While in school you must not pray. Or maybe it is not okay when they say
There’s not right or wrong.
Just do what feels the best for you
And everyone else can get along.
Or was it when God’s word was
Ignored, And they said it’s not a sin
For women to love other women
And men to be lovers of men.
What happened to America,
Where did we go wrong?
When did we lose the principles
Our nation was founded on?
“In God we trust,” no longer seems
To be the motto of our land.
We’ve become so educated and smart,
So we place our trust in man.
What happened to America,
How did we get this way?
I really think it happened
When God’s people had nothing to say.
If we’re to talk God’s truth,
And on its words firmly stand,
Can we expect Him to keep us safe
In His protective hand?
What WILL happen to America,
Will she come back to God someday?
Nothing is impossible
If God’s people will earnestly pray.

shortly after the shooting fiasco at a
Littleton High School this guest editorial appeared in the Dallas Morning News—
[From the Dallas Morning News, May 2, 1999]
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Mr. DeLAY. Mr. Speaker, during our chari-
table choice debates on H.R. 3073, The Fa-
ther’s Count Act, I would like to em-
phasize to Mr. Edwards express his reasons why
he believes the Constitution and the Founding
Fathers would have objected to this body pro-
viding opportunity for all people—including
those in the community of faith—to participate
in government opportunities and serv-
eses. Mr. Edwards set forth several historical
inaccuracies and argued that they should be
“precedents” to be followed by this body.
Nothing is more certain than that bad history
leads to bad policy, and this is certainly true
in the case of both the policy and the history
set forth by Mr. Edwards.
First of all, Mr. Edwards cited James Madi-
son and Thomas Jefferson in support of his
church-hostile proposals, and then he argued
that these two had framed the Establishment
Clause in the Bill of Rights. As historical
records clearly prove, Mr. Edwards was
Wrong.
Consider first the role of Thomas Jefferson.
During the time that both the Constitution
and the Bill of Rights and its religion clauses were
written and approved, Thomas Jefferson was
Furthermore, according to Mr. Jefferson, his
total input on the Bill of Rights amounted to
one letter. As Jefferson explained:
I wrote [a single letter] strongly urging the
want of protection of the freedom of religion,
freedom of the press, trial by jury, habeas
corpus, the substitution of militia for a
standing army, and an express reservation to
the States of all rights not specifically
granted to the Union. . . . This is all the
hand I had in what related to the Constitu-
tion.

Since Jefferson was neither one of the
55 individuals at the Convention who framed
the Constitution nor one of the 90 members of the
First Congress who framed the Bill of Rights,
how, then, can he be considered as an au-
thoritative voice on either document, especially
in preference to the 145 actual participants
who did write that document? Evidently, Mr.
Edwards chooses to ignore these important
historical facts and he wrongly elevates Mr.
Jefferson into a position which Jefferson him-
self properly refused to accept.

Madison, too, similarly disqualified himself—
although for different reasons. As he explained
to a supporter:
You give me a credit to which I have no
claim in calling me “the writer of the Con-
stitution of the United States.” This was
not, like the fabled Goddess of Wisdom, the
offspring of a single brain. It ought to be re-
garded as the work of many heads and
many hands.

Interestingly, Mr. Madison—while undeni-
able an important influence during the
Constitutional Convention—was often out of step
with the majority of the other delegates. This
is proven by the fact that 40 of Mr. Madison’s
71 proposals offered during the Convention
were rejected by the other delegates. Addition-
ally, the Constitution that Mr. Madison initially
sought was far removed from the final docu-
ment.

And what was Mr. Madison’s influence on
the Bill of Rights and the religion clauses of
the First Amendment? Significantly, when
George Mason proposed at the Constitutional
Convention that a Bill of Rights be added to
the Constitution, it was opposed by Mr. Madi-
on (and on this occasion, Mr. Madison’s posi-
tion prevailed). When the Constitution arrived
in Virginia for ratification, the State proposed
the addition of a Bill of Rights and Mr. Madi-
on again opposed it. This time, however, he lost.

Virginia insisted—like many other States—
that a Bill of Rights be added; and the Virginia
Convention—like many other State conven-
tions—adopted its own version of the Bill of
Rights. The religious protections sent from Vir-
ginia to the United States Congress were writ-
ten not by James Madison but by George
Mason, Patrick Henry, and John Randolph.
In Congress, Madison introduced his own proposal for a Bill of Rights, but very little of his original language was included. However, he made it into the final wording. In fact, the records of Congress make clear that Fisher Ames and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, John Vining of Delaware, Daniel Carroll and Charles Carroll of Maryland, Benjamin Huntington, Roger Sherman, and Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut, and William Paterson of New Jersey, and many others exerted a significant influence on the wording of the religion clauses.

Why, then, did Mr. Edwards cite Mr. Madison—whose version was not accepted—and fail to cite those who did produce the final wording of the First Amendment? And furthermore, why did Mr. Edwards cite Thomas Jefferson instead of those who actually wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? And why did Mr. Edwards fail to cite individuals like George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, James Wilson, and so many other important men who drafted those documents? Very simply, it is because none of them made any statements which Mr. Edwards could possibly twist and misconstrue into a support for his position. Mr. Edwards' service to this Body and to the nation by singing out two Founders with whom he agrees and ignoring 144 others with whom he disagrees! This is not to say, however, that Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson were not significant and important Founding Fathers—they clearly were. However, they were not the only two voices in America on religious issues—there were 144 other Founders who had direct impact on the Constitution and its religion clauses.

I was further intrigued by another of Mr. Edwards' comments. He declared—and I quote: “I think it is time for this House to take a stand in saying that we are not going to read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion.” Mr. Edwards' reading of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment directly contradicts the interpretation of that Clause given by the Founding Fathers (including Mr. Edwards' two heroes, Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson). Furthermore, Mr. Edwards' reading is opposed to that rendered by legal experts and governmental bodies for a century-and-a-half following the adoption of the Constitution's religion clauses.

For example, in 1854, our own House Judiciary Committee conducted an investigation on what constituted “an establishment of religion” under the First Amendment. After a year of hearings and investigations, the House Judiciary Committee emphatically reported:

What is “an establishment of religion”? It must have a creed defining what a man must believe; it must have rites and ordinances which believers must observe; it must have ministers of defined qualifications to teach the doctrines and administer the rites; it must have tests for the submissive and penalties for the nonconformist. There never was an established religion without all these.

In 1853, the Senate Judiciary Committee similarly reported:

The [First Amendment] speaks of “an establishment of religion.” What is meant by that expression? It refer[s] without doubt to . . . [1] endowment [of a religious group] at the public expense in exclusion of or in preference to any other. [2] giving to its members exclusive political rights, and [3] compelling the attendance of those who rejected its communion upon its worship or religious observances. These three particulars constituted that union of church and state of which our ancestors were so justly jealous, and against which they so wisely and carefully provided. . . . They intended by [the First] Amendment to prohibit “an establishment of religion” such as the English church presented, or anything like it. But they had no fear or jealousy of religion itself, nor did they wish to see an irreligious people . . . they did not intend to spread over all the public authorities and the whole public action of the nation the degradation and revolting spectacle of atheistic apathy.

Further confirmation on what the word “establishment” meant in the First Amendment is provided by Justice Joseph Story, a legal expert appointed to the Supreme Court by President James Madison. Justice Story is titled the “Father of American Jurisprudence,” and in his famous Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States—a work which is still cited regularly in this Body—Justice Story explained:

[At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and of the First Amendment, there were] . . . the general, if not the universal, sentiment in America was that . . . [an] attempt to level all religions and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation. And if not universal indignation, . . . the real object of the [First] Amendment was . . . to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, and to provide a hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.

The historical sources agree: to have a First Amendment “establishment of religion” there must be a single, national ecclesiastical group which has the exclusive support of the federal government; there must be a defined creed and a religious hierarchy of ministers to teach those creeds; there must be exclusive political rights for the members of that religion; and the national government must be able to compel attendance and observance of those rites and impose penalties for those who do not conform. As the House Judiciary Committee properly noted in 1854, “There never was an established religion without all these.”

Those early legal experts reached their conclusions because of the Founders' succinct declarations made during the framing of the Constitution's religion clauses. For example, according to the Congressional Records, James Madison recommended that the First Amendment say: “The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established.”

Subsequent discussions during the framing of the First Amendment confirm this goal of preventing the establishment of a national religion. For example, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1879, report:

Mr. [Peter] Sylvestr [of New York] . . . feared [the First Amendment] might be thought to have a tendency to abolish religion altogether . . . [T]he State[s] . . . seemed to entertain an opinion that . . . it enabled [Congress] to . . . establish a national religion. . . . Mr. Madison thought if the word “national” was inserted before religion . . . it would point the amendment directly to the object it was intended to prevent.

The records are clear—the purpose of the First Amendment was to prevent the establishment of a national denomination by the federal Congress. The First Amendment was never intended to stifle public religious expressions, nor was it intended to prevent this Body from encouraging religion in general or the existing faith institutions. Only in recent years has the meaning of the First Amendment begun to change at the hands of activists like Mr. Edwards who are intolerant of the faith-centered community.

In fact, Mr. Edwards' approbation of the many extremist groups supporting his position (he specifically lists the ACLU, the Baptist Joint Committee, and Americans United for Separation of Church and State) simple confirms the religion-hostile position he is advocating.

Is there any group in America more responsible for the current hostility of the courts toward religion than the ACLU? And Mr. Edwards has their support! It was the ACLU which opposed a legislatively passed bill in Arizona that permitted schools to post classic historical documents like George Washington's Farewell Address. Why did the ACLU oppose that measure? Because many of the comments made by our Founding Fathers contain religious references, and the ACLU felt that to expose students to such religious references in our history would violate the “establishment clause” of the First Amendment! And it was the ACLU which opposed the legislative effort in California to teach sexual abstinence to students. Why? Because the ACLU claimed that to expose children to this moral teaching would violate the “establishment clause”! There are scores of other cases...
which reflect their radical, intolerant, anti-religious agenda.

Additionally, the faith-hostile agenda of other groups supporting Mr. Edwards (such as Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and the Baptist Joint Committee, etc.) is clearly documented through the legal action they take in courts and in legislatures. And Mr. Edwards is pleased to have their support.

Another comment by Mr. Edwards which was of interest to me was his statement that—

The best way to have religious freedom and respect in America is to build a firewall between government regulations and religion. And that separation, that wall of separation between church and State, has for 200 years worked extraordinarily well.

I wish that Mr. Edwards really believed his own statement! If he really thought there should be no government regulations imposed on the church, then he should aggressively pursue repealing the government tax regulations imposed on churches—government regulations which would have ended the government's ability to view his convictions from the pulpit for fear of running afoul of the IRS or some other government body or regulation. And, surely, if Mr. Edwards wants to see churches free from government regulations, he should aggressively pursue exemptions for churches from government zoning regulations, from government fire regulations, from government health regulations, from government hiring regulations, from government social-service regulations, and from so many other government regulations which have resulted in literally hundreds of lawsuits brought by the government against churches.

Unfortunately, Mr. Edwards' record proves that he does not believe in protecting the faith-community from government regulations—evidenced by his vote against the Religious Freedom Amendment. That Amendment was specifically designed (1) to free the community of faith from government intrusion into their religious expressions and (2) to protect voluntary citizen expressions of faith—including those of students. In opposing that Amendment—an Amendment which would have ended the government regulation of religious expression—Mr. Edwards amazingly declared—and I quote:

In my opinion, th[is] Amendment is the worst and most dangerous piece of legislation I have seen in my 15 years in public office.

Mr. Edwards actually feels that it is "dangerous" to end government regulation of public expressions of faith and to allow students to participate voluntarily in prayer.

Another problem with Mr. Edwards' "firewall" quote is that it attaches the phrase "separation of church and state" to the requirements of the First Amendment. He claims that the "separation of church and state" phrase accurately reflects the intent of those who framed the First Amendment. He claims that the "separation of church and state" phrase accurately reflects the intent of those who framed the First Amendment. Again, official records prove Mr. Edwards wrong.

The evidence showing the framing of the First Amendment are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from June 7 to September 25, 1789. Over those months, ninety Founding Fathers in the first Congress debated and produced the First Amendment. And those records make one fact exceptionally clear: in months of recorded discussions over the First Amendment not one of the ninety Founding Fathers who framed the Constitution's religion clauses ever mentioned the phrase "separation of church and state"! It does seem that if this had been their intent, that at least one of them would have said something about it! None did.

For this reason, legal scholars committed to historical and constitutional accuracy rather than an activist judicial agenda have correctly drawn attention to the type of blunder committed by Mr. Edwards. In fact, one judge accurately commented: "[S]o much has been written in recent years . . . to 'a wall of separation between church and State.' . . . that one would almost think at times that it is to be found somewhere in our Constitution." And Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart similarly observed: "[T]he metaphor of the 'wall of separation' is a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution." And Chief-Justice William Rehnquist also noted: "[T]he greatest injury of the 'wall' notion is its mischievous diversion from the actual thoughts of the drafters of the Bill of Rights. . . . The 'wall of separation between church and State' is a metaphor based on bad history. . . . It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned!"

It is indeed striking that in the century-and-a-half following the adoption of the Constitution, the "separation of church and state" rhetoric so heatedly embraced by Mr. Edwards was thrust and federal courts made a dozen times—and on those occasions, the phrase was interpreted to mean that (1) America would establish no national denomination and (2) the federal government would not limit public religious expressions or activities. However, in the last 50 years, the federal courts have cited the "separation of church and state" principle in over 3,000 cases in order to allow the federal government to regulate public religious bodies and expressions—in direct opposition to the original intent of the First Amendment!

In summary, Mr. Edwards claims that "separation of church and state" was the goal of the First Amendment. It was not. Mr. Edwards also claims that Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison would support his view. They would not. However, even if they had, they were only two among the 145 Founders who framed the Constitution and drafted the Bill of Rights. And unless Mr. Edwards can show that a majority of those framing the Constitution and First Amendment support his reading, then the views of two cannot be extrapolated to establish the intent of the entire body, especially when the great majority of those Founders—according to their own writings and legislative acts—opposed what Mr. Edwards proposes.

No Member of this Body should be part of obfuscating the clear, self-evident wording of the Constitution, or misleading the American public by claiming the First Amendment says something it doesn't. We should stick with what the First Amendment actually says rather than what constitutional and historical revisionists like Mr. Edwards wish that it said.

IN COMMEMNATION OF THE CHILDREN OF THE WORLD FOUNDATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the November 7th New York Times entitled "Little Ambassadors with Hearts in Need of Repair." It tells the story of two infant children from Siberia who were transported to the United States to receive life saving heart surgeries. It also tells the story of a remarkable public private partnership between the United States and Russia involving our Department of Energy, the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy and the Children of the World Foundation. This wonderful organization's Chairman is a great friend of mine: William Denis Fugazy of New York. Mr. Fugazy and the Children of the World Foundation have not only sponsored these two Siberian infants for their emergency medical procedures but five previous children all of whom have received vital heart surgeries.

The heart procedures are being done at the Children's Hospital of the Westchester Medical Center of New York. I know all of my colleagues join me in wishing these two young infants the best of luck in these surgeries and a wonderful life to follow. I also commend the work of the Children of the World Foundation which is part of the Forum Club of New York which itself brings key business and political leaders together.

I believe that in the New York Times article Bill Fugazy summed up the importance of the work of the Children of the World Foundation when he said that the medical procedures being performed on these children and the ones done previously "have opened avenues not before and create amazing possibilities for human development and lives." [From the New York Times, Nov. 7, 1999]

LITTLE AMBASSADORS WITH HEARTS IN NEED OF REPAIR

(By Elsa Brenner)

Two Siberian toddlers have arrived in the United States on an adult-size mission: to serve as emissaries of Russia and symbols of an effort to improve relations between the two countries.

Because they were born with potentially fatal heart defects and faced limited prospects for reaching adulthood in Russia, Sophia Ovchinnikova and Sergei Yurinski are at the Westchester Medical Center here to undergo surgery not available in Russia.

Some political and business leaders are want the two babies, handpicked from among thousands of others suffering from congenital heart defects in Russia, will serve as symbols of healing between nations—particularly in the area of nuclear disarmament. "The children show the real human side of the work we're doing in Russia's nuclear cities," Energy Secretary Bill Richardson said last week. "Everyone—Russians and Americans want what's best for kids."

The United States Department of Energy has been working in the remote Siberian regions of Tomsk, where Sophia lives, and Krasnoyarsk, Sergei's home, on a non-proliferation program aimed at reducing the availability of nuclear material for weapons.
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