

First Amendment
by Rev. J. W. (Bro. Chip) White, Jr.

This is a letter that was written to a web site of the liberal persuasion in rebuttal of the obvious subject matter. The web site was found, and the letter written in 2007. There was no response or return communication from the web site. It is made available to you solely for the public's benefit for those holding an interest in this subject matter, or addressed to those holding to the same attitudes of the originator of the web site.

In 2005, a Federal judge in Dover, Pennsylvania ruled that ID (Intelligent Design) was nothing but creation "science" renamed, and was unconstitutional to teach.

It is not my intention to start a dialog that will resemble an argument of any type. This contact will be the only one you receive from me (unless there is a question you would like answered). But to be fair, if you wish to respond you are welcome to do so. However, I will waste no more of your time (nor my own) than that, which will also give you the advantage of the last word.

I am what Christians generally call a minister, although I fancy myself simply a preacher. My expertise is the teaching of the Rapture which differs from the Evangelical mainstream in some respects. These facts, including the subjects of evolution, creation, intelligent design or even atheism for that matter, have no bearing on this contact. This short exchange is centered on the statement from your web site that is listed above. I reinsert it below for absolute subject clarity.

In 2005, a Federal judge in Dover, Pennsylvania ruled that ID was nothing but creation "science" renamed, and was unconstitutional to teach.

Question :

What makes Intelligent Design or Creation Science an unconstitutional teaching? I wish clarification on the constitutional amendment by which that judgment was handed down.

Answer:

The last time I requested clarification on an issue of this nature, my opponent responded with a reference to The First Amendment To the Constitution Of The United States sighting the ever present argument of "separation of church and state". I answered in kind with the following information, which has been adapted to address your web site statements in regards to this subject.

The common man's tendency to accept at face value what he is told, when it appears to be presented to him from a position of authority, never ceases to amaze me. In short, the worlds population is full of individuals who are unaware of the facts, and a secular "enlightened authority" which is determined to keep them in that condition or is ignorant of the truth itself.

Your use of the information concerning the Dover, Pennsylvania federal judge handing down a ruling of unconstitutionality on a teaching, however correct the information (and I have no doubt of its accuracy) is itself an example of the injustice that is levied on the American people as a whole every single day in our supposedly free society.

His judgment, of which I have no doubt took place, was itself unconstitutional. It does not surprise me in the least as I have seen many such examples over the years. But, in point of fact, he made a judgment on a matter that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to the population of the United States in promise that the Congress of the United States itself can not even rule on.

Unfortunately, that promise is broken every day of the week as exemplified by your Dover, Pennsylvania federal judge. I am confident you have no idea what I am referring to so I will explain.

There are two massive misconceptions that the population of this once great country have come to almost unanimously accept and believe.

THAT

1. The Constitution of the United States guarantees we the people of the United States freedom of religion. (It does not).

AND THAT

2. Through the Constitution of the United States is established "separation of church and state".

(Also known as "the wall of separation", there is no such "rule of law" established by our Constitution).

Neither of these privileges can be proved to exist inside the First Amendment to the Constitution. However, the rights that are insured to us by our government are denied to us and trampled upon every single day we live. Quite regularly I hear remarks made by individuals that resemble the teachings stated above. Those comments will include the phrases "separation of church and state", as well as "freedom of religion". I repeat, neither of these privileges exists directly through the Constitution.

These rights are commonly accepted to be guaranteed to us through the First Amendment. However, the First Amendment does not directly address we the people. Nothing in the First Amendment directly grants we the people any rights or privileges. Allow me to explain.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of The United States of America does not notify we the people of any rights and privileges we may or may not have nor does it inform us of what we can or can not do, but it directly addresses the Congress of the United States and dictates to it, as a governing body, what it is forbidden to do.

1st Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

I repeat. 1st Amendment - Congress shall make no law

The First Amendment does not directly grant we the people any rights or privileges, but informs Congress of their limitations in passing laws concerning the subjects mentioned. The subjects in question are contained inside the first two phrases and entail,,

[1] respecting an establishment of religion.

The Constitution forbids the establishment by our government, through the passing of any law a federally recognized, preferred and acceptance of any "religion", which was a reference to any one particular faith, of which at the time of its drafting meant Christian denomination, and,,

[2] prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The First Amendment to the Constitution forbids our Congress the ability to pass any laws that would restrict the free exercise of religion, faith or beliefs by we the people inside our understood freedom of religious choice.

In short, Congress can make no laws concerning these two subjects. I repeat, Congress can make no laws in establishment of the first subject mentioned or restricting the second subject mentioned.

If Congress can not make a law concerning either of these two subjects, how can a federal judge from Dover, Pennsylvania (or anywhere else for that matter) legally pass judgment on an issue that his own Congress is forbidden to pass law on and therefore has no authority itself upon which to act? What gives him that authority, (other than the ignorance of the court and the people who allow the ruling)?

1st Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

This has been reinterpreted by liberal state and federal courts during our modern times to insinuate "separation of church and state" and the majority of we the people have accepted that false reinterpretation. The phrase "separation of church and state" actually does not appear in any official government document. Legally it is nonexistent. It is also referred to as "the wall of separation" between religion (which to them means any organized religious body "or church") and the state (or government).

If left up to the proponents of this interpretation, "believers" of the Christian faith would have no hand or say in our so called democratic process (which is actually a republic) because our decisions are derived from our "religion" (what we believe) or faith. They fail to recognize the same process concerning their own lack of faith which is just as "religious" and derived also from what constitutes their beliefs leading to the establishment of right and wrong in their own mind.

What this phrase actually says is that the federal government will never have the right to place into authority by the passing of any law a federally recognized national religious organization of and by our government. And it never has.

Ironically, this could be the only promise ever made by our government to its population that has gone completely unbroken to this day. (Unless one subscribes to the notion that the theory of evolution is a religion or the teaching of it is religious in nature as some do. Some contend that evolution today still stands unobserved thereby the theory remains unproved, and as such requires no less faith as a foundation of belief. In addition it is financed by government funding that is derived from the gathering of taxes from we the people.) The subject of a "state faith" and the necessity for us to be able to freely exercise our personal faith was the very reason for our original exodus from Europe, and the primary purpose for which this country was founded and declared independent.

The modern so called "wall of separation" is a figment of the 20th century liberal imagination. All of our political decisions are based on what each of us "believe" is right, and we are all religious in our beliefs and non-beliefs alike. When correctly defined separation of church and state is a one way street with mobile traffic, not a fixed wall of separation between church and state. It is the concept of the state or government remaining outside the affairs of the traditional organized religious establishment. Period. It has nothing to do with religion (the people and their beliefs), staying out of politics or governmental affairs. Every individual believes something, even atheists "believe" there is no god (allegedly), but all have equality under the Constitution to the political process. (Supposedly).

What our secular society wishes to impose on the whole of our population is what they like to think of as neutrality. But their idea of "neutral" is a void inside our political system of the notion of a creator and the free public worship of that entity. What they refuse to admit is our country was founded on the reality of the Creator. Without that recognition, there would be no United States of America, therefore no other freedoms to accompany the free exercise of religion. Simply put, we would not be here, and where ever we were, we would not be free.

A prayer spoken at any gathering whether on the floor of The Congress, The House of Representatives, The Senate or the flag pole or football game of any public school for that matter does nothing to establish, by the passing of any law, a "federal faith". And if I might add, our "public" schools are funded by we the people tax dollars who are forbidden to have a say in most, if not all of its curriculum which is exactly what your Dover, Pennsylvania federal judge ruled against that makes his judgment unconstitutional.

Joe Q. Public should be determining the subjects taught in our "Public" schools not the state since it receives that funding from Joe Q. Public in the first place and its the children of Joe Q. Public on the receiving end of those teachings. These acts which include religious expression such as voluntary public prayer (class room or otherwise) fall within the next phrase of the First Amendment.

1st Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Congress, or any authority beneath it, are forbidden by our Constitution to pass any law prohibiting the free exercise of religion in this country. This phrase does not give us freedom of religion. The First Amendment takes the next great step and awards to we the people the freedom to exercise (or freedom of expressing) in any way we see fit, the faith of our choice. Freedom of religion is understood for there can be no free exercise of anything without the possession of that with which to exercise.

Every time an authority, in any form, makes a ruling forcing anyone to remove from public view or to modify in any way a religious expression, (such as a nativity scene or a Christian cross) to satisfy someone's adulterated view of "political correctness", it is a direct violation of our First Amendment rights. There is no constitutional amendment against such a display and one can not be past even by Congress as prohibited by our First Amendment. Any attempt by a lower authority to restrict such actions are by definition unconstitutional itself.

This is a mute point for we all know very well that ample restrictions are in existence today all across our once great nation. But, every instance that does exist where an authority anywhere in this country makes a ruling concerning just these two issues that curtail our religious expression by restricting our personal actions which reflect our beliefs, effectively violates we the peoples First Amendment rights.

The First Amendment forbids our Congress from making any laws regarding these two subjects, therefore no lesser authority can even dream to do so by mere court rule. One can not hand down a ruling concerning a subject of which there is no law in existence by which it is governed, thereby it stands outside any jurisdiction. In a sense, the free exercise of religion possesses the equivalent of diplomatic immunity. Yet, through ignorance of this fact, attacks on and restrictions of that freedom take place every single day.

Through reinterpretation you and others have successfully taken away our freedom to exercise our "religion" in various avenues of public life, while retaining the right to publicly practice your own. I will not forget that fact.

But be aware, it is my sincere belief that sooner or later sometime in the near future the authority you support, in error, will remove from your list of freedoms something you cherish and hold dear. If the courts of our country can deny and restrict us (as they have done under your assistance and approval), given enough time there will be no one to keep them from denying and restricting you as well.

1st Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

This is the rest of the list. You might want to make note of them now, before its too late. At the point of no return in the future the powers that be are going to disagree with portions of your "theology" or the lack thereof. At which time it will become necessary to begin revoking the remaining freedoms on the list. Good luck and God Bless.

Rev. J. W. (Bro. Chip) White, Jr.

Author : The Partial Rapture "Theory" Explained

Courtland Baptist Church

P. O. Box 550 Queen City , Texas 75572

AMEN 900 Radio KPYN / Sunday mornings 8:30 am via Internet

E-Mail: revjwwhitejr@aol.com