

Please Note: The link to lectures on the Constitution has been removed, it was in error. Not of deception but out of hope and anticipation. Those hopes, by watching the first of its series, based on the advertisement, **HAVE NOT BEEN REALIZED**. Serious Scriptural errors are presented in the first of the programs. At minutes 12:21-15:26 link below—angels are disembodied intellects—*which then do not have feet, Rev. 22:8,9;19:10;1Cor. 15:40. Nor would angles have hands Gen. 19:1,10,15-16. That man was equal to beasts, see Eccl. 3:19 . Yet Jesus was placed on the same level as man and not beasts—Heb. 2:9. And promotes a union of church and state, leading Christians to link their interest with a temporal kingdom and not Christ. Heb. 11:10; John 18:36. And Where is the record in the Bible that Angels are not perfect? No reference is given, so I'll give it, evil fallen angels NOT THOSE WHO ARE UNFALLEN THAT DO HIS BIDDING—2Peter 2:4;Jude 1:6. For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;” That man has needs and pressures, called to do right but not always—the you can't be perfect lie. This is the reason we need laws? And that's why God gave His the Ten. Here's the reason for the Gospel. Putting on the new man. Due. 11:1. And what's the will of the people—union of church and state. Human laws are external measures and the remedy of an immoral soul must reach the heart—the Gospel and:—*

But *today* in the religious world there are multitudes who, as *they* believe, *are working for the establishment of the kingdom of Christ as an earthly and temporal dominion. They desire to make our Lord the ruler of the kingdoms of this world, the ruler in its courts and camps, its legislative halls, its palaces and market places. They expect Him to rule through legal enactments, enforced by human authority. Since Christ is not now here in person, they themselves will undertake to act in His stead, to execute the laws of His kingdom.* The establishment of such a kingdom is what the Jews desired in the days of Christ. They would have received Jesus, had He been willing to establish a temporal dominion, to enforce what they regarded as the laws of God, and to make them the *expositors* of His will and the agents of His authority. But He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." John 18:36. He would not accept the earthly throne. {DA 509.2}

“ Not by the decisions of courts or councils or legislative assemblies, not by the patronage of worldly great men, is the kingdom of Christ established, but by the implanting of Christ's nature in humanity through the work of the Holy Spirit. “ DA 509.4

Nothing is more destructive or dangerous to a separation of Church and State than the popular misunderstanding of Romans 13:1-7. Government is ordained of God, why? Rom. 13:4 and 5; Gen. 9:5,6. To enforce man's duty to man. Not man's duty to God. Dan. 3:29. But which type of Government? Those I like or those that I dislike.? Both, otherwise there'd be no consent. Rom. 6:16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey;

whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? Can one yield obedience unto righteousness under any government YES! *If Angels governed man, internal nor external controls would be needed, these would be Faithful Unfallen angels. This would be true of men who are faithful to God see Daniel's service as well as Joseph's Esther's, Mordecai's, Nehemiah's.* Certainly He allows "Governments" by consent of the people but why does He remove them?. Dan. 2:21;5:23-28. Because they a point where He can longer let them continue. Note the Jews in Samual's day. God had been the head of their Government:—1Sam. 8:5 . . . "now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. . . 7 And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." From Babylon to Rome to modern Europe they were subject unto other nations.

At 18:40 -20:20 link below, please read the following.

"The Jewish constitution was a theocracy, in which Jehovah assumed to that people a special relation—a relation which he never sustained to any other portion of our race,—the relation of their King,—himself conducting the administration of their government, by a system of supernatural interposition, and immediate manifestation of his presence and authority. Who but Jehovah himself can imitate this? He must select another Abraham, make his seed a nation, separate that nation to himself as a peculiar people, and, regarding the community, collectively worship considered as his church, institute for it the ordinances of an exclusive worship, as well as prescribe for it its civil constitution and laws. To talk of imitation, in a case so thoroughly peculiar, or to call that imitation, in which the very essence of the thing imitated is of necessity wanting, is the height of absurdity. It must be God's doing not man's.—"*Civil Establishments of Christianity,*" *Ralph Wardlaw, D. D. (Glasgow), p. 12. London: Arthur Miall, 1866.*" *Due 4:34*

<https://youtu.be/oU5gasRxYdU>

Then Why Did They Say This?

THE

TWO-HORNED BEAST

—OF—

REV. XIII,

A SYMBOL
—OF—
THE UNITED STATES.

BY J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

REVIEW AND HERALD.

1857.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION, ART. 1.

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

We subjoin George Washington’s decision in regard to the intent of the Constitution. A letter written to the committee of a Baptist society in Virginia, in reply to questions as to the design of that instrument.”—*Aug. 4th, 1789.*

“If I had the least idea of any difficulty resulting from the Constitution adopted by the Convention, of which I had the honor to be President when it was formed, so as to endanger the rights of any religious denomination, then I never should have attached my name to that instrument. If I had any idea that the general government was so administered that liberty of conscience was endangered, I pray you be assured that no man would be more willing than myself to revise and alter that part of it, so as to avoid all religious persecutions. You can, without doubt, remember that I have often expressed my opinion, that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience.”

Source Book for Bible

Students

Review and Herald Publishing Association

WASHINGTON, D.C.

1940

Page 450

Religious Liberty, GEORGE WASHINGTON ON CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE OFF.—If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed by the convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious rights of *any* ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual *barriers* against the horrors of spiritual tyranny and every species of religious persecution. For, you doubtless remember, I have often expressed my sentiments that *any* man, conducting himself as a good citizen and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his

own conscience.— *George Washington, to Baptist delegation, Aug. 8, 1789; "A History of the Baptists," Thomas Armitage, D. D., LL. D., pp. 806, 807. New York: Taylor & Co., 1887.*

Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists

The Final Letter, as Sent

To messrs. Nehemiah Dodge, Ephraim Robbins, & Stephen S. Nelson, a committee of the Danbury Baptist association in the state of Connecticut.

Gentlemen

The affectionate sentiments of esteem and approbation which you are so good as to express towards me, on behalf of the Danbury Baptist association, give me the highest satisfaction. my duties dictate a faithful and zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents, & in proportion as they are persuaded of my fidelity to those duties, the discharge of them becomes more and more pleasing.

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely *between Man & his God*, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," *thus building a wall of separation between Church & State*. Adhering to this expression of the *supreme will of the nation* in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.

I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection & blessing of the common father and creator of man, and tender you for yourselves & your religious association, assurances of my high respect & esteem.

Th Jefferson

Jan. 1. 1802.

Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists (June 1998) - Library of Congress Information Bulletin

Jefferson's dire warning if religion is recognized by Government.

AMERICAN STATE PAPERS
BEARING ON
RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION
By W. A. Blakely

Notes

Jefferson foresaw the same retrogradation in public opinion on the matter of the individual's religious rights. He stated explicitly that from the close of the Revolution public opinion would "be going down hill" In Query xvii, of his "Notes on Virginia," he says in closing:

"Besides, the spirit of the times may alter, will alter. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better men be his victims. It can never

be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war (Revolutionary) we shall be going down hill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion. "

MADISON'S MEMORIAL.

DURING THE YEAR 1785

To the Honorable, the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

A MEMORIAL AND REMONSTRANCE.

We, the subscribers, citizens of the said Commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration, a Bill printed by order of the last Session of General Assembly, entitled "A Bill establishing a provision for teachers of the Christian Religion," and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State, to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said Bill,

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, "that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable; because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men: It is unalienable also; because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. 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. We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of Civil Society, and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. True it is, that no other rule exists, by which any question which may divide a Society, can be ultimately determined, but the will of the majority; but it is also true, that the majority may trespass on the rights of the minority.

2. Because if religion be exempt from the authority of the Society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the Legislative Body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited: it is limited with regard to the coordinate departments, more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government requires not merely, that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power may be invariably maintained; but more especially, that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great Barrier which defends the rights of the people. The Rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are Tyrants. The People who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves, nor by an authority derived from them, and are slaves.

3. Because, it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of [the] noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other Religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other Sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

4. Because, the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable, in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. If "all men are by nature equally free and independent," all men are to be considered as entering into Society on equal conditions; as relinquishing no more, and therefore retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all are they to be considered as retaining an "equal title to the free exercise of Religion according to the dictates of conscience". Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess and to observe the Religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offence against God, not against man: To God, therefore, not to men, must an account of it be rendered. As the bill violates equality by subjecting some to peculiar burdens; so it violates the same principle, by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be intrusted with the care of public worship? Ought their Religions to be endowed above all others, with extraordinary privileges, by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favorably of the justice and good sense of these denominations, to believe that they either covet pre-eminencies over their fellow citizens, or that they will be seduced by them, from the common opposition to the measure.

5. Because the bill implies either that the Civil Magistrate is a competent Judge of Religious truth; or that he may employ Religion as an engine of Civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension falsified by the contradictory opinions of Rulers in all ages, and throughout the world: The second an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

6. Because the establishment proposed by the Bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian Religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian Religion itself; for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world: it is a contradiction to fact; for it is known that this Religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them; and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence, and the ordinary care of Providence: Nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a Religion not invented by human policy, must have pre-existed and been supported, before it was established by human policy. It is moreover to weaken in those who profess this Religion a pious confidence in its innate excellence, and the patronage of its Author; and to foster in those who still reject it, a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies, to trust it to its own merits.

7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of Religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries, has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the Clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry and persecution. Enquire of the Teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest lustre; those of every sect, point to the ages prior to its incorporation with Civil policy. Propose a restoration of this primitive state in which its Teachers depended on the voluntary rewards of their flocks; many of them predict its downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have greatest weight, when for or when against their interest?

8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of Civil Government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of Civil Government only as it is a means of supporting Religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If Religion be not within [the] cognizance of Civil Government, how can its legal establishment be said to be necessary to Civil Government? What influence in fact have ecclesiastical establishments had on Civil Society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of Civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberties, may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure & perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his Religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property; by neither invading the equal rights by any Sect, nor suffering any Sect to invade those of another.

9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every Nation and Religion, promised a lustre to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is the Bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of Citizens all those whose opinions in Religion do not bend to those of the Legislative authority. Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the Inquisition it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other the last in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer under this cruel scourge in foreign Regions, must view the Bill as a Beacon on our Coast, warning him to seek some other haven,

where liberty and philanthropy in their due extent may offer a more certain repose from his troubles.

10. Because, it will have a like tendency to banish our Citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration, by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly which has dishonoured and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

11. Because, it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with Religion, has produced amongst its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the old world, by vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish Religious discord, by proscribing all difference in Religious opinions. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American Theatre has exhibited proofs, that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bonds of Religious freedom, we know no name that will too severely reproach our folly. At least let warning be taken at the first fruit of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the Bill has transformed that "Christian forbearance, love and charity," which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not soon be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded should this enemy to the public quiet be armed with the force of a law?

12. Because, the policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those who enjoy this precious gift, ought to be that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those who have as yet received it with the number still remaining under the dominion of false Religions; and how small is the former! Does the policy of the Bill tend to lessen the disproportion? No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of [revelation] from coming into the Region of it; and countenances, by example the nations who continue in darkness, in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of levelling as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the Bill with an ignoble and unchristian timidity would circumscribe it, with a wall of defence, against the encroachments of error.

13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of Citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of Society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? and what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the Government, on its general authority?

14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed, without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens: and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. "The people of the respective counties are indeed requested to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of the Bill to the next Session of Assembly." But the representation must be made equal, before the voice either of the Representatives or of the

Counties, will be that of the people. Our hope is that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the Bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence, that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

15. Because, finally, "the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his Religion according to the dictates of conscience" is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the Declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia, as the "basis and foundation of Government," it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather studied emphasis. Either then, we must say, that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority; and that in the plentitude of this authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred: Either we must say, that they may controul the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the Executive and Judiciary Powers of the State; nay that they may despoil us of our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly: or we must say, that they have no authority to enact into law the Bill under consideration. We the subscribers say, that the General Assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority: And that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it, this remonstrance; earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront his holy prerogative, or violate the trust committed to them: and on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of his [blessing, may re]dound to their own praise, and may establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the Happiness of the Commonwealth.

Writings of James Madison, published by order of Congress, (Philadelphia,1865), volume i, page 162, *et seq*

"DECLARATION OF RIGHTS," article 16.

AMERICAN STATE PAPERS BEARING ON RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION, MADISON'S MEMORIAL page 27

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

WRITTEN BY JAMES MADISON TO EDWARD LIVINGSTON

MONTPELIER, July 10, 1822

DEAR SIR: . . . I observe with particular pleasure the view you have taken of the immunity of religion from civil jurisdiction, in every case where it does not trespass on private rights or the public peace. This has always been a favorite principle with me; *and it was not with my approbation, that the deviation from it took place in Congress, when they appointed Chaplains, to be paid from the national treasury.* It would have been a much better proof to their constituents of their pious feeling if the members had contributed for the purpose a pittance from

their own pockets. As the precedent is not likely to be rescinded, the best that can now be done, may be to apply to the Constitution the maxim of the law, *de minimis non curat*.

There has been another deviation from the strict principle in the executive proclamations of fasts & festivals, so far, at least, as they have spoken the language of injunction, or have lost sight of the equality of all religious sects in the eye of the Constitution. Whilst I was honored with the executive trust, I found it necessary on more than one occasion to follow the example of predecessors. But I was always careful to make the Proclamations absolutely indiscriminate, and merely recommendatory; or rather, mere designations of a day on which all who thought proper might unite in consecrating it to religious purposes, according to their own faith and forms. In this sense, I presume, you reserve to the government a right to appoint particular days for religious worship. I know not what may be the way of thinking on this subject in Louisiana. I should suppose the Catholic portion of the people, at least, as a small and even unpopular sect in the United States, would rally, as they did in Virginia, when religious liberty was a Legislative topic, to its broadest principle. Notwithstanding the general progress made within the two last centuries in favour of this branch of liberty, and the full establishment of it in some parts of our country, there remains in others a strong bias towards the old error, that without some sort of alliance or coalition between government and religion, neither can be duly supported. Such, indeed, is the tendency to such a coalition, and such its corrupting influence on both the parties, that the danger cannot be too carefully guarded against. And in a government of opinion, like ours, the only effectual guard must be found in the soundness and stability of the general opinion on the subject. Every new and successful example therefore of a perfect separation between ecclesiastical and civil matters, is of importance, and I have no doubt that every new example will succeed, as every past one has done, in shewing that religion and government will both exist in greater purity, the less they are mixed together. It was the belief of all sects at one time that the establishment of religion by law, was right and necessary; that the true religion ought to be established in exclusion of every other; and that the only question to be decided was, which was the true religion. The example of Holland proved that a toleration of sects dissenting from the established sect was safe, and even useful. The example of the colonies, now States, which rejected religious establishments altogether, proved that all sects might be safely and advantageously put on a footing of equal and entire freedom; and a continuance of their example since the Declaration of Independence has shown that its success in colonies was not to be ascribed to their connection with the parent country. If a further confirmation of the truth could be wanted, it is to be found in the examples furnished by the States which have abolished their religious establishments. I cannot speak particularly of any of the cases excepting that of Virginia, where it is impossible to deny that religion prevails with more zeal and a more exemplary priesthood than it ever did when established and patronised by public authority. We are teaching the world the great truth that governments do better without kings than with them. The merit will be doubled by the other lesson: that religion flourishes in greater purity without, than with, the aid of government.

My pen, I perceive, has rambled into reflections for which it was taken up. I recall it to the proper object, of thanking you for your very interesting pamphlet, and of tendering you my respects and good wishes.

"The framers of the Constitution recognized *the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation*, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate" James Madison – Congressional documents (USA). Serial No. 200. document No. 271.

RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

WRITTEN BY JAMES MADISON TO EDWARD EVERETT

MONTPELIER, March, 19, 1823.

DEAR SIR: . . . A university with sectarian professorships becomes, of course, a sectarian monopoly; with professorships of rival sects, it would be an arena of theological gladiators. Without any such professorships, it may incur, for a time at least, the *imputation of irreligious tendencies, if not designs. The last difficulty was thought more manageable than either of the others.* On this view of the subject, there seems to be no alternative between a public university without theological professorship, and sectarian seminaries without a university.

I recollect to have seen, many years ago, a project of prayer, by Governor Livingston, father of the present Judge, intended to comprehend and conciliate college students of every Christian denomination, by a form composed wholly of texts and phrases of Scripture. If a trial of expedient was ever made, it must have failed, notwithstanding its winning aspect, from the single cause that many sects reject all set forms of worship.

The difficulty of reconciling the Christian mind to the absence of a religious tuition from a university established by law, and common expense, is probably less with us than with you. The settled opinion here is that *religion is essentially distinct from civil government, and exempt from its cognizance; that connection between them is injurious to both; that there are causes in the human breast which insure the perpetuity of religion without the aid of the law; that rival sects, with equal rights, exercise mutual censorships in favor of good morals; that if the new sects arise with absurd opinions or overheated imaginations, the proper remedies lie in time, forbearance, and example; that a legal establishment of religion without a toleration could not be thought of, and with a toleration, is no security for public quiet and harmony, but rather a source itself of discord and animosity; and, finally, that these opinions are supported by experience, which has shown that every relaxation of the alliance between law and religion, from the partial example of the Holland to its consummation in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, etc., has been found as safe in practice as it is sound in theory. Prior to the Revolution, the Episcopal Church was established by law in this State. On the Declaration of Independence it was left, with all other*

sects, to a self-support. And no doubt exists that there is much more of religion among us now than there ever was before the change, and particularly in the sect which enjoyed the legal patronage. This proves rather more than that the law is not necessary to the support of religion.

With such a public opinion, it may be expected that a university, with the feature peculiar to ours, will succeed here if anywhere. Some of the clergy did not fail to arraign the peculiarity; but it is not improbable that they had an eye to the chance of introducing their own creed into the professor's chair. A late resolution for establishing an Episcopal school within the Collage of William and Mary, *though in a very guarded manner*, drew immediate animadversions from the press, which, if they have not put an end to the project, are a proof of what would follow such an experiment in the university of the State, endowed and supported, as this will be, altogether by the public authority and at the common expense.

"Writings of James Madison," volume iii, page 305 et seq.

AMERICAN STATE PAPERS BEARING ON RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION page 78-9

Authored by American diplomat Joel Barlow in 1796, the following treaty was sent to the floor of the Senate, June 7, 1797, where it was read aloud in its entirety and unanimously approved. John Adams, having seen the treaty, signed it and proudly proclaimed it to the Nation.

5th CONGRESS.]

No. 122.

[1st SESSION.

TRIPOLI.

COMMUNICATED TO THE SENATE, MAY 26, 1797.

UNITED STATES, *May 26,*

1797.

Gentlemen of the Senate:

I lay before you, for your consideration and advice, a treaty of perpetual peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Bey and subjects of Tripoli. of Barbary, concluded, at Tripoli, on the 4th day of November, 1796.

JOHN ADAMS

Art. 11. As the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity, of Mussulmen; and, as the said States never entered into any war, or act of hostility against any Mahometan nation, it is declared by the parties, that no pretext arising from religious opinions, shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.

ARMY REUNION SPEECH
IOWA SEPTEMBER 1875
GENERAL GRANT

Let us labor for the security of free thought, free speech, free press, pure morals, unfettered religious sentiments, and equal rights and privileges for all men, irrespective of nationality, color, or religion; encourage free schools, resolve that not one dollar appropriated to them shall go to the support of any sectarian school; resolve that neither state nor nation shall support any institution save those where every child may get a common school education, unmixed with any atheistic, pagan, or sectarian teaching; leave the matter of religious teaching to the family altar, the church and the private school, supported entirely by private contributions, and *keep church and state forever separate.* U.S. Grant 1875.