

# Our Biblical Foundation In Politics, Part 5

One of the problems we have today is we don't teach about our government much at all and virtually nothing about the Constitution and the Bill of rights. These courses, what little that is taught, are taught usually in high school. After the Revolutionary War we began teaching the history of our nation in early elementary school. Noah Webster stated: ***"Every child in America should be acquainted with his own country. He should read books that furnish him with ideas that will be useful to him in life and practice. As soon as he opens his lips, he should rehearse the history of his own country."*** We were teaching catacisims out of the Constitution in 1828 to elementary students that Justices on the Supreme Court today couldn't answer.

Last week I mentioned theologian John Locke. He wrote the Two Treatises of Government and Richard Henry Lee, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence stated: ***"We copied the Declaration of Independence from John Locke's Two Treatises of Government."*** Early in our history all government classes in school read John Locke's Two Treatises of Government. It was required reading because that is where our Declaration of Independence government came from. This hasn't been taught in our schools in over fifty years. It won't, or really can't be taught today because it references over 1500 bible verses in relation to government.

In a school book used in our schools in 1843, The Young American Book of Government and Law, it discussed political parties, pro and con. What was stated concerning the con is very interesting as we see the fulfilment of it today. ***"Thus one party always begets another; and as ambitious individuals are apt to put themselves at the head of these several parties, and excite them against each other, there is usually a***

***agood deal of bitterness between them. It has often happened that persons have become so devoted to party, as to forget their country; and in some instances patriotism has been swallowed up in party spirit.***” This is what has happened in today’s politics in both parties. Both parties ignore the principles of the Constitution and the will of the people and are more concerned with the party’s agenda then the will of the people and the rule of law. This is the result of allowing globalists, which are in both Party’s, take control of the party instead of keeping nationalists that have the concern of the people and implimentation of the constitutional principles. George Washington in his farewell speech warned us about loving party more than country: ***“Let me warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party. . . [In elective governments]], it is truly their worst enemy. The alternative domination of one faction [party] over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to a party dissention . . . is itself a frightful despotism. The common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to mske it the interedst and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.”*** [1]

Understand that everyone has a world view and this will include what they believe should be allowed in the public arena. Again, we must be careful of the type of person we allow in places of authority. In Sante Fe, Texas a few people did not approve of prayer before a sporting event or at graduation so they took the school to court and under judge Samuel Kent he administered this ruling concerning prayers at the school: ***The court will allow that prayer to be a typical nondenominational prayer, which can refer to God of the Almighty or that sort of thing, The prayer must not refer to a specific deity by name, whether it be Jesus, Budda, Mohammed, the Great God Sheba or anyone else.***

***And make no mistake, the court is going to have a United States marshal in attendance at the graduation. If any***

***student offends this court, that student will be summarily arrested and will face up to six months incarceration I the Glaveston County Jail for contempt of court. Anyone who thinks I'm kidding about this order better think again.*** This is a ruling from a so-called non-partisian judge. It is as if he has never read the Constitution nor the Bill of Rights. This ruling violates our First Amendment right of freedom of religion and the free exercise thereof. But that is his world view of prayer. He should have been removed from the bench for violation of his oath to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the land.

Take United States Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg. She believes that the US Supreme Court should use international law to adjudicate some cases even though they are sworn to using only the Constitution. ***Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg of the Supreme Court embraced the practice of consulting foreign legal decisions on Friday, rejecting the argument from conservatives that United States law should not take international thinking into account.***

***After a strongly worded dissent in a juvenile death penalty case from Justice Antonin Scalia last month that accused the court of putting too much faith in international opinion, Justice Ginsberg said the United States system should, if anything, consider international law more often.***

***"Judges in the United States are free to consult all manner of commentary," she said in a speech to several hundred lawyers and scholars here Friday.***

***She cited several instances when the logic of foreign courts had been applied to help untangle legal questions domestically, and of legislatures and courts abroad adopting United States law.***[2] The United States Supreme Court also used international law to overturn the Texas sodomy law because they found nothing in our Constitution that gave them the right to do so and their world view is the Texas law

unconstitutional. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg recently bragged to the leftist American Constitution Society, "Our island or lone ranger mentality is beginning to change." Several justices "are becoming more open to comparative and international law perspectives." American lawyers' and judges' "perspective on constitutional law should encompass the world."

During a visit to Europe in 1998, Justice Sandra O'Connor claimed that "In the next century, we are going to want to draw upon judgments from other jurisdictions. We are going to be more inclined to look at the decisions of [the European] court...and perhaps use them and cite them."

In a recent TV interview, Justice Stephen Breyer commented that "...the world really, it's trite but it's true, is growing together...And how [people are] going to live together across the world will be the challenge and whether our Constitution and how it fits into the governing documents of other nations I think will be a challenge for the next generation." His incoherent style aside, Breyer's words are ominous coming from one who has sworn to uphold the Constitution.

The trend that these justices celebrate has shown itself in several recent high profile cases. In ruling that states may not apply the death penalty when the perpetrator is judged to be mentally retarded, the court's majority opinion cited a brief for the European Union as evidence that Europeans would not approve of the practice.

The ruling against the Texas sodomy law was supported by reference to a decision of the European Court of Human rights, which had invalidated an Irish sodomy law. After describing the European case, the US decision claimed that "There has been no showing that in this country the governmental interest in circumscribing personal choice is somehow more legitimate or urgent" than it is in Europe, as if we had a duty to bow to European standards of personal liberty. I don't think

***Americans need the aid of Europeans to understand liberty and the means of preserving it.***[3]

One has to wonder why these justices have not been removed from the bench. The laws in this country can only be judged by what our Constitution allows. They have violated their oath to uphold the Constitution multiple times. The globalists that are in our Congress will do nothing to remove them. They themselves are as guilty as the jurists. We are as guilty for not removing the members of Congress that refuse to call for the upholding of our Constitution.

Foot Notes:

1. [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/washing.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp)
2. [Justice Ginsburg backs value of foreign law](#)
3. <http://www.neusysinc.com/columnarchive/colm0198.html>