

# Faith and Science in Unity [Rev. 20190318]

By J — Latest revision: [http://allis.foundation/Faith\\_and\\_Science\\_in\\_Unity.pdf](http://allis.foundation/Faith_and_Science_in_Unity.pdf)



ABOVE: 'CLIMBING A MOUNTAIN IS AN ACT OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE, WHEREAS CLIMBING THE MOUNTAIN "WITHIN YOU" LEADS TO GOD'. \*1

## The Rise of the Moral Narcissists

Why do few people change their political views "even in the face of literally earthshaking world events" like 9/11? Roger Simon's answer to that question is "moral narcissism." His book explains the nature and consequences of this malady that was largely spawned by members of the "Least Great Generation"—folks, including the author (1943), born during or shortly before World War Two. These are radical wannabes that include John Lennon (1940), Tom Hayden (1939), Abbie Hoffman (1936), and Gloria Steinem (1934).

An illustration of moral narcissism not employed by Simon is the *Seinfeld* character Elaine—a woman whose sense of moral worth is derived from opinions that coincide with fashionable progressivism (Greenpeace activism, contempt for pro-lifers, contempt for her boyfriend's "Jesus fish," contempt for Christian music radio presets, contempt for women wearing fur coats). Despite a largely self-centered, shallow, and promiscuous life, Elaine is convinced she's a "good humanitarian" and proves it by self-consciously complimenting her waitress on "doing a great job."

The examples provided by Simon, unfortunately, aren't fictional and have had disastrous, perhaps fatal, consequences for the nation—fashionable anti-capitalist Marxism (espoused by thousands of well compensated professors as well as Pope Francis); a nostalgia for racism that stokes racial hatred by inventing micro-aggressions that supposedly explain and thus excuse black criminality; climate change ideologues who declare the issue settled (a ridiculously anti-scientific assertion) and who label anyone who dissents from the media-enforced consensus (even MIT's premier climatologist, Richard Lindzen) a "denier."

Radical environmentalism is another arena where moral narcissism flourishes—a movement whose DDT ban, spawned in 1962 by Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, led to hundreds of thousands of malaria deaths in Africa. Then there is the non-judgmental, all-religions-are-equal view of Islam that blames Western imperialism for causing terrorism—a pat-oneself-on-the-back brand of "tolerance" that ignores or chooses to remain ignorant of Islam's bloody, expansionist history prior to the era of Western imperialism.

The primary goal of moral narcissism is not "to do" good, but rather "to feel" good about oneself for having "the right opinion"—i.e. opinions promulgated by those who deem themselves superior by virtue of their "enlightened" views. These moral mandarins consist primarily of left-wing politicians, leftist academicians, the mainstream media, and almost all the entertainment industry. As with *Seinfeld*'s Elaine, it isn't how one lives one's life that counts; it's the political and moral slogans one mouths. Indeed, the moral stature gained from being politically *au courant* serves as absolution for what used to count as personal moral failings—an arena where non-judgmentalism is demanded by political correctness, at least with respect to ideological soul mates.

Sympathy for Fidel Castro boosts one's moral standing, since Castro supposedly believes in a utopian socialist state where folks contribute according to their abilities and receive according to their needs. Never mind that the dictator lives "a lifestyle, including yachts and private islands, that would be the envy of George Soros, while his citizens suffer in penury under constant surveillance, the specter of imprisonment looming." Identifying with various victim groups and spouting politically correct mantras likewise "allows Hillary Clinton to go from undergraduate Alinskyite to Chappaqua plutocrat with a net worth in the tens of millions without missing a beat." The destructive consequences of leftist policies for minorities aren't what matter. What matters is that Hillary and the current narcissist-in-chief feel morally superior to rubes in flyover country.

Just when you think Simon is becoming tiresome (as he does when repeating polling statistics about gay marriage), he provides a critical insight in chapter 24 that should have been placed near the book's beginning: "Moral narcissism ... is a way of explaining away evil, blaming all ills on social causes and therefore pushing back the necessity of examining the human soul or one's own, of not seeing the possible darkness within[.] ... [M]oral narcissism obscures reality and therefore threatens democracy. That not everything is perfectible, that there is evil in the world, and that evil is likely to remain forever." In short, self-scrutiny is replaced with verbal orthodoxies promulgated by an American nomenclatura eager to secure moral status, financial perquisites, and a stream of personal indulgences by endlessly repeating politically correct slogans that are overwhelmingly destructive when applied to the real world—slogans that promise financial and personal retribution for "bigoted" dissenters..."<sup>2</sup>

"The point of the demoralization process was to get people to where they cannot come to sensible conclusions about what is right and what is wrong, about what is true and what is false. Exposure to true information does not matter anymore. A person who is demoralized is unable to assess true information. The facts tell nothing to him. Even if I shower him with information, with authentic proof, with documents and pictures, even if I take him by force and show him the actual, material physical proof, he will refuse to believe it, until he receives a kick on his fat bottom..."  
—Yuri Bezmenov, *KGB Defector (describing how the Soviet Union subverted moral foundations of America)*

## Horrific Results of ‘Men Turning Away from God’

In 1570, Ivan the Terrible attacked Novgorod, which had been for centuries a successful Russian republic on the Baltic Sea. Ivan's first command was to subjugate the church. He stripped cathedrals and monasteries of their valuables; put priests and deacons in shackles and flogged them til they paid a ransom; and he ordered some 500 clergymen beaten to death.

Ivan laid waste to 90 percent of the farmland surrounding Novgorod. Ivan's 6,000 secret police, called Oprichniki, pillaged, burned, arrested and terrorized with cruel violence. Men, women and children were roasted over fires; tied to sleds and dragged through town; trapped under ice in the Volkhov River and if they managed to surface they were shoved back under. According to “The First Pskov Chronicle,” 60,000 people were senselessly slaughtered by Ivan the Terrible.

The French Revolution's Reign of Terror, was led by Robespierre, head of the “Committee of Public Safety.” In a speech titled “The Terror Justified,” Robespierre told the National Assembly, Feb. 5, 1794: “Lead ... the enemies of the people by terror. ... Terror is nothing else than swift, severe, indomitable justice.”

Robespierre attacked Christianity and turned churches into Temples of Reason. The secular French French government beheaded 40,000 in Paris, then slaughtered 300,000 in the Vendee from 1793-1796.

During World War II, Nazi General Hans Frank executed a reign of terror in Poland, plundering and committing mass murder of millions of Poles and Jews in death camps. After the war, Hans Frank was arrested. During his imprisonment, Fr. O'Conner led him to believe in the atonement of Christ for his sins and he became a Roman Catholic.

At the Nuremberg Trials, Aug. 31, 1945, Hans Frank was convicted and executed. Being remorseful at his trial, Hans Frank stated: “At the beginning of our way we did not suspect that our turning away from God could have such disastrous deadly consequences and that we would necessarily become more and more deeply involved in guilt. At that time we could not have known that so much loyalty and willingness to sacrifice on the part of the German people could have been so badly directed by us. Thus, by turning away from God, we were overthrown and had to perish. ...”

Nazi leader Hans Frank continued: “Before all, God pronounced and executed judgment on Hitler and the system which we served with minds far from God. Therefore, may our people, too, be called back from the road on which Hitler—and we with him—have led them. I beg of our people not to continue in this direction, be it even a single step; because Hitler's road was the way without God, the way of turning from Christ, and, in the last analysis, the way of political foolishness, the way of disaster, and the way of death. ... His path became more and more that of a frightful adventurer without conscience or honesty, as I know today at the end of this trial. We call upon the German people ... to return from this road which, according to the law and justice of God, had to lead us and our system into disaster and which will lead everyone into disaster who tries to walk on it ... everywhere in the whole world.”

Another instance of government without God was during the Soviet era where millions were killed in purges. Stalin said: “Crisis alone permitted the authorities to demand—and obtain—total submission and all the necessary sacrifices from its citizens.”

President Franklin Roosevelt told the delegates of the American Youth Congress, Feb. 10, 1940: "The Soviet Union ... is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world."

Stalin controlled citizens through "fear and food." The people were kept in constant fear that government agencies would falsely accuse them and cart them away in the night, and the people were kept in a continual shortage of food, so they could not have the resources to rebel. Stalin engineered a famine in his war against the kulaks that killed millions.

Richard Pipes commented on the absolute power of Russia's Josef Stalin in his book, "Communism—A History" (Random House, 2001): "To break the resistance of the peasants in the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, and the Kazakhstan, Stalin inflicted on these areas in 1932-33 an artificial famine, shipping out all the food from entire districts and deploying the army to prevent the starving peasants from migrating in search of nourishment. It is estimated that between 6 and 7 million people perished in this man-made catastrophe."

Richard Pipes recorded in his book, "Communism—A History": "Stalin's regime needed another crisis ... as Fidel Castro, the leader of Communist Cuba, would explain ... 'The revolution needs the enemy. ... The revolution needs for its development its antithesis.' ... And if enemies were lacking, they had to be fabricated. ..."

Richard Pipes continued: "In 1934, a prominent Bolshevik, Sergei Kirov, the party boss of Leningrad, was assassinated under mysterious conditions ... evidence points to Stalin. ... Kirov was gaining too much popularity in party ranks for Stalin's comfort. His assassination brought Stalin two advantages: it rid him of a potential rival and provided a rationale for instigating a vast campaign against alleged anti-Soviet conspirators. ... Purges of the 1930's were a terror campaign that in indiscriminate ferocity and number of victims had no parallel in world history. ... Authorities ... beat them until they confess to their crimes they have not committed."

In February 1945, Alexander Solzhenitsyn was arrested in the Soviet Union for writing politically incorrect comments against Joseph Stalin. He was imprisoned for eight years, as he described in his autobiographical lecture, printed in the Nobel Foundation's publication, *Les Prix Nobel*, 1971: "I was arrested on the grounds of what the censorship had found in my correspondence with a school friend, mainly because of certain disrespectful remarks about Stalin, although we referred to him in disguised terms. A further basis for the 'charge' were drafts of stories and reflections which had been found in my map case."

Alexander Solzhenitsyn described: "Over a half century ago, while I was still a child, I recall hearing a number of old people offer the following explanation for the great disasters that had befallen Russia: 'Men have forgotten God; that's why all this has happened. ...' Since then I have spent well-nigh 50 years working on the history of our revolution; in the process I have read hundreds of books, collected hundreds of personal testimonies. ... But if I were asked today to formulate as concisely as possible the main cause of the ruinous revolution that swallowed up some 60 million of our people, I could not put it more accurately than to repeat: 'Men have forgotten God; that's why all this has happened.'"

Alexander Solzhenitsyn was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1970, but the Communist government did not allow him to leave the country to accept it...

The following year in Washington, D.C., Alexander Solzhenitsyn warned: "I ... call upon America to be more careful ... because they are trying to weaken you ... to disarm your strong and magnificent country in the face of this fearful threat—one that has never been seen before in the history of the world." \*3

# Trump Derangement Syndrome: America's Coasts, Cities, Colleges And Newsrooms Hardest Hit

The election of President Donald Trump has infected small, seemingly contained portions of America with a disease. The outbreak exists largely along both coasts—but there are also major infestations in urban areas and university campuses throughout the country. And a particularly virulent strain is running rampant through newsrooms nigh everywhere.

The malady is Trump Derangement Syndrome (TDS). TDS doesn't seem to affect the sufferer's body—but the mind is quickly and, it so far appears, irrevocably warped.

President Trump ran promising certain things. And he is now implementing precisely those things. This is, of course, quite astonishing to most political observers—who are used to politicians doing close to nil of what they promised on the trail.

But Trump won on those things, so people un-afflicted with TDS find his keeping his word to be generally refreshing—and think he has won the right to do those things.

Those suffering from TDS find this pleasantly surprising circumstance—screeching-ly objectionable. Set-fires-and-break-things objectionable. Professors-losing-their-minds-at-cops objectionable. Because nothing says “The other side is unhinged”—like mass unhinged actions.

Let us look at one Trump promise—and TDS sufferers' reaction to his keeping it.

Behold Network Neutrality. Net Neutrality is Socialism for the Internet—it guarantees everyone equal amounts of nothing. It is government preemptively ruling out any innovation anywhere—unless and until it rules it in. So it is Survival of the Fattest—May-the-Best-Lobbyists-Win. The companies with the most campaign and K Street coin to throw around—get the government policy they want. Net Neutrality is terrible, top-down, cronyism-infested, government-overlord-ism.

Net Neutrality is something that, under an orderly Constitutional process, would emanate from Congress. Legislation imposing it would be passed by the Legislative Branch, signed by the President—and then his Executive Branch would execute it.

But Net Neutrality is such a terrible idea, most Democrats wouldn't even touch it. The Donkey Party gave up on passing it through Congress—back when they controlled Congress.

And We the People certainly didn't seem at all interested. In 2010, ninety-five Congressional Democrat candidates ran on a Net Neutrality pledge—all ninety-five lost.

But Constitutional order and the will of the people never mattered to the Barack Obama Administration—so in February 2015 its Federal Communications Commission (FCC) unilaterally imposed Net Neutrality.

Not yet even a candidate, Trump in advance of the FCC's seizure Tweeted “Obama's attack on the internet is another top down power grab. Net neutrality is the Fairness Doctrine. Will target conservative media.”

Trump was, of course, exactly right. And given how President Trump is rigorously adhering to Candidate Trump's campaign promises—no one should be stunned that his FCC is already working to undo Net Neutrality. Yet TDS sufferers everywhere are losing their collective hive mind. [Headlines:]

### **Trump Appoints Anti-Regulation Net Neutrality Enemy to Head FCC**

### **Trump's New F.C.C. Chair Wants to End Net Neutrality, and Silicon Valley is 'Freaking Out'**

### **How Donald Trump Could Dismantle Net Neutrality and the Rest of Obama's Internet Legacy**

### **Net Neutrality Advocates Brace for Fight with Trump**

And the winner for understated media analysis:

### **Trump's New FCC Chair Is Screwing Everything Up as Fast as He Can**

Subtle. Understated. Hallmarks of TDS.

But before you mind meld into their mindless meltdown—some Reality.

The Internet was privatized in the mid-1990s—by the Democrat Bill Clinton Administration. As nigh always happens when the government gets out of the way of something—the Internet exploded. Nothing in human history has grown this big this fast. It has become a free speech-free market Xanadu.

And it did all of it—without any Net Neutrality regulations whatsoever in place for 98+% of its existence. Was the Internet in 2015 anything other than amazing and incredible? Hadn't it repeatedly, serially exceeded all our expectations and dreams? Absolutely it had—and it had done so without any Net Neutrality regulations ever being in place.

If ever the phrase "If it ain't broke—don't fix it" applied to anything—the Net-Neutrality-regulation-free Internet was it.

But the Obama Administration didn't like all of that free market success—totally bereft of unnecessary government interloping. So it started unnecessarily interloping—unilaterally imposing Net Neutrality upon an Internet that didn't need or want any part of it.

The result?

Title II (and Net Neutrality) Has Depressed Broadband Investment: "(FCC Commissioner Ajit) Pai pointed to research that showed a decline in capital expenditures by the major wireless companies of 12% in the first half of 2015 compared to the same time period in 2014—when the FCC was still expected to restore open Internet rules without reclassifying broadband. Only twice before have broadband service providers' capital expenditures fallen on a year-over-year basis,' he said, 'following the dot.com bust in 2001 and the Great Recession in 2008."

Get that? Internet investment had only dropped twice—after a massive terrorist attack, and a global financial collapse. And then a third time under Net Neutrality—which, economically, inflicts damage similar the these two cataclysms.

Trump Derangement Syndrome and all of its anti-Reality afflictions—appears to be here to stay. Net Neutrality—and all of its anti-Reality afflictions—thankfully does not.

The cure for Net Neutrality—is repeal. The cure for Trump Derangement Syndrome—remains a mystery for the ages.

\*4



ABOVE: POLITICAL CARTOON BY JAKE FULLER — “LIBERALS EXPLODE EVERY TIME THEY HEAR THE WORD ‘TRUMP’” IS A FORM OF T.D.S. \*5

"Until you heal the wounds of your past, you are going to bleed. You can bandage the bleeding with food, with alcohol, with drugs, with work, with cigarettes, with sex; But eventually, it will all ooze through and stain your life. You must find the strength to open the wounds, Stick your hands inside, pull out the core of the pain that is holding you in your past, the memories and make peace with them." —*Iyanla Vanzant*



## Belgian: ‘I’ve Been Pretty Leftist My Entire Life’ But ‘I Am Done Defending’ Islam

In the wake of the Brussels terror attacks, a Belgian Reddit user wrote that though, “I’ve been pretty leftist my entire life ... I am done defending” Islamic culture.

Responding to the “Reports of explosions at Brussels airport” thread, the now deleted comment—which was screen captured and re-shared on “The Donald” subreddit—explained that “enough is enough.”

“I’m all for integration and tolerance, but something is rotten to the core when it comes to Muslim culture within Europe,” the post continued. “Djihadis, fundamentalists, whatever you want to call them are either too plentiful or have too much influence. Whether that was our fault due to not giving them the tools to integrate or theirs for refusing to take advantage of those tools is besides the point.”

“I am done defending this culture. I am done playing devil’s advocate... Perhaps it’s time we showed the world again that when we stand as one force, we will not bend. It’s time to show that dogs without bark can still bite.” \*6

[-] [REDACTED] 1864 points 5 hours ago 🗳️ x2

Belgian here, I’ve been pretty leftist my entire life. Communist sympathies as a teenager and a socialist supporter as soon as I sobered up.

Enough is enough. I’m all for integration and tolerance but something is rotten to the core when it comes to muslim culture within Europe. Djihadis, fundamentalists, whatever you want to call them are either too plentiful or have too much influence. Whether that was our fault due to not giving them the tools to integrate or theirs for refusing to take advantage of those tools is besides the point.

I am done defending this culture. I am done playing devil’s advocate when I go out for drinks with my friends.

Ever since WW2 ended Europe has tried its damndest to avoid conflict. We banded together under these principles in both the European Union and the United Nations. Perhaps it’s time we showed the world again that when we stand as one force, we will not bend. It’s time to show that dogs without bark can still bite.

## This is How Atheism Became Our Official ‘Religion’

“Each year on January 16, we celebrate Religious Freedom Day in commemoration of the passage of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom,”—wrote President George W. Bush in his 2003 proclamation.

The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was passed by Virginia’s Assembly on Jan. 16, 1786. It was drafted by Thomas Jefferson and commemorated on his tombstone.

Did Jefferson intend to limit the public religious expression of students, teachers, coaches, chaplains, schools, organizations and communities?

Jefferson wrote in his original 1777 draft of the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom: “Almighty God hath created the mind free, and ... all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments ... tend only to begat habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do, but to extend it by its influence on reason alone.”



Thomas Jefferson explained in his second inaugural address, March 4, 1805: "In matters of religion I have considered that its free exercise is placed by the Constitution independent of the powers of the General Government. I have therefore undertaken, on no occasion, to prescribe the religious exercise suited to it; but have left them, as the Constitution found them, under the direction and discipline of state and church authorities by the several religious societies."

Jefferson explained to Samuel Miller, Jan. 23, 1808: "I consider the government of the United States as interdicted (prohibited) by the Constitution from inter-meddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises. ... This results not only from the provision that no law shall be made respecting the establishment or free exercise of religion, but from that also which reserves to the states the powers not delegated to the United States (10th Amendment). ..."

Jefferson continued: "Certainly no power to prescribe any religious exercise, or to assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the General government. ... I do not believe it is for the interest of religion to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines. ... Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the times for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets."

In 1776, a year before Jefferson drafted his Statute, another Virginian, George Mason, drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights, which was later revised by James Madison and referred to in his Memorial and Remonstrance, 1785.

The Virginia Declaration of Rights stated: "Religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator, and manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, that all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity toward each other."

James Madison made a journal entry, June 12, 1788: "There is not a shadow of right in the general government to inter-meddle with religion. ... The subject is, for the honor of America, perfectly free and unshackled. The government has no jurisdiction over it."

On June 7, 1789, James Madison introduced the First Amendment in the first session of Congress with the wording: "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship."

James Madison appointed to the Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story. Justice Joseph Story wrote in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," 1833, Chapter XLIV, "Amendments to the Constitution," Section 991: "The real object of the First Amendment was, not to countenance, much less advance Mohammedanism, or Judaism, or infidelity, by prostrating Christianity; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects."

Samuel Chase, who had been appointed to the Supreme Court by George Washington, wrote in the Maryland case of *Runkel v. Winemiller*, 1799: "By our form of government, the Christian religion is the established religion; and all sects and denominations of Christians are placed upon the same equal footing, and are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty."

**How did the interpretation of the First Amendment evolve?**

Below is an extended explanation:

Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens admitted in *Wallace v. Jaffree*, 1985: "At one time it was thought that this right merely proscribed the preference of one Christian sect over another, but would not require equal respect for the conscience of the infidel, the atheist, or the adherent of a non-Christian faith."

When the country began, religious liberty was under each individual colony's jurisdiction. In the decision *Engel v. Vitale*, 1962, Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black wrote: "Groups which had most strenuously opposed the established Church of England ... passed laws making their own religion the official religion of their respective colonies."

Like dropping a pebble in a pond and the ripples go out, individual states began to expand religious liberty at their own speeds:

- from the particular Christian denomination that founded each colony
- to all Protestants
- then to Catholics
- then to new and sometimes more liberal Christian denominations
- then to Jews
- then to monotheists
- then to polytheists

Through court cases, religion transitioned from the states to being under the federal government's jurisdiction, and process continued to expand "religious" liberty to atheists, pagans, occultic, and eventually to religions demonstrably anti-Judeo-Christian.

After the Constitution went into effect, the 13 original states ratified the first Ten Amendments which were specifically intended to limit the power of the new federal government.

The First Amendment begins: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

The word "Congress" meant the federal Congress.

"Shall make no law" meant the federal Congress could not introduce, debate, vote on or send to the president any bill respecting an establishment of religion. The word "respecting" meant "concerning" or "pertaining to." It was simply telling the federal government to keep its "hands off" all religious issues. When anything regarding religion came before the federal government, the response was that it had absolutely no jurisdiction to decide anything on that issue, neither for nor against.

"Establishment" did not mean "acknowledgment." "Establishment" did not mean a mere mentioning God or Judeo-Christian beliefs. Establishment was a clearly understood term. It meant setting up one particular Christian denomination as the official denomination.

Noah Webster's 1828 dictionary defined "establishment" of religion as: "The episcopal form of religion, so called in England."

With varying levels of official state endorsement, at the time of America's independence, most other countries had some kind of established church:

England had established the Anglican Church

Sweden had established the Lutheran Church

Scotland had established the Church of Scotland

Holland had established the Dutch Reformed Church

Russia had established the Russian Orthodox Church

Serbia had established the Serbian Orthodox Church

Romania had established the Romanian Orthodox Church

Greece had established the Greek Orthodox Church

Bulgaria had established the Bulgarian Orthodox Church

Finland had established the Finnish Orthodox Church

Ethiopia had established the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church

Switzerland had established Calvin's Ecclesiastical Ordinances

Italy, Spain, France, Poland, Austria, Mexico, Costa Rica, Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco, Vatican City had established the Roman Catholic Church

The attitude of the original 13 states was that they did not want the new federal government to follow the pattern of these other nations and have one denomination set up its headquarters in the Capitol building.

Allegorically, they did not want a federal "Walmart" church to come into town and put out of business their individual state "mom & pop store" denominations.

To make the purpose of the First Amendment unquestionably clear, they went on to state that the federal Congress could make no laws prohibiting "the free exercise" of religion.

Ronald Reagan stated in a radio address, 1982: "Founding Fathers ... enshrined the principle of freedom of religion in the First Amendment. ... The purpose of that Amendment was to protect religion from the interference of government and to guarantee, in its own words, 'the free exercise of religion.'"

Like dealing a deck of cards in a card game, the states dealt to the federal government jurisdiction over few things, such as providing for the common defense and regulating interstate commerce, but the rest of the cards were held by the states.

Justice Joseph Story wrote in his "Commentaries on the Constitution," 1833: "The whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusively to the state governments, to be acted upon according to their own sense of justice and the state constitutions."

Just as today:

some states allow minors to consume alcohol and other States do not  
some states allow the selling of marijuana and others do not  
some states have smoking bans and others do not  
some states allow gambling and others do not  
some states allow gay marriage and others do not  
some states allow prostitution (Nevada and formerly Rhode Island) and the rest do not  
at the time the Constitution and Bill of Rights were ratified, some states allowed more religious freedom, such as Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, and other states, such as Connecticut and Massachusetts, did not

But it was up to the people in each state to decide.

Congressman James Meacham of Vermont gave a House Judiciary Committee report, March 27, 1854: “At the adoption of the Constitution, we believe every state—certainly ten of the thirteen—provided as regularly for the support of the church as for the support of the government.”

### **When did things change?**

Charles Darwin theory's that species could evolve inspired a political theorist named Herbert Spencer to suggest that laws could evolve. This influenced Harvard Law Dean Christopher Columbus Langdell to develop the “case precedent” method of practicing law, which influenced his student, Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.

This occurred near the same time the 14th Amendment was passed in 1868, introduced by Republicans in Congress to guarantee rights to freed slaves in the Democrat South. The evolutionary “case-precedent” method provided a way to side-step the Constitutional means of changing the Constitution through the Amendment process.

Activist Justices began to creatively use the 14th Amendment to take jurisdiction away from the states over issues such as unions, strikes, railroads, farming, polygamy, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly.

Freedom of religion was still under each individual state's jurisdiction until Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected president four times. His 12 years in office yielded an unprecedented concentration of power, with its accompanying cronyism and entrenched interests. This led to the country insisting on a 22nd Amendment limiting all future presidents to only two terms.

In 1937, FDR nominated Justice Hugo Black to the Supreme Court, who also concentrated power by writing decisions taking jurisdiction away from the states in the area of religion. He did this by simply inserting the phrase “Neither a state” in his 1947 *Everson v Board of Education* decision: “The ‘establishment of religion’ clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the federal government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions or prefer one religion over another.”

Justice Hugo Black conveniently ignored numerous references in state constitutions regarding religion, such as North Carolina's Constitution in 1835, Article 32: “That no person, who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the

Christian religion, or the Divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within this State” (in effect till 1868, when it was changed to just believing in “the being of Almighty God”).

In a word, Justice Hugo Black took the handcuffs off the federal government and placed them on the states. After this, federal courts began evolving the definition of “religion” away from that originally used by George Mason and James Madison in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, 1776: “Religion ... the duty we owe our Creator and the manner of discharging it.”

This progression can be seen in several cases.

### **“Ethical” is considered a religion**

In 1957, the IRS denied tax-exempt status to an “ethical society” stating it did not qualify as a 501(c)3 tax-exempt “church” or “religious society.” The case went to the Supreme Court, where Justice Warren Burger wrote in *Washington Ethical Society v. District of Columbia* (1957): “We hold on this record and under the controlling statutory language petitioner (The Washington Ethical Society) qualifies as ‘a religious corporation or society’ ... It is incumbent upon Congress to utilize this broad definition of religion in all its legislative actions bearing on the support or non-support of religion, within the context of the ‘no-establishment’ clause of the First Amendment.”

### **“Secular humanism” is considered a religion**

In 1961, Roy Torcaso wanted to be a notary public in Maryland, but did not want to make “a declaration of belief in the existence of God,” as required by Maryland’s State Constitution, Article 37.

In the Supreme Court case *Torcaso v. Watkins* (1961), Justice Hugo Black included a footnote which has been cited authoritatively in subsequent cases: “Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others.”

Justice Scalia wrote in *Edwards v. Aguillard* (1987): “In *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488, 495, n. 11 (1961), we did indeed refer to ‘secular humanism’ as a ‘religion.’”

### **“A sincere and meaningful belief” is considered a religion**

During the Vietnam War, Mr. Seeger said he could not affirm or deny the existence of a Supreme Being and wanted to be a draft-dodger, claiming to be a conscientious objector under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, Section 6(j) that allowed exemptions for “religious training and belief.”

In *United States v. Seeger*, (1965), U.S. Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark stated: “The test of religious belief within the meaning in Section 6(j) is whether it is a sincere and meaningful belief occupying in the life of its possessor a place parallel to that filled by the God of those admittedly qualified for the exemption.”

### **“Beliefs about right and wrong” is considered a religion**

Another draft-dodger case involved Elliot Welsh. The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Welsh v. United States* (1970), decided that belief in a “deity” is not necessary to be “religious”: “Having decided that all religious conscientious objectors were entitled to the exemption, we faced the more serious problem of determining which beliefs were ‘religious’ within the meaning of the statute. ... Determining whether the registrant’s beliefs are religious is whether these beliefs play the role of religion and function as a religion in the registrant’s life. ...

“Because his beliefs function as a religion in his life, such an individual is as much entitled to a ‘religious’ conscientious objector exemption under Section 6(j) as is someone who derives his conscientious opposition to the war from traditional religious convictions. ... We think it clear that the beliefs which prompted his objection occupy the same place in his life as the belief in a traditional deity holds in the lives of his friends, the Quakers. ... A registrant’s conscientious objection to all war is ‘religious’ within the meaning Section 6(j) if this opposition stems from the registrant’s moral, ethical, or religious beliefs about what is right and wrong and these beliefs are held with the strength of traditional religious convictions.”

### **“Atheism” is considered a religion**

The 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, (W.D. WI) decision in *Kaufman v. McCaughtry*, August 19, 2005, stated: “A religion need not be based on a belief in the existence of a supreme being. ... Atheism may be considered ... religion. ... ‘Atheism is indeed a form of religion. ...’ The Supreme Court has recognized atheism as equivalent to a ‘religion’ for purposes of the First Amendment. ...

“The Court has adopted a broad definition of ‘religion’ that includes non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, as well as theistic ones. ... Atheism is Kaufman’s religion, and the group that he wanted to start was religious in nature even though it expressly rejects a belief in a supreme being.”

Overlooking that the Constitution is only to be changed by Amendments voted in by the majority of the people, the Supreme Court admitted in *Wallace v. Jaffree* (472 U.S. 38, 1985) that the original meaning of the First Amendment was modified “in the crucible of litigation,” a term not mentioned in the Constitution: “At one time it was thought that this right merely proscribed the preference of one Christian sect over another, but would not require equal respect for the consciences of the infidel, the atheist, or the adherent of a non-Christian faith such as Islam or Judaism.

“But when the underlying principle has been examined in the crucible of litigation, the Court has unambiguously concluded that the individual freedom of conscience protected by the First Amendment embraces the right to select any religious faith or none at all.”

The federal courts gradually used its novel “crucible of litigation” to give the word “religion” a new definition which included “ethical,” “secular humanism,” “a sincere and meaningful belief,” “beliefs about right and wrong,” and “atheism.”

Under this new definition, so as not to prefer one “religion” over another, federal courts have prohibited God. Ironically, this effectively established the religion of atheism in the exact the way the First Amendment was intended to prohibit.

This was warned against by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart in his dissent in *Abington Township v. Schempp*, 1963: “The state may not establish a ‘religion of secularism’ in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion, thus ‘preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe’ ... Refusal to

permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism.”

Ronald Reagan referred to this decision in a radio address, Feb. 25, 1984: “Former Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart noted if religious exercises are held to be impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage. Permission for such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit them is seen not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism.”

U.S. District Court, *Crockett v. Sorenson*, W.D. Va., 1983: “The First Amendment was never intended to insulate our public institutions from any mention of God, the Bible or religion. When such insulation occurs, another religion, such as secular humanism, is effectively established.”

Ronald Reagan stated in a Q & A session, Oct. 13, 1983: “The First Amendment has been twisted to the point that freedom of religion is in danger of becoming freedom from religion.”

Ronald Reagan stated in a Ceremony for Prayer in Schools, Sept. 25, 1982: “In the last two decades we’ve experienced an onslaught of such twisted logic that if Alice were visiting America, she might think she’d never left Wonderland. We’re told that it somehow violates the rights of others to permit students in school who desire to pray to do so. Clearly, this infringes on the freedom of those who choose to pray. ... To prevent those who believe in God from expressing their faith is an outrage.”

It may be just a coincidence that the ACLU’s agenda is similar to the Communist agenda, read into the Congressional Record, Jan. 10, 1963 by Congressman Albert S. Herlong, Jr., of Florida (Vol 109, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Appendix, pp. A34-A35): “Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principle of ‘separation of church and state.’”

Ronald Reagan stated in a radio address, 1982: “The Constitution was never meant to prevent people from praying; its declared purpose was to protect their freedom to pray.”

Judge Richard Suhrheinrich stated in *ACLU v Mercer County*, 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, Dec. 20, 2005: “The ACLU makes repeated reference to ‘the separation of church and state.’ This extra-constitutional construct has grown tiresome. The First Amendment does not demand a wall of separation between church and state. Our nation’s history is replete with governmental acknowledgment and in some case, accommodation of religion.”

The Supreme Court stated in *Lynch v Donnelly*, 1984: “The Constitution does not ‘require complete separation of church and state.’”

Associate Justice William Rehnquist wrote in the U.S. Supreme Court case *Wallace v. Jafree*, 1985, dissent, 472 U. S., 38, 99: “The ‘wall of separation between church and state’ is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned. It is impossible to build sound constitutional doctrine upon a mistaken understanding of Constitutional history. ... The establishment clause had been expressly freighted with Jefferson’s misleading metaphor for nearly forty years. ...

“There is simply no historical foundation for the proposition that the framers intended to build a wall of separation. ... Recent court decisions are in no way based on either the language or intent of the framers. ... But the greatest



injury of the 'wall' notion is its mischievous diversion of judges from the actual intentions of the drafters of the Bill of Rights."

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart wrote in *Engle v Vitale*, 1962, dissent: "The Court ... is not aided ... by the ... invocation of metaphors like the 'wall of separation,' a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution."

In the U.S. Supreme Court decision, *McCullum v Board of Education*, it stated: "Rule of law should not be drawn from a figure of speech."

Justice William O'Douglas wrote in *Zorach v Clausen*, 1952: "The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. ... We find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence. ... We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion."

Ronald Reagan told the annual convention of the National Religious Broadcasters, Jan. 30, 1984: "I was pleased last year to proclaim 1983 the Year of the Bible. But, you know, a group called the ACLU severely criticized me for doing that. Well, I wear their indictment like a badge of honor."

Are anti-faith groups using the evolved interpretation of the First Amendment to take away the liberties which the original First Amendment was intended to guarantee?

Dwight Eisenhower is quoted in the TIME Magazine article, "Eisenhower on Communism," Oct. 13, 1952: "The Bill of Rights contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to destroy the Bill of Rights. A group—like the Communist conspiracy—dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties, cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the government."

Ronald Reagan worded it differently on the National Day of Prayer, May 6, 1982: "Well-meaning Americans in the name of freedom have taken freedom away. For the sake of religious tolerance, they've forbidden religious practice."

Ronald Reagan stated at an Ecumenical Prayer Breakfast, Aug. 23, 1984: "The frustrating thing is that those who are attacking religion claim they are doing it in the name of tolerance and freedom and open-mindedness. Question: Isn't the real truth that they are intolerant of religion?"

Did Jefferson intend to outlaw the acknowledgment of God and limit students, teachers, coaches, chaplains, schools, organizations, and communities from public religious expression?

In light of mandates in the healthcare law forcing individuals to violate their religious beliefs and fund abortions or be subject to "temporal punishments" for non-compliance; or forcing out of business those who believe in natural marriage, it is worth re-reading the words of Thomas Jefferson's "Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom": "Almighty God hath created the mind free, and ... all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments ... are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of religion. ... That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical. ...

"That therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence, by laying upon him an incapacity ... unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and

advantages, to which ... he has a natural right. ... That to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion ... is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgment and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own. ...

“Be it enacted by General Assembly that no man ... shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.”

Ronald Reagan addressed the Alabama State Legislature, March 15, 1982: “The First Amendment of the Constitution was not written to protect the people of this country from religious values; it was written to protect religious values from government tyranny.” <sup>\*7</sup>

## **The America-Basher in Chief Rolls on**

How could America have twice elected a president who not only can't stand America but also won't perform his constitutional duty of defending it?

Even some former administration officials and rank-and-file Democrats are finally recognizing that there is something strange about a commander in chief who declines to listen to his advisers on terrorism, won't read their daily briefings and is uninterested in their threat assessments.

It's sad that so many refused to take Obama seriously when he promised to fundamentally transform America. It's inexcusable that the media and so many naive voters believed that his radical past and his ongoing affiliation with the Rev. Jeremiah Wright's racist church were irrelevant. It's disgraceful that a man who pledged to unite America on race, gender and income groups has intentionally polarized us to a point not seen since the 1960s. It's contemptible that he has used his office to alienate citizens from law enforcement officials throughout the nation. It's abominable that he is systematically dismantling our defense capabilities and approaching foreign policy as if his actions and inactions had no more consequences than a chalkboard exercise by a clique of airheaded leftist professors in their faculty lounge.

Islamist terrorists are waging a global war against America and our allies, and the president won't even identify our enemy. He sees Christians, Republicans and conservatives as the real threat to America—the distorted version of America, that is, that he envisions. He continues to trash America on foreign soil at every opportunity.

I (and others) have long been saying that Obama is obsessed with apologizing for America. Many of us documented his world apology tour, whereby he deeply criticized this nation at every stop of his globetrotting junket. Yet his shameless defenders say he was just building bridges and alliances. Talk about a bridge to nowhere.

I wonder whether these intellectually dishonest defenders will still deny that Obama is apologizing for America after hearing his words from Malaysia last week. Actually, I don't wonder. They'll love it. They are fellow America haters and have never been more ecstatic about a president—one who is finally using the immense power of the presidential office to tear this nation apart.

If you think my words are harsh, it's only because you are not talking to people all over this nation who are feeling and thinking exactly as I am. They are legion. They are fed up. They are not having any more of it.

At a town hall meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, on Friday, Obama denigrated the United States for its hypocrisy, its “growing inequality” and the inadequacies of our political system. A Martian traveler might well conclude that this man hasn’t occupied the Oval Office for the past seven years. Why doesn’t Obama just go on TV and confess that his entire presidency has been a failure—by his own regrettable benchmarks?

Concerning America’s hypocrisy, he told his rapt audience that we have to have some humility and not tell other nations what to do because we don’t have such a great track record ourselves. We’ve meddled in other nations’ internal affairs, and we have problems in our own country. Here again, Obama forgets that he has been president and that he has improperly intermeddled with other nations, especially our reliable ally Israel. And problems in our own country? I know this is news to the utopian left, but every nation is always going to have problems.

He particularly lamented our “growing inequality” and even blames it for our divisive politics and cynicism—two conditions to which he has been the greatest contributor for years. What’s that you said about hypocrisy, Mr. Obama?

But he gets the biggest prize for audaciously complaining about our political system, claiming that money is overwhelming ideas. Politicians are listening more to their wealthy contributors than to “ordinary people.”

Well, that may be true as far as it goes. We conservatives are tired of the ruling class and the establishment elite and their incestuous lobbyists, but we don’t believe that the left’s proposals of suppressing speech are the solution. And if anyone’s hands are dirty on this score, Obama’s are.

More importantly, Obama has no credibility in complaining about politicians who fail to listen to the American people—whether or not because of money. No one listens less to the people than he does. No one is more self-assured with less justification than he is. The American people are aghast at his arrogant refusal to defend America and listen to his advisers, his insistence on bringing terrorist-imbedded refugees and immigrants into this nation, his bizarre assertion that global warming is a greater threat to this nation than Islamic terrorism, his endless lies on Obamacare, his constant slandering of this country, and on and on.

It will be a sheer joy when we have a new president, God willing, who genuinely loves this nation and sees it as a force for good throughout the world and begins to return it to that path. No, this nation is not over, but it needs to turn back to its founding principles and believe in itself again. <sup>\*8</sup>

## **Muslim War with Americans Began Around 640 A.D.**

Muslims conquered the Eastern Roman Empire, Syria, Palestine, Eastern Anatolia, Armenia, Upper Egypt, Lower Egypt and North Africa between 634-644 A.D. Muslim pirates blockaded trade across the Mediterranean. This caused a catastrophic drop in products shipped from the East to the West, including papyrus reeds from the Nile delta which were used for paper in Europe. The paper shortage resulted in literacy declining and fewer books being written which, together with other factors, led to the Dark Ages.

A story passed down by Abd-Al-Latif of Baghdad (1162-1231), Jamal Ad-din Al-Kufti (1169-1248), and Bar Hebraeus (1226-1286) was that when Caliph Omar was asked in 642 A.D. what to do with the world famous Library at Alexandria, he replied: "If those books are in agreement with the Qur'an, we have no need of them; and if these are opposed to the Qur'an, destroy them."

When the Ottoman Muslims sacked Constantinople in 1453, it ended the land trade routes from Europe to India and China which led Columbus to look for a sea route, beginning the Age of Discovery. When Ottoman Muslims invaded Greece, there was a flood of Greek treasures, art and literature hurriedly carried to Florence, Italy. This led Europe to a re-interest in Greek culture called the Renaissance.

As the wealth of Greek Byzantine Empire flowed to Florence, Italy, many were made rich, most notably the families of Medici and Borgia, who financed artists Michelangelo and Leonardo DaVinci.

Condemning rising sensualism, the preacher Savonarola brought a notable Christian revival till he was excommunicated, tortured and executed. Fleeing Greek scholars also brought to Europe the Greek Bible, which was translated by Erasmus. This led to the Reformation, begun by Martin Luther in 1517.

The King of France, Francis I, caused a scandal in Europe by making an alliance with Muslim Ottomans against Italy, Spain and England. Francis I ordered the punishment of religious dissidents known as Waldensians. Over the next century, the Religious Wars resulted in atrocities committed by both Protestant and Catholic armies against each other.

Lorenzo de' Medici, to whom Niccolò Machiavelli dedicated his notorious book, "The Prince," 1515, had his daughter, Catherine de' Medici, marry the next King of France, Henry II. Henry II suppressed Protestant Huguenots, and after his death Catherine de' Medici was credited with the 1572 St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in Paris, after which Protestants fled France.

Catherine de' Medici's teenage son, King Francis II, was married to Mary, Queen of Scots, as France had for centuries helped Scotland struggle for independence from England. When King Francis II died at age 16, Mary Queen of Scots, age 18, returned to Scotland in 1561. She was immediately criticized by Protestant Reformer John Knox from the pulpit.

John Knox's influence on Scotland had a significant impact on the Revolution in America through the millions of Scots and Scot-Irish immigrants. John Knox had been arrested as a young man and sentenced in 1547 to be a galley slave on a French ship.

Sailing away from Scotland, John Knox looked up as they passed St. Andrews and said: "I see the steeple of that place where God first in public opened my mouth to glory; and I am fully persuaded. ... I shall not depart this life till my tongue shall glorify his godly name in the same place."

After two years, John Knox was released and exiled to England. John Knox rose to be the royal chaplain to the young King Edward VI where he helped influence the writing of the "Book of Common Prayer."

When King Edward died, his sister Queen Mary Tudor took the throne and attempted to bring England back under the Catholic Church. John Knox escaped England to Geneva, Switzerland, where he met John Calvin, the Reformer

who confronted the Queen of Navarre, April 28, 1545: "A dog barks when his master is attacked. I would be a coward if I saw that God's truth is attacked and yet would remain silent."

John Knox wrote tracts attacking all monarchs, then returned to Scotland to lead the Reformation. He preached a sermon in St. Andrews which incited hearers to smash statues and loot Catholic churches. Through the efforts of John Knox, Protestantism spread till the Scottish Parliament voted to officially accept the Reformation in 1560, beginning the Presbyterian Church.

The Scottish Parliament took control away from Mary Queen of Scots due to unfortunate events in her personal life. She had married Lord Darnley in 1565, but he became jealous of Mary's private secretary, David Rizzio, and had him murdered. Lord Darnley was then suspiciously killed two years later in an explosion. The chief suspect in his murder was the Earl of Bothwell, who manipulated Mary into marrying him a month later.

This upheaval caused the Scottish Parliament to force Mary to abdicate her throne to be replaced by her and Lord Darnley's infant son, James. James, at the age of 13 months, was crowned King James VI of Scotland. John Knox gave the coronation sermon. Bothwell tried to raise forces to return Mary to her throne, but he was captured in Norway and died in prison. Mary Queen of Scots fled to England in 1568 to be protected by her cousin, Queen Elizabeth I, who turned this into her forced custody for 19 years.

Elizabeth was the daughter of Henry VIII by Anne Boleyn. Anne Boleyn had refused to be another of Henry's mistresses, so Henry divorced his first wife, broke with the Roman Catholic Church and began the Anglican Church. Henry VIII later beheaded Anne Boleyn. The fate of Henry VIII's six wives were: divorced; beheaded; died; divorced; beheaded; survived.

Elizabeth sent Sir Francis Drake to circumnavigate the globe, 1577-1580. She sent Sir Walter Raleigh to found a colony in America in 1584, which he named "Virginia" after the virgin Queen Elizabeth.

Elizabeth was made aware of a plot against her which questionably implicated her captive Catholic cousin Mary Queen of Scots. Elizabeth tragically signed the order for Mary's execution in 1587. Catholics in England went into hiding or fled. Large numbers of priests sent to England were captured and executed. In 1588, Elizabeth had Sir Francis Drake fight the Spanish Armada.

When Elizabeth died in 1603, the son of Mary Queen of Scots was made King of England, Ireland, Wales and Scotland as King James I. King James I had been raised by Scottish Presbyterian Protestant tutors. He was responsible for arranging both Anglican and Puritan scholars to work together to produce the King James Bible—the best-selling book of all time. King James I is the namesake of Jamestown, Virginia—the first permanent English settlement in America.

The Pilgrims were sailing on the Mayflower ship to join the Jamestown Colony when they got blown off course in a winter storm and landed at Cape Cod. The Pilgrims had no charter from the King so they wrote their famous Mayflower Compact.

When Spanish and Italian Catholic troops plotted to help Ireland break from Anglican English control, beginning in 1569, the English crushed the attempt and executed thousands of Irish Catholics. The Irish had their crops and farms destroyed, leading to famine and disease and thousands dying. Over the next century, the British killed over a half-

million Irish Catholics and sold the same number into slavery in the West Indies, Virginia, New England, Barbados and Virginia.

In an effort to make Ireland more Protestant, Britain relocated 200,000 Presbyterians from Scotland to Ireland. Crop failures, increasing rent, and collapsing linen trade caused over a million Scott and Scott-Irish Protestant Presbyterian descendants to leave Ireland and immigrate to the American colonies. Through this mass immigration, the influence of Scotland's Reformer John Knox was felt in America.

John Knox, who died Nov. 24, 1572, had stated: "A man with God is always in the majority."

The first Presbyterian Church in America was founded by Rev. Francis Makemie in Maryland in 1684. By the time of the Revolution, the Presbyterian denomination was one of the four largest denominations in the country, along with Anglican, Congregational and Baptist.

A descendant of John Knox was Presbyterian minister John Witherspoon, who signed the Declaration of Independence and was a primary proponent of separation of powers. John Witherspoon circulated letters urging ministers to support independence, even publishing a sermon, "Address to the Natives of Scotland residing in America," in which he beseeched those of Scottish descent to insist on their ancient rights against Britain.

John Witherspoon served as the president of Princeton College, where he taught nine of the 55 writers of the U.S. Constitution, including James Madison.

The Presbyterian churches in the United States wrote to President George Washington, May 26, 1789: "We ... esteem it a peculiar happiness to behold in our Chief Magistrate, a steady, avowed friend of the Christian religion ... who, in his private conduct, adorns the doctrines of the gospel of Christ."

President George Washington wrote back in May of 1789: "Gentlemen: I receive with great sensibility the testimonial given by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. ... While I reiterate the professions of my dependence upon Heaven as the source of all public and private blessings; I will observe that the general prevalence of piety, philanthropy, honesty, industry, and economy seems, in the ordinary course of human affairs, particularly necessary for advancing and conforming the happiness of our country. ..."

Washington added: "While all men within our territories are protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of their consciences; it is rationally to be expected from them in return, that they will be emulous of evincing the sanctity of their professions by the innocence of their lives and the beneficence of their actions; for no man who is profligate in his morals, or a bad member of the civil community, can possibly be a true Christian, or a credit to his own religious society. ..."

Washington concluded: "I desire you to accept my acknowledgments for your laudable endeavors to render men sober, honest, and good citizens, and the obedient subjects of a lawful government, as well as for your prayers to Almighty God for His blessings on our common country, and the humble instrument which He has been pleased to make use of in the administration of its government." <sup>9</sup>

"Anybody who goes to a psychiatrist should have his head examined." —*Samuel Goldwyn*

# "A world free from religion"

Atheist power fantasy	Reality
	

ABOVE: MEME CREATOR UNKNOWN — LEFT, FANTASIES OF BECOMING GOD CREATING A COSMIC UTOPIA VS. UGLY, VULGAR REALITY. \*10

"This is the real task before us: to reassert our commitment as a nation to a law higher than our own, to renew our spiritual strength. Only by building a wall of such spiritual resolve can we, as a free people, hope to protect our own heritage and make it someday the birthright of all men." —*Ronald Reagan*

"When a distinguished but elderly scientist states that something is possible, he is almost certainly right. When he states that something is impossible, he is very probably wrong." —*Clarke's First Law*



# Victim Mentality Causing Millennial Meltdown

I was scheduled to do commentary this week as a psychology expert on a major network. The topic was shaming, and per custom, they asked me for commentary.

I guess I was supposed to say that Selena Gomez being called “fat” when she showed up in a tiny bikini was a horrible, unspeakable thing and that there should be new laws and regulations that should make such speech illegal. Instead, I pointed to the mental fragility that both the victim mentality and the entire diversity movement have created. And I provided proof.

I was canceled.

Shaming, which is essentially a new word for bullying, is epidemic. And it is true that millennials are more affected than ever. This week a new study found that millennials are mentally weaker than ever. The statist media took to the airwaves to blame shaming and inequality. They are wrong. Here's why.

Shaming shouldn't be so easy, but we have fostered a victimhood mentality by coddling children and precluding consequences. That has created both the “shamers” and the “shamed.”

The shamers, craving self-esteem that they don't have based on their own accomplishments, seek instead to destroy or injure someone else to feel a sense of personal power.

The shamed, who see themselves as victims (of sexism, ageism, racism, circumstances, poverty, divorce, homophobia, the list goes on ...) anyway, confirm their fears when even one person says something cruel, since their own sense of personal power is already low. When everyone gets a trophy for doing essentially nothing, then everyone expects a trophy for doing essentially nothing.

This is proven in psychological test after psychological test. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, or MMPI, for example, has been administered to a large group of college students since the 1930s. Even with the advent of the end of slavery, great “advances” for women and other minorities, sex ed, massive increases in our ability to prevent disease, increased wealth for every strata in America, the shift toward anxiety and depression has gotten progressively worse.

Jean Twenge at San Diego State University, who compared all the results, said not only is the advent of anxiety and depression sharply increased, but the data indicate that college-aged people's beliefs that they have control over their own destinies had declined sharply over the decades. Twenge's results are consistent with other studies done across the country and through the decades. Students are getting more and more mentally ill, and less and less able to handle their own problems with confidence and perseverance.

Psychology Today reported a massive epidemic of young people seeking counseling over things that were traditionally handled intrinsically. They gave examples of one college woman seeking counseling because her roommate called her a “b-tch.” Another set of college roommates called the police to set a mouse trap for them, and then needed counseling services to get over the anxiety of the fact that they had a mouse in their dorm.

These stories are not isolated. Young people today simply can't cope with the daily ups and downs of life, and what used to be considered a "challenge" is perceived today as a tragedy. What used to be considered a growth opportunity or a "bootstraps" moment is today perceived as victimization and cause for more laws and lawsuits.

It is coming through challenges that makes people strong, not taking an easy road.

Today, even our playgrounds are built to prevent a child's ability to fall down and get back up with a scrape on the knee and a kiss from mama.

In the short term, we can all pat ourselves on the backs for the social justice for victims who are compensated in our courts, but the results for our culture are tantamount to a padded room—a tragedy for our sanity as a society.

Twenge also studied locus of control in children through the lifespan, and found the same sharp linear increase in the number of young people who feel very little ability to control their world intrinsically. In 1960, young people scored 80 percent higher on the Nowicki-Strickland Scale of Internal/External Locus of Control. (This is an age-adjusted locus of control scale for young people based on the famous Rotter Scale traditionally used for adults.) The sharp rise in externality among young people over a 42-year period showed parallel linear increases to the incidence of depression and anxiety.

This shift is particularly defining because with a loss of internal locus of control comes a shift to the importance of the external. Externality is a focus on what is visible, such as money, appearance, status. Internality is pursuit of personal, internal improvement, not visible to the observer, but critical to the sense of self.

The reason this shift is so important is because the external is defined by others. The internal is defined by self. Thus, an insult to someone 25 years ago was easily dismissed by a strong internal sense of control. The same insult today can quite literally cause anxiety, depression and even suicide, because as we have devolved to value the external and lost our locus of control as a society. We are much more vulnerable to what other people say and do to us. This is why shaming works, and this is why it has become an epidemic.

Some will blame helicopter parenting, media, reality TV, over-schooling, video games, etc. But I believe smaller families headed up by single-parent households perhaps underpin all of the causality above.

I am a child of divorce, and I did my second master's thesis on the phenomenon of father loss. Daughters of divorce almost invariably suffer many of the aforementioned problems, and as such, enter life in a more compromised, vulnerable, easily victimized status with certain relatively predictable outcomes. Additionally, smaller families mean less interpersonal socialization.

It is much more difficult to get along with four siblings all day, every day, than it is to get along with a classroom of students you see between classes and extracurricular activities.

Sibling rivalry can be destructive, especially in broken families, but without it, children can quite literally enter junior high with zero experience being challenged, and without having their own internal tools to combat it.

I was one of those children. I had no coping skills, no ability to realize that when the first bully said the first mean thing, that was no measure of reality. I wondered, instead, what was wrong with me. With a busy single mom and an over-scheduled life with only structured, brief socialization, I was a sitting duck for bullying, shaming and trying to

instead control what was evident and external. This is epidemic in our culture today, and I believe a breeding ground for the shaming culture.

Smaller families also results in more pressure, thus more schooling, and more measure of the external since that has come to define success. Parents prevent failure with structured, institutionalization (from school, to extra-curricular activities, even summer camps) and creative, free play is often off the table. Additionally, parents have been raised in a declining culture of internal motivation and locus of control, thus they are more dependent for their children to define themselves. Many parents feel like they're personal failures in their own lives, and they become desperately dependent on the success of their children in all of the external ways. This is yet another recipe for disaster.

So what is the answer to the shaming and bullying epidemic in our culture?

- 1) We have to create a culture wherein shaming is ineffective. In our media-driven culture, this means role models need to be fostered for their internal heroics, not their external measures.
- 2) Role models need to avoid crying victim when they are shamed, and instead embrace a sense of internal strength that can be emulated.
- 3) Families need to be celebrated in media, rather than demeaned and marginalized. Children stand the best chance of success when they are raised in a family, and not by a single parent. Everything from our social-welfare system to our music argues that single parenting can be just as successful in raising children, but studies say otherwise. No matter how much people like me wish that being raised in a single family was just as good as being raised in a family, the data doesn't lie. So it is back to "bootstraps" if I want to succeed in life.
- 4) Less institutionalized learning and play. Learning and play alongside parents, siblings and friends is a natural occurrence when allowed to happen organically. Structure has a role in our culture, but we need to recognize when our desire to control our children is more about our own sense of loss of power than their need for another day camp, another monitored after-school sport or another week added into the school year.
- 5) Less legalism. There are too many laws, too many lawsuits and too many people screaming victim when maybe they really need to be taught how to turn challenge into victory instead. Bootstraps alone might go a long way in solving this entire problem of shaming. <sup>\*11</sup>



The majority believes that everything hard to comprehend must be very profound. This is incorrect. What is hard to understand is what is immature, unclear and often false. The highest wisdom is simple and passes through the brain directly into the heart

— Viktor Schauberger —

AZ QUOTES

## Sources

- \*1 = <https://lauratownsend.files.wordpress.com/2013/11/image16.jpg>
- \*2 = [https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/07/the\\_rise\\_of\\_the\\_moral\\_narcissists.html](https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/07/the_rise_of_the_moral_narcissists.html)
- \*3 = <https://www.wnd.com/2016/02/horrific-results-of-men-turning-away-from-god/>
- \*4 = <https://www.redstate.com/setonmotley/2017/02/06/trump-derangement-syndrome-america's-coasts-cities-colleges-newsrooms-hardest-hit/>
- \*5 = <https://www.artizans.com/image/FUL1600/liberals-explode-every-time-they-hear-the-word-trump-color/>
- \*6 = <http://dailycaller.com/2016/03/22/belgian-ive-been-pretty-leftist-my-entire-life-but-i-am-done-defending-islam/>
- \*7 = <https://www.wnd.com/2016/01/this-is-how-atheism-became-our-official-religion/>
- \*8 = <https://www.wnd.com/2015/11/the-america-basher-in-chief-rolls-on/>
- \*9 = <https://www.wnd.com/2015/11/muslim-war-with-americans-began-around-640-a-d/>
- \*10 = [https://www.nairaland.com/attachments/6516537\\_fbimg15151749949993713\\_jpeg4f3171615fe3b562314a2c040a566456](https://www.nairaland.com/attachments/6516537_fbimg15151749949993713_jpeg4f3171615fe3b562314a2c040a566456)
- \*11 = <https://www.wnd.com/2015/10/victim-mentality-causing-millennial-meltdown/>

This research paper was created without commercial intent—all materials were discovered online.

## Acknowledgments

To all uncredited authors (*Sources*), whose work was sampled for compilation into this document:

Thank *you*.

### God

The *All* that *IS*.

**Donate**

**Yearly**

AISF welcomes non-tax deductible donations to continue spiritual research and fund development of a Light in Life™ Online app, to enable guides and users to measure their Self-healing progress.

Donate via PayPal [ [paypal.me/allisfoundation](https://paypal.me/allisfoundation) ] or Yearly (contributing to the foundation's future).

## Contact

*\* PDF Documents may be freely shared/copied only if preserved entirely/unedited. © [All IS Foundation](#), 2019.*