Part III, note 19.)

After reading this article, it should be obvious that it is not just a responsibility, but an absolute necessity for those who love God and Country to vote for true Christians, who have the best potential for being elected, to any and every public office. “Our liberty and its foundation must have champions, especially when under assault like they are today.”²⁸

[Home](#) | [Introduction](#) | [Articles](#)

Notes

1. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg*, Blue Series (Nuremberg: International Military Tribunal, 1947), 2.100.
2. *Ibid*, (1948), 19.405.
3. *Ibid*, 19.439.
4. *Ibid*.
5. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th Ed., Bryan A. Garner, ed. in ch. (St. Paul: Thomas West Publishing, 2004), s.v. “legal positivism.”
6. *Trial of the Major War Criminals*, 2.143.
7. *Ibid*, 19.398.
8. Harry Alonzo Cushing, col. and ed., *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 2.352.
9. *Trial of the Major War Criminals*, 2.115.
10. This truth is covered in detail in *IRREFUTABLE*.
11. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman*, 1950 (Washington: Government Printing House, 1965), 157, item 37, “Address Before the Attorney General's Conference on Law Enforcement Problems,” February 15, 1950.
12. Charles Francis Adams, *The Works of John Adams*, Second President of the United States (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1851), 9.401.
13. *Ibid*, 2.510.
14. *Stone v. Graham*, 449 U.S. 39 (1980)
15. *Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668 (1984)
16. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (London: Henry Colburn, 1818), 389.
17. *The Works of President Edwards* (New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co., 1844), 1.321.
18. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, 390.
19. *Girouard v. United States* 328 U.S. 61 (1946).
20. Harold R. McKinnon, “The Higher Law: Reaction Has Permeated Our Legal Thinking,” *American Bar Association Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (February 1947): 203.
21. *The Federalist*, No. 78 (Washington: Jacob Gideon, 1818), 490.
22. George Ernest Bowman, *The Mayflower Compact and Its Signers* (Boston: Massachusetts Society of Mayflower Descendants, 1920), 15.
23. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3rd ser, “A Modell of Christian Charity” (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1838), 7.47.
24. *Journals of the Continental Congress 1774-1789* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1906), 4.208-209.
25. Cushing, *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, 3.237.
26. William Jay, *The Life of John Jay* (New York: J. & J. Harper, 1833), 2.376.

27. Joseph Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States* (Boston: Marsh, Capen, Lyon, and Webb, 1840), 253

28 Video: *The Rise of Tyranny: America on the Brink* (anApologetic.com)