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This is a story you won’t believe.

It starts with a hundred famished, starving people so desperate for food they had to eat their milk cows, slaughter their plough horses, and kill their dogs. When that ran out they hunted birds and squirrels, and then trapped rats and mice, and finally boiled the leather of their shoes to chew. When that was gone, they turned to each other, waiting on the dying for their next meal.

It’s an ugly tale of starvation and desperation that didn’t happen at some faraway place, it happened right here in our own backyard—Jamestown, Virginia.

A Hard Beginning

By Christmas day of 1607, more than two thirds of those first colonists in Jamestown were dead. The next year, more settlers arrived but most of them died that winter. The year after that came additional arrivals and more deaths—from starvation. It was an experiment in failure that repeated its deadly tally for seven terrible years.

The plan was simple, really: plant the first English settlement in America—more of a business venture than a colonization—and gather up all that gold. You know, all that gold that lies around everywhere?

When word of the colony spread around England, hundreds more crossed the ocean to Virginia, each anxious to out-perform the dead who preceded them and prove that a fresh load of strong backs and keen minds could stand the rigors of the wilds—after all, English settlers had been colonizing faraway places for ages, all over the world, why should the Americas be any different?

But the “starving times” kept killing them off. Of the estimated 9,000 who sailed to Virginia, only 1,000 survived.

There were two main reasons why Jamestown wasn’t working, and this is my point.

The first was the problem of habit—everybody had been doing things the same old way for more than 5,000 years.

Okay, we made some improvements since the pyramids, but not many. The Jamestown settlers traveled in boats not much better than those that sailed the Nile. Their farm tools consisted of a shovel, a stick plow and a scythe—about the same as you could pick up at your local Baghdad Hardware and Feed back in 3000 B.C. And even though there was an early form of China, there was still no Walmart, so their clothing had to be handspun and hand-woven. Transportation was by cart and oxen, and their medicine was more superstition than substance—and worst of all, most of them died young.

The second reason the colony wasn’t working was that the leadership didn’t bother updating the way they ran the place. They started off with communalism—every man could take from the general storehouse what he needed and was supposed to give back what he could. In theory, everybody would give back enough so they all could survive. After all, shouldn’t the
welfare of the colony be more important than individual welfare? While people would like to believe otherwise, the real answer is a resounding no.

The Jamestown experiment backfired. Worse than that, it was a pure disaster—uglier than Plato had promised.

It was in fact pure socialism in action.

The men were divided into threes—a third to start the farm, a third to build the fort, and a third to head off into the woods and find gold. Naturally everybody slipped away to go hunt for gold and they neglected the fort and the farm. Oh yes, some of them bothered the local Indians and were shot with arrows—back in those days the welcome wagon was nowhere in sight.

The big fix didn’t come until 1614. That’s when the colony leadership realized it wasn’t a lack of food that kept killing off the settlers—it was a famine of knowledge of correct principles.

Sir Thomas Dale spotted it immediately that year when he first stepped off the boat and into a stagnated mass of unmotivated colonists. It seemed obvious what the problem was—the men were lazy because they had no investment in the land—they had no private property.

Without asking permission from the colony’s shareholders, Dale went ahead and gave three acres of land to the old timers, less to the newly arrived, and asked only that in return they provide two barrels of corn for the store house at harvest time.

It’s amazing what a little freedom can do for the downtrodden!

The colonists were thrilled. They dropped what they were doing and hurried about clearing their land, plowing their ground, planting, dunging, watering—whatever they could to have their own food for the winter. By that fall, the storehouse was full thanks to the two-barrel tax, and the people were alive. Tobacco came later, and suddenly the colony took root and started on the road to prosperity.

Why Jamestown Was Different

Jamestown was different from other colonies because it finally shed its failing ways and started practicing free enterprise principles—the freedom to own and control property, and enjoy its fruits. Years later these ideas worked their way into Adam Smith and his famous book, The Wealth of Nations. The blood of these pioneers started the groundswell that brought us the first popular assembly of legislative representatives in the western hemisphere. Their descendants included many of the foremost intellects who built the framework for our future United States of America: Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence; James Madison, “Father of the Constitution;” George Washington, hero-general of the War for Independence; George Mason, author of the first American Bill of Rights in Virginia. Four of the first five presidents of the United States sprung from this fire-tested colony.

Two Hundred Years Later
Can we lose it?

Dr. Skousen warns us that when we don’t teach the rising generation those cultural and moral lessons that keep society healthy and safe, the people end up making all the same mistakes—and not just once, but half a dozen times or more. We’re doing it right now, he says, and muddle our lives with “drugs, riots, revolutions, and terrorism; predatory wars; unnatural sexual practices; merry-go-round marriages; organized crime; neglected and sometimes brutalized children; plateau intoxication; debt-ridden prosperity; and all the other ingredients of insanity which have shattered twenty mighty civilizations in the past.” And he made that list 30 years ago!


The 28 Great Ideas That Helped Change the World

There are 28 great ideas that helped change our world, and the funny thing is, the American Founding Fathers hardly invented a single one of them. But they did find them, and brought them all together in a single document that has blessed this great nation and the entire world.

These ideas didn’t all come together at once. After Jamestown, it took 180 years to pull these great concepts together so that true and lasting freedom was born.

It worked so well so fast that after just two years as a nation, George Washington was able to write, “The United States enjoy a scene of prosperity and tranquility under the new government that could hardly have been hoped for.” And the very next day in another letter he said, “Tranquility reigns among the people with that disposition towards the general government which is likely to preserve it....Our public credit stands on that [high] ground which three years ago it would have been considered as a species of madness to have foretold.” (The Writings of George Washington, Vol. 31: 316-317, 318-319)


It's Time to Get Back to Basics

How can I hand this country to my children and grand children in better shape than it was given to me?

Without any answers, I spiraled into a sort of despair. How do you fix these problems? How do you fix the economic nightmare that is on its way caused by overspending, massive debt, and giant social programs? How do you protect your kids and country from a force that doesn’t have a uniform? What’s the right balance between security and liberty? How do you cure American’s lack of faith in their government when the political parties are intentionally dividing us?
Then one day in the spring, I was walking down the Avenue of the Americas in Manhattan and the answer came to me. It was so dramatic that it made me stop in the middle of the sidewalk and laugh out loud. The answer was obvious and best of all, the thinking and worrying had already been done for me. The questions that we face were foreseen by the greatest group of Americans to ever live; our Founding Fathers. They knew we would be grappling with issues like the ones we face today at some point, so they designed a ship that could withstand even the mightiest storm. They also knew that we would eventually lose our way and that we would need a beacon to lead our way back.

Part I
The Founders' Monumental Task:
Structuring a Government with
All Power in the People

What is Left? What is Right?

What Is Left? What Is Right? It is extremely unfortunate that the writers on political philosophy today have undertaken to measure various issues in terms of political parties instead of political power. No doubt the American Founding Fathers would have considered this modern measuring stick most objectionable, even meaningless.

Today, as we mentioned, it is popular in the classroom as well as the press to refer to "Communism on the left," and "Fascism on the right." People and parties are often called "Leftist," or "Rightist." The public do not really understand what they are talking about. These terms actually refer to the manner in which the various parties are seated in the parliaments of Europe. The radical revolutionaries (usually the Communists) occupy the far left and the military dictatorships (such as the Fascists) are on the far right. Other parties are located in between.

Measuring people and issues in terms of political parties has turned out to be philosophically fallacious if not totally misleading. This is because the platforms or positions of political parties are often superficial and structured on shifting sand. The platform of a political party of one generation can hardly be recognized by the next. Furthermore, Communism and Fascism turned out to be different names for approximately the same thing -- the police state. They are not opposite extremes but, for all practical purposes, are virtually identical.

The American Founding Fathers Used a More Accurate Yardstick

Government is defined in the dictionary as "a system of ruling or controlling," and therefore the American Founders measured political systems in terms of the amount of coercive power or systematic control which a particular system of government exercises over its people. In other words, the yardstick is not political parties, but political power.

Using this type of yardstick, the American Founders considered the two extremes to be anarchy on the one hand, and tyranny on the other. At the one extreme of anarchy there is no government, no law, no systematic control and no governmental power, while at the other extreme there is too much control, too much political oppression, too much government. Or, as the Founders called it, "tyranny."

The object of the Founders was to discover the "balanced center" between these two extremes. They recognized that under the chaotic confusion of anarchy there is "no law," whereas at the other extreme the law is totally dominated by the ruling power and is therefore "Ruler's Law." What they wanted to establish was a system of "People's Law," where the government is kept under the control of the people and political power is maintained at the
balanced center with enough government to maintain security, justice, and good order, but not enough government to abuse the people.

...  

**Ruler's Law**

The Founders seemed anxious that modern man recognize the subversive characteristics of oppressive Ruler's Law which they identified primarily with a tyrannical monarchy. Here are its basic characteristics:

1. Authority under Ruler's Law is nearly always established by force, violence, and conquest.
2. Therefore, all sovereign power is considered to be in the conqueror or his descendants.
3. The people are not equal, but are divided into classes and are all looked upon as "subjects" of the king.
4. The entire country is considered to be the property of the ruler. He speaks of it as his "realm."
5. The thrust of governmental power is from the top down, not from the people upward.
6. The people have no unalienable rights. The "king giveth and the king taketh away."
7. Government is by the whims of men, not by the fixed rule of law which the people need in order to govern their affairs with confidence.
8. The ruler issues edicts which are called "the law." He then interprets the law and enforces it, thus maintaining tyrannical control over the people.
9. Under Ruler's Law, problems are always solved by issuing more edicts or laws, setting up more bureaus, harassing the people with more regulators, and charging the people for these "services" by continually adding to their burden of taxes.
10. Freedom is never looked upon as a viable solution to anything.
11. The long history of Ruler's Law is one of blood and terror, both anciently and in modern times. Under it the people are stratified into an aristocracy of the ruler's retinue while the lot of the common people is one of perpetual poverty, excessive taxation, stringent regulations, and a continuous existence of misery.


**The Founders Note the Similarities Between Anglo-Saxon Common Law and the People's Law of Ancient Israel**

... Reverend Thomas Hooker wrote the "Fundamental Orders of Connecticut" based on the principles recorded by Moses in the first chapter of Deuteronomy. ... Here are the principal characteristics of the People's Law in ancient Israel which were almost identical with those of the Anglo-Saxons:

1. They were set up as a commonwealth of freemen. A basic tenet was: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." ...
2. All the people were organized into small manageable units where the representative of each family had a voice and a vote.

3. There was specific emphasis on strong, local self-government. Problems were solved to the greatest possible extent on the level where they originated.

4. The entire code of justice was based primarily on reparation to the victim rather than fines and punishment by the commonwealth. The one crime for which no "satisfaction" could be given was first-degree murder. The penalty was death.

5. Leaders were elected and new laws were approved by the common consent of the people.

6. Accused persons were presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. Evidence had to be strong enough to remove any question of doubt as to guilt. Borderline cases were decided in favor of the accused and he was released. It was felt that if he were actually guilty, his punishment could be left to the judgment of God in the future life.

Memorializing These Two Examples of People's Law on the U.S. Seal

It was the original intent of the Founders to have both the ancient Israelites and the Anglo-Saxons represented on the official seal of the United States. The members of the committee were Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin.

In this way the Founders hoped to memorialize the two ancient peoples who had practiced People's Law and from whom the Founders had acquired many of their basic ideas for their new commonwealth of freedom.

As it turned out, all of this was a little complicated for a small seal, and therefore a more simple design was utilized.

The Founders' First Constitution Ends Up Too Close to Anarchy

... even before the Declaration of Independence, the Continental Congress appointed a committee on June 11, 1776, to write a constitution. John Dickinson served as chairman of the committee and wrote a draft based on a proposal made by Benjamin Franklin in 1775. However, the states felt that Dickinson's so-called "Articles of Confederation" gave too much power to the central government. They therefore hacked away at the draft until November 15, 1777, when they proclaimed that the new central government would have no powers whatever except those "expressly" authorized by the states. And the states did not expressly authorize much of anything. Under the Articles of Confederation as finally adopted, there was no executive, no judiciary, no taxing power, and no enforcement power. The national government ended up being little more than a general "Committee of the States." It made recommendations to the states and then prayed they would respond favorably. Very often they did not.
The suffering and death at Valley Forge and Morristown were an unforgettable demonstration of the abject weakness of the central government and its inability to provide food, clothes, equipment, and manpower for the war. At Valley Forge the common fare for six weeks was flour, water, and salt, mixed together and baked in a skillet -- fire cakes, they were called. Out of approximately 8,000 soldiers, around 3,000 abandoned General Washington and went home. Approximately 200 officers resigned their commissions. Over 2,000 soldiers died of starvation and disease. Washington attributed this near-disaster at Valley Forge to the constitutional weakness of the central government under the Articles of Confederation.


The Genius of the Constitutional Convention in 1787

Not one of the Founding Fathers could have come up with the much-needed Constitutional formula by himself, and the delegates who attended the Convention knew it. At that very moment the states were bitterly divided. The Continental dollar was inflated almost out of existence. The economy was deeply depressed, and rioting had broken out. New England had threatened to secede, and both England and Spain were standing close by, ready to snatch up the disUnited States at the first propitious opportunity.

Writing a Constitution under these circumstances was a frightening experience. None of the delegates had expected the Convention to require four tedious months. In fact, within a few weeks many of the delegates, including James Madison, were living on borrowed funds.

From the opening day of the Convention it was known that the brain-storming discussions would require frequent shifting of positions and changing of minds. For this reason the Convention debates were held in secret to avoid public embarrassment as the delegates made concessions, reversed earlier positions, and moved gradually toward some kind of agreement.


A Special Device Employed to Encourage Open Discussion

The object of the Founders was to seek a consensus or general agreement on what the Constitution should provide. After four months of debate they were able to reach general agreement on just about everything except the issues of slavery, proportionate representation, and the regulation of commerce. All three of these issues had to be settled by compromise.

It is a mistake however, to describe the rest of the Constitution as a "conglomerate of compromises," because extreme patience was used to bring the minds of the delegates into agreement rather than simply force the issue to finality with a compromise. This is demonstrated in the fact that over 60 ballots were taken before they resolved the issue of how to elect the President. They could have let the matter lie after the first ballot, but they did not. They were anxious to talk it out until the vast majority felt good about the arrangement. That is why it took 60 ballots to resolve the matter.
When the Founders had finished their work on September 17, 1787, President Washington attached a letter to the signed draft and sent it to the Congress. The Congress ratified the Constitution without any changes and sent it to the states. When several of the larger states threatened to reject the Constitution, they were invited to ratify the main body of the Constitution but attach suggested amendments. They submitted 189! At the first session of Congress, these suggested amendments were reduced to 12 by James Madison, and 10 of them were finally approved and ratified by the states. Thus was born America's famous Bill of Rights.


**Thomas Jefferson Describes the Need for Balance**

When Thomas Jefferson became President, he used his first inaugural address to describe the need to make room for the problem-solving wing, to which his own Democratic-Republican party belonged, and also make room for the conservation wing, to which the Federalist party of John Adams belonged. He tried to stress the fact that all Americans should have some elements of both of these party dimensions in their thinking. In his inaugural address he said: "We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans -- we are all Federalists."


**The Problem of Political Extremists**

Nevertheless, Jefferson saw fringe elements in both of these parties which were political extremists. In the Federalist party were those who would pull the eagle away from its balanced center toward the tyrannical left and form a central government so strong that it would border on a monarchy. Concerning the monarchist fringe of the Federalist party, he wrote:

"I have spoken of the Federalists as if they were a homogeneous body, but this is not the truth. Under that name lurks the heretical sect of monarchists. Afraid to wear their own name, they creep under the mantle of Federalism, and the Federalists, like sheep permit the fox to take shelter among them, when pursued by dogs. These men have no right to office. If a monarchist be in office, anywhere, and it be known to the President, the oath he has taken to support the Constitution imperiously requires the instantaneous dismissal of such officer; and I hold the President criminal if he permitted such to remain. To appoint a monarchist to conduct the affairs of a republic, is like appointing an atheist to the priesthood. As to the real federalists, I take them to my bosom as brothers. I view them as honest men, friends to the present Constitution."


**Jefferson's Conversation with Washington**

Jefferson reports a conversation with President Washington in August 1793 in which Jefferson expressed deep concern that some elements of the President's administration were pushing
toward oppressive monarchial-type powers. The President immediately responded that republican principles must be maintained and that "the Constitution we have is an excellent one, if we can keep it where it is." With reference to the possibility of a monarchial party arising, President Washington stated that "there was not a man in the United States who would set his face more decidedly against it than himself." Jefferson nevertheless pointed out to the President that:

"There does not pass a week, in which we cannot prove declarations dropping from the monarchical party [the branch of the administration pushing for a central government with massive powers and saying] that our government is good for nothing, is a milk and water thing which cannot support itself, we must knock it down, and set up something of more energy. President Washington replied that if anyone were guilty of such nonsense, it would be "a proof of their insanity."

Jefferson's Concern About the Radical Fringe Element in His Own Party

In May 1805, while serving as President, Jefferson wrote to Dr. George Logan. He was concerned with elements of extremism pushing toward the extreme right which, to the Founders, meant "anarchy." He wrote:

"I see with infinite pain the bloody schism which has taken place among our friends in Pennsylvania and New York, and will probably take place in other States. The main body of both sections mean well, but their good intentions will produce great public evil." Like President Washington, Jefferson saw the need for maintaining the government in the balanced center where the Constitution had placed it. He wrote to Governor George Clinton in 1803, "Our business is to march straight forward ... without either turning to the right or left."

With both of the eagle's wings flying -- one solving problems, the other preserving resources and freedom -- the American future could not help but ascend to unprecedented heights of wealth and influence.

The Founders Warn Against the Drift Toward the Collectivist Left

Since the genius of the American system is maintaining the eagle in the balanced center of the spectrum, the Founders warned against a number of temptations which might lure subsequent generations to abandon their freedoms and their rights by subjecting themselves to a strong federal administration operating on the collectivist Left.

They warned against the "welfare state" where the government endeavors to take care of everyone from the cradle to the grave. Jefferson wrote:

"If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

They warned against confiscatory taxation and deficit spending. Jefferson said it was immoral for one generation to pass on the results of its extravagance in the form of debts to
the next generation. He wrote: "... we shall all consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts, and morally bound to pay them ourselves; and consequently within what may be deemed the period of a generation, or the life [expectancy] of the majority."

Every generation of Americans struggled to pay off the national debt up until the present one.

The Founders also warned that the only way for the nation to prosper was to have equal protection of "rights," and not allow the government to get involved in trying to provide equal distribution of "things." They also warned against the pooling of property as advocated by the proponents of communism. Samuel Adams said they had done everything possible to make the ideas of socialism and communism unconstitutional. Said he:

"The Utopian schemes of leveling [re-distribution of the wealth and a community of goods [central ownership of the means of production and distribution], are as visionary and impractical as those which vest all property in the Crown. [These ideas] are arbitrary, despotic, and, in our government, unconstitutional."


The Need for an "Enlightened Electorate"

To prevent the American eagle from tipping toward anarchy on the right, or tyranny on the left, and to see that the American system remained in a firm, fixed position in the balanced center of the political spectrum, the Founders campaigned for a strong program of widespread education. Channels were needed through which the Founders and other leaders could develop and maintain an intelligent, informed electorate.

Jefferson hammered home the necessity for an educated electorate on numerous occasions. Here are some samples:

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."


The Founders' Common Denominator of Basic Beliefs

One of the most amazing aspects of the American story is that while the nation's founders came from widely divergent backgrounds, their fundamental beliefs were virtually identical. They quarreled bitterly over the most practical plan of implementing those beliefs, but rarely, if ever, disputed about their final objectives or basic convictions.

These men came from several different churches, and some from no churches at all. They ranged in occupation from farmers to presidents of universities. Their social background included everything from wilderness pioneering to the aristocracy of landed estates. Their dialects included everything from the loquacious drawl of South Carolina to the clipped staccato of Yankee New England. Their economic origins included everything from frontier poverty to opulent wealth.

Then how do we explain their remarkable unanimity in fundamental beliefs?
Perhaps the explanation will be found in the fact that they were all remarkably well read, and mostly from the same books. Although the level of their formal training varied from spasmodic doses of home tutoring to the rigorous regimen of Harvard's classical studies, the debates in the Constitutional Convention and the writings of the Founders reflect a far broader knowledge of religious, political, historical, economic, and philosophical studies than would be found in any cross-section of American leaders today.

The thinking of Polybius, Cicero, Thomas Hooker, Coke, Montesquieu, Blackstone, John Locke, and Adam Smith salt-and-peppered their writings and their conversations. They were also careful students of the Bible, especially the Old Testament, and even though some did not belong to any Christian denomination, the teachings of Jesus were held in universal respect and admiration.

Their historical readings included a broad perspective of Greek, Roman, Anglo-Saxon, European, and English history. To this writer, nothing is more remarkable about the early American leaders than their breadth of reading and depth of knowledge concerning the essential elements of sound nation building.


**Fundamental Principles**

The relative uniformity of fundamental thought shared by these men included strong and unusually well-defined convictions concerning religious principles, political precepts, economic fundamentals, and long-range social goals. On particulars, of course, they quarreled, but when discussing fundamental precepts and ultimate objectives they seemed practically unanimous.

They even had strong criticism of one another as individual personalities, yet admired each other as laborers in the common cause. John Adams, for example, felt a strong personality conflict between himself and Benjamin Franklin and even Thomas Jefferson. Yet Adams' writings are steeped in accolades for both of them, and their writings carried the same for him. One of George Washington's most vehement critics was Dr. Benjamin Rush, and yet that Pennsylvania physician boldly supported everything for which Washington worked and fought.

Part II
The Founders' Basic Principles

... Cicero's compelling honesty led him to conclude that once the reality of the Creator is clearly identified in the mind, the only intelligent approach to government, justice, and human relations is in terms of the laws which the Supreme Creator has already established. The Creator's order of things is called Natural Law.


... to Cicero, the glue which holds a body of human beings together in the commonwealth of a just society is love -- love of God; love of God's great law of Justice; and love of one's fellow-men which provides the desire to promote true justice among mankind.


The Lessons of History

... Virtue has to be earned and it has to be learned. Neither is virtue a permanent quality in human nature. It has to be cultivated continually and exercised from hour to hour and from day to day. The Founders looked to the home, the school, and the churches to fuel the fires of virtue from generation to generation.


... Benjamin Franklin stressed the same point and added how precious good teachers are:

"I think with you, that nothing is of more importance for the public weal, than to form and train up youth in wisdom and virtue. Wise and good men are in my opinion, the strength of the state; more so than riches or arms...."

"I think also, that general virtue is more probably to be expected and obtained from the education of youth, than from the exhortations of adult persons; bad habits and vices of the mind being, like diseases of the body, more easily prevented [in youth] than cured [in adults]. I think, moreover, that talents for the education of youth are the gift of God; and that he on whom they are bestowed, whenever a way is opened for the use of them, is as strongly called as if he heard a voice from heaven...."

A Warning from the Founders

At the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, Samuel Adams, who is sometimes called the "father of the revolution," wrote to Richard Henry Lee:

"I thank God that I have lived to see my country independent and free. She may long enjoy her independence and freedom if she will. It depends on her virtue."

John Adams pointed out why the future of the United States depended upon the level of virtue and morality maintained among the people. He said:

"Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

Samuel Adams knew the price of American survival under a Constitutional form of government when he wrote:

"The sum of all is, if we would most truly enjoy the gift of Heaven, let us become a virtuous people; then shall we both deserve and enjoy it. While, on the other hand, if we are universally vicious and debauched in our manners, though the form of our Constitution carries the face of the most exalted freedom, we shall in reality be the most abject slaves."


In the Absence of Angels

. . . As Madison said:

"If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary."


John Adams on the "Divine Science of Politics"

American history will show that both Samuel Adams and his younger cousin, John Adams, sacrificed their fortunes to serve in politics. They both considered politics to be a "divine science."


Preparation for Service in Politics

. . .

If one is astonished by the level of idealism which Founders such as Adams and Jefferson attached to the role of political public service, it cannot be more surprising than the supreme desire they expressed to prevent those offices from becoming monetary attractions. Benjamin Franklin remonstrated both in Europe and America against extravagant compensation for positions of public service.

Benjamin Franklin's Prophecy

Peering down through the corridor of time, Franklin proclaimed his prophetic judgment as to what could be expected if future generations of Americans permitted the Jure of high salaries to be associated with public offices. Here are the remarkably profound insights from the "Sage of Philadelphia" to the members of the Constitutional Convention:

"Sir, though we may set out in the beginning with moderate salaries, we shall find that such will not be of long continuance. Reasons will never be wanting for proposed augmentations; and there will always be a party for giving more to the rulers, that the rulers may be able in return to give more to them. Hence, as all history informs us, there has been in every state and kingdom a constant kind of warfare between the governing and the governed, the one striving to obtain more for its support, and the other to pay less. And this has alone occasioned great convulsions, actual civil wars, ending either in dethroning of the princes or enslaving of the people. Generally, indeed, the ruling power carries its point, and we see the revenues of princes constantly increasing, and we see that they are never satisfied, but always in want of more. The more the people are discontented with the oppression of taxes, the greater need the prince has of money to distribute among his partisans, and pay the troops that are to suppress all resistance, and enable him to plunder at pleasure."


Without religion the government of a free people cannot be maintained

Americans of the twentieth century often fail to realize the supreme importance which the Founding Fathers originally attached to the role of religion in the structure of the unique civilization which they hoped would emerge as the first free people in modern times. Many Americans also fail to realize that the Founders felt the role of religion would be as important in our own day as it was in theirs.


The Teaching of Religion in Schools Restricted to Universal Fundamentals

Having established that "religion" is the foundation of morality and that both are essential to "good government and the happiness of mankind," the Founders then set about to exclude the creeds and biases or dissensions of individual denominations so as to make the teaching of religion a unifying cultural adhesive rather than a divisive apparatus. Jefferson wrote a Bill for Establishing Elementary Schools in Virginia and made this point clear by stating:

"No religious reading, instruction, or exercise shall be prescribed or practiced inconsistent with the tenets of any religious sect or denomination."

Franklin Describes the Five Fundamentals of "All Sound Religion"

Several of the Founders have left us with descriptions of their basic religious beliefs, and Benjamin Franklin summarized those which he felt were the "fundamental points in all sound religion." This is the way he said it in a letter to Ezra Stiles, president of Yale University:

"Here is my creed: I believe in one God, the Creator of the universe. That he governs it by his providence. That he ought to be worshipped. That the most acceptable service we render to him is in doing good to his other children. That the soul of man is immortal, and will be treated with justice in another life respecting its conduct in this. These I take to be the fundamental points in all sound religion."


Points" to Be Taught in the Schools

The five points of fundamental religious belief expressed or implied in Franklin's statement are these:

1. There exists a Creator who made all things, and mankind should recognize and worship Him.
2. The Creator has revealed a moral code of behavior for happy living which distinguishes right from wrong.
3. The Creator holds mankind responsible for the way they treat each other.
4. All mankind live beyond this life.
5. In the next life mankind are judged for their conduct in this one.

All five of these tenets run through practically all of the Founders' writings. These are the beliefs which the Founders sometimes referred to as the "religion of America," and they felt these Fundamentals were so important in providing "good government and the happiness of mankind" that they wanted them taught in the public schools along with morality and knowledge.


Statements of the Founders Concerning These Principles

... it is obvious how significantly the Founders looked upon the fundamental precepts of religion and morality as the cornerstones of a free government. This gives additional importance to the previously quoted warning of Washington when he said: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports.... Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?"

Washington issued this solemn warning because in France, shortly before he wrote his Farewell Address (1796), the promoters of atheism and amorality had seized control and turned the French Revolution into a shocking blood bath of wild excesses and violence. Washington
obviously never wanted anything like that to happen in the United States. Therefore he had said: "In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness [religion and morality]."


European Philosophers Turned Out to Be Wrong

In Europe, it had been popular to teach that religion and liberty were enemies of each other. De Tocqueville saw the very opposite happening in America. He wrote:

"The philosophers of the eighteenth century explained in a very simple manner the gradual decay of religious faith. Religious zeal, said they, must necessarily fail the more generally liberty is established and knowledge diffused. Unfortunately, the facts by no means accord with their theory. There are certain populations in Europe whose unbelief is only equaled by their ignorance and debasement; while in America, one of the freest and most enlightened nations in the world, the people fulfill with fervor all the outward duties of religion."


Emerges in America

De Tocqueville pointed out that "in France I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom marching in opposite directions. But in America I found they were intimately united." . . .

. . .

It was astonishing to de Tocqueville that liberty and religion could be combined in such a balanced structure of harmony and good order. He wrote:

"The revolutionists of America are obliged to profess an ostensible respect for Christian morality and equity, which does not permit them to violate wantonly the laws that oppose their designs.... Thus, while the law permits the Americans to do what they please, religion prevents them from conceiving, and forbids them to commit, what is rash or unjust."


De Tocqueville Describes the Role of the American Clergy

Alexis de Tocqueville saw a unique quality of cohesive strength emanating from the clergy of the various churches in America.

. . .

In America, he noted, the clergy remained politically separated from the government but nevertheless provided a moral stability among the people which permitted the government to prosper. In other words, there was separation of church and state but not separation of state and religion.
The Clergy Fueled the Flame of Freedom, Stressed Morality, and Alerted the Citizenry to Dangerous Trends

De Tocqueville discovered that while the clergy felt it would be demeaning to their profession to become involved in partisan politics, they nevertheless believed implicitly in their duty to keep a message of religious principles and moral values flowing out to the people as the best safeguard for America's freedom and political security. In one of de Tocqueville's most frequently quoted passages, he stated:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in her fertile fields and boundless prairies, and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast world commerce, and it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

Why the Founders Wanted the Federal Government Excluded from All Problems Relating to Religion and Churches

The Supreme Court has stated on numerous occasions that to most people freedom of religion is the most precious of all the unalienable rights next to life itself.

The Reality of a Divine Creator

Locke felt that a person who calls himself an "atheist" is merely confessing that he has never dealt with the issue of the Creator's existence. Therefore, to Locke an atheist would be to that extent "irrational," and out of touch with reality; in fact, out of touch with the most important and fundamental reality.

How Can One Know There Is a God?

In his Essay Concerning Human Understanding, John Locke insisted that everyone can know there is a divine Creator. It is simply a case of thinking about it.

To begin with, each person knows that he exists. With Descartes each person can say, "Cogito ergo sum." With God, each person can say, "I am!"
Furthermore, each person knows that he is *something*. He also knows that a *something* could not be produced by a *nothing*. Therefore, whatever brought man and everything else into existence also had to be *something*. It follows that this *something* which did all of this organizing and arranging would have to be all-knowing to the full extent required for such an organization and arrangement.

This *something* would therefore have to be superior to everything which had resulted from this effort. This element of superiority makes this *something* the ultimate "good" for all that has been organized and arranged. In the Anglo-Saxon language, the word for supreme or ultimate good is "God."


### Getting to Know God

Man is capable of knowing many things about God, Locke said. The Creator must of necessity be a cogitative (reasoning or thinking) being, for man is a cogitative (reasoning) being. Certainly a non-cogitative being like a rock could never have produced a cogitative being like a man. We may also know that the divine Creator has a sense of compassion and love, for he gave mankind these sublime qualities.

The Creator would also reflect a fine sense of right and wrong, and also a sense of indignation or even anger with those who violate the laws of "right" action. In other words, God has a strong sense of "justice." Remorse for wrong also arouses a sense of compassion in the Creator, just as it does in human beings whom he designed.

There are other attributes of man which human beings must necessarily share with their Creator if man is "made in the image of God." One would be a sense of humor. The Creator must also be a great artist on the visual plane. Everything the Creator organizes is in terms of beauty through color, form, and contrasts. Obviously, man can enjoy only to a finite degree the capacity of his Creator to appreciate the vast panorama of sensory satisfaction which we call "beauty."

So, as John Locke says, there are many things man can know about God. And because any thoughtful person can gain an appreciation and conviction of these many attributes of the Creator, Locke felt that an atheist has failed to apply his divine capacity for reason and observation.

The American Founding Fathers agreed with Locke. They considered the existence of the Creator as the most fundamental premise underlying ALL self-evident truth. It will be noted as we proceed through this study that every single self-evident truth enunciated by the Founders is rooted in the presupposition of a divine Creator.


### Concerning God’s Revealed Law Distinguishing Right from Wrong

The Founders considered the whole foundation of a just society to be structured on the basis of God's revealed law. These laws constituted a moral code clearly distinguishing right from
wrong. This concept was not new with the Founders. This was the entire foundation of all religious cultures world-wide. It was particularly emphasized in the Judeo-Christian structure of the English law. No authority on the subject was more widely read than William Blackstone (1723-1780). He established the classes for the first law school at Oxford in 1753. His lectures on the English law were published in 1765 and were as widely read in America as they were in England.

In his Commentaries on the Laws of England, Blackstone propounded the generally accepted idea that "when the Supreme Being formed the universe" he organized it and then "impressed certain principles upon that matter, from which it can never depart, and without which it would cease to be." He then went on to say that the will of God which is expressed in the orderly arrangement of the universe is called "the law of nature," and that there are laws for "human" nature just as surely as they exist for the rest of the universe. He said the laws for human nature had been revealed by God, whereas the laws of the universe (natural law) must be learned through scientific investigation.

"In God We Trust"

... In fact, it was not at all uncommon, as Alexis de Tocqueville discovered, to look with the greatest precaution upon an individual who had no religious convictions. He wrote:

"While I was in America, a witness who happened to be called at the Sessions of the county of Chester (state of New York) declared that he did not believe in the existence of God or in the immortality of the soul. The judge refused to admit the evidence, on the ground that the witness had destroyed beforehand all the confidence of the court in what he was about to say."

All men are created equal

The Founders wrote in the Declaration of Independence that some truths are self-evident, and one of these is the fact that all men are created equal.

Yet everyone knows that no two human beings are exactly alike in any respect. They are different when they are born. They plainly exhibit different natural skills. They acquire different tastes. They develop along different lines. They vary in physical strength, mental capacity, emotional stability, inherited social status, in their opportunities for self-fulfillment, and in scores of other ways. Then how can they be equal?

The answer is, they can't, except in three ways. They can only be treated as equals in the sight of God, in the sight of the law, and in the protection of their rights. In these three ways all men are created equal. It is the task of society, as it is with God, to accept people in all their vast array of individual differences, but treat them as equals when it comes to their role as human beings. As members of society, all persons should have their equality guaranteed in two areas. Constitutional writer Clarence Carson describes them:
"First, there is equality before the law. This means that every man's case is tried by the same law governing any particular case. Practically, it means that there are no different laws for different classes and orders of men [as there were in ancient times]. The definition of premeditated murder is the same for the millionaire as for the tramp. A corollary of this is that no classes are created or recognized by law.

"Second, the Declaration refers to an equality of rights.... Each man is equally entitled to his life with every other man; each man has an equal title to God-given liberties along with every other."

---

The Japanese and Chinese

One of the best examples of minority adjustment under adverse circumstances is the American saga of the Japanese and Chinese.

The treatment they received is an embarrassment to modern Americans. They were not only shabbily treated, but sometimes they were treated brutally. (In certain situations this happened to other minorities as well.) But practically none of the Japanese and Chinese went home. They became domestics, field workers, and truck farmers; they ran laundries, worked for a pittance on railroads, ate their simple fare, and slept on bare boards. Meanwhile, they sent their children to school and endured their mistreatment with patience. By 1940 the Chinese were virtually assimilated and the Japanese had almost made it. Then came the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Within weeks the vast Japanese population in California had been hauled off to concentration camps in the Rocky Mountains. J. Edgar Hoover knew there were practically no espionage agents among them. The few security risks had already been identified and incarcerated. He vigorously protested the Japanese evacuation and so did many others, but all to no avail.

The Japanese could have been very bitter, but to the ultimate embarrassment and chagrin of those who had engineered this fiasco, they loyally mobilized their sons and sent them into the American armed services as volunteers! Japanese-American regiments were among the most decorated in World War II. They went into the military ranks under suspicion and resentment, but they came out in hero roles. A few years later the entire State of California was represented in the Senate by a Japanese-American.

---

The Black Minority

But of all the minorities in America, the blacks have undertaken assimilation as first-class citizens under the greatest number of handicaps. Many early political leaders of the United States, including Abraham Lincoln, were fearful the blacks might never achieve complete adjustment because of the slavery culture in which the first few generations were raised.
Nevertheless, freedom and education brought a whole new horizon of hope to the blacks within three generations. Tens of thousands of them hurdled the culture gap, and soon the blacks in other countries saw their ethnic cousins in the United States enjoying a higher standard of living than blacks in any part of the world. In fact, by 1970 a black high school student in Alabama or Mississippi had a better opportunity to get a college education than a white student in England.

Providing equality for the blacks has never been approached with any degree of consensus. Some felt that with education and job opportunities the blacks could leap the culture gap just as other minorities had done. Others felt they should be made the beneficiaries of substantial government gratuities. Experience soon demonstrated, however, that government gratuities are as corrupting and debilitating to blacks as they are to the Indians or any other minorities. The blacks themselves asked for equal opportunity at the hiring hall. Thus, the trend began to shift in the direction which no doubt the Founders such as Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin would have strongly approved.

Violence Proves Counter-Productive

In the mid-sixties there were groups of Marxist agitators who moved in among the blacks to promote direct action by violence. One of these was Eldridge Cleaver, who had been trained in Marxist philosophy and tactics while serving a fifteen-year sentence in a California state penitentiary. In 1967 he became the Minister of Information for the Black Panthers. In his books, Eldridge Cleaver describes the rationale behind their philosophy of violence. It was to destroy the whole economic and social structure of the United States so that blacks could enjoy equal rights under an American Communist regime. The crescendo of violence increased year after year. During the summer of 1968 over a hundred American cities were burning. But the burning was always in black ghettos. The idea was to put the blacks in direct confrontation with the police and state militia in order to solidify their apparent need to become a racial bloc for the coming revolution.

But the burning and fire-bombing backfired. The black population began to realize it was only the homes of blacks that were being burned. Other than police, it was primarily blacks that were being hurt in the melee of the riots. In the shoot-outs with the police, nineteen of the Black Panther leaders were killed. Eldridge Cleaver was wounded. He and his wife later fled to Cuba and then to other Communist countries.

The whole scenario of violence had proved tragically counter-productive. It temporarily jolted out of joint a broad spectrum of reforms which the blacks were really seeking and the rest of the nation was trying to provide.

A Dissident Returns

After nearly eight years as an exile in Communist and Socialist countries, Eldridge Cleaver asked to be allowed to return to the United States and pay whatever penalty was due on charges pending against him. He and his wife were no longer atheists. They were no longer Communists. Those bitter years behind the iron and bamboo curtains had dispelled all the propaganda concerning "equality" and "justice" under Communism. Cleaver told the press: "I would rather be in jail in America than free anywhere else." He then went on to say:

"I was wrong and the Black Panthers were wrong.... We [black Americans] are inside the system and I feel that the number one objective for Black America is to recognize that they have the same equal rights under the Constitution as Ford or Rockefeller, even if we have no blue-chip stocks. But our membership in the United States is the supreme blue-chip stock and the one we have to exercise."

By 1981 Eldridge Cleaver had paid his final debt to society. No further charges were pending against him. Although he had been involved in a police shoot-out in Oakland, California, he had not been accused of causing any deaths. In fact, it was in the Oakland shoot-out that he was wounded. As he was released on parole, the judge required that he finish his obligation to society by putting in several hundred hours of public service at a California college.

Soon after that he began accepting speaking engagements before schools, churches, community gatherings, and even prison groups to describe his new and yet profound appreciation for America. He described the despondency which came over him when he found what a betrayal of human rights and human dignity Communism turned out to be. He described the long and strenuous intellectual struggle with his Marxist atheism before he recognized its fraudulent fallacies. He frankly and patiently dialogued with university students still struggling with similar philosophical problems. He assured them, as Locke had done, that a persistent pursuit of the truth would bring them to the threshold of reality, where the Creator could be recognized and thereafter have a place in their lives.


The proper role of government is to protect equal rights, not provide equal things.

In Europe, during the days of the Founders, it was very popular to proclaim that the role of government was to take from the "haves" and give to the "have nots" so that all might be truly "equal." However, the American Founders perceived that this proposition contained a huge fallacy.


What Powers Can Be Assigned to Government

The Founders recognized that the people cannot delegate to their government the power to do anything except that which they have the lawful right to do themselves.
For example, every person is entitled to protection of his life and property. Therefore it is perfectly legitimate to delegate to the government the task of setting up a police force to protect the lives and property of all the people.

But suppose a kind-hearted man saw that one of his neighbors had two cars while another neighbor had none. What would happen if, in a spirit of benevolence, the kind man went over and took one of the cars from his prosperous neighbor and generously gave it to the neighbor in need? Obviously, he would be arrested for car theft. No matter how kind his intentions, he is guilty of flagrantly violating the natural rights of his prosperous neighbor, who is entitled to be protected in his property.

Of course, the two-car neighbor could donate a car to his poor neighbor, if he liked, but that is his decision and not the prerogative of the kind-hearted neighbor who wants to play Robin Hood.


How Governments Sometimes Commit "Legal" Crimes

But suppose the kind-hearted man decided to ask the mayor and city council to force the man with two cars to give one to his pedestrian neighbor. Does that make it any more legitimate? Obviously, this makes it even worse because if the mayor and city council do it in the name of the law, the man who has lost his car has not only lost the rights to his property, but (since it is the "law") he has lost all right to appeal for help in protecting his property.

The American Founders recognized that the moment the government is authorized to start leveling the material possessions of the rich in order to have an "equal distribution of goods," the government thereafter has the power to deprive any of the people of their "equal" rights to enjoy their lives, liberties, and property.


Nevertheless, the Founders Had a Deep Concern for the Poor and the Needy

A survey of Franklin's views on counter-productive compassion might be summarized as follows:
1. Compassion which gives a drunk the means to increase his drunkenness is counter-productive.
2. Compassion which breeds debilitating dependency and weakness is counter-productive.
3. Compassion which blunts the desire or necessity to work for a living is counter-productive.
4. Compassion which smothers the instinct to strive and excel is counter-productive.

The Founders' Formula for "Calculated" Compassion

...Nearly all of the Founders seem to have acquired deep convictions that assisting those in need had to be done through means which might be called "calculated" compassion. Highlights from their writings suggest the following:

1. Do not help the needy completely. Merely help them to help themselves.
2. Give the poor the satisfaction of "earned achievement" instead of rewarding them without achievement.
3. Allow the poor to climb the "appreciation ladder" -- from tents to cabins, cabins to cottages, cottages to comfortable houses.
4. Where emergency help is provided, do not prolong it to the point where it becomes habitual.
5. Strictly enforce the scale of "fixed responsibility." The first and foremost level of responsibility is with the individual himself; the second level is the family; then the church; next the community; finally the county, and, in a disaster or emergency, the state. Under no circumstances is the federal government to become involved in public welfare. The Founders felt it would corrupt the government and also the poor. No Constitutional authority exists for the federal government to participate in charity or welfare.


Should Taxpayers Compensate Victims of Crimes?

In some states, the victims of criminal activities may apply to the state for damages. This most unfortunate policy is a counter-productive procedure which encourages crime rather than deters it. It encourages a bandit to say to his victim, "Don't worry, mister. You'll get it all back from the state."


Algernon Sidney Is Beheaded

King Charles II beheaded Algernon Sidney in 1683 for saying that there is no divine right of kings to rule over the people. Sidney insisted that the right to rule is actually in the people and therefore no person can rightfully rule the people without their consent.


Alexander Hamilton

...The divine right of the people to govern themselves and exercise exclusive power of sovereignty in their official affairs was expressed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in its Proclamation of January 23, 1776:
"It is a maxim that in every government, there must exist, somewhere, a supreme, sovereign, absolute, and uncontrollable power; but this power resides always in the body of the people; and it never was, or can be, delegated to one man, or a few; the great Creator has never given to men a right to vest others with authority over them, unlimited either in duration or degree."


The majority of the people may alter or abolish a government which has become tyrannical

...Once again, we find John Locke setting forth this same doctrine in his classical Second Essay Concerning Civil Government:

"The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their property.... [Therefore,] whenever the legislators endeavor to take away and destroy the property of the people, or to reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they [the officials of government] put themselves into a state of war with the people, who are thereupon absolved from any further obedience, and are left to the common refuge which God hath provided for all men against force and violence. Whencever, therefore, the legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society, and either by ambition, fear, folly, or corruption, endeavor to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people, by this breach of trust they [the government officials] forfeit the power the people had put into their hands ... and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and ... provide for their own safety and security."


A constitution should be structured to permanently protect the people from the human frailties of their rulers

**Distrust of Power Not Necessarily Disrespect for Leaders**

...Two hundred years of American history have demonstrated the wisdom of the Founders in proclaiming a warning against the frailties of human nature in the people's elected or appointed leaders. Every unconstitutional action has usually been justified because it was for a "good cause." Every illegal transfer of power from one department to another has been excused as "necessary."

Why the Original Constitution Will Never Be Obsolete

And that is what the Constitution is all about -- providing freedom from abuse by those in authority. Anyone who says the American Constitution is obsolete just because social and economic conditions have changed does not understand the real genius of the Constitution. It was designed to control something which has not changed and will not change -- namely, human nature.


Development of the Earth Mostly by Private Endeavor

... It is obvious that if there were no such thing as "ownership" in property, which means legally protected exclusiveness, there would be no subduing or extensive development of the resources of the earth. Without private "rights" in developed or improved property, it would be perfectly lawful for a lazy, covetous neighbor to move in as soon as the improvements were completed and take possession of the fruits of his industrious neighbor. And even the covetous neighbor would not be secure, because someone stronger than he could take it away from him.


Without Property Rights, Four Things Would Occur

Note that if property rights did not exist, four things would occur which would completely frustrate the Creator's command to multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it and bring it under dominion:

1. One experience like the above would tend to completely destroy the incentive of an industrious person to develop and improve any more property.
2. The industrious individual would also be deprived of the fruits of his labor.
3. Marauding bands would even be tempted to go about the country confiscating by force and violence the good things which others had frugally and painstakingly provided.
4. Mankind would be impelled to remain on a bare subsistence level of hand-to-mouth survival because the accumulation of anything would invite attack.


A Person's Property is a Projection of Life Itself

... Another interesting point made by Locke is the fact that all property is an extension of a person's life, energy, and ingenuity. Therefore, to destroy or confiscate such property is, in reality, an attack on the essence of life itself.

Property Rights Sacred?

It is important to recognize that the common law does not make property sacred, but only the right which someone has acquired in that property. Justice George Sutherland of the U.S. Supreme Court once told the New York State Bar Association:

"It is not the right of property which is protected, but the right to property. Property, per se, has no rights; but the individual -- the man -- has three great rights, equally sacred from arbitrary interference: the right to his life, the right to his liberty, the right to his property.... The three rights are so bound together as to be essentially one right. To give a man his life but deny him his liberty, is to take from him all that makes his life worth living. To give him his liberty but take from him the property which is the fruit and badge of his liberty, is to still leave him a slave." In this same spirit Abraham Lincoln once said:

"Property is the fruit of labor. Property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently to build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence.... I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good."


Caring for the Poor Without Violating Property Rights

But, of course, the nagging question still remains. If it corrupts a society for the government to take care of the poor by violating the principle of property rights, who will take care of the poor? The answer of those who built America seems to be: "Anybody but the federal government."

... though the people support the Government the Government should not support the people.


The highest level of prosperity occurs when there is a free-market economy and a minimum of government regulations

Adam Smith's Free-enterprise Economics Tried First in America

... Therefore, the United States was the first people to undertake the structuring of a whole national economy on the basis of natural law and the free-market concept described by Adam Smith. Among other things, this formula called for the following:

1. Specialized production -- let each person or corporation persons do what they do best.
2. Exchange of goods takes place in a free-market environment without governmental interference in production, prices, or wages.

3. The free market provides the needs of the people on the basis of supply and demand, with no government imposed monopolies.

4. Prices are regulated by competition on the basis of supply and demand.

5. Profits are looked upon as the means by which production of goods and services is made worthwhile.

6. Competition is looked upon as the means by which quality is improved, quantity is increased, and prices are reduced.


The Four Laws of Economic Freedom

Prosperity also depends on a climate of wholesome stimulation protected by law. Reduced to its simplest formula, there are four laws of economic freedom which a nation must maintain if its people are to prosper at the maximum level. These are:

1. The Freedom to try.
2. The Freedom to buy.
3. The Freedom to sell.
4. The Freedom to fail.

By 1905 the United States had become the richest industrial nation in the world. With only 5 percent of the earth's continental land area and merely 6 percent of the world's population, the American people were producing over half of almost everything -- clothes, food, houses, transportation, communications, even luxuries. It was a great tribute to Adam Smith.


The Role of Government in Economics

The Founding Fathers agreed with Adam Smith that the greatest threat to economic prosperity is the arbitrary intervention of the government into the economic affairs of private business and the buying public. Historically, this has usually involved fixing prices, fixing wages, controlling production, controlling distribution, granting monopolies, or subsidizing certain products.

Nevertheless, there are four areas of legitimate responsibility which properly belong to government. These involve the policing responsibilities of government to prevent:

1. _Illegal Force_ in the market place to compel purchase or sale of products.
2. _Fraud_ in misrepresenting the quality, location, or ownership of the item being sold or bought.
3. _Monopoly_ which eliminates competition and results in restraint of trade.
4. Debauchery of the cultural standards and moral fiber of society by commercial exploitation of vice -- pornography, obscenity, drugs, liquor, prostitution, or commercial gambling.


**After 1900 Adam Smith Got Lost in the Shuffle**

In spite of the fact that the fruits of the free-market economy were making the United States the biggest and richest industrial nation in the world, the beginning of the twentieth century saw many prominent and influential leaders losing confidence in the system. These included wealthy industrialists, heads of multi-national banking institutions, leaders in the academic world, and some of the more innovative minds in the media. The same feverish restlessness was taking hold in similar circles in Europe.

It was true, as it is with all systems, that the freemarket economy was in need of some adjustments and fine tuning, but these leaders were getting ready to throw the entire system overboard. The problems of the day included a number of large-scale strikes, the rise of powerful trusts, the mysterious recurrence of boom-and-bust cycles, and the rise of a new Populist movement in which certain agriculture and labor groups were demanding that the government get involved in the redistribution of the wealth.

Many of these problems were either caused or aggravated by the very people who were demanding "a new system." The new system would involve extensive government regulation if not outright expropriation of major industries and natural resources. In Europe, certain confederations of wealthy families had gained control of their respective governments and were making a financial killing. Some of the wealthy families in America coveted the rich government monopolies of their trans-Atlantic cousins.


**The Rediscovery of Adam Smith**

... "We had to discover the real Adam Smith the hard way, by living our mistakes, and by being led to the whole body of the literature of freedom that had created the American federal system. Only then were we able to appreciate Smith. Ironically, our education paralleled that of Adam Smith himself, which took place over a period of a dozen years between the close of the Seven Years War and the outbreak of the American Revolution. We would have been saved so much trouble if we had only been compelled to read -- and digest -- *The Wealth of Nations* in a first college course in economics, with James Madison's political theory as a side dressing.

"Smith's book is, indeed, the beginnings of everything that is important to economic theory, the lack of clarity on value theory notwithstanding. It should be the natural starting point for students of economics for the simple and compelling reason that it anticipated Ludwig von Mises by a full century and a half in considering economics as part of a wider science of human
choices. Smith backed into his study by way of a general preoccupation with human destiny in a way that should be utterly convincing to our own pragmatic day."


A system of checks and balances should be adopted to prevent the abuse of power

Blending Does Not Mean Usurping

... The failure to use the checks and balances effectively has allowed the judiciary to create new laws (called judicial legislation) by pretending to be merely interpreting old ones. Failure to use the checks and balances has also allowed the President to make thousands of new laws, instead of Congress, by issuing executive orders. It has allowed the federal government to invade the reserved rights of the states on a massive scale. It has allowed the legislature to impose taxes on the people never contemplated by the Founders or the Constitution.


Beginnings of a Written Constitution in America

... "On the 14th of January, 1639, all the freemen of the three towns assembled at Hartford and adopted a written constitution in which the hand of the great preacher [the Reverend Thomas Hooker] is clearly discernible. ... It was the first written constitution known to [modern] history, that created a government, and it marked the beginnings of American democracy, of which Thomas Hooker deserves more than any other man to be called the father.


Strong local self-government is the keystone to preserving human freedom

Political power automatically gravitates toward the center, and the purpose of the Constitution is to prevent that from happening. The centralization of political power always destroys liberty by removing the decision-making function from the people on the local level and transferring it to the officers of the central government. This process gradually benumbs the spirit of "voluntarism" among the people, and they lose the will to solve their own problems. They also cease to be involved in community affairs. They seek the anonymity of oblivion in the seething crowds of the city and often degenerate into faceless automatons who have neither a voice nor a vote.

Deployment of Power Between the Federal Government and the States

James Madison, who is sometimes described as "the father of the Constitution," emphasized the necessity to reserve all possible authority in the states and the people. The Constitution delegates to the federal government only that which involves the whole people as a nation.

Federal Government to Remain Relatively Small

Thomas Jefferson emphasized that if the oncoming generations perpetuated the Constitutional pattern, the federal government would be small and cohesive and would serve as an inexpensive operation because of the limited problems which would be assigned to it.

A Prophecy

One of the greatest American historians of the last generation was John Fiske. He caught the spirit of the Founders and studied their writings. He knew the secret to the 5,000 year leap which was then well on its way. He also saw some dangerous trends away from the Founders' basic formula of sound government. He therefore wrote a prophecy which Americans of our own day might ponder with profit:

"If the day should ever arrive (which God forbid!) when the people of the different parts of our country shall allow their local affairs to be administered by prefects sent from Washington, and when the self government of the states shall have been so far lost as that of the departments of France, or even so closely limited as that of the counties of England -- on that day the political career of the American people will have been robbed of its most interesting and valuable features, and the usefulness of this nation will be lamentably impaired."

Aristotle

. . . Here are the words of Aristotle in his Politics:

"Even the best of men in authority are liable to be corrupted by passion. We may conclude then that the law is reason without passion, and it is therefore preferable to any individual."

Plato Was Wrong

. . . Plato believed that in the ideal society the people should be governed "by the few" who would rule according to "scientific principles" and make on-the-spot decisions to force the people to do what is good for them. Plato argued that these men must not be restricted by
written laws but should govern the people in whatever manner they felt was for the best. He said:

"The best thing of all is not that the law should rule, but that a man should rule, supposing him to have wisdom and royal power."

Plato acknowledged that in the absence of rulers with the "scientific" wisdom to govern, a code of laws would be needed, but he insisted that this would be the "second best thing."


**Law Is a Positive Good in Preserving Liberty**

As we have seen, the American Founding Fathers would have agreed with Aristotle rather than Plato. Part of this was due to the fact that the Founders looked upon law differently than Plato. Instead of treating law as merely a code of negative restraints and prohibitions, they considered law to be a system of positive rules by which they could be assured of enjoying their rights and the protection of themselves, their families, and their property. In other words, law was a positive good rather than a necessary evil. This was precisely the view of John Locke when he wrote:

"The end of law is not to abolish or restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom. For in all the states of created beings, capable of laws, where there is no law there is no freedom. For liberty is to be free from restraint and violence from others, which cannot be where there is no law."


**Law Should Be Understandable and Stable**

The Founders were sensitive to the fact that the people have confidence in the law only to the extent that they can understand it and feel that it is a rule of relative permanence which will not be continually changed. James Madison emphasized both of these points when he wrote:

"It will be of little avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man, who knows what the law is today, can guess what it will be tomorrow. Law is defined to be a rule of action; but how can that be a rule, which is little known and less fixed?"


A free society cannot survive as a republic without a broad program of general education
Early Americans Educated to Speak with Eloquence

It was commonplace for the many people on the frontier, as well as on the Atlantic seaboard, to speak with a genuine flavor of eloquence. Sermons and orations by men of limited formal education reflected a flourish and style of expression which few Americans could duplicate today. Many of these attributed their abilities to extensive reading of the Bible. Such was the case with Abraham Lincoln. Certainly the classical beauty of the Gettysburg Address and his many other famous expressions cannot be attributed to college training, for he had none.


A free people will not survive unless they stay strong.

Franklin's Philosophy of Defense

... Peace was the goal, but strength was the means. Franklin envisioned the day when a prudent policy of national defense would provide the American people with the protection which their rise to greatness would require. He wrote:

"The very fame of our strength and readiness would be a means of discouraging our enemies; for 'tis a wise and true saying, that "One sword often keeps another in the scabbard." The way to secure peace is to be prepared for war.

Franklin further saw that those in authority have the inherent responsibility to initiate the means by which adequate defenses can be provided. He declared:

"Protection is as truly due from the government to the people, as obedience from the people [is due] to the government."

In later life he held to the same solid philosophy of peace through strength as an assurance of survival in the future:

"Our security lies, I think, in our growing strength, both in numbers and wealth; that creates an increasing ability of assisting this nation in its wars, which will make us more respectable, our friendship more valued, and our enmity feared; thence it will soon be thought proper to treat us not with justice only, but with kindness, and thence we may expect in a few years a total change of measures with regard to us; unless, by a neglect of military discipline, we should lose all martial spirit, and our western people become as tame as those in the eastern dominions of Britain [India], when we may expect the same oppressions; for there is much truth in the Italian saying, "Make yourselves sheep, and the wolves will eat you."


"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations -- entangling alliances with none."
Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh Counts American "Internationalism" a Serious Mistake

After World War I, Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., father of the famous "Lone Eagle" who was the first to fly the Atlantic, asked the people of the United States to reconsider the policy Washington was pursuing in its foreign affairs. He was particularly concerned about how Americans were pushed into World War I. In 1923 he wrote:

"Take for example our entry into the World War [in 1917]. We did not think. We elected a president for a second term because he said he 'kept us out of war' in his first term. We proved by a large vote that we did not want to go to war, but no sooner was the president re-elected than the propaganda started to put us to war. Then we became hysterical, as people always have done in war, and we believed everything bad against our enemy and believed only good of our allies and ourselves. As a matter of fact all the leaders were bad, vicious. They lost their reason and the people followed....

"We cannot properly blame the people of any of the European nations, unless we blame ourselves. None of them were free from danger of the others.... We, however, were not in danger, statements by profiteers and militarists to the contrary notwithstanding.... The greatest good we could do the world at that time was to stay out, and that would have been infinitely better for ourselves, for we could have helped the world had we conserved our resources.

"There never was a nation that did a more un-statesmanlike thing than we did to enter the war. We came out without establishing a single principle for which we entered....

"The one compelling duty of America is to put its own house in shape, and to stand upon an economic system that will make its natural resources available to the intelligence, industry and use of the people. When we do that the way to world redemption from the folly of present chaos will stand out in our country so clearly, honestly and usefully that we shall be copied wherever peoples do their own thinking.


The core unit which determines the strength of any society is the family; therefore, the government should foster and protect its integrity

Benjamin Franklin's Comment on Marriage

From his own pen, we have Franklin at the age of emphasizing the importance of marriage as he attempted to dissuade a young friend from taking a mistress. He wrote:

"Marriage is the proper remedy. It is the most natural state of man, and therefore the state in which you are most likely to find solid happiness. Your reasons against entering into it at present appear to me not well founded. The circumstantial advantages you have in view by postponing it are not only uncertain, but they are small in comparison with that of the thing itself, the being married and settled [emphasis by Franklin]. It is the man and woman united that make the complete human being. Separate, she wants his force of body and strength of reason; he, her softness, sensibility, and acute discernment. Together they are more likely to
succeed in the world. A single man has not nearly the value he would have in that state of union. He is an incomplete animal. He resembles the odd half of a pair of scissors. If you get a prudent, healthy wife, your industry in your profession, with her good economy, will be a fortune sufficient."


The burden of debt is as destructive to freedom as subjugation by conquest

**The Founders' Policy Concerning a National Debt**

The pioneers of the American commonwealth had the wisdom born of experience to know that the debts of a nation are no different from the debts of an individual. The fact that the indebtedness is shared by the whole people makes it no less ominous. The Founders knew that dire circumstances, such as war or other emergency, could force a nation to borrow, so they authorized the federal government to do so in Article I of the Constitution. Nevertheless, they considered it a matter of supreme importance for the survival of a free people to get out of debt and enjoy complete solvency in order to prosper.

This is reflected in the declaration of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"I, however, place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."


**Should One Generation Impose Its Debts on the Next?**

It has always been popular in some countries to justify the practice of passing on the debts incurred by one generation to the next for payment. This was justified, particularly in the case of war debts, by the rationalization that since war is fought to maintain the independence and integrity of the nation, future generations should bear the burden of the cost.

But this was not the view of the American Founding Fathers. They felt that the wars, economic problems, and debts of one generation should be paid for by the generation which incurred them. They wanted the rising generation to be genuinely free -- both politically and economically. It was their feeling that passing on their debts to the next generation would be forcing the children of the future to be born into a certain amount of bondage or involuntary servitude-something for which they had neither voted nor subscribed. It would be, in a very literal sense, "taxation without representation." Clearly, they said, it was a blatant violation of a fundamental republican principle.

The History of the American National Debt

When we trace the history of the national debt, we find that the policy laid down by the Founders has been followed by every generation until the present one. One of the charts accompanying this chapter reflects the annual national debt from the days of George Washington to the present. By carefully tracing the pattern of these debts, we notice that after every war or financial emergency involving heavy indebtedness there was an immediate effort to pay it off as rapidly as possible. This policy was followed for the sake of the rising generation. The adult citizens of America wanted their children born in freedom, not bondage.

In our own day, however, a different attitude toward national fiscal policies has evolved. This is not only reflected in the skyrocketing thrust of an astonishing level of national indebtedness, but it has been accompanied by an equally profligate explosion in the cost of government operations, as reflected in the chart showing "Outlays of the Federal Government: 1789 to 2006."

---


... Vice President, Dick Cheney has reminded us that: "Deficits don't matter." United States citizens seem to regard thrift as a mental disorder and not a virtue. In the private sector during 2005, for every $19 Americans earned, they spent $20. If a thinking person will look at it, the absurdity becomes glaring. America has become an "empire of debt" and is sowing the seeds of her own destruction. ...

... Beginning with the era of the Great Depression, all three branches of the federal government used the climate of emergency to overstep their Constitutional authority and aggressively undertake to perform tasks not authorized by the Founders. Extensive studies by Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman have demonstrated that every one of these adventures in non-Constitutional activities proved counter-productive, some of them tragically so.

Secondly, the people were induced to believe that these serious aberrations of Constitutional principles would provide a shortcut to economic prosperity, thereby lifting the people out of the depression. Unfortunately, it was successful only politically. It gave the people the illusion that by spending vast quantities of borrowed money they would prosper, when, as a matter of fact, the outcome was exactly the opposite, just as the Founders had predicted.

Dr. Milton Friedman points out that after the federal government had spent many billions of dollars and had seriously meddled with the Constitutional structure of the nation, the unemployment rate was higher in 1938 than it had been in 1932. Had not the crisis of World War II suddenly emerged, which required the spending of many additional billions of borrowed dollars and also resulted in absorbing the unemployed work force, the fiscal failure of the New Deal experiments would be better remembered by the American people.

---

Splurge Spending Is Habit-Forming

It is highly significant that the political formula which Harry Hopkins recommended to keep a particular administration in power was "tax, tax -- spend, spend -- elect, elect." Once the people have been encouraged by their political leaders to indulge in splurge spending, the result is like a snowball rolling downhill -- it increases in size and gains in speed. This is dramatically demonstrated in the charts. It will be noted that the national budget was less than a hundred billion dollars in 1960. Today we spend almost that much just for interest on the national debt. And that is more than the entire cost of World War I in real dollars! Since 1970 the national debt has tripled.


The Problem of the "Fix"

Of course, the Founders would understand exactly what this generation is doing to itself. It is the very essence of human nature to pursue this disastrous course once the appetite has been created to demand it. As a result, American taxpayers now discover themselves playing a role almost identical to that of an addict on hard drugs. The addict denounces his "habit" and despises the "pusher" who got him into it, but when he is confronted with the crisis of needing a "fix" he will plead with tears of anguish for the narcotic remedy.

The "fix," of course, is not a remedy at all. The real remedy is "withdrawal." The addict must escape from the tortuous cycle of vicious repetition which is not solving his problem but compounding it. If withdrawal is painful, at least it is not prolonged. The problem is primarily a matter of will power -- the determination to change.

Every aspect of this reprehensible example applies to the mood of the American masses during recent years. Polemics against the government's profligate spending are vehement. The denunciation of high taxes is virtually universal. From banker to ditch-digger it is eloquently explained how this entire syndrome of big spending, high taxes, oppressive government regulations, and mountainous debt is stifling the economy, inhibiting the rate of production, and stagnating the wholesome development of the traditional American life-style. Yet, with all of that, any Congressman will verify that it has been, at least until recently, almost political suicide to try to change the trend. When it comes to cutting programs and reducing costs, balancing the budget, and eliminating deficit spending, it is amazing how few will make the necessary adjustment without the most violent outcries of protest when it affects them personally. But then, this would come as no surprise to the Founders. It is called "human nature." They would know that the only solution is to develop the will power to make the change. This is not easy, but it can be done.

The Teaching of Religion in Schools Restricted to Universal Fundamentals

Having established that “religion” is the foundation of morality and both are essential to “good government and the happiness of mankind,” the Founders then set about to exclude the creeds and biases or dissensions of individual denominations so as to make the teaching of religion a unifying cultural adhesive rather than a divisive apparatus. Jefferson wrote a bill for the “Establishing of Elementary Schools” in Virginia and made this point clear by stating:

“No religious reading, instruction or exercise, shall be prescribed or practiced inconsistent with the tenets of any religious sect or denomination.” (J. Randolph, editor, Early History of the University of Virginia, 1856, pp. 96-97)

Obviously, under such restrictions the only religious tenets to be taught in public schools would have to be those which were universally accepted by all faiths and completely fundamental in their premises.

Franklin Describes the Five Fundamentals of “All Sound Religions”

Several of the Founders have left us with a description of their basic religious beliefs, and Benjamin Franklin summarized those which he felt were the “fundamental points in all sound religion.” Here is the way he said it:

“Here is my creed. I believe in one God, the Creator of the universe. That he governs it by his Providence. That he ought to be worshipped. That the most acceptable service we render to him is in doing good to his other children. That the soul of man is immortal, and will be treated with justice in another life respecting its conduct in this. . . . "

The “Fundamental Points” to be Taught in the Schools

The five points of fundamental religious belief which are to be found in all of the principal religions of the world are those expressed or implied in Franklin’s statement:

1. Recognition and worship of a Creator who made all things.
2. That the Creator has revealed a moral code of behavior for happy living which distinguishes right from wrong.
3. That the Creator holds mankind responsible for the way they treat each other.
4. That all mankind live beyond this life.
5. That in the next life mankind are judged for their conduct in this one.
All five of these tenets run through practically all of the Founders’ writings. These are the beliefs which the Founders sometimes referred to as the “religion of America,” and they felt these fundamentals were so important in providing “good government and the happiness of mankind” that they wanted them taught in the public schools along with morality and knowledge.


**Statements of the Founders Concerning these Principles**

Samuel Adams said these basic beliefs which constitute “the religion of America is the religion of all mankind.” . . . In other words, these fundamental beliefs belong to all world faiths and could therefore be taught without being offensive to any “sect or denomination” as indicated in the Virginia bill establishing elementary schools.

John Adams called these tenets the “general principles” on which the American civilization had been founded. Thomas Jefferson called these basic beliefs the principles “in which God has united us all.” . . .


**A New Kind of Christianity Emerges in America**

. . .

It was astonishing to de Tocqueville that liberty and religion could be combined in such a balanced structure of harmony and good order. He wrote:

“... the revolutionists of America are obliged to profess an ostensible respect for Christian morality and equity, which does not permit them to violate wantonly the laws that oppose their designs.... Thus, while the law permits the Americans to do what they please, religion prevents them from conceiving and forbids them to commit, what is rash or unjust.”


**The Clergy Fuel the Flame of Freedom, Stress Morality and Alert the Citizenry to Dangerous Trends**

. . .

. . . In one of de Tocqueville’s most frequently quoted passages, he stated:

“I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in her fertile fields and boundless prairies, and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast world commerce, and it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.”
Summary of Jefferson’s Views

From these various documented sources it is apparent that Thomas Jefferson had a number of clearly defined views which he hoped would become the traditional American life-style with reference to religion and the Constitution. Perhaps these views might be summarized as follows:

1. The First Amendment prohibits the Federal government from intermeddling in religious matters in any way. It is not to take any positive action which would tend to create or favor some “establishment of religion” nor is it to interfere or prohibit the free exercise of any religion.

2. The individual state, however has the responsibility to see that laws and conditions are such that all religious denominations or sects receive equal treatment.

3. There should be a regularly established policy of teaching the fundamentals of religion and morality in the public schools.

4. In addition, there should be an opportunity on the university level at least, for each denomination to be invited to build facilities on or adjacent to the campus where the students of that particular denomination could be expected to attend regular worship services and receive instructions in their particular faith.

5. Professors might also hold special services or classes of religious instruction in the rooms assigned to them at the university in order to accommodate the needs of the students belonging to their particular faith.

6. Students studying for the ministry at nearby seminaries should be allowed to have full access to the resources of the university library.

7. However, in spite of all of these efforts to encourage religion indirectly, there must be no use of tax funds to subsidize any religion directly.

In 1948 the Supreme Court Prohibited Teaching of Religion in Schools

... in 1948 in McCollum v. Board of Education (333 U.S. 203), the Supreme Court interviewed in a religious question, used the Gitlow doctrine to tell a State Board of Education that it would not allow children, even with their parents’ consent, to take religion classes in school.
Daniel Webster Describes the Founders’ Traditional Goal

In our own day of accelerating crimes of violence, narcotics addiction, billion-dollar pornography sales, hedonistic sexual aberrations, high divorce rates, and deteriorating family life, the American people might well recall the stirring words of Daniel Webster when he spoke to the New York Historical Society, February 22, 1852:

“Unborn ages and visions of glory crowd upon my soul, the realization of all which, however, is in the hands and good pleasure of Almighty God; but, under his divine blessing, it will be dependent on the character and virtues of ourselves and of our posterity ... if we and they shall live always in the fear of God, and shall respect his commandments ... we may have the highest hopes of the future fortunes of our country.... It will have no decline and fall. It will go on prospering.... But if we and our posterity reject religious instruction and authority, violate the rules of eternal justice, trifle with the injunctions of morality, and recklessly destroy the political constitution which holds us together, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us, that shall bury all our glory in profound obscurity. Should that catastrophe happen, let it have no history! Let the horrible narrative never be written!”

Unfortunately, unless the present generation of American leadership returns to fundamental values, that history is being written right now.


Appendix C

... the United States came into existence as a Nation, and if their Citizens should not be completely free and happy, the fault will be entirely their own.


... it is yet to be decided, whether the Revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse: a blessing or a curse, not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn Millions be involved.


... Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.
Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

There is a rank due to the United States among Nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known, that we are at all times ready for War.

let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that National morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

The Great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign Nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled, with perfect good faith.

There is a rank due to the United States among Nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known, that we are at all times ready for War.