



The BIBLE,
VOTERS &
the 2008
ELECTION



DAVID BARTON



The BIBLE,
VOTERS &
the 2008
ELECTION

DAVID BARTON



Aledo, Texas

www.wallbuilders.com

The Bible, Voters, and the 2008 Election

Copyright © 2008 David Barton

1st Edition, 1st Printing

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews.

Additional materials available from:

WallBuilders

P. O. Box 397

Aledo, TX 76008

(817) 441-6044

www.wallbuilders.com

ISBN-10: 1-932225-62-5

ISBN-13: 978-1-932225-62-4

Printed in the United States of America

The Bible, Voters, and the 2008 Presidential Election: Keeping First Things First

As the November 2008 Presidential Election approaches, the Bible (as well as American history) offers sound counsel to people of faith to help determine their selection for President. That counsel will be examined in this book, which is written primarily for persons of Biblical faith – for those who hold the Scriptures as the authority in their lives. Regrettably, this does not encompass all who call themselves Christian, Jew, Protestant, or Catholic, for many individuals in each of those categories are not Biblical in their thinking. † And while some of the rhetoric in this work is specifically Christian, the principles are firmly grounded in the Scriptures and are therefore Judeo-Christian and thus appropriate for both Christians and Jews.

Maintaining a National and not a Personal Perspective

- ▶ Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people. PROVERBS 14:34

† Regrettably, the United Church of Christ (UCC) – the Christian denomination of 1.2 million members recently made famous by Barack Obama and the Rev. Jeremiah Wright – provides a clear illustration of a non-Biblical “Christian” group. The UCC was the first denomination to ordain an openly gay minister and to call for recognition of homosexual marriages (in 1976),¹ and currently some 200 openly homosexual UCC clergy serve in its various ministries or pastorates.² The UCC is also a strong advocate of abortion, openly endorsing abortion-on-demand a full two years before the *Roe v. Wade* decision of 1973;³ they even oppose the ban on partial-birth abortions.⁴ The UCC also holds positions that favor Palestinians above Jews (the Jewish Anti-Defamation League is uncomfortable with their position toward Israel),⁵ and the UCC doesn’t celebrate the “sexist” God of the Bible but instead uses gender-neutral images of God that can be either “he,” “she,” or whatever the individual wants Him to be.⁶ Believing that “God speaks in new ways every day” and that “doctrine and the intent of the Bible are affected by culture and context,”⁷ the UCC does not embrace fixed absolutes from the Scriptures (especially on moral issues) but rewrites the Bible to match whatever position they embrace at that time. Clearly, this denomination, while officially considered Christian, is certainly not Biblical; there unfortunately are other Christian and Jewish groups and individuals that have also rejected traditional Biblical truths and standards.

- ▶ Righteousness alone can exalt [America] as a nation. Reader! Whoever thou art, remember this; and in thy sphere practice virtue thyself and encourage it in others. ⁸ PATRICK HENRY
- ▶ I have one great political idea. . . . It is in substance, “Righteousness exalteth a nation; sin is a reproach to any people” [PROVERBS 14:34]. . . . [T]his constitutes my politics – the negative and positive of my politics, and the whole of my politics. ⁹ FREDERICK DOUGLASS, BLACK GOSPEL MINISTER; CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER
- ▶ If the time ever comes when we shall go to pieces, it will . . . [be] from losing sight of the fact that “Righteousness exalteth a nation, but that sin is a reproach to any people” [PROVERBS 14:34]. . . . Unless we hold firmly to the great principles of righteousness [enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, in the Golden Rule, in the Ten Commandments, in the Sermon on the Mount], [America,] if it continues to exist, will be a curse and not a blessing. ¹⁰ FRANCIS GRIMKE, BLACK GOSPEL MINISTER; CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER

Because the Scripture unequivocally declares that “Righteousness exalts a nation,” then the issues that the Bible identifies as directly impacting national righteousness should be foremost in Biblical voters’ minds as they select a President. Dozens of Bible passages (cf. Deuteronomy 28, I Chronicles 21, I Kings 18) affirm that a nation’s righteousness is determined by its public policies and how well they conform to God’s standards; only God-honoring policies that lead to God-honoring actions can exalt a nation.

How can a nation achieve God-honoring policies? William Paterson, a signer of the Constitution and a U. S. Supreme Court Justice, answered that question by citing Proverbs 29:2, ¹¹ which says:

When the righteous rule, the people rejoice; when the wicked rule, the people groan.

God-honoring public policies in a nation are the result of God-honoring public officials enacting those policies. Therefore, if righ-

teousness (i.e., God-honoring policy) is to exalt a nation, then a nation must have leaders like Daniel, Nehemiah, David, or Moses rather than Ahab, Jezebel, Manasseh, or Jeroboam.

In America, the only way there will be God-honoring public officials is if God-honoring citizens elect them. As Founding Father Noah Webster reminded citizens in his day:

[T]he Scriptures teach. . . . that rulers should be men who rule in the fear of God, able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness [cf. EXODUS 18:21]. . . . [I]t is to the neglect of this rule of conduct in our citizens that we must ascribe the multiplied frauds, breaches of trust, peculations [white-collar larceny], and embezzlements of public property which astonish even ourselves.¹²

Therefore, the first and foremost consideration in choosing a President † is whether that individual will advance policies upholding Biblical standards of righteousness and oppose policies that encourage what the Bible defines as sin or unrighteous behavior. For this reason, issues involving Biblical righteousness – i.e., Biblical rights and wrongs – must always take precedence over economic, environmental, health care, energy, and other issues. These other issues are important, but recall from Matthew 6 that Jesus told His disciples that if they would make the pursuit of righteousness their primary emphasis, then everything else would be provided (v. 33). However, if economic (or other) issues become the primary focus for voters, the nation usually ends up attaining neither the economic prosperity voters desired nor the national righteousness that should have been their primary concern in the first place.

† While the evaluation of a presidential candidate is the primary emphasis of this work, the President should never be the sole focus in federal elections. A President is important, but three or four dozen other names will also appear on the same ballot this Fall (including those running for Congress as well as state and local candidates), and those elected to every one of those offices will also have a direct impact on the lives of citizens. The standards set forth in this work will apply equally to those offices as well as to President; these are universal standards.

Prioritizing the Issues

In recent elections, the millions of Biblical voters who sought to advance issues of righteousness through their vote were dubbed “value voters.” Those whose agenda did not benefit from (or was even impeded by) these voters are now trying to win their support by redefining other topics as a “traditional value” or a so-called “moral” issue. For example:

- ▶ The Rev. Robert Edgar (the former general secretary of the very liberal National Council of Churches) laments: “The religious right has successfully gotten out there shaping personal piety issues – civil unions, abortion – as almost the total content of ‘moral values.’ And yet you can’t read the Old Testament without knowing God was concerned about the environment, war and peace, poverty. God doesn’t want 45 million Americans without health care.”¹³
- ▶ Supporters of homosexual marriage now assert that it is “moral” to extend partnership rights to homosexuals who have “committed” themselves to each other.¹⁴
- ▶ Pro-abortion advocates are now claiming that it is “moral” for a poor mother to have an abortion rather than give birth to a child she might not want.¹⁵
- ▶ A new movement that labels itself as “Biblically-orthodox”¹⁶ claims: “We believe the Risen Lord Jesus cares about what we drive. . . . Obeying Jesus in our transportation choices is one of the great Christian obligations and opportunities of the twenty-first century.”¹⁷
- ▶ Another frequently invoked “moral value” involves ending poverty. As the Rev. Stephen Bouman explains, “One thing Jesus was absolutely clear about was helping the poor.”¹⁸

These claims seek to do what the Rev. Joel Hunter and others of the aberrant Emerging Church movement describe as “expand

the agenda,”¹⁹ and even some traditional Biblical groups are now joining the effort.

For example, a group of 117 Evangelical leaders released the “Evangelical Climate Initiative” calling for immediate government action on global warming.²⁰ The media portrayed that group as speaking for all Evangelicals but failed to note that over 1,500 Evangelical and conservative religious leaders instead signed the “Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation”²¹ that sets forth a Biblical approach to the issue of global warming very different from that of the first and much smaller group of Evangelicals.

Similarly, a group of 72 Evangelical leaders released an “Evangelical Manifesto,” calling for an “expansion of . . . concern beyond single-issue politics such as abortion and marriage.”²² The media reported the Manifesto as the new voice and agenda of Evangelicals but failed to note that many of the most recognizable Evangelical leaders did not sign that Manifesto. In fact, of the “25 Most Influential Evangelicals in America” as identified by *Time* magazine,²³ twenty-two did not sign that document. Furthermore, several top Evangelical leaders not only refused to sign but were openly critical of it,²⁴ and others of the original 72 signers reported that their names were used without permission and that they did not support the Manifesto’s objectives.²⁵

Those trumpeting “agenda expansion” want desperately to shift the focus away from the centuries-old traditional issues of Biblical righteousness about which there has never been serious debate to other specific issues over which there is great debate. However, this is not to say that some of the issues they raise cannot be considered as Biblical issues of righteousness. For example, the Rev. Edgar and the Rev. Bouman are correct in claiming that the Bible does have much to say about helping the poor, war and peace, the environment, and health care – and the Bible also speaks about numerous additional issues which they did not mention, including immigration, taxation, property rights, and national sovereignty.

Every one of these issues is addressed in the comprehensive system of 613 laws delivered in the first five books of the Bible.

Yet God made it abundantly clear that some issues were definitely more important than others. In fact, from that expansive system of 613 laws, God selected His “Top Ten” commands, thus creating a prioritization of what was most significant to Him. (In Exodus 34:27-28, God specifically described those Ten as the “tenor” – that is, the core substance – of his 613 laws.)

Protecting innocent life did make God’s Top Ten (#6), as did protecting the sanctity of marriage (#7), but the issues of poverty, environment, health care, immigration, taxation, etc., did not make the Top Ten. This is not to say that those issues are not important but rather that citizens should always keep first things first – that they should make God’s Top Ten their own. In fact, to elevate an issue above where God has elevated it is to usurp His authority and that of His Word, and for a voter to select a candidate who is “right” on immigration, health care, the economy, energy, etc., but wrong on the priority issues of righteousness such as abortion and marriage is similarly to usurp His authority and that of His word.

The Bible does establish priorities in national righteousness, and four of its highest ranking issues will be presented below and should be at the forefront of a Biblical voter’s decision on which candidate to support.

Issue #1 – Judicial Appointments

- ▶ I will restore your judges as at the first and your attorneys as at the beginning; then you will be called the city of righteousness – the faithful city. ISAIAH 1:26
- ▶ Take warning, O judges of the earth! Worship the Lord and do homage to the Son so that He not become angry and His wrath be kindled. PSALM 2:10-12
- ▶ Appoint judges who know the laws of God. EZRA 7:25
- ▶ Judges, be careful what you do, for you do not judge for man but for the Lord, Who is with you in judgment. Therefore let the fear of the Lord be upon you. 2 CHRONICLES 19:6-7

- ▶ It has long . . . been my opinion . . . that the germ of dissolution of our federal government is in the constitution of the federal Judiciary . . . working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped. ²⁶ THOMAS JEFFERSON
- ▶ It is necessary that the Supreme Judiciary should have the confidence of the people. This will soon be lost if they are employed in the task of remonstrating against [i.e., opposing and striking down] popular measures of the legislature. ²⁷ LUTHER MARTIN, FRAMER OF THE U. S. CONSTITUTION; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND

The Scriptures speak extensively about judges and their direct impact on the righteousness of a nation. For this reason, the Scriptures direct that we are to “appoint judges who know the laws of God” (Ezra 7:25) and select judges who will “rule in the fear of God” (Exodus 18:21), because as God affirms in Isaiah 1:26, the righteousness of a land is directly affected by its judges. (America clearly demonstrates the veracity of this Scripture, for it has been judges and not legislatures who have imposed most of the clearly un-Biblical policies now in place across the land: abortion-on-demand, homosexual marriage, prohibitions against public acknowledgments of God, etc.)

A President will be gone in eight years or less, but his judges may remain on the bench for decades afterwards, and their influence is far greater than his. Therefore, a President should be selected first and foremost on the type of judges he will nominate.

In recent years, two competing philosophies of judicial nominations have emerged. For most citizens, the first exposure to these conflicting views came during the 2000 presidential debates. When asked what type of judges should be placed on the bench, one candidate responded, “I believe that the judges ought not to take the place of the legislative branch of government . . . and that they ought to look at the Constitution as sacred. . . . I don’t believe in liberal, activist judges; I believe in strict constructionists.” ²⁸ The other can-

didate countered, “The Constitution ought to be interpreted as a document that grows.”²⁹ [T]he Constitution is a living and breathing document. . . . We have interpreted our founding charter over the years and found deeper meanings in it in light of the subsequent experience in American life.”³⁰ So, the two competing philosophies are to follow original intent, or to judicially rewrite the Constitution and treat it as a daily evolving document.

Under original intent (also called a “strict constructionist,” “textualist,” or “originalist” approach), judges actually read the Constitution and attempt to follow its clear written meanings until such time as the people themselves amend the Constitution to give it a new direction in a specific area. The result is that originalist justices acknowledge the people and the legislature – and not the judiciary – as the national policy-making branch and thus honor the will of the legislature and the people (unless there is a blatant and overt violation of the written Constitution, such as electing a twelve-year old to Congress or allowing a President to serve three terms). This approach leaves power with the people and their elected representatives.

Under the living constitution approach, history and precedent are largely irrelevant; the argument is that people today should not be bound by a two centuries-old document. Persuaded that judges can best craft policies to meet current needs, judges therefore become super-legislators and create national policy in areas ranging from national morality to the environment, from criminal justice and military operations to education. For such judges, their guidance comes not from an actual written document with fixed absolutes but rather from their own previous decisions on a subject. Their “constitution” is therefore completely flexible (or “living”) and is always evolving as they rewrite it at will from decision to decision. As former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes explained:

We are under a constitution, but the constitution is what the judges say it is.³¹

Supreme Court Justice Benjamin Cardozo similarly affirmed:

I take judge-made law as one of the existing realities of life.³²

Judicially-enacted policies more often reflect the personal beliefs of judges than of society at large, and judicial policy-makers are regularly out of step with the people. For example, even though 82 percent of the nation support school prayers,³³ living constitution judges disallow that practice.³⁴ And while 66 percent support marriage as being between one man and one woman,³⁵ living constitution judges reject that arrangement and mandate other combinations.³⁶ Living constitution judges have also made abortion-on-demand for any reason the national policy,³⁷ even though only 21 percent of the nation support that unrestricted abortion policy.³⁸

Living constitution judges also overturn popular elections with which they disagree, including elections in New York and Washington that banned physician-assisted suicides,³⁹ in Arkansas and Washington that enacted term limits,⁴⁰ in Missouri that rejected a tax increase,⁴¹ and in California that defined legal marriage as a man and a woman.⁴² Ironically, each of these elections would have been valid under an originalist judge because none of the issues violated explicit constitutional clauses.

In short, original intent empowers the people whereas the living constitution empowers an unaccountable elite; and the President, more than any other individual, will determine which approach becomes national policy through the judges he appoints. This is especially true in this election, for when the next President takes office in January 2009, six of the nine Supreme Court Justices will be at least 70 years old – and five of those six Justices have been living constitution adherents, repeatedly striking down public policies friendly to Biblical values.

To understand the impact of new Justices, one need look no further than the two most recent appointees, Justices John Roberts and Samuel Alito. Those two raise the total of original intent Justices on the Court to four (still not a majority, although at times they have been able to persuade one of the other Justices to their view on a particular issue), and a number of positive decisions related to the culture have already come from the Court as a result of the influence of its new members.

For example, in the area of abortion, prior to these Justices there had been no pro-life rulings by the Supreme Court since its original 1973 abortion-on-demand decision in *Roe v. Wade*, but after the arrival of Justice Roberts, the Court upheld the federal pro-life law banning partial-birth abortions by a 5-4 vote⁴³ (having seven years earlier struck down the law by the same 5-4 margin⁴⁴). The Court also brought an end to a 20-year abortion dispute, reversing its earlier pro-abortion ruling⁴⁵ and instead holding that the Hobbs Act (and thus the RICO anti-racketeering act) does not apply to pro-life protests.⁴⁶ (Through that Act, abortion clinics had been able to compel jail time for pro-life protesters – including children – and force them into personal bankruptcies by allowing clinics to collect triple “damages” from protestors.)

Additionally, the new Court refused to hear a lower court case challenging the federal definition of marriage as one man and one woman.⁴⁷ It also upheld the constitutionality of federal faith-based programs⁴⁸ – a ruling that has resulted in numerous religious expression victories in lower courts over the last year,⁴⁹ and not one of the numerous Ten Commandments cases in any lower federal court has been lost in the past two years – an opposite and refreshing trend from the previous three decades when most Ten Commandments cases were lost.

Clearly, on issues such as abortion, marriage, and religious expressions, the Supreme Court has indisputably begun to move in a new direction through the appointment of two new strict constructionist Justices. (Significantly, Barack Obama opposed the addition of both of those Justices to the Court.⁵⁰) And as just noted, with at least six of the nine current Justices approaching a time when they are increasingly likely to retire, the judicial impact on the nation from this election is likely to be far greater than any recent election, for the next President will determine whether the current positive progress will continue or be reversed.

Therefore, recognizing the impact of judges upon national righteousness as described in Isaiah 1:26 and other verses, Biblical voters should make their selection for President first and foremost on the basis of each candidate’s judicial philosophy.

Issue #2 – Abortion & Inalienable Rights

- ▶ You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother’s womb. I am fearfully and wonderfully made. My frame was not hidden from You when I was made in secret. Your eyes saw my substance when I was yet unformed, and in Your book the days fashioned for me all were written when as yet there were none of them. PSALM 139:13-16
- ▶ The Lord made you and formed you from the womb. The Lord your Redeemer formed you from the womb. ISAIAH 44:2, 24
- ▶ [T]he Declaration of Independence . . . will tell you that its authors held for self-evident truth that the right to life is the first of the inalienable rights of man – [and] to secure and not to destroy [that right], governments are instituted among men. ⁵¹ JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, PRESIDENT; DIPLOMAT; LEGISLATOR
- ▶ With consistency, beautiful and undeviating, human life from its commencement to its close is protected by the common law. In the contemplations of law, life begins when the infant is first able to stir in the womb. By the law, [that] life is protected. ⁵² JAMES WILSON, SIGNER OF THE DECLARATION AND CONSTITUTION; ORIGINAL U. S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

Defending the life of an unborn child must continue to remain a priority for Biblical voters. (If individuals want to add issues such as the environment, poverty, health care, *et. al.*, to their voting considerations, they must do so after the abortion issue and not instead of it.)

In the American governing philosophy set forth in the Declaration (and then subsequently secured in the Constitution), protecting the right to life is so important that it is the first of the three specifically-enumerated inalienable rights (others were subsequently specified in the Bill of Rights). Our governing documents also make clear that the most important function of government is to protect inalienable rights. Thomas Jefferson affirmed that government is to “enforce only our natural [inalienable] rights and duties and to take none of them

from us,”⁵³ and James Wilson (signer of the Declaration and Constitution) even declared that “every government which has not this in view as its principal object is not a government of the legitimate kind”⁵⁴ (emphasis added).

American government was established on the thesis that certain rights come from God rather than men and that government is to protect those rights inviolable. So long as the recognition remains that God-given rights cannot be infringed, then those rights will remain safe; if that conviction is lost, government will then begin to regulate, alter, and even repeal those rights.

In fact, experience regularly attests that if a government leader is willing to violate the foremost of all inalienable rights (the right to life), then he will also disregard other inalienable rights. That is, if a leader does not support the inalienable right to life, then he will almost certainly be wrong on the protection of private property (as guaranteed in the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution), the Biblical right of self defense (the right to keep and bear arms guaranteed in the Second Amendment), the right of religious expression (guaranteed in the First Amendment), the sanctity of the home (guaranteed in the Third Amendment), etc. In short, if a leader refuses to recognize the role of God in the creation of life and does not pledge himself to protect that first of all inalienable rights, then all other individual rights are also in danger. (Barack Obama has never voted to protect unborn life either as a state senator in Illinois⁵⁵ or as a U. S. Senator.⁵⁶ Furthermore, he is a sponsor of the deplorable Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA)⁵⁷ – a federal law that would prohibit all restrictions on abortion, including even the current state bans on partial-birth abortions as well as parental consent and parental notification laws.)

Thomas Jefferson’s clarion warning from two centuries ago still rings true today:

[C]an the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis: a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? – that they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for

my country when I reflect that God is just – that His justice cannot sleep forever.⁵⁸

Where a candidate stands on the issue of abortion is of paramount importance and is also the most accurate indicator of how likely he is to protect other inalienable rights.

Issue #3 – Homosexuality & The Moral Law

- ▶ The law is not made for a righteous person but for . . . homosexuals . . . and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching. 1 TIMOTHY 1:9-11
- ▶ If a man lies with a male as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination. LEVITICUS 20:13
- ▶ There were sodomites in the land, and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out. 1 KINGS 14:24
- ▶ Were they ashamed because of the abomination they have done? They were not even ashamed at all. JEREMIAH 6:15
- ▶ God gave them up to vile passions. The men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error which was due. ROMANS 1:26-27
- ▶ The crime not to be named [sodomy], I pass in a total silence.⁵⁹ JAMES WILSON, ORIGINAL U. S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE; SIGNER OF THE DECLARATION AND CONSTITUTION
- ▶ It [sodomy], though repugnant to every sentiment of decency and delicacy, is very prevalent in corrupt and debauched countries where the low pleasures of sensuality and luxury have depraved the mind and degraded the appetite below the brutal [animal] creation.⁶⁰ ZEPHANIAH SWIFT, AUTHOR OF AMERICA'S FIRST LEGAL TEXT (1795)
- ▶ Without morals a republic cannot subsist any length of time.⁶¹ CHARLES CARROLL, SIGNER OF THE DECLARATION; FRAMER OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

If a candidate is willing to accept, empower, and advance homosexuality, it is a clear indication that he does not embrace the moral absolutes of the Bible.

Historically speaking, Biblically-established rights and wrongs formed the basis of morals and thus of law in the civilized nations of the Western World, and nowhere was this more manifest than in America. Notice some of the many American courts that unabashedly acknowledged this fact:

Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly or so perfectly as from the New Testament? ⁶² U. S. SUPREME COURT

[T]he morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity. . . . [We are] people whose manners . . . and whose morals have been elevated and inspired . . . by means of the Christian religion. ⁶³ NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

[T]he Christian concept of right and wrong, or right and justice, motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic frictions and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled. ⁶⁴ FLORIDA SUPREME COURT

Christianity has reference to the principles of right and wrong . . . it is the foundation of those morals and manners upon which our society is formed; it is their basis. ⁶⁵ SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

[T]he Christian religion [is] . . . the basis of our morals and the strength of our government. ⁶⁶ NEW YORK SUPREME COURT

Today, however, some have begun to reject the Judeo-Christian moral absolutes of the Bible in favor of their own personal preferences – a situation thrice denounced in the Scriptures as “every man doing that which is right in his own eyes” (Deuteronomy 12:8, Judges 17:6, and 21:25). The Supreme Court recently bestowed its blessing on individual preference as the national moral standard in its 2003 *Lawrence v. Texas* decision ⁶⁷ (a decision made before the arrival of the two new Justices) when it struck down Texas’ law ban-

ning sodomy – a decision which one of the Justices said “effectively decrees the end of all morals legislation.”⁶⁸ He also noted that “state laws against bigamy, same-sex marriage, adult incest, prostitution, masturbation, adultery, fornication, bestiality, and obscenity are likewise. . . . called into question.”⁶⁹ By that ruling, if something is sexually consensual, it is constitutional.

Consequently, in North Carolina a federal judge threw out charges against a man arrested for soliciting sodomy in a public park.⁷⁰ And certainly, if solicitation of homosexual sex in public is now permissible, so, too, must be the public solicitation of heterosexual sex, for prostitution is definitely consensual.

In Utah, three adults used the Court’s decision in an attempt to obtain a marriage license that would enable the husband to marry an additional wife;⁷¹ after all, since polygamy is consensual and agreed to by all parties involved, that behavior must be constitutional.

In Ohio, an attorney defending his client from prosecution under anti-pornography and anti-obscenity laws similarly asserted that such laws were no longer constitutional,⁷² for those who purchase obscene videos to view abominable and societally horrendous sexual acts, including bestiality (human sex with animals), are doing so consensually.

There are numerous additional examples, and the danger is that when there are no longer objective, fixed moral absolutes to govern a society, right and wrong is determined merely by who makes the better argument or has the greater power to enforce his views (which affirms the importance of having Supreme Court Justices with a philosophy that embraces moral absolutes). Founding Father James Otis warned of the peril to a society resulting from a situation in which there were no longer God-given moral absolutes:

When a man’s will and pleasure is his only rule and guide, what safety can there be either for him or against him but in the point of a sword?⁷³

Because previous generations understood that obeying what God commanded – including His moral laws – always benefited and prospered a society (Deuteronomy 6:24), it was easy to predict and

then verify what transpired in any culture rejecting His moral law. In fact, a popular 1814 four-volume legal work outlined the historically-documented impact of homosexuality upon a society:

If we reflect on the dreadful consequences of sodomy to a state and on the extent to which this abominable vice may be secretly carried on and spread, we cannot, on the principles of sound policy, consider the punishment as too severe. For if it once begins to prevail, not only will boys be easily corrupted by adults but also by other boys; nor will it ever cease – more especially as it must thus soon lose all its shamefulness and infamy and become fashionable and the national taste; and then . . . national weakness (for which all remedies are ineffectual) must inevitably follow; not perhaps in the very first generation, but certainly in the course of the third or fourth. . . . Whoever, therefore, wishes to ruin a nation has only to get this vice introduced, for it is extremely difficult to extirpate [remove] it where it has once taken root because it can be propagated with much more secrecy . . . and when we perceive that it has once got a footing in any country, however powerful and flourishing, we may venture as politicians to predict that the foundation of its future decline is laid and that after some hundred years it will no longer be the same . . . powerful country it is at present. ⁷⁴

In addition to the moral and cultural effects, medical and sociological studies document numerous adverse societal effects resulting from the practice of homosexuality. For example, because of the enormous health risk to the general population, regulations from the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) prohibit homosexual or bisexual men (MSM – Men who have Sex with other Men) from donating blood ⁷⁵ because MSM . . .

have an HIV prevalence 60 times higher than the general population, 800 times higher than first time blood donors and 8,000 times higher than repeat blood donors (American Red Cross). They also have an increased risk of having

other infections that can be transmitted to others by blood transfusion. For example, infection with the Hepatitis B virus is about 5-6 times more common, and Hepatitis C virus infections are about 2 times more common in [MSM] than in the general population.⁷⁶

(And even though homosexuals are less than 3 percent of the population,⁷⁷ they also “account for an epidemic 64 percent of all syphilis cases.”⁷⁸)

Despite the documented dangers from homosexual blood donors, the head of the Human Rights Campaign (one of America’s largest pro-homosexual advocacy groups) is calling for a lifting of the medical ban, dismissing the scientific evidence as discriminatory.⁷⁹ Elsewhere, homosexuals have begun ignoring the medical evidence and are giving blood without revealing their behavior, thus placing the general population at risk.⁸⁰

For several decades, homosexual activists have denied that HIV/AIDS is almost exclusively a homosexual disease, yet when the disease was first identified by the Centers for Disease Control in 1982, it was actually called GRID^S (Gay Related Immune Deficiency Syndrome), or Gay Compromise Syndrome, or gay cancer.⁸¹ When the disease eventually spread into the heterosexual community through transfusions of infected blood donated by homosexuals and by women having sex with bisexual men who had previously had sex with other men, the name of the disease was changed to AIDS. The pro-homosexual community in America has successfully managed to keep HIV/AIDS as a political disease enjoying legal protection rather than a medical communicable disease for which normal societal procedures are followed to prevent its spread. Yet today, nearly three decades after its discovery, the scientific evidence remains so unequivocal that the Executive Director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force finally acknowledged that “we cannot deny that HIV is a gay disease.”⁸² Other homosexual leaders also acknowledge the same fact.⁸³

But beyond the direct health dangers both to homosexuals and to society as a direct consequence of homosexual behavior, there are

also many economic consequences. For example, in 2007 alone, the federal government appropriated \$18.9 billion ⁸⁴ to deal with the consequences of this “gay disease” (and this does not include state and local expenditures); the nation also bears elevated health care costs with higher insurance premiums because of the costly medical treatments associated with gay behavior.

The homosexual community is understandably clamoring for more funding to find a vaccine for AIDS, but based on the Scriptural truth set forth in Romans 1:27 (“Men abandoned natural relations with women and committed indecent acts with other men, *receiving in their bodies the due penalty for their perversion*”), it is unlikely that any vaccine will ever be found, for such a vaccine would relieve the accountability and consequences of wrong behavior. In fact, the medical search for a vaccine has been frustrated by the fact that HIV is one of the fastest known self-mutating viruses – as soon as a vaccine appears close to success, the virus transmutes itself into something different, thereby requiring a new effort to find a vaccine.

Despite assertions to the contrary, being homosexual is *not* about who one is but rather about what one does (a point recently medically proved in a mammoth scientific study ⁸⁵); and the evidence is conclusive that homosexual behavior has adverse medical, economic, and societal effects. These effects are now especially apparent in nations already much further down the road than America in making homosexuality mainstream in their societies. For example, nine European countries now grant marital rights to homosexual individuals, ⁸⁶ and statistics from those countries provide a clear warning to America. For example:

- ▶ While a high percentage of [traditional] married couples remain married for up to 20 years or longer, the vast majority of homosexual relationships are short-lived and transitory. A study in the Netherlands, one of the most “gay-tolerant” nations on earth, and which has legalized gay marriage, found that the average duration of a homosexual relationship was 1.5 years. ⁸⁷
- ▶ While a high percentage of [traditional] married couples remain faithful to each other, homosexual couples typically

engage in a shocking degree of promiscuity. The same Dutch study found that “committed” homosexual couples had an average of 8 sexual partners (outside of the relationship) per year. This is not anti-gay rhetoric, these are statistics published in the respected journal *AIDS*.⁸⁸ (emphasis added)

- ▶ Homosexual and lesbian couples experience by far the highest levels of intimate partner violence. Lesbians, for example, suffer more than 4 times the level of violence as do [traditional] married women.⁸⁹

For citizens in those countries witnessing such casual arrangements whereby a “committed marriage” not only involves eight extra-marital partners but also a divorce within only eighteen months, the conclusion is inescapable that marriage is irrelevant. Consequently:

Marriage is slowly dying in Scandinavia. A majority of children in Sweden and Norway are born out of wedlock. Sixty percent of first-born children in Denmark have unmarried parents. Not coincidentally, these countries have had something close to full gay marriage for a decade or more.⁹⁰

Similarly, in Great Britain (which began openly embracing homosexual conduct decades ago and finally adopted homosexual marriage, or its equivalent, in 2005), a recent report now laments, “Marriage hits lowest rate since records began almost 150 years ago.”⁹¹ These and other international statistics clearly demonstrate that weakening heterosexual marriage increases out-of-wedlock births.

In America, where the same trend of the open acceptance of homosexuality has now begun, out-of-wedlock birth rates have started to soar,⁹² resulting in staggering societal costs in both economic and human terms. For example, in human terms, those in America born out of wedlock are not only seven times more likely to end up in poverty⁹³ but they currently represent 70 percent of America’s prison population.⁹⁴ (For those who believe that addressing poverty should be a priority for people of faith, one of the best ways to address it is to prevent individuals from going into poverty – which means poli-

cies strengthening morals and marriage, not weakening them.) In economic consequences, \$112 billion is spent annually to address the numerous societal problems caused by out-of-wedlock births.⁹⁵

Imagine taking America's current problems with out-of-wedlock births and increasing them by up to 60 percent – as has occurred in Scandinavian nations following the adoption of homosexual marriage. (Incidentally, those nations seem to be unable to cope with the economic costs of the problems generated by the lack of moral restraint on behavior. For example, the tax rate in Scandinavian nations such as Denmark has reached 68 percent, with the lowest tax rate in that country being 42 percent.⁹⁶)

Empirical evidence from across the world demonstrates that homosexuality not only destroys the traditional definition of marriage but also weakens marriage in general, which clearly harms a society. Understanding this, the U. S. Supreme Court had earlier acknowledged:

[C]ertainly no legislation can be supposed more wholesome and necessary in the founding of a free, self governing commonwealth . . . than that which seeks to establish it on the basis of the idea of the family as consisting in and springing from the union for life of one man and one woman in the holy estate of matrimony; [the family is] the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization – the best guarantee of that reverent morality which is the source of all beneficent progress in social and political improvement.⁹⁷

State Supreme Courts were equally succinct in their declarations:

The truth is that civil government has grown out of marriage . . . which created homes, and population, and society, from which government became necessary. . . . [Marriages] will produce a home and family that will contribute to good society, to free and just government, and to the support of Christianity. . . . It would be sacrilegious to apply the designation “a civil contract” to such a marriage. It is that and more; a status ordained by God.⁹⁸

There is a tangible societal consequence of not embracing God's moral law – and not just in the area of homosexuality, for statistics also affirm the detrimental effects of other forms of moral misbehavior (e.g., adultery, pre-marital sex, living together before marriage, etc.). So why single out a candidate's stand on homosexuality above other moral misbehaviors? Because homosexuality is currently the focus of favorable political action; the others are not. It is therefore appropriate to investigate a candidate's position on homosexuality.

For example, former presidential candidate Hillary Clinton announced a plan to repeal the centuries-old ban on homosexuals in the military and also declared her dream of becoming "the first U. S. President to march in a Gay Pride parade,"⁹⁹ but Barack Obama has gone even further. He embraces the same positions but is also seeking the repeal of DOMA¹⁰⁰ (the federal Defense Of Marriage Act that defines marriage as a legal union between one man and one woman for purposes of all federal laws). So emboldened are homosexuals by the favorable attention given them by Obama that:

The Gay and Lesbian Leadership Institute is teaming up with homosexual groups such as the Human Rights Campaign, the Stonewall Democrats, and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force for an initiative called the "Presidential Appointments Project." It is being billed as a "talent bank" for openly homosexual professionals who want to "set or influence" policies of a potential . . . [presidential] administration.¹⁰¹

Where a candidate stands on the issue of homosexuality is one of the best indicators of whether that candidate embraces the moral absolutes established by God, and consideration of this issue should therefore be a priority when examining a presidential candidate.

Issue #4 – Public Religious Acknowledgments

- ▶ In all your ways acknowledge Him. PROVERBS 3:6
- ▶ As they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind to do those things which are not proper. ROMANS 1:28

- ▶ Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord. PSALM 33:12
- ▶ I . . . recommend a general and public return of praise and thanksgiving to Him from whose goodness these blessings descend. The most effectual means of securing the continuance of our civil and religious liberties is always to remember with reverence and gratitude the Source from which they flow. ¹⁰²
JOHN JAY, ORIGINAL CHIEF JUSTICE U. S. SUPREME COURT; AUTHOR OF
THE FEDERALIST PAPERS (emphasis added)

The Ten Commandments begin with the pronouncement, “I am the Lord your God” (Exodus 20:2). While Christians attach this definitive proclamation as the prologue to the Ten Commandments, Jews consider that forceful declaration to be the First Commandment. ¹⁰³ They properly believe that acknowledging God is the highest priority – that the commands listed after that affirmation have force only because God is recognized for Who He is and is acknowledged as the Authority behind those commands. Therefore, acknowledging and honoring God is a priority in His Top Ten.

Proverbs 3:5-6 reemphasizes that pivotal message, reminding us that in all our ways (in public as well as in private) we are to acknowledge Him; and Psalm 79:6 and Jeremiah 10:25 call for God’s wrath upon all nations which do not call upon His name, while Matthew 10:32 and Luke 12:8 affirm the blessings of acknowledging Him in public. Numerous other verses could be cited, but the Biblical message is clear: it is essential to acknowledge and honor God publicly. The warranty of 1 Samuel 2:30 that “Those who honor Me I will honor, and those who despise Me will be disdained” applies to nations as well as individuals.

In the political arena, there are a variety of ways to determine where a candidate stands on the public acknowledgment of God, including by whether he supports public displays of the Ten Commandments (which 76 percent of the nation does ¹⁰⁴), public displays of holiday symbols (which 81 percent of the nation does ¹⁰⁵), prayer at school events and gatherings (supported by 82 percent of the country ¹⁰⁶), government funding of faith-based programs (supported

by 75 percent ¹⁰⁷), etc. (Information will be presented shortly about how to examine a candidate's voting record to determine where he stands on public religious acknowledgments.) The nation understands better than most public officials that public recognitions of God do not violate the separation of church and state; after all, the same Bible that teaches to publicly acknowledge and honor God also simultaneously teaches that there is to be a separation between the two institutions of Church and State.

Recall that God Himself separated the two institutions by placing Moses over the civil affairs and Aaron over the spiritual ones – the nation was one but the jurisdictions were two; and both acknowledged and honored God. That model was maintained throughout the Scriptures – as clearly demonstrated in 11 Chronicles 26.

That account involves King Uzziah of Judah (808-739BC) – an outstanding ruler whose fame spread across the civilized world as the nation prospered under his leadership. His personal piety was known and he openly and boldly honored God throughout his kingdom – all of which, according to the Scripture, was commendable. But then a dramatic change occurred when Uzziah “entered the temple of the Lord to burn incense on the altar of incense” (v. 16) – a duty that had been reserved by God strictly for His priests. Uzziah – civil ruler over the kingdom – had decided that he would also take unto himself the function of a priest by burning incense on the altar.

By trying to perform the responsibilities of both Church and State and become the head in each, Uzziah had crossed an institutional line established by God Himself. Therefore, when he took the priest's sacred utensils and prepared to make use of them, God sovereignly weighed in and instantly struck Uzziah with leprosy. It had been acceptable for Uzziah to honor God in his kingdom, and it had been acceptable for Uzziah to enter the temple to worship God; but when he attempted to violate the jurisdictional separation between State and Church – when he sought to be in charge of both the civil and religious arenas at the same time – God provided a dramatic message of His disapproval.

Understanding such clear Biblical teachings, one early American Episcopal Bishop correctly acknowledged:

Christ and Caesar are at peace, but their kingdoms are independent. They cooperate but should never unite. ¹⁰⁸

But Americans also understood that an institutional separation did not require a public secularization. As early national Quaker leader Will Wood (1797-1877) affirmed:

The separation of Church and State does not mean the exclusion of God, righteousness, morality, from the State. ¹⁰⁹

Early American Bishop Charles Galloway agreed, noting that:

[T]he separation of the Church from the State did not mean the severance of the State from God. ¹¹⁰

The U. S. Supreme Court long upheld a policy of government cooperation with religious expressions and activities – as in its 1952 decision affirming:

The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. . . . Otherwise the State and religion would be aliens to each other – hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. . . . When the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. . . . We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion. ¹¹¹

Regrettably, the once clear institutional separation of Church and State has now been subverted into a militant policy of civic secular-

ization, thus depriving America of the positive benefits it long experienced from the public acknowledgment of God. As James Adams (an editor of the *Cincinnati Post*) correctly noted:

The Founding Fathers called only for separation, not divorce. Only in the latter half of [the twentieth] century has the United States Supreme Court held that Church and State should be legally divorced. . . . To require religion to stand mute in any public debate deprives the nation of a voice that needs to be heard. We dare not muzzle morality in the marketplace or permit the wall of separation to turn into an Iron Curtain of religious repression.¹¹²

Today, secularists have convinced many Americans to compartmentalize their faith – to acknowledge God at church, home, or other private settings but to refrain in public venues. If a candidate holds this position, it means that he is willing to disconnect God from what he does – that he can put his faith in one box, his behavior in another, and never let the two meet. Such candidates often speak glowingly about faith but usually their votes show no indication of its influence on either their thinking or actions. The entire nation is put at risk by leaders who publicly acknowledge faith but then privately compartmentalize it. As the Rev. Matthias Burnet (1749-1806) insightfully warned in 1803:

Think not that men who acknowledge not the providence of God nor regard His laws will be uncorrupt in office, firm in defense of the righteous cause against the oppressor, or resolutely oppose the torrent of iniquity.¹¹³ (emphasis added)

Notice the emphasis not only on acknowledging but also on regarding – i.e., honoring and personally observing – God’s laws. If both aspects are not present, then faith’s primary role will be limited merely to favorable publicity for the campaign.

Understanding the national benefits resulting from both publicly acknowledging God in words and honoring Him in actions, President George Washington forcefully declared:

[I]t is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor. ¹¹⁴ (emphasis added)

President John Adams agreed:

[T]he safety and prosperity of nations ultimately and essentially depend on the protection and the blessing of Almighty God, and the national acknowledgment of this truth is . . . an indispensable duty which the people owe to Him. ¹¹⁵ (emphasis added)

People of faith should elect leaders who will not only protect and expand the opportunity for the public acknowledgment of God but who will also apply His principles to public venues.

-----•-----

The four non-negotiables that a Biblical voter should verify about a candidate are his positions on:

1. Appointing originalist judges
2. Protecting unborn human life
3. Opposing the ennoblement of homosexuality
4. Publicly acknowledging God and honoring Him in policy

Other Considerations – Such as Helping the Poor

Some religious leaders have strongly advocated that the issue of helping the poor should be a key consideration in selecting a presidential candidate. ¹¹⁶ Certainly, the Bible does deliver explicit and frequent commands to help the poor, including:

You shall open your hand wide to your brother, to the poor, and to the needy in your land. DEUTERONOMY 15:11

Remember the poor. GALATIANS 2:10

Literally scores of passages address the issue of helping the poor, and ironically, from them emerges the clear reason why the issue of poverty must not be a consideration for Biblical voters in an election.

For example, reading the full passage in which each of the two verses above appear, it quickly becomes apparent that the command in Deuteronomy is directed at individuals and that the mandate in Galatians is directed at the church and those in ministry; in neither case is the command directed at government. Scores of other passages reaffirm in even more explicit terms that the care of the poor is the responsibility of individuals and the congregation, not of government. Consider some of those verses.

THE INDIVIDUAL

The overwhelming majority of Scriptures direct individuals to address the needs of the poor. For example, in Leviticus 25:25, 35, and 39 individuals are pointedly told to identify the poor around them and then help care for them until they get back on their feet. Individuals are also commanded:

When you happen on someone who's in trouble or needs help among your people with whom you live in this land that God gave you, don't look the other way pretending you don't see him – don't keep a tight grip on your purse. No. Look at him; open your purse; lend whatever and as much as he needs. . . . Give freely and spontaneously. Don't have a stingy heart. The way you handle matters like this triggers God's blessing in everything you do – all your work and ventures. There are always going to be poor and needy people among you. So I command you: Always be generous; open purse and hands; give to your neighbors in trouble – your poor and hurting neighbors. (emphasis added) (DEUTERONOMY 15:7-8, 10-11, THE MESSAGE)

Indisputably, the above directives to care for the poor are not pointed at government but rather directly at the individual. In fact, God makes clear through His prophet Isaiah that a primary lesson

He wants to teach through fasting and prayer is for individuals to learn to take the responsibility of caring for the poor:

Is not this the kind of fasting I have chosen – to loose the chains of injustice and untie the cords of the yoke? – to set the oppressed free and break every yoke? Is it not to share your food with the hungry and to provide the poor wanderer with shelter – when you see the naked, to clothe him and not to turn away from your own flesh and blood? Then your light will break forth like the dawn and your healing will quickly appear; then your righteousness will go before you and the glory of the Lord will be your rear guard. Then you will call and the Lord will answer; you will cry for help and He will say: “Here am I.” If you do away with the yoke of oppression, with the pointing finger and malicious talk, and if you spend yourselves in behalf of the hungry and satisfy the needs of the oppressed, then your light will rise in the darkness and your night will become like the noonday. (emphasis added) ISAIAH 58:6-10

Jesus similarly told His followers:

Then the King will say to those on His right, “Come, you who are blessed by My Father – take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave Me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave Me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited Me in, I needed clothes and you clothed Me, I was sick and you looked after Me, I was in prison and you came to visit Me.” Then the righteous will answer Him, “Lord, when did we see You hungry and feed You, or thirsty and give You something to drink? When did we see You a stranger and invite You in, or needing clothes and clothe You? When did we see You sick or in prison and go to visit You?” The King will reply, “I tell you the truth, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers of Mine, you did for Me.” (emphasis added) MATTHEW 25:34-40

The emphasis is again on the individual’s responsibility, not the government’s. Moreover, individuals are specifically taught that one of

the purposes of working and having a job is so that they might “have something to share with those in need” (Ephesians 4:28).

(Numerous other verses directly addressing the responsibility of individuals toward the poor include Deuteronomy 24:12, Job 29:12-16, Psalm 41:1, Proverbs 14:21, 19:17, 31:20, Matthew 19:21, Mark 10:21, 14:7, and Luke 14:13-14, 18:22.)

There are also specific instructions to individuals engaged in various professions. For example, in Exodus 23:11, those involved in the production of food are told that in the seventh year they are to leave their crops unharvested and “let the land rest and lie still, that the poor people may eat from it. You shall also do the same with your vineyard and oliveyard.” And Leviticus 19:9-10 (and 23:22) further declares: “When you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not reap the corners of your field or gather the gleanings [that which the reapers leave] of your harvest. Similarly, do not go over your vineyard a second time, or pick up the grapes that have fallen. Leave them for the poor.”

And for those involved in business, banking, or who have some personal affluence, Exodus 22:25-27 directs:

If you lend money to one of My people among you who is needy, charge him no interest. If you take his cloak as a pledge, return it to him by sunset, because his cloak is the only covering he has for his body. What else will he sleep in? When he cries out to Me, I will hear, for I am compassionate.

And for employers, the Scriptures instruct that when the poor are hired, the employer is to pay him wages at the end of each day so that he will have immediate income to take care of his needs of daily sustenance (Deuteronomy 24:14-15).

So important is it for individuals (including those from designated professions) to take the responsibility of caring for the needs of the poor that the Scripture explicitly warns:

Whoever closes his ears at the cry of the poor, he will cry out himself and will not be heard. PROVERBS 21:13

Conversely, blessings are promised to individuals who help the poor:

Whoever has a bountiful eye will be blessed, for he gives of his bread to the poor. PROVERBS 22:9

(Notice, again, the directive to the individual – that he give of his own personal bread, not someone else’s – i.e., the government’s.)

And then, combining both the promise of a blessing and the warning of a curse, the Scriptures admonish:

Whoever gives to the poor will not lack, but whoever hides his eyes will receive many curses. PROVERBS 28:27

Significantly, the overwhelming body of Scriptures addressing the issue of caring for the poor is directed at individual action.

THE CONGREGATION

Just as the Scriptures direct individuals to care for the poor, so, too, do they direct the church and congregation. For example, if a poor individual is unable to meet his obligations, the priests are specifically instructed to examine that person, determine the extent of his needs, see what he was capable of paying, and then grant appropriate relief (see Leviticus 27:8). Similarly, in Esther 9:22, after God had delivered His people from their enemies, the Scriptures note that Mordecai “wrote them to observe the days as days of feasting and joy and giving presents of food to one another and gifts to the poor.” This command was to the collective people of God.

Also notice the New Testament’s powerful directives to the church to take care of the poor. For example, Acts 4:34-35 reveals that in the early church under the leadership of the Apostles, “there was not a needy person among them” because the church “distributed to each as any had need.” And when the Apostles James, Peter, and John later met with Paul in Jerusalem, they specifically charged him to “remember the poor” (Galatians 2:10), which Paul reports “was something I was already committed to doing” (v. 10). As he made his subsequent missionary journeys, he proudly reported of the churches he started

in Macedonia and Achaia that they “were pleased to make a contribution for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem” (Romans 15:26). In fact, he specifically noted that “They were pleased to do it – and indeed they owe it to them” (v. 27).

Clearly, then, the church or congregation is also directed to help the poor.

THE GOVERNMENT

Since directives are given to individuals and to the congregation, are explicit commands also given to government? The answer is a definitive “Yes!” For example, civil authorities are commanded:

- ▶ Do not show favoritism to a poor man in his lawsuit, and do not deny justice to poor people in their lawsuits. EXODUS 23:3, 6
- ▶ Do not pervert justice – do not show partiality to the poor or favoritism to the great. LEVITICUS 19:15
- ▶ Defend the cause of the weak and fatherless; maintain the rights of the poor and oppressed. PSALM 82:3
- ▶ The ruler that faithfully judges the poor, his power and dignity shall be established forever. PROVERBS 29:14

Notice that the directives to civil government include providing justice to the poor and maintaining their rights whenever they utilize the civil process, but government is not charged to meet their material needs. Therefore, to make government the object for helping the poor redraws the jurisdictional lines established by God and usurps His direct commands to the individual and the congregation.

However, as a hypothetical consideration, if the numerous Biblical references for dealing with the poor did not exist, would it then be acceptable and even sagacious for government to address the issue of poverty? Empirical evidence on the subject causes the answer to remain a resounding “No!”

As a starting point, consider information from the American Institute of Philanthropy (AIP). In order to help donors maximize the effect

of their charitable giving, the AIP rates various charities by calculating the percentage of donated income that actually makes it through to its intended target. According to the AIP, a charity's effectiveness is "acceptable" if 60 percent of what it collects reaches its intended charitable mission; ¹¹⁷ donors should avoid contributing to organizations where less than 60 percent of funds reach the designated target.

What percentage of every dollar collected by the government for the poor actually reaches them? A dismal 30 percent. ¹¹⁸ The U. S. government is quite possibly the nation's most inefficient mechanism for meeting the needs of the poor.

No reasonable donor would fund an organization where only 30 cents out of each dollar reaches its target, but today many not only tolerate but even encourage increased government spending to fight poverty. Why? – just to see 70 percent of each additional dollar wasted? Significantly, if the government would just take the money it currently designates to fight poverty and pass it on to private charities that serve the poor, the actual assistance reaching those in need would more than double – just by the government staying out of that arena.

Despite such stark statistical evidence, one presidential candidate promised greater involvement for the government in this issue, pledging to establish a new cabinet level department to eliminate poverty:

I believe we should appoint a cabinet level position that will be solely and fully devoted to ending poverty as we know it in America – a position that will focus the attention of our nation on the issue and never let it go – a person who I could see being asked by the President every single day, "What have you done to end poverty in America?" No more excuses. No more whining, but instead, a concerted effort. ¹¹⁹

Such an initiative violates the Scriptural directives for addressing poverty. Furthermore, it can be successful only if the Bible is in error, because the Scriptures succinctly declare . . .

There will always be poor people in the land. DEUTERONOMY 15:11

The poor you will always have with you, and you can help them any time you want. MARK 14:7

If the Scriptures are accurate, then government efforts to eliminate poverty are destined for futility. (As a side note, perhaps one of the reasons that “the poor you will always have with you” is to test the character and obedience of individuals, churches, and congregations as to whether they will do what God told them and open their hearts and hands to those in need, or whether they will transfer that private responsibility to the public sector to assuage their consciences.) In fact, the “unconditional war on poverty in America”¹²⁰ declared by President Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1964 provides incontrovertible evidence of the exactitude of these Scriptures.

President Johnson told the nation: “I have called for a national war on poverty”¹²¹ because “for the first time in our history, it is possible to conquer poverty.”¹²² Yet now – nearly half-a-century later (and with over \$9 trillion spent by the government thus far in its war on poverty¹²³) – data from the U. S. Census Bureau reveals that the poverty level has remained unchanged¹²⁴ (in fact, some measurements show that the poverty level has actually increased since the War on Poverty began¹²⁵). The original design was well-intentioned, but the endeavor has been no more effective than trying to use a screwdriver as a shovel, or a hammer as a sponge. Government simply was not designed by God to take care of the poor, and to use it for that purpose is a disservice not only to the poor but also to the government.

In short, for both Biblical and statistical reasons, addressing poverty through the government should not be an election issue for Biblical voters. They should instead remain focused on keeping first things first – on keeping the four non-negotiables at the top of the list:

1. Appointing originalist judges
2. Protecting unborn human life
3. Opposing the ennoblement of homosexuality
4. Publicly acknowledging God and honoring Him in policy

Separating Fact from Rhetoric – Investigating a Candidate

In identifying a candidate's position in each of these four areas, citizens should not listen to what either of the current presidential candidates say, because their voting record as a U. S. Senator more accurately identifies their true position than do their words. As Founding Father Benjamin Franklin wisely noted two centuries ago, "Well done is better than well said" ¹²⁶ – an adage that merely summarizes an oft-repeated Scriptural truth:

By their fruits you will know them. MATTHEW 7:20

They profess that they know God but in works they deny Him, being disobedient and unto every good work reprobate.

TITUS 1:16

Why do you call me "Lord" and not do the things I tell you?

LUKE 6:46

(The modern version of this is, "Actions speak louder than words.")

But how can an official's actions – i.e., his voting record – be checked on specific issues? After all, between 10,000 and 13,000 bills are introduced during each two-year session of Congress, and a Congressman or Senator will cast literally hundreds of votes, including dozens on most issues about which they publicly speak (e.g., abortion, agriculture, homosexuality, taxes, foreign affairs, education, etc.). So how can the average citizen wade through hundreds and even thousands of votes? Fortunately, there are dozens of public watchdog groups (both for and against any issue) that track the votes of every elected official in Congress.

For example, if a Biblical voter wants to determine where a candidate stands on the issue of abortion and the protection of unborn human life, pro-life groups such as National Right to Life will monitor those votes and award a score to each official – as will pro-abortion groups such as National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL) and Planned Parenthood. Consequently, a voter can check the congressional scorecards of these groups to see whether an individual has a demonstrated record

of voting pro-life or pro-abortion. (Of course, if the monitoring group is pro-abortion, then a 100 percent rating means that the official is an enthusiastic supporter of abortion, while a voting record of 0 percent means that the official is unequivocally pro-life; and the opposite is true when examining the ratings of a pro-life group.)

Similarly, in the area of homosexuality, groups such as the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) and the Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network (GLSEN) monitor voting records in support of homosexual issues. Therefore, for a Biblical voter, it is important that an official receive a low rating from these groups.

And organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Americans United for Separation of Church and State (AU) want a completely secular public square, so their rating of an official also needs to be low in order for that official to win the support of the Biblical voter.

(When possible, it is always good to consult the records of more than just one group on any issue; after all, the Bible instructs that something should be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses; cf. Deuteronomy 19:15, Matthew 18:16, 2 Corinthians 13:1.)

Numerous groups produce a scorecard and each makes its record available on its own website, but there is now a single website to which voters may turn to see the scorecards of many groups collected in one location:

1. Go to Project Vote Smart (<http://www.votesmart.org/>).
2. At the top right of the front page, click on “Presidential Candidates” (which will take you to http://www.votesmart.org/election_president.php?dist=bio.php).
3. Click on the photo of a presidential candidate.
4. When the page comes up for that candidate, *under* the candidate’s photo, click on “Interest Group Ratings.”
5. Dozens of scorecards on the candidates will appear, listed alphabetically by categories. To see where the candidate stands on abortion, go to the “Abortion” section at the top.

Then scroll down to “Civil Liberties and Civil Rights” to see the ratings of groups like the ACLU and AU and other secular groups that oppose public religious expressions as well as the ratings of pro-homosexual groups such as the Human Rights Campaign and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Scroll down to “Conservative” to see the ratings of many Biblically-oriented pro-family groups such as Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, Christian Action Network. And scroll down even further to “Family and Children Issues” to find the ratings of Biblical-values groups such as the Family Research Council.

6. Realize that the ratings presented in each category are from groups that are religious as well as secular, liberal as well as conservative, so make sure you know the philosophy of each group to understand whether its rating is good or bad from a Biblical viewpoint.

(This same procedure can be used to check the voting records of others running for office, including U. S. Senators and Representatives.)

Casting a Vote

If you determine that a candidate is acceptable on the four non-negotiables, only then should you extend your consideration to include other issues (e.g., economics, foreign policy, taxes, health care, etc.). Realize that no candidate will ever be the perfect candidate and support everything you do, and that must never become the sole measuring stick for selecting a candidate. After all, if that were true, then faith voters likely would not have supported most of the Biblical heroes had they run for office in America today, for David – although a man commended by God and recommended as our example in numerous areas – had a record of adultery (and more); Noah had trouble with drunkenness; Samuel, Eli, and Gideon did not control their children; Lot committed incest; Moses was guilty of murder; etc.

Despite the fact that such individuals are commended as heroes of the faith and many appear in the Hebrews 11 “Faith Hall

of Fame,” most faith voters today likely would not vote for them because of their short-comings. Does this not suggest that God’s standard might be different from the one we too often apply? God regularly used very imperfect individuals – even individuals with major flaws – to accomplish great and positive things in the life of a nation. We should therefore always support the candidate most in line with the four non-negotiables rather than one who appears to be the superficially “perfect” candidate.

And even though the true measuring stick must always be how well a candidate stacks up against the four non-negotiables, there will undoubtedly be times when a candidate who aligns with only two of the non-negotiables might be running against a candidate who aligns with only one – that is, there will be times when the choice is between the bad and the worse. What should a Biblical voter do on such occasions? – withhold his vote from both? Definitely not. He must always remember the Biblical principle of incrementalism – the principle of small but steady gains.

Recall that thousands of years ago when the Israelites were fighting their own culture war against those whose values were quite contrary to their own, God promised them victory – but only gradually. Concerning their opponents, He pointedly told them:

I will not drive them out in a single year. Little by little I will drive them out before you. (emphasis added) EXODUS 23:29-30

The Lord your God will drive them out from before you little by little. You will not be allowed to eliminate them all at once. (emphasis added) DEUTERONOMY 7:22

They were promised victory – but only incrementally. Therefore, voting in every election should always be viewed from a long-term perspective – that is, you are not voting to win the entire battle in just one election but rather that particular election is just one small step in what might be a lifelong journey. Consequently, one candidate might have a Right-to-Life rating of 75 or 60 percent; the other perhaps only 25 or 15 percent. Do we avoid voting because

neither is perfect? Assuredly not. We must vote to advance life (or preserve moral absolutes, or public religious acknowledgments, or better judicial appointments) as far as possible in each and every election – we must always remember the “little by little” strategy set forth in the Scriptures.

As a result, voting should always be viewed as nothing less than an unconditional duty – it is not something optional but is an activity in which a Biblical voter is required to be engaged. To be faithful in one’s duty was a virtue frequently praised by the Founders:

[W]e must go home to be happy, and our home is not in this world. Here we have nothing to do but our duty.¹²⁷ All that the best men can do is to persevere in doing their duty to their country and leave the consequences to Him who made it their duty, being neither elated by success, however great, nor discouraged by disappointment, however frequent and mortifying.¹²⁸ JOHN JAY, A FOUNDER OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY; ORIGINAL CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE U. S. SUPREME COURT; AUTHOR OF *THE FEDERALIST PAPERS*; GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

[W]hilst we are using the means in our power, let us humbly commit our righteous cause to the great Lord of the universe, Who loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. And having secured the approbation of our hearts by a faithful and unwearied discharge of our duty to our country, let us joyfully leave our concerns in the hands of Him Who raiseth up and pulleth down the empires and kingdoms of the world as He pleases.¹²⁹ JOHN HANCOCK, SIGNER OF THE DECLARATION; GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

The man who is conscientiously doing his duty will ever be protected by that righteous and all powerful Being, and when he has finished his work he will receive an ample reward.¹³⁰ SAMUEL ADAMS, SIGNER OF THE DECLARATION; GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

The sum of the whole is that the blessing of God is only to be looked for by those who are not wanting in the discharge of their own duty. ¹³¹ JOHN WITHERSPOON, SIGNER OF THE DECLARATION; PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON

Biblical voters can find a particularly excellent model of this virtue in John Quincy Adams. Historians who later studied and wrote about his life and numerous accomplishments (including his lifelong and relentless but largely unsuccessful fight to abolish slavery) observed that Adams' life was guided by one simple principle:

Duty is ours; results are God's. ¹³²

It is vital that Biblical voters develop an attitude of resolute steadfastness and unswervable duty. In recent years, too many believers have manifested a short-term mentality toward the civic arena – they get involved in an election or two and if they don't see a complete turnaround, they throw up their hands, declare that they tried and that it didn't make any difference, and then scurry off to their next inspiration. Biblical voters must realize that it took almost three quarters-of-a-century to arrive at the situation in which we find ourselves today, and that situation will not be reversed in just one election or two. And even if the recovery turns out to be just as lengthy as was the illness, a recovery will come – *if* we faithfully persist (Galatians 6:9).

The principle of retaking lost ground slowly, one election at a time, is neither appealing nor gratifying to our natural impatience but it is a well-articulated Biblical principle; therefore, arm yourself with the mentality of a marathon runner, not a sprinter: be willing to stay and compete until you win. This attitude is much easier to adopt once we accept the truth that voting is an obligatory duty we owe not only to our country but also to God. As Samuel Adams explained:

Let each citizen remember at the moment he is offering his vote that he is not making a present or a compliment to please an individual – or at least that he ought not so to do; but that he is executing one of the most solemn trusts in human society for which he is accountable to God and his country. ¹³³ [He]

may then reflect, each one on his own integrity, and appeal to the Monitor within his breast that he has not trifled with the sacred trust reposed in him by God and his country.¹³⁴

Founder Peter Muhlenberg articulated the same conviction. (Peter was a minister of the Gospel who left his pulpit during the American Revolution to defend the liberties he enjoyed and to which he had become accustomed; three hundred men from his congregation followed him into military service. He became a Major General and then a Member of Congress, where he helped frame the Bill of Rights.) Once, when criticized for being a minister involved in the civic arena,¹³⁵ he pointedly responded:

I am convinced it is my duty so to do – and duty I owe to God and my Country.¹³⁶ (emphasis added)

The viewpoint expressed by these and other early leaders simply reflected their understanding of Jesus' command in Matthew 22:21 (a command frequently turned on its head today). In that verse, Jesus told His followers:

Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.

Today, too many mistakenly think that the conjunction in Jesus' command is "or" – that is, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, or unto God the things that are God's," but that is not what the verse says. To the contrary, it deliberately uses the conjunction "and" – that is, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." People of faith are clearly commanded to do their duty in both the spiritual and the civil arenas.

The Founders believed that this dual responsibility was so self-evident we would never neglect it. As George Washington explained:

No country upon earth ever had it more in its power to attain these blessings than United America. Wondrously strange, then, and much to be regretted indeed would it be, were we to neglect the means and to depart from the road which

Providence has pointed us to so plainly; I cannot believe it will ever come to pass.¹³⁷

Yet in recent years, far too many God-fearing individuals have neglected their responsibilities as national voting stewards, and the impact of that neglect is now measurable. Consider the area of abortion.

Over the four elections from 1992-2002, Christian voter turnout declined by almost forty percent,¹³⁸ but in 2002, that trend reversed and there was a 2 percent increase above the 2000 turnout numbers (which was actually a sizeable increase since 2002 was a non-presidential year when voter turnout is traditionally much lower). Exit polling in 2002 showed that 41 percent of voters in that election identified abortion as an important issue affecting their vote: 23 percent said they voted a pro-life ticket, and 16 percent voted a pro-abortion ticket,¹³⁹ thus giving a 7 percent advantage to those running as a pro-life candidate. The result was evident: of the 54 freshmen elected to the U. S. House in 2002, 36 were pro-life¹⁴⁰ (67 percent), and of the 10 freshmen elected to the U. S. Senate, eight (80 percent) were pro-life.¹⁴¹

In 2004, Christian voter turnout increased 93 percent over the 2002 numbers¹⁴² (part of this surge was due to the fact that it was a presidential year when turnout typically rises and part to the fact that the percentage of Christian voters actually increased). In that election, 42 percent of voters identified abortion as an important issue:¹⁴³ 25 percent voted pro-life, and 13 percent pro-abortion,¹⁴⁴ resulting in a 12 percent advantage for pro-life candidates. The 2004 elections sent 40 new freshmen to the U. S. House, of whom 25 were pro-life¹⁴⁵ (63 percent), and nine new freshmen to the U. S. Senate, of whom seven (77 percent) were pro-life.¹⁴⁶

In those two elections when Christian voter turnout rose, a total of 94 freshmen were sent to the House, of whom 61 were pro-life (65 percent), and 19 freshmen were sent to the Senate, of whom 15 (79 percent) were pro-life. The result was the prompt enactment of three stand-alone federal pro-life laws: the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban, and the Fetal Farming Ban.¹⁴⁷ (Prior congressional pro-life activity had been limited almost

exclusively to abortion funding prohibitions such as the Mexico City policy and the Hyde, Kemp-Casten, Dickey, and Weldon amendments.¹⁴⁸) Furthermore, the addition of so many new pro-life Senators resulted in the confirmation of the two pro-life Supreme Court Justices mentioned earlier¹⁴⁹ as well as scores of pro-life court of appeals and federal district court judges.¹⁵⁰

In 2006, however, the trend reversed: Christian voter turnout fell by 30 percent.¹⁵¹ Not surprisingly, given that dramatic drop, exit polling on the percentage of voters who considered abortion as an important issue also showed a commensurate drop, plummeting from 42 percent in 2004 to only about 30 percent in 2006.¹⁵² The result was that of the 54 new freshmen sent to the U. S. House in the 2006 election, only 17 were pro-life (31 percent),¹⁵³ and of the ten freshmen elected to the U. S. Senate, only one (10 percent) was pro-life.¹⁵⁴ The *Baltimore Sun* described the results of that election as producing “the most pro-choice Congress in the history of the Republic.”¹⁵⁵

Incidentally, for those who wonder why the current Congress has become so aggressively pro-homosexual, actually pushing through two stand-alone pro-homosexual bills,¹⁵⁶ it might be instructive to note that 92.5 percent of homosexual men and 91 percent of lesbian women voted¹⁵⁷ – a percentage much higher than that of Biblical voters.

Most citizens wrongly believe that Congress reflects the values of Americans, but such is not the case; to the contrary, Congress does not reflect the values of the nation but only of those who voted in the last election, whether pro-life, pro-homosexual, or pro-anything else. As President James A. Garfield confirmed a century ago:

[N]ow, more than ever before, the people are responsible for the character of their Congress. If that body be ignorant, reckless, and corrupt, it is because the people tolerate ignorance, recklessness, and corruption. If it be intelligent, brave, and pure, it is because the people demand these high qualities to represent them in the national legislature. . . . [I]f the next centennial does not find us a great nation . . . it will be because those who

represent the enterprise, the culture, and the morality of the nation do not aid in controlling the political forces.¹⁵⁸

Daniel Webster also warned of the tragic consequence that could result from citizen neglect of our political system:

I apprehend no danger to our country from a foreign foe. . . . Our destruction, should it come at all, will be from another quarter – from the inattention of the people to the concerns of their government – from their carelessness and negligence.¹⁵⁹

We should therefore heed the warning delivered to citizens in 1803 when the Rev. Matthias Burnet charged:

To God and posterity you are accountable. . . . Let not your children have reason to curse you for giving up those rights and prostrating those institutions which your fathers delivered to you.¹⁶⁰

For the sake of this generation as well as future ones, we must be active citizens. As John Hancock admonished:

I [urge] you, by all that is dear, by all that is honorable, by all that is sacred, not only that ye pray but that ye act.¹⁶¹

The responsibilities facing God-fearing citizens in this election are somber, and the potential repercussions from our actions (or lack thereof) are both far-reaching and long-lasting. Wherever civic indifference rules among Biblical persons of faith, wrong principles and policies will abound in the institutions around them; therefore, when it comes to sound government, the greatest enemy is not “them” but rather our own complacency. ■

Endnotes

1. "About Us: UCC Firsts," *United Church of Christ* (at: <http://www.ucc.org/about-us/firsts.html>) (accessed June 10, 2008). See also Shaila Dewan, "United Church of Christ Backs Same-Sex Marriage," *New York Times*, July 5, 2005 (at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/05/national/05church.html>).

2. W. Evan Golder, "Bill Johnson reflects on his historic ordination, 30 years later," *United Church of Christ*, June 2002 (at: <http://www.ucc.org/ucnews/june2002/bill-johnson-reflects-on-his.html>).

3. Hans Holznagel, "Fact Sheet: Reproductive Choice, HR 1833 and the United Church of Christ," *United Church of Christ*, April 1996 (at: <http://www.wfn.org/1996/05/msg00749.html>). See also John Brown, Jr. "The Struggle for Life Within the Church of Christ," *National Right to Life*, 1999 (at: <http://www.nrlc.org/news/1999/NRL199/brown.html>).

4. Hans Holznagel "Fact Sheet: Reproductive Choice, HR 1833 and the United Church of Christ," *United Church of Christ*, April 1996 (at: <http://www.wfn.org/1996/05/msg00749.html>). See also "Denominations and their stand on the issue of Abortion," *SpiritRestoration*, 2008 (at: <http://www.spiritrestoration.org/Church/Denominational-stand-on-the-issue-of-abortion.htm>).

5. "United Church of Christ's Israel Divestment Action 'Troubling'; Contravenes Months of Interfaith Dialogue," *Anti-Defamation League*, June 26, 2007 (at: http://www.adl.org/PresRele/IsIME_62/4749_62.htm). See also "ADL Assails United Church of Christ for Ignoring Israeli Suffering in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," *Anti-Defamation League*, June 26, 2007 (at: http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ChJew_31/5058_62.htm); "ADL Welcomes Effort by United Church of Christ to Give Israel a Fair Hearing," *Anti-Defamation League*, June 26, 2007 (at: http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ChJew_31/20070626_31.htm); John H. Thomas, "The Church, the Synagogue, and the Dilemma of the Middle East," *Boston College*, September 19, 2006 (at: http://www.bc.edu/research/cjl/meta-elements/texts/cjrelations/topics/jthomas_thechurch.pdf); J. Bennett Guess, "Thomas: Synod policy on Israel-Palestine 'remains today what it was before,'" *United Church of Christ*, June 29, 2007 (at: <http://www.ucc.org/news/thomas-synod-policy-on.html>).

6. "About Us: UCC Firsts," *United Church of Christ* (at: <http://www.ucc.org/about-us/firsts.html>) (accessed June 10, 2008).

7. Brad A. Greenberg, "Church Deems Unions Equal," *San Bernardino Sun*, July 5, 2005 (at: <http://musclys.blogspot.com/2008/07/ucc-deems-gay-marriages-equal-before.html>).

8. Patrick Henry, *Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence and Speeches*, William Wirt Henry, editor (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), Vol. I, p. 82, in his handwritten endorsement on the back of his copy of the 1765 resolutions of the Virginia Assembly addressing the Stamp Act.

9. Frederick Douglass, *The Frederick Douglass Papers*, John Blassingame, editor (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), Vol. II, p. 397, "An Address Delivered in Ithaca, New York, October 14th, 1852."

10. Francis J. Grimké, "Equality of Rights for All Citizens, Black and White, Alike" in *Masterpieces of Negro Eloquence*, Alice Moore Dunbar, editor (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2000), pp. 246-247, "Discourse Delivered in the Fifteenth Street Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.," March 7, 1909.

11. *The Documentary History of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1789-1800*, Maeva Marcus, editor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), Vol. III, p. 436.

12. Noah Webster, *Letters to a Young Gentleman Commencing His Education* (New Haven: S. Converse, 1823), pp. 18-19, Letter 1.

13. David Limbaugh, "Right Side of the Morals Issue," *NewsMax.com*, November 12, 2004 (at: <http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2004/11/12/84011.shtml>), quoting the Rev. Robert Edgar.

14. See, for example, "Homosexuality: Is it Changeable or Unchangeable; Normal or Abnormal; Moral or Immoral?," *ReligiousTolerance.org*, 2004 (at: http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_fixe1.htm). See also Austin Cline, "Arguments for Gay Marriage: Moral and Social Arguments for Gay Marriage," *About.com* (at: <http://atheism.about.com/od/gaymarriage/p/ProGayMarriage.htm>) (accessed June 10, 2008); David Brooks, "David Brooks: The Moral Case for Gay Marriage," *New York Times*, November 25, 2003 (at: <http://www.aclu.org/getequal/ffm/section2/2g7brooks.pdf>).

15. See, for example, Religious Institute on Sexual Morality, Justice, and Healing, "An Open Letter to Religious Leaders on Abortion as a Moral Decision," *ReligiousInstitute.org*, 2005 (at: http://www.religioustolerance.org/letters/Abortion_OpenLetter.pdf). See also Patricia E. Bauer, "The Abortion Debate No One Wants to Have," *Washington Post*, October 18, 2005, A25 (at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/17/AR20051017013111.html>); Diana Alstad, "Abortion & the Morality Wars: Taking the Moral Offensive," remarks from a speech given at NARAL, 2007 (at: <http://www.rit.org/editorials/abortion/moralwar.html>); Amanda Marcotte, "Time to Open up the Overton Window some more: Abortion is a Moral Good," *Pandagon*, February 22, 2007 (at: <http://pandagon.blogspot.com/2007/02/22/time-to-open-up-the-overton-window-some-more-abortion-is-a-moral-good/>). (Amanda Marcotte runs the weblog "Pandagon" and was briefly the blogmaster for the 2008 Presidential campaign of former Senator John Edwards); and many others.

16. Evangelical Environmental Network, "What Would Jesus Drive?," *Evangelical Environmental Network & Creation Care Magazine*, (n. d.) (at: <http://www.whatwouldjesusdrive.org/intro.php>) (accessed June 10, 2008).

17. Evangelical Environmental Network, "What Would Jesus Drive?," *Evangelical Environmental Network & Creation Care Magazine*, (n. d.) (at: <http://www.whatwouldjesusdrive.org/intro.php>) (accessed June 10, 2008).

18. See, for example, David Crary, "Liberals Dismayed by Conservatives Claims on Values," *Lawrence Journal-World*, November 9, 2004 (at: http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2004/nov/09/liberals_dismayed_by/), quoting the Rev. Stephen Bouman.

19. See, for example, "New Christian Coalition Head Quits Before Starting Job," *Religion News Service*, 2006 (at: http://www.beliefnet.com/story/205/story_20505_1.html). See also "Values Issues, Values Voters," *ProgressiveStates.org* (at: <http://www.progressivestates.org/content/479/values-voters-and-the-2006-election#r1>) (accessed June 10, 2008), quoting the Rev. Joel Hunter.

20. See "Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action," *Evangelical Climate Initiative*, January 2006 (at: <http://christiansandclimate.org/learn/call-to-action/>); "Signatories to Climate Change: An Evangelical Call to Action," *Evangelical Climate Initiative*, January 2006 (at: <http://christiansandclimate.org/learn/call-to-action/signatories/>).

21. See "Cornwall Declaration," *Cornwall Alliance* (at: <http://www.cornwallalliance.org/articles/read/the-cornwall-declaration-on-environmental-stewardship/>) (accessed

June 10, 2008); “Notable Signers of the Cornwall Declaration,” *Cornwall Alliance* (at: <http://www.cornwallalliance.org/articles/read/notable-signers-of-the-cornwall-declaration/>) (accessed June 10, 2008).

22. Evangelical Manifesto Steering Committee, *An Evangelical Manifesto: A Declaration of Evangelical Identity and Public Commitment* (Washington, DC: May 7, 2008), p. 13 (at: http://www.evangelicalmanifesto.com/docs/Evangelical_Manifesto.pdf).

23. David Van Biema, Cathy Booth-Thomas/Dallas, Massimo Calabresi and John F. Dickerson/Washington, John Cloud and Rebecca Winters/New York, and Sonja Steptoe/Los Angeles, “The 25 Most Influential Evangelicals in America,” *Time Magazine*, February 7, 2005 (at: <http://www.time.com/time/covers/1101050207/photoessay/>).

24. See, for example, Allie Martin, “Mohler, Guinness face off over Manifesto,” *OneNewsNow*, May 16, 2008 (at: <http://www.onenewsnow.com/Church/Default.aspx?id=116338>); Jim Brown, “‘Manifesto’ excludes black Christians,” *OneNewsNow*, May 12, 2008 (at: <http://www.onenewsnow.com/Church/Default.aspx?id=112708>).

25. See, for example, Allie Martin and Jody Brown, “Caner didn’t Endorse ‘Manifesto,’” *OneNewsNow*, May 16, 2008 (at: <http://www.onenewsnow.com/Church/Default.aspx?id=118542>).

26. Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Albert Ellery Bergh, editor (Washington, DC: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XV, pp. 331-332, to Charles Hammond, August 18, 1821.

27. James Madison, *The Papers of James Madison*, Henry D. Gilpin, editor (Washington, DC: Langtree & O’Sullivan, 1840), Vol. II, p. 1166, Luther Martin at the Constitutional Convention, July 21, 1787.

28. “The 2000 Campaign: Transcript of Debate Between Vice President Gore and Governor Bush,” *The New York Times*, October 4, 2000 (at: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9407E3DF1E3DF937A35753C1A9669C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=5>).

29. “The 2000 Campaign: Transcript of Debate Between Vice President Gore and Governor Bush,” *The New York Times*, October 4, 2000 (at: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9407E3DF1E3DF937A35753C1A9669C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=5>).

30. Jim Lehrer, “Vice President Al Gore Considers Issues Such as Oil Prices, Abortion and Gun Control,” *Online NewsHour*, March 14, 2000 (at: http://www.pbs.org/newshour/election2000/candidates/gore_3-14c.html).

31. Charles Evans Hughes, *The Autobiographical Notes of Charles Evans Hughes*, David J. Danelski and Joseph S. Tulchin, editors (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 144, speech at Elmira on May 3, 1907.

32. Benjamin Cardozo, *The Nature of the Judicial Process* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), p. 10.

33. “FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll,” *FoxNews*, December 1, 2005 (at: http://www.foxnews.com/projects/pdf/poll_religion.pdf). See also David W. Moore, “Public Favors Voluntary Prayer for Public Schools,” *Gallup*, August 26, 2005 (at: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/18136/Public-Favors-Voluntary-Prayer-Public-Schools.aspx>); “Education: Topics A to Z,” *Gallup*, August 26, 2005 (at: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1612/Education.aspx>).

34. See, for example, *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962); *Abington v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963); *Commissioner of Education v. School Committee of Leyden*, 267 N. E. 2d 226 (Sup. Ct. Mass. 1971), cert. denied, 404 U.S. 849; *Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38 (1985); *Lee v. Weisman*, 505 U.S. 577 (1992); *Santa Fe School Dist. v. Doe*, 530 U.S. 290 (2000); etc.

35. Dana Blanton, “Majority Opposes Same-Sex Marriage,” *Fox News Poll*, June 18, 2004 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,103756,00.html>).

36. See, for example, *Baker v. State*, 744 A.2d 864 (Vt. 1999). See also *Goodridge v. Dept. of Public Health*, 798 N.E.2d 941 (Mass. 2003); *In Re Marriage Cases*, S147999 (Cal. Sp. Ct. May 15, 2008).

37. As a result of *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973); *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179 (1973).

38. “Washington Post-ABC News poll,” *Washington Post*, January 14, 2008 (at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/postpoll_011408.html).

39. *Compassion in Dying v. Washington*, No. 94-35534 (9th Cir. 1996); *Quill v. Vacco*, No. 95-7028 (2nd Cir. 1996).

40. *U. S. Term Limits v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779 (1995); *Thorsted v. Munro*, 75 F.3d 454 (1996).

41. *Missouri v. Kalima Jenkins*, 58 L.W. 4480 (1990).

42. *In Re Marriage Cases*, S147999 (Cal. Sp. Ct. May 15, 2008).

43. *Gonzales v. Carhart*, No. 05-380, 550 U. S. ____ (2007); *Gonzales v. Planned Parenthood Federation of America*, No. 05-1382, 550 U. S. ____ (2007).

44. *Stenberg v. Carhart*, 530 U.S. 914 (2000).

45. *National Organization for Women (NOW) v. Scheidler*, 510 U.S. 249 (1994).

46. *Scheidler v. National Organization for Women, et al.*, and *Operation Rescue v. National Organization for Women*, No. 04-1244/04-1352, 547 U.S. ____ (2006).

47. *Smelt v. County of Orange*, 374 F. Supp. 2d 861 (C.D. Cal. 2005), aff’d in part, vacated in part and remanded with directions to dismiss for lack of standing, 447 F.3d 673 (9th Cir. 2006). See also Lisa Keen, “U. S. Supreme Court Refuses Marriage Case,” *Bay Area Reporter*, October 12, 2006 (at: <http://www.ebar.com/news/article.php?sec=news&article=1246>).

48. *Hein v. Freedom From Religion Foundation, Inc.*, 551 U.S. ____ (2007).

49. See, for example, *Hinrichs v. Speaker*, Nos. 05-4604 & 05-4781 (7th Cir. October 30, 2007); *Doe v. Tangipahoa Parish Sch. Dist.*, 494 F.3d 494 (5th Cir. 2007); *Univ. of Notre Dame v. Laskowski*, 127 S. Ct. 3051 (2007) (vacating and remanding, for reconsideration in light of *Hein*, *Laskowski v. Spellings*, 443 F.3d 930 (7th Cir. 2006)); *Freedom From Religion Foundation, Inc. v. Nicholson*, 469 F.Supp.2d 609 (W.D.Wis. 2007), appeal docketed, No. 07-1292 (7th Cir.) (parties now briefing issue of taxpayer standing in light of *Hein v. FFRF*, No. 06-157, slip op. (U.S. June 25, 2007) (see Order 7th Cir. 7/27/07); etc. See also Ira C. Lupu and Robert W. Tuttle, “Ball on a Needle: *Hein v. Freedom from Religion Foundation, Inc.* and the Future of Establishment Clause Adjudication,” *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 2008 (at: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3736/is_200801/ai_n25139691); Claire Hughes, “Lawsuit Targeting Faith-Based Prison Program Becomes ‘Hein Fatality,’” *The Roundtable on Religion & Social Welfare Policy*, July 10, 2007 (at: <http://www.religion-and-socialpolicy.org/news/article.cfm?id=6740>).

50. “U. S. Senate Roll Call Votes 109th Congress – 2nd Session,” *United States Senate*, vote date January 31, 2006 (at: http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=2&vote=00002); “U. S. Senate Roll Call Votes 109th Congress – 1st Session,” *United States Senate*, vote date September 29, 2005 (at: http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=1&vote=00245).

51. John Quincy Adams, *An Oration Addressed to the Citizens of the Town of Quincy, on the Fourth of July, 1831, The Fifty-Fifth Anniversary of the Independence of the United States of America* (Boston: Richardson, Lord and Holbrook, 1831), p. 14.

52. James Wilson, *The Works of the Honorable James Wilson*, Bird Wilson, editor (Philadelphia: Lorenzo Press, 1804), Vol. II, p. 475, "Lectures on Law: On the Natural Rights of Individuals."

53. Thomas Jefferson, *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, From the Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, editor (Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1830), Vol. IV, p. 278, to Francis Gilmer, June 7, 1816.

54. James Wilson, *The Works of James Wilson*, Bird Wilson, editor (Philadelphia: Bronson and Chauncey, 1804), Vol. II, p. 466, "Lectures on Law: On the Natural Rights of Individuals."

55. Obama's completely pro-abortion record as a state legislator is available from numerous sources, including Associated Press, "Obama Record May Be Gold Mine For Critics: Eight Years As State Senator Were Full Of Controversial Votes, Including Abortion and Gun Control," *CBS News*, January 17, 2007 (at: <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/01/17/politics/main2369157.shtml>).

56. Obama's perfect pro-abortion voting record as a U. S. Senator is confirmed by the NARAL (the National Abortion Rights Action League) report on Obama in which they proudly announce: "Sen. Barack Obama has served in the U.S. Senate since 2005. During that time, he has cast 13 votes on abortion and other reproductive-rights issues. All 13 of those votes were pro-choice" (at: <http://www.prochoiceamerica.org/assets/files/obama-fact-sheet.pdf>). See also information from the National Right to Life (at: <http://www.nrlc.org/Election2008/obamarecord0608.pdf>).

57. "S. 1173," *Library of Congress*, introduced April 19, 2007 (at: <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:SNO11173:@@P>), Obama was added as cosponsor on May 11, 2007. See also Barack Obama, "Obama Statement on 35th Anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* Decision," *BarackObama.com*, January 22, 2008 (at: http://www.barackobama.com/2008/01/22/obama_statement_on_35th_annive.php).

58. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1794), p. 237, Query XVIII.

59. James Wilson, *The Works of James Wilson*, Bird Wilson, editor (Philadelphia: Lorenzo Press, 1804), Vol. III, p. 656, "Lectures on Law: Crimes Against Safety," 1790 and 1791.

60. Zephaniah Swift, *A System of Laws of the State of Connecticut* (Windham: John Byrne, 1796), Vol. II, pp. 310-311.

61. Bernard Steiner, *The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry* (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company, 1907), p. 475, from Charles Carroll, November 4, 1800.

62. *Vidal v. Girard's Executors*, 43 U. S. 126, 198, 200 (1844).

63. *People v. Ruggles*, 8 Johns 545-547 (Sup. Ct. NY. 1811).

64. *Strauss v. Strauss*, 148 Fla. 23, 3 So.2d 727 (Sup.Ct.Fla. 1941).

65. *City Council of Charleston v. S. A. Benjamin*, 2 Strob. 508, 518-520 (Sup.Ct.S.C. 1846).

66. *Lindenmuller v. The People*, 33 Barb 548, 560-564, 567 (Sup. Ct. NY 1861).

67. *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003).

68. *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 599 (2003) (Justice Scalia, dissenting).

69. *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 599 (2003) (Justice Scalia, dissenting).

70. Associated Press, "N. C. Sodomy Law Still Being Enforced Despite Supreme Court Ruling," *The Daily Record*, August 25, 2003 (at: <http://www.dunndailyrecord.com/Main.asp?SectionID=1&SubSectionID=1&ArticleID=48265>). See also Raymond A. Warren, "Mecklenburg Judge Declares Sodomy Law Unconstitutional (Corrected Copy)," July 11, 2003 (at: <http://www.raywarrenlaw.com/release-071103.pdf>); Cristina C. Breen,

“Texas sodomy ruling applied to soliciting,” *The Charlotte Observer*, July 12, 2002 (at: <http://209.157.64.200/focus/f-news/944832/posts>).

71. *Bronson v. Swenson*, 2:04-CV-21 TS (D.C. Utah 2005); *Bronson v. Swenson*, No. 05-4161 (10th Cir. Aug. 29, 2007). See also *State v. Holm*, 137 P.3d 726 (Utah 2006); Leonard Post “Shades of ‘Lawrence’: Scalia’s dissent in Texas sodomy case is echoed in a Utah action,” *The National Law Journal*, January 30, 2004 (at: <http://www.law.com/jsp/article.jsp?id=1075219833754>); Ben Winslow, “Polygamy case in court: Trio asks 10th Circuit to overturn longtime Utah ban on the practice,” *Deseret News*, September 25, 2006 (at: <http://www.deseretnews.com/dn/view/0,1249,650193578,00.html>).

72. *State v. Shawn Jenkins*, No. C-040111 (1st Dist. Ct. App., Hamilton Co. 12-30-04).

73. James Otis, *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* (Boston and London: J. Williams and J. Almon, 1766), p. 4.

74. John David Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, Alexander Smith, translator (London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1814), Vol. IV, pp. 115-117.

75. “FDA Policy on Blood Donations from Men Who Have Sex with Other Men,” *Food and Drug Administration*, May 23, 2007 (at: <http://www.fda.gov/Cber/faq/msmdonor.htm>). See also “Blood Donation Frequently Asked Questions,” *AABB* (at: http://www.aabb.org/Content/Donate_Blood/Blood_Donation_FAQs/donatefaqs.htm) (accessed July 1, 2008).

76. “FDA Policy on Blood Donations from Men Who Have Sex with Other Men,” *Food and Drug Administration*, May 23, 2007 (at: <http://www.fda.gov/Cber/faq/msmdonor.htm>). See also “Gay Activist Would Risk Lives to Push Political Agenda,” *Christian Newswire*, March 20, 2008 (at: <http://christiannewswire.com/news/694626045.html>); “The CDC has acknowledged that many of those same high-risk behaviors, such as male-male anal sex, are chiefly responsible for spreading HIV/AIDS,” and “HIV/AIDS Among Men Who Have Sex With Men,” *Center for Disease Control*, June 2007 (at: <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/msm/resources/factsheets/print/msm.htm>).

77. “Poll Shows Less than 3 Percent of Americans are Gay,” *Citizen Link*, May 2, 2008 (at: <http://www.citizenlink.org/CLBriefs/A000007323.cfm>) (poll by New York’s Hunter College).

78. “Gay Activist Would Risk Lives to Push Political Agenda,” *Christian Newswire*, March 20, 2008 (at: <http://christiannewswire.com/news/694626045.html>). See also “Syphilis & MSM (Men Who Have Sex With Men) – CDC Fact Sheet,” *Center for Disease Control*, April 8, 2008 (at: <http://www.cdc.gov/STD/syphilis/STDFact-MSM&Syphilis.htm>) for percentage of MSM with syphilis.

79. “FDA Decision More Like 1977, Not 2007,” *Human Rights Campaign*, May 24, 2007 (at: http://www.hrc.org/issues/health/hiv_and_aids/3024.htm). See also “Gay Activist Would Risk Lives to Push Political Agenda,” *Christian Newswire*, March 20, 2008, (at: <http://christiannewswire.com/news/694626045.html>).

80. See, for example, Mahlatse Gallens, “SA gays in ‘blood flood’ protest,” *BBC News*, January 13, 2006 (at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/africa/4610196.stm>); Traci Johnson and Niall Mackay Roberts, “Protest shuts down blood drive,” *McGill Tribune Online*, January 1, 2006 (at: <http://media.www.mcgilltribune.com/media/storage/paper234/news/2006/01/31/News/Campus.Students.See.Red-1545735.shtml>).

81. L. K. Altman, “New homosexual disorder worries officials,” *The New York Times*, May 11, 1982 (at: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?sec=health&res=9E0DE5D8143>

8F932A25756C0A964948260). See also “The history of AIDS up to 1986,” *AVERT*, June 12, 2008 (at: http://www.avert.org/his81_86.htm); etc.

82. Matt Foreman, “State of the Movement Address by Matt Foreman, Executive Director, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force,” *National Gay and Lesbian Task Force*, February 8, 2008 (at: http://www.thetaskforce.org/press/releases/prcc08_mfspeech_020808). See also “HIV and AIDS in the United States: A Picture of Today’s Epidemic,” *Center for Disease Control*, April 2, 2008 (at: http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/united_states.htm); “HIV/AIDS Among Men Who Have Sex With Men,” *Center for Disease Control*, updated June, 2007 (at: <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/msm/resources/factsheets/pint/msm/htm>).

83. See, for example, Diego Vasquez, “Own It. End It.’: Turning heads around. The message in big letters: ‘HIV is a gay disease,’” *Media Life Magazine*, October 10, 2006 (at: <http://www.medialifemagazine.com/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi?archive=444&num=7806>). See also Ryan Lee, “Experts Debate the ‘New Face’ of AIDS,” *Washington Blade: National*, December 1, 2006 (at: <http://www.washblade.com/2006/12-1/news/national/national.cfm>).

84. HIV/AIDS Policy Fact Sheet, “U. S. Federal Funding for HIV/AIDS: The FY 2007 Budget Request,” report by the *Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation*, February 2006 (at: <http://www.kff.org/hiv/aids/upload/7029-03.pdf>).

85. Stanton L. Jones and Mark A. Yarhouse, *Ex-Gays? A Longitudinal Study of Religiously-Mediated Change in Sexual Orientation* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academics, 2007), pp. 325, 387.

86. See, for example, “Norway Okays Homosexual Marriage, Adoptions,” *OneNewsNow*, May 14, 2008 (at: <http://www.onenewsnow.com/Culture/Default.aspx?id=136648>); Stanley Kurtz, “The End of Marriage in Scandinavia,” *Weekly Standard*, Vol. 9, Issue 20, February 2, 2004 (at: <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp>); Maggie Gallaher and Joshua K. Baker, “Same-Sex Unions and Divorce Risk: Data from Sweden,” *IMAPP*, May 3, 2004 (at: <http://www.marriage Debate.com/pb.php>); “Marriage and Divorce in France,” *Living and Working in France* (at: <http://www.justlanded.com/english/layout/se/print/content/view/full/448530>) (accessed July 1, 2008); etc.

87. Timothy J. Dailey, “The Slippery Slope of Same-Sex ‘Marriage,’” *Family Research Council*, March 23, 2004 (at: <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=BC04C02>). See also Maria Xiridou, et al., “The Contribution of Steady and Casual Partnerships to the Incidence of HIV Infection among Homosexual Men in Amsterdam,” *AIDS* (Lippincott: Williams & Wilkins, 2003), Issue 17, p. 1,031.

88. Timothy J. Dailey, “The Slippery Slope of Same-Sex ‘Marriage,’” *Family Research Council*, March 23, 2004 (at: <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=BC04C02>). See also Maria Xiridou, et al., “The Contribution of Steady and Casual Partnerships to the Incidence of HIV Infection among Homosexual Men in Amsterdam,” *AIDS* (Lippincott: Williams & Wilkins, 2003), Issue 17, p. 1,031.

89. Timothy J. Dailey, “The Slippery Slope of Same-Sex ‘Marriage,’” *Family Research Council*, March 23, 2004 (at: <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=BC04C02>).

90. Stanley Kurtz, “The End of Marriage in Scandinavia,” *Weekly Standard*, Vol. 9, Issue 20, February 2, 2004 (at: <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp>).

91. “Marriage rates hit lowest rate since records began almost 150 years ago,” *Associated Newspapers Limited*, March 26, 2008 (at: <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-23465208-details/Marriage+rates+hit+lowest+rate+since+records+began+almost+150+years+ago/article.do>).

92. National Center for Health Statistics, *Health, United States, 2007 with Charbook on Trends in the Health of Americans*, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office, 2007), p. 143, "Table 10: Non-Marital Childbearing by Detailed Race and Hispanic Origin of Mother, and Maternal Age: United States, Selected Years 1970-2005." See also Jeffrey Leving and Glenn Sacks, "Rise in Out-Of-Wedlock Births Bad News for Kids," *NewsWithViews.com*, December 22, 2006 (at: <http://www.newswithviews.com/Sacks/glenn56.htm>); Mike Stobbe, "37 Percent of US Births Out of Wedlock," *Associated Press*, November 21, 2006 (at: http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D8LHMFD00&show_article=1).

93. Robert Rector, "The Wrong Course: The Senate's Proposed Amnesty will Cost a Fortune," *The Heritage Foundation*, May 26, 2006 (at: <http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed052606b.cfm>).

94. Michael Medved, "The Jessie Davis Case and Dangers of Out-of-Wedlock Parenthood," *Salem Web Network*, June 27, 2007 (at: http://www.townhall.com/columnists/MichaelMedved/2007/06/27/the_jessie_davis_case_and_dangers_of_out-of-wedlock_parenthood).

95. David Crary, "Divorce, Unwed Parenting Costing Taxpayers," *Associated Press*, April 14, 2008 (at: <http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=4653932>). (The full report is available from the *Institute for American Values* at: <http://www.americanvalues.org/>.)

96. "What country has the highest tax rate?," *Guinness World Records* (at: <http://www.libraryspot.com/know/highesttax.htm>) (accessed July 1, 2008).

97. *Murphy v. Ramsey*, 144 U. S. 15, 45 (1885).

98. *Grigsby v. Reib*, 153 S.W. 1124, 1129-30 (Tex.Sup.Ct. 1913).

99. Kevin Naff, "An Interview with Hillary Clinton: Reiterates Support for Gay Issues, knocks Obama over McClurkin Flap," *The Washington Blade*, February 11, 2008 (at: http://www.washblade.com/thelatest/thelatest.cfm?blog_id=16508).

100. Kevin Naff, "An Interview with Hillary Clinton: Reiterates Support for Gay Issues, knocks Obama over McClurkin Flap," *The Washington Blade*, February 11, 2008 (at: http://www.washblade.com/thelatest/thelatest.cfm?blog_id=16508).

101. Jim Brown, "Announced Project Proof of 'Gay Agenda,' says DC Activist," *OneNewsNow*, February 28, 2008 (at: <http://www.onenewsnw.com/Politics/Default.aspx?id=68553>).

102. John Jay, *The Life of John Jay: With Selections From His Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers*, William Jay, editor (New York: J. & J. Harper, 1833), Vol. I, pp. 457-458, to the Committee of the Corporation of the City of New York, June 29, 1826.

103. See, for example, "Aseret haDibrot: The "Ten Commandments," *Temple Emanu-El of San Jose*, 2008 (at: <http://www.templeofsanjose.org/JudaismInfo/Torah/tenccommand.htm>). See also Neil MacQueen, "The Numbering of the Ten Commandments," *Sunday Software* (at: <http://www.sundaysoftware.com/ten/number.htm>) (accessed on July 1, 2008); Joseph Telushkin, *Jewish Literacy: The Most Important Things to Know about the Jewish Religions, Its People, and Its History* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991) p. 40.

104. Dana Blanton, "12/01/05 FOX Poll: Courts Driving Religion Out of Public Life; Christianity Under Attack," *Fox News*, December 1, 2005 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,177355,00.html>). (The entire poll can be found from *Fox News* at: http://www.foxnews.com/projects/pdf/poll_religion.pdf).

105. "A National Poll Shows More than 80 Percent of Americans Support the Temporary Display of Religious Symbols in Public Places During the Holiday Season," *Spero News*, November 19, 2005 (at: <http://www.speroforum.com/site/print.asp?idarticle=2156>). See also Sacred Heart University, "80.8% of Americans Support Display of Religious Symbols During Holiday Season, Says SHU Poll," *Sacred Heart University*, November 2005 (at: http://www.sacredheart.edu/pages/10477_80_8_of_americans_support_display_of_religious_symbols_during_holiday_season_says_shu_poll.cfm).

106. See, for example, "FOX News/ Opinion Dynamics Poll," *Fox News*, December 1, 2005 (at: http://www.foxnews.com/projects/pdf/poll_religion.pdf); Dana Blanton, "12/01/05 FOX Poll: Courts Driving Religion Out of Public Life; Christianity Under Attack," *Fox News*, December 1, 2005 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,177355,00.html>).

107. "Faith-Based Funding Backed, But Church-States Doubts Abound," *Pew Research Center for the People & the Press*, April 10, 2001 (at: <http://people-press.org/reports/print.php3?ReportID=15>).

108. Charles B. Galloway, *Christianity and the American Commonwealth* (Nashville: Publishing House Methodist Episcopal Church, 1898), p. 144.

109. Will C. Wood, *Five Problems of State and Religion* (Boston: Henry Hoyt, 1877), p. 92.

110. Galloway, *Christianity and the American Commonwealth*, p. 143.

111. *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U. S. 306, 312-314, 315 (1952).

112. James L. Adams, *Yankee Doodle Went to Church: The Righteous Revolution of 1776* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1989), pp. 11, 14.

113. Matthias Burnet, *An Election Sermon, Preached at Hartford, on the Day of the Anniversary Election, May 12, 1803* (Hartford: Hudson and Goodwin, 1803), p. 27.

114. *The Providence Gazette and Country Journal*, October 17, 1789, p. 1. See also George Washington, *The Writings of George Washington*, Jared Sparks, editor (Boston: American Stationers' Company, 1838), Vol. XII, p. 119, Thanksgiving Proclamation, October 3, 1789.

115. John Adams, *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States*, Charles Frances Adams, editor (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1854), Vol. IX, p. 169, Proclamation for a National Fast, March 23, 1798.

116. See, for example, "In 2008 Race, US Religious Vote Fragmenting," *AFP*, March 30, 2008 (at: http://www.faithinpubliclife.org/content/news/2008/03/in_2008_race_us_religious_vote.html).

117. "How American Institute of Philanthropy Rates Charities: Criteria," *American Institute of Philanthropy* (at: <http://www.charitywatch.org/criteria.html>) (accessed June 10, 2008).

118. See, for example, "Welfare Reform: Testimony of Michael Tanner, Director, Health and Welfare Studies, Cato Institute, Before the Finance Committee, United States Senate, March 9, 1995," *CATO Congressional Testimony* (at: <http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-ta3-9.html>). See also Michael Tanner, *The End of Welfare: Fighting Poverty in the Civil Society* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 1996), statistics throughout his book.

119. Hillary Clinton, "Hillary's Remarks on the 40th Anniversary of Dr. King's Death in Memphis, Tennessee," *HillaryClinton.com*, April 4, 2008 (at: <http://www.hillaryclinton.com/news/speech/view/?id=6929>).

120. Lyndon Baines Johnson, "Annual Message to the Congress on the State of the Union," *The American Presidency Project*, January 8, 1964 (at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26787&cst=war+on+poverty&st1>).

121. Lyndon Baines Johnson, "Special Message to the Congress Proposing a Nationwide War on the Sources of Poverty," *The American Presidency Project*, March 16, 1964 (at: <http://www.presidency.ucs.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26109&st=war+on+poverty&st1>).

122. Lyndon Baines Johnson, "Special Message to the Congress Proposing a Nationwide War On The Sources of Poverty," *The American Presidency Project*, March 16, 1964 (at: <http://www.presidency.ucs.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26109&st=war+on+poverty&st1>).

123. Jenifer Zeigler, "War on Poverty Needs New Strategy," *Fox News*, September 1, 2004 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,131174,00.html>).

124. See, for example, Leon Felkins, "Poverty in the USA," January 13, 2001 (at: <http://perspicuity.net/civics/poverty.html>); Robert Rector, "The Poverty Paradox: How America Spent \$5 Trillion on the War on Poverty without Reducing the Poverty Rate," *The Heritage Foundation*, September 22, 1993 (at: <http://www.heritage.org/Research/religion/EM364.cfm>); Dick Arney, "The 'War on Poverty' Turns 40: Economic Growth and Opportunity are the Best Anti-Poverty Program," *Freedom Works*, January 9, 2004 (at: http://www.freedomworks.org/informed/issues_template.php?issue_id=1657); etc.

125. See, for example, Robert Rector, "The Poverty Paradox: How America Spent \$5 Trillion on the War on Poverty without Reducing the Poverty Rate," *The Heritage Foundation*, September 22, 1993 (at: <http://www.heritage.org/Research/religion/EM364.cfm>); Jenifer Zeigler, "War on Poverty Needs New Strategy," *Fox News*, September 1, 2004 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,131174,00.html>); and numerous others.

126. Benjamin Franklin, *Papers of Benjamin Franklin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), Vol. II, p. 168, "Poor Richard, 1737. An Almanack for the Year of Christ 1737."

127. John Jay, *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*, Henry P. Johnston editor (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893), Vol. IV, p. 51, to Lindley Murray, August 22, 1794.

128. John Jay, *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*, Henry P. Johnston, editor (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1891), Vol. III, p. 169, to Dr. Richard Price, September 27, 1785.

129. John R. Musick, *John Hancock* (Chicago: Union School Furnishing Company, 1898), p. 118, Address of John Hancock, Delivered in 1774, in the Old South Church, on the Boston Massacre of 1770.

130. Samuel Adams, *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, Harry Alonzo Cushing, editor (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907), Vol. III, p. 349, to Mrs. Adams, January 29, 1777.

131. John Witherspoon, *The Works of the Rev. John Witherspoon* (Philadelphia: William W. Woodward, 1802), Vol. III, p. 41, "The Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men," May 17, 1776.

132. Elbridge Brooks, *Historic Americans* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1899), p. 209.

133. Samuel Adams, *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, Harry Alonzo Cushing, editor (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905), Vol. IV, p. 253, in the *Boston Gazette*, April 2, 1781.

134. Samuel Adams, *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, Harry Alonzo Cushing, editor (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), Vol. IV, p. 256, in the *Boston Gazette*, April 16, 1781.

135. Paul Wallace, *The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950), p. 120.

136. Wallace, *The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania*, p. 121.

137. George Washington, *The Writings of George Washington*, Jared Sparks, editor (Boston: Russell, Odiorne, and Metcalf; and Hilliard, Gray, and Co., 1835), Vol. IX, pp. 391-392, letter to Benjamin Lincoln, June 29, 1788.

138. Numbers are based on information provided by the Republican National Committee in 2001, derived from calculations made from numbers provided by the Federal Election Commission and information provided by national polling sources. For example, in 1992, the Barna poll demonstrated that 40% of the U. S. population was Born-Again; in that same year the FEC reports that 113,866,000 Americans voted; the number of Born-Again voters in that election is therefore estimated at 45.6 million. In 1996, Barna reports that 36% of the U. S. population was Born-Again; in that same year the FEC reports that 105,017,000 Americans voted; the number of Born-Again voters in that election is therefore estimated at 37.8 million – a drop of 17% from the 1992 election. The same method is used to calculate the further drop between the 1996 and 2000 elections, thus producing a 40% Born-Again voter decrease from 1992 to 2000.

139. “The Pro-Life Advantage for Candidates,” *National Right to Life*, 2006 (at: <http://www.nrlpac.org/pdf/increment%202006.pdf>).

140. Numbers provided by the U. S. House Pro-Life Caucus following the election.

141. Carol Tobias, “Senate Results Cause for Rejoicing,” *National Right to Life*, November 2002 (at: <http://nrlc.org/news/2002/NRL11/senate.html>).

142. In the 2004 elections, a total of 125,736,000 votes were cast; 23% of voters were “Evangelicals,” thus translating into 28.9 million votes. See sources at Laurie Goodstein, “Religious Voting Data Show Some Shift, Observers Say,” *The New York Times*, November 9, 2006 (at: <http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50F17F7355B0C7A8CDDA80994DE404482&cn=Top%2fReference%2fTimes%20Topics%2fSubjects%2fE%2fEvangelical%20Movement>); “Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2004,” *U. S. Census Bureau* (at: <http://www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/p20-556.pdf>).

143. “Statement by Carol Tobias: National Right to Life Political Director, November 4, 2004,” *National Right to Life* (at: <http://www.nrlc.org/Post/Tobias110404.html>).

144. “Statement by Carol Tobias: National Right to Life Political Director, November 4, 2004,” *National Right to Life* (at: <http://www.nrlc.org/Post/Tobias110404.html>).

145. Numbers provided by the U. S. House Pro-Life Caucus following the election.

146. “Statement by Carol Tobias: National Right to Life Political Director, November 4, 2004,” *National Right to Life* (at: <http://www.nrlc.org/Post/Tobias110404.html>).

147. See “President Bush Signs Unborn Victims of Violence Act into Law, After Dramatic One-vote Win in Senate,” *National Right to Life*, April 6, 2004 (at: http://www.nrlc.org/Unborn_victims/BushsignsUVVA.html); “President Signs Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003,” *Office of the Press Secretary*, November 5, 2003 (at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/11/20031105-1.html>); “S. 3504: Fetal Farming Prohibition Act of 2006,” *Library of Congress*, July 19, 2006 (at: http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109_cong_public_laws&docid=f:publ242.109.pdf).

148. “Loretta Sanchez of California Amendment; National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004,” *American Family Association* (at: <http://www.congress.org/afanet/issues/votes/?votenum=215&chamber=H&congress=1081>) (accessed June 10, 2008). See also “CRS Report for Congress: Abortion Services and Military Medical Facilities,” *University of Maryland*, November 24, 2002 (at: http://www.law.umaryland.edu/marshall/crsreports/crsdocuments/95-387_F.pdf), pp. 17-18 (pp. 14-15 on PDF); “The Women’s Health Activists: The Hyde Amendment’s Prohibition of Federal Funding for Abortion – 30 Years is Enough!,” *National Women’s Health Network*, 2006 (at: <http://www.hyde30years.nnaf.org/documents/NWHNSchewelarticle.pdf>); “The Hyde Amendment: Fact Sheet,”

National Committee for a Human Life Amendment, April 22, 2008 (at: <http://www.nchla.org/datasource/ifactsheets/4FSHydeAm22a.08.pdf>); “Hyde Amendment,” *National Committee for a Human Life Amendment* (at: <http://www.nchla.org/issues.asp?ID=1>) (accessed June 10, 2008); Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance, “US ‘Mexico’ policy: Abortion funding in foreign countries,” *ReligiousTolerance.org*, April 27, 2007 (at: http://www.religioustolerance.org/abo_wrld.htm).

149. See, for example, “U. S. Senate Roll Call Votes 109th Congress – 2nd Session,” *United States Senate*, vote date January 31, 2006 (at: http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=2&vote=00002); “U. S. Senate Roll Call Votes 109th Congress – 1st Session,” *United States Senate*, vote date September 29, 2005 (at: http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=1&vote=00245).

150. See for example, “President Bush Will Nominate 20 Pro-Life Judges, Democrat Fight Looms,” *Christian Life Resources*, December 27, 2004 (at: <http://christianliferesources.com/index.php?news/view.php&newsid=4512>); Steven Ertelt, “President Bush Renominates Pro-Life Judges, Senate Abortion Battle Begins,” *Lifenews.com*, February 15, 2005 (at: <http://www.lifenews.com/nat1197.html>), etc.

151. In the 2006 elections, a total of 85,724,135 votes were cast; 24% of voters were “Evangelicals,” thus translating into 20.5 million votes. See sources at “United States Elections Project: 2006 Voting-Age and Voting-Eligible Population Estimates,” *George Mason University*, July 3, 2007 (at: http://elections.gmu.edu/Voter_Turnout_2006.htm); Laurie Goodstein, “Religious Voting Data Show Some Shift, Observers Say,” *New York Times*, November 9, 2006 (at: <http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50F17F7355B0C7A8CDDA80994DE404482&n=Top%2fReference%2fTimes%20Topics%2fSubjects%2fE%2fEvangelical%20Movement>).

152. In the last election, most exit polling did not separate out abortion as a single issue but instead combined it with marriage and other issues to call it “values”; in that exit polling, the “values” numbers ranged from 27 to 36 percent. For polls that did break abortion out as a single issue, it was the driving issue for only 6 to 12 percent of voters. See, for example, “Religion and the 2006 Elections: Exit Poll Results – The ‘God Gap’ Widens,” *The Pew Forum*, 2006 (at: <http://pewforum.org/docs/index.php?DocID=174>); “National Exit Poll: Midterms Come Down to Iraq, Bush,” *FoxNews*, November 8, 2006 (at: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,228104,00.html>); “Exit Poll Shows Shift in Religious Vote Driven By ‘Kitchen Table’ Moral Issues,” *Faith in Public Life*, November 15, 2006 (at: www.faithin-publiclife.org/content/files/zogby_exit_poll_memo_EntryFile_1.pdf); etc.

153. Numbers provided by the U. S. House Pro-Life Caucus following the election.

154. “Senate Freshmen Since Direct Election (1914),” *United States Senate* (at: http://www.senate.gov/pagelayout/reference/five_column_table/Freshmen.htm) (accessed June 30, 2008). See also Bob Corker, “Issues & Legislation: Protecting the Unborn,” *United States Senate* (at: http://corker.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=IssueStatementsView&Issues_id=1b819b38-7e9-9af9-7277-cbb6309d99fe&CFID=21826125&CFTOKEN=86750223) (accessed June 30, 2008).

155. Thomas F. Shaller, “Despite Exceptions, New Congress is the Most Pro-Choice Ever,” *Baltimore Sun*, February 28, 2007 (at: <http://www.sba-list.org/newstems.aspx>).

156. See “Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2007” (Referred to Senate Committee after being Received from House), *Library of Congress*, March 20, 2007

(at: http://thomas.loc.gov/home/gpoxmlc110/h1592_ih.xml); "HR 3685," *Library of Congress*, November 13, 2007 (at: <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:H.R.3685>).

157. Numbers from a study by San Francisco-based Community Marketing, Inc. reported in the *Los Angeles Times* online blog, August 8, 2007 (at: <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/washington/2007/08/gay-power.html>).

158. James Garfield, *The Works of James Abram Garfield*, Burke A. Hinsdale editor (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1883), pp. 486, 489, quoted from "A Century of Congress," by James A. Garfield, *Atlantic*, July 1877.

159. Daniel Webster, *The Works of Daniel Webster* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1853), Vol. I, p. 403, from a Speech Delivered at Madison, IN, June 1, 1837.

160. Matthias Burnet, *An Election Sermon, Preached at Hartford, on the Day of the Anniversary Election, May 12, 1803* (Hartford: Hudson and Goodwin, 1803), p. 27.

161. John R. Musick, *John Hancock* (Chicago: Union School Furnishing Company, 1898), pp. 116-117, Address of John Hancock, Delivered in 1774, in the Old South Church, on the Boston Massacre of 1770.

Also Available from WallBuilders



A history curriculum that unabashedly delivers the truth!
Drive Thru History America
written by David Barton & presented by award-winning actor Dave Stotts

Visit our website for other great resources!



800-873-2845 • www.wallbuilders.com