

THREE



Supreme Court v. Ten Commandments

Posting of religious texts on the wall serves no . . . educational function. If the posted copies of the Ten Commandments are to have any effect at all, it will be to induce the children to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey the Commandments . . . [This] is not a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause.

—JUSTICE PAUL STEVENS
for the majority in *Stone v. Graham* (1980)

IF YOU WERE TO ASK where the American concepts of right and wrong came from, the most common answer would undoubtedly be the Bible. If you pressed further for more specifics, the answer in most instances would be the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount. Ask any historian to name the source of the legal concepts underlying the criminal laws of Western civilization, and a substantial majority would say either the Law of Moses or the Ten Commandments.

The chief justice of the current Supreme Court, William Rehnquist, declared, “The secular application of the Ten Commandments is clearly seen in its adoption *as the fundamental legal code of Western Civilization and the Common Law of the United States*” (emphasis added).

Consider our laws that prohibit the taking of an innocent life. We regard murder as heinous. We debate motives for killing, issues of premeditation, and forensic evidence that either points to guilt or innocence. Then with eyes agog, we stare for hours at the legal maneuverings in the murder trials of the O. J. Simpsons and Scott

Petersons, and the nation becomes a great jury to convict or acquit. We are shown endless episodes of television shows like *Law and Order*, in which the hard-charging prosecuting attorney talks each week about making a deal with the accused for “man one” or “man two” (for first- or second-degree manslaughter).

Most civilized people have innate respect for human life, but where do we get our notions that killing another human being is wrong? The answer is very simple: from the Sixth Commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exodus 20:13 KJV).

WHY ALL THE VIOLENCE?

I recall a news account some years ago of a gang of teenage hoodlums in Southern California who invaded the stands at a Friday night high school football game. They picked out a handsome young couple and proceeded to gun down the boy in cold blood. There was no provocation. No revenge. No turf battle. Just cold-blooded killing for the thrill of the experience.

The three hoodlums fled the stadium before security could intervene. What happened next sends chills down my spine. They calmly entered a fast-food restaurant three blocks away and ordered double cheeseburgers, French fries, and cokes. Then they laughed about how their victim had gurgled on his own blood while he was dying from the wounds they had inflicted.

Think of it: going to town on Friday night for sport, killing a promising young teenager, and then spending the remainder of the evening wolfing down double cheeseburgers and regaling one another with the victim’s death agonies. No twinge of conscience. No remorse. No sense that they had done anything wrong.

In the 1970s, David Wilkerson, the founder of Teen Challenge, wrote of a vision he said he received from the Lord. Part of this vision centered on the terror that would be loosed on our cities by

preteens and teenagers who were born out of wedlock or who had little or no parental love and discipline. According to Wilkerson, these youngsters would grow up wild, with no discipline and no natural affection, and they would begin to terrorize our cities with murder, rape, robbery, and mayhem.

Surely the young killers in Southern California lived up to the description of the wild youth of Wilkerson's "vision."

Only an old man wearing a long black robe, totally detached from reality, could have possibly written that teaching our young people that their Creator commands them not to kill would have "no educational function," or, for that matter, no secular purpose.

WHAT WILL BE THE FATE OF OUR CHILDREN?

In days gone by, it was assumed that schools were to be the conduits of the ethical and moral principles of our nation to the next generation. Without question, the nation believed that stealing and murder and perjury were wrong. Our criminal laws imposed stiff penalties for those who violated these norms. And isn't it far superior to tell students that there is a Higher Power who is the ultimate impartial Lawgiver, that there is ultimate reward and punishment for our actions here on earth, and that our legal standards of right and wrong are not merely the creation of the all-too-fallible Democratic or Republican majority of the legislature?

Some years ago I hosted a segment on my television program, *The 700 Club*, about ethical education in the schools of a major county in Georgia. My guests were three public school teachers. One of them told me of a teachers' instruction guide published by the National Education Association and approved for use in the high schools of the school district.

In the teacher's manual was this question: "What do you say if a student asks you if shoplifting is wrong?" The approved answer

should shock you as much as it shocked me: “I cannot tell you if shoplifting is right or wrong; you must decide for yourself.”

I exploded with indignation. “If that kid is caught shoplifting, he will go to jail. How dare the schools set these students up to commit crime like that!” Of course, the teachers had no answer.

But this is the situational ethics and cultural relativism of John Dewey run amuck. The commandments of God are absolute, not situational. The Eighth Commandment says, “Thou shalt not steal” (Exodus 20:15 KJV), not “You have to determine for yourself if stealing is wrong, depending on the situation and the culture.” Is there not an educational benefit to be derived from teaching children not to steal? A majority of the Supreme Court finds no benefit in obedience to such a commandment.

In our television news at CBN, we like to take the pulse of ordinary people on the streets of cities and towns. What people say in pop interviews is informative and interesting. One of our reporters was given an assignment to test the attitudes of typical high school teenagers regarding moral and ethical issues. What she discovered was the following pattern:

Question: Is killing right or wrong?

Answer: It depends. Perhaps it might be a good thing to help a person to be killed.

A study of teenage attitudes was released several years ago by a popular teen magazine. On a scale of one to ten, an overwhelming majority of the teens interviewed felt that using a parking space reserved for the handicapped was much worse than premarital sex.

With an explosion of inner-city, out-of-wedlock births at over 70 percent; with the welfare rolls bursting because of the poverty of single women with children; with over three million teenagers contracting some form of sexually transmitted disease each year; how

can the Supreme Court say that teaching the Ten Commandments has no educational value for today's schoolchildren?

The Seventh Commandment says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exodus 10:14 KJV). Will not homes be stronger, society be stronger, children be better cared for, and poverty be reduced if that commandment is followed? How dare Justice Stevens declare that under our Constitution it is, effectively, impermissible for children to be taught marital fidelity!

CORRUPT TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY BUSINESS ETHICS

For the past year, our newspapers and television news programs have been filled with shocking revelations of corporate fraud and deceptive behavior at major corporations such as Enron, World-Com, Adelphia, and Tyco. Some of our largest public auditors have been charged with obstruction of justice and run out of business.

Perhaps the most intriguing figure is Martha Stewart. Martha was a guest on my television program to demonstrate the secrets of preparing the perfect holiday meal. She was and is fascinating.

When she started her career, women could not get enough of Martha Stewart's decorating, cooking, and gardening tips. She was so popular that before long she not only had a regular television show, but a magazine and a line of home products, followed by a lucrative contract with a major retail chain. She formed a company, Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, which was considered a growth company on the New York Stock Exchange. At one time, this daughter of poor immigrants held stock valued by the market at nearly one billion dollars.

Along the way, Martha Stewart purchased a relatively modest number of shares in a company called ImClone Systems, which had been founded by a physician who was a friend of her family. ImClone Systems had a fast run on the stock market because it held

patents on a drug called Erbitux, which was supposed to cure certain cancers. Then the Food and Drug Administration declined to approve Erbitux and sent a notice to that effect to Sam Waksal, the founder of the company.

What happened next is open to speculation. Martha Stewart sold her ImClone stock. The price was around \$300,000—which is pocket change for someone of Martha's wealth. She stated when questioned that she had placed a previous stop-loss order with her broker to sell when the stock of Imclone fell to sixty dollars per share. Later, a broker's assistant maintained that he had told Martha that the Waksals were selling and so should she.

In either case, Martha was not privy to what could be termed insider information. Even if she sold her stock after a tip from her broker, in the worst light it would be a civil offense requiring undue profits to be disgorged.

Apparently, though, the government was looking to convict a high-profile person like Martha Stewart, so they began a barrage of questioning. If she had said, "It's true. I got a call from my broker and sold my stock. So what?" some government accountant would have assessed a modest penalty and the case would have been over—or Martha could have possibly fought the penalty, won, and the case would have been closed.

However, she seemed to change stories under questioning. Suddenly, the federal investigators, who until this time had no case at all, could bring a criminal charge of perjury and obstruction of justice against Martha Stewart. Throughout America, this talented and successful woman was reviled and ridiculed in the press. The value of her stock plummeted, and with it, several hundred million dollars of Martha Stewart's net worth.

Mistakes, oversights, poor judgment, and even some illegal or immoral acts can be forgiven by the public, but if one lies to cover up bad behavior, the original act is magnified ten times over. Our

culture still honors truth telling, so why on earth does the Supreme Court object to posting the Ninth Commandment—not to bear false witness—in public places?

Once again it becomes crystal clear that the tortured reasoning of the Supreme Court is not only at cross-purposes with God, but it puts our children in serious jeopardy before the laws of our land.

REMOVING THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Virtually all Americans, along with Chief Justice Rehnquist, believe that the Ten Commandments form the basis of the moral and legal standards of the United States. So the Court's decision in the 1980 case of *Stone v. Graham* shocked the nation by striking down a Kentucky statute that required posting privately funded Ten Commandment displays "on the wall of each public classroom in the state."

The Kentucky legislature's avowed secular purpose for posting the Ten Commandments was clearly printed at the bottom of each display: "The secular application of the Ten Commandments is clearly seen in its adoption as the fundamental legal code of Western Civilization and the Common Law of the United States."

The Supreme Court dismissed this clear statement, declaring that "requiring the posting of the Ten Commandments in public schoolrooms has no secular legislative purpose and is therefore unconstitutional," under what is known as the "Lemon test" (from the standard of the Supreme Court case of *Lemon v. Kurtzman* [1971]). The Court went on to say, "The pre-eminent purpose for posting the Ten Commandments on schoolroom walls is plainly religious in nature. The Ten Commandments are undeniably a sacred text in the Jewish and Christian faiths, and no legislative recitation of a supposed secular purpose can blind us to that fact."

This finding, according to the Chief Justice in his dissent, suggests an improper purpose on the part of the Court to insulate "the

public sectors . . . from all things which may have a religious significance or origin,” especially those things that have their origin in the Christian religion. Our nation’s founders and the framers of our Constitution would be horrified at the Court’s ruling.

Our first president, the father of our country, and the presiding officer at the convention that drafted the United States Constitution said it eloquently in his farewell address, which I once again repeat: “Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.”

And again the words of John Adams: “We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice, ambition, revenge, or gallantry would break the strongest cords of our Constitution as a whale goes through a net. Our Constitution is designed only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for any other.”

The people and their elected representatives—comprising millions of individuals—realize that there can be no law and order, no public morality, in the absence of religious principle. Yet the Supreme Court majority—consisting of five individuals—has mandated that no governmental agency may bring to bear the restraining force of religious principle on the conduct of its citizens.

In short, in a society that is wallowing in sexual permissiveness, drug addiction, broken homes, crime, and violence, the Supreme Court forbids legislators to reach into the great religious heritage of our nation to set forth for American citizens God’s way to a better, happier life.

THE ACLU AND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ATTACK

As if this secularization wasn’t enough, consider two recent cases—one in California by the ACLU, the other in Florida by Planned Parenthood. Fortunately, the courts at this time were unwilling to

rule favorably on these outlandish motions, but the fact that lawyers would suggest such things shows how the ultra-left interprets the final logic of the Supreme Court's anti-God decisions.

In California, the ACLU sued to strike down as unconstitutional a California law promoting heterosexual, monogamous marriage. To the ACLU, heterosexual, monogamous marriage was a "religious" concept and therefore impermissible under recent Supreme Court rulings as an "establishment of religion."

The suit brought by Planned Parenthood in Duval County, Florida, was equally outlandish. The School Board of Duval County had introduced a course in the curriculum that encouraged sexual abstinence among unmarried teenagers. The lawyers for Planned Parenthood urged upon the lower court the premise that sexual abstinence is a "religious" concept; therefore, teaching sexual abstinence in public schools is unconstitutional.

Although these two plaintiffs were unsuccessful, it is easy to see the absurd results that the Supreme Court's reasoning can bring about. Almost all of our concepts of right and wrong come from religious sources. If every legislative initiative must be purely secular, then this nation will have lost the restraining religious principle underlying our laws, and one day in the distant future we may find ourselves open to lawless anarchy.

ASSAULTS ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Another case involving the Ten Commandments, titled *Books v. Elkhart*, was decided in 2000. In the *Elkhart* case, the Supreme Court refused to consider a Seventh Circuit decision that a Ten Commandments monument that had been displayed for over forty years on the lawn of the Elkhart, Indiana, municipal building violated the Establishment Clause. Washington, Adams, and Jefferson would have thought that was ridiculous.

Once again, Chief Justice Rehnquist argued vigorously against the Court's refusal to hear the case. In his dissent he regarded as an accepted and unassailable law that a state is permitted a religious act only if it has a secular purpose and does not advance the cause of religion. As I have discussed above, these concepts are alien to the original intent of the framers of the Constitution.

Nevertheless, the Chief Justice wished to support the Elkhart monument. Here are his words:

The city has displayed the monument outside the Municipal Building, which houses the local courts and local prosecutor's office. This location emphasizes the foundational role of the Ten Commandments in secular, legal matters. Indeed, a carving of Moses holding the Ten Commandments, surrounded by representations of other historical legal figures, adorns the frieze on the south wall of our courtroom, and we have said that the carving "signals respect not for great prose-lytizers but for great lawgivers." Similarly, the Ten Commandments monument and surrounding structures convey that the monument is part of the city's celebration of its cultural and historical roots, not a promotion of religious faith. To that end, the monument shares the lawn outside the Municipal Building with the Revolutionary War Monument, which honors the Revolutionary War soldiers buried in Elkhart County, and a structure called the "Freedom Monument" . . . I would grant certiorari to decide whether a monument which has stood for more than 40 years, and has at least as much civic significance as it does religious, must be physically removed from its place in front of the city's Municipal Building.

COURT LOGIC GONE MAD

But the words of the Chief Justice were not to prevail as the eighty-

year-old Justice Stevens, continuing his vendetta against the Ten Commandments, wrote for the majority:

The first two lines of the monument's text appear in significantly larger font than the remainder . . . These lines read: "The Ten Commandments—I Am The Lord Thy God." The graphic emphasis placed on those first lines is rather hard to square with the proposition that the monument expresses no particular religious preference . . . Moreover, three principal speakers at the monument's dedication had been a Catholic priest, a Protestant minister, and a Jewish rabbi . . . who spoke of the cross-cultural significance of the Ten Commandments.

Imagine, a religion is established when three clergymen speak of "crosscultural significance"!

Push the unbelievable logic of Stevens's argument much farther and the State of California will be forced to change the religious names of its three principal cities: Los Angeles (the angels), San Francisco (the Catholic Saint Francis), and Sacramento (the sacraments of the Christian church). Or should two cities named Santa Fe (holy faith) be forced by the Supreme Court to change their names for being religiously motivated? Or how about Los Cruces (the crosses) in New Mexico or the Sangre de Christo (blood of Christ) mountains, also in New Mexico? Perhaps the Court will next take aim at St. Louis, Missouri; or Zion, Illinois; or Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; or St. Paul, Minnesota; or St. Petersburg, Florida. Where could it ever end?

Frankly, we are left with the inescapable conclusion that either the majority of the Court is made up of illogical left-wing fanatics or people so trapped by their own convoluted reasoning that they don't see the emotional, political, and spiritual shipwreck they are slowly but surely bringing on this great nation.

THE CASE AGAINST JUDGE MOORE

As I write this book today, I am looking at the headline on an Associated Press story: "Supreme Court rejects church-state fight over Ten Commandments monument."

What was this dispute all about? Alabama state judge Roy Moore became famous after the Kentucky and Indiana cases by posting the Ten Commandments in his courtroom. The people of Alabama were furious at the treatment given their cherished religious symbols by the U.S. Supreme Court. Judge Moore became a hero throughout Alabama because of his defense of the Ten Commandments. In the following statewide election, Judge Moore was elected by a decisive majority as the next chief justice of the sovereign state of Alabama.

Shortly after assuming office, Chief Justice Moore, using private funds, caused a 5,200-pound granite monument to be carved to display the Ten Commandments. This monument was given a prominent place in the rotunda of the building that houses the Supreme Court of Alabama.

The people of Alabama were strongly supportive of Justice Moore's efforts, but the ACLU, which has declared itself opposed to every expression of religious faith in the public arena, brought a suit in the Montgomery federal district court to have the monument removed.

Since Moore was chief justice of the highest court in Alabama, and since the Alabama Constitution contained clear references to God, he considered it perfectly appropriate to have in his courthouse the same commandments that adorn the walls of the United States Supreme Court in Washington, D.C. Chief Justice Moore was certainly within his rights to question whether a federal district court judge had the power to order him to do anything.

The federal judge trying the case said that he did not know who or what God was, and then he speculated about a Hindu God or a Bud-

dhist God or no God at all. The judge could have enlightened himself by looking at the reverse side of a United States one-dollar bill.

The U.S. District Court judge ordered the monument removed. Judge Moore appealed but, unfortunately, did not ask for a timely stay of the order, so it appeared that he was in contempt of court by not removing the monument as ordered. Therefore, he was suspended from his post by his Alabama colleagues. The monument was hauled away and dumped out of sight in a storeroom.

On November 13, 2003, Judge Moore was removed from the bench by the nine members of the Supreme Court for having “placed himself above the law.”

“I have absolutely no regrets,” Moore told supporters at the courthouse in Montgomery. “It’s about whether or not you can acknowledge God as a source of our law and our liberty.”

Judge Moore’s case reveals the blatant hypocrisy of the U.S. Supreme Court. As Rob Schenck, president of the Washington-based National Clergy Council, declared to the Court, “If you can display these Ten Commandments above your head, why can’t the people of Alabama display them in the rotunda of their Supreme Court building?”

SEARCH AND DESTROY THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Emboldened by their success, the ACLU has asked their supporters to hunt down every display of the Ten Commandments for the purpose of eradicating them by judicial action. In the days of the ascendance of the worship of Baal in Israel, God raised up the prophet Elijah to hunt down and destroy the statues of Baal throughout God’s land. Isn’t it ironic in post-Christian America to find an organization mobilizing its forces to hunt down and destroy across our land one of the most prominent public symbols of the same God who showed His power against the priests of Baal in the days of Elijah?

It is abundantly clear from the facts of history that the Supreme

Court of the United States over the years has executed a judicial *coup d'état*. The judges have stolen power not granted them by the Constitution and used it for decades to wage a relentless and thoroughgoing war against the Judeo-Christian spiritual foundation of our nation.

In an address to the Intercollegiate Studies Institute on October 23, 2003, one of the conservative members of the Court, Antonin Scalia, ridiculed a recent Supreme Court ruling on consensual sodomy that, according to Scalia, “held to be a constitutional right what had been a criminal offense at the time of the founding and for nearly 200 years thereafter.”

Scalia said judges, including his colleagues on the Supreme Court, throw over the original meaning of the Constitution when it suits them. “Most of today’s experts on the Constitution think the document written in Philadelphia in 1787 was simply an early attempt at the construction of what is called a liberal political order,” the Associated Press reported Scalia as saying. “All that the person interpreting or applying that document has to do is to read up on the latest academic understanding of liberal political theory and interpolate these constitutional understandings into the constitutional text.”

BREAKING FREE FROM THE SUPREME COURT

So how do free people break themselves free from this black-robed bondage? What avenues are open?

Article XI of the United States Constitution states that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. “All executive and judicial offices, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution.”

The judges are not supporting or defending the Constitution; they are destroying its original meaning to make it say what its framers never intended. This in itself is grounds for impeachment. These judges have violated their oath and no longer can serve on “good behavior,” as they declare in their oath of office.

Whether Congress has the will to act is problematic. Congress will only act if the people have become so outraged that their elected representatives once again take back the power given them under the Constitution.

Some of us can remember a similar effort in the 1960s when billboards across the land shouted “Impeach Earl Warren!” But in that era there was no groundswell in America against the excesses of the Warren Court. “Impeach Earl Warren” came to be regarded as the ravings of the loony fringe . . . never anything more.

Recently I was able to enlist 120,000 Christian people across America to petition the Supreme Judge of the universe for help. In what we called Operation Supreme Court Freedom, we asked God to spare this nation for our children and grandchildren by causing three liberal judges of the Supreme Court to retire. With God’s help, the task is relatively simple.

WHO ARE THESE JUSTICES?

Justice Anthony Kennedy is a Catholic appointed to the Court by Ronald Reagan. Kennedy came to the bench as a conservative. Now he only occasionally votes for conservative causes. His denunciation of the graduation prayer by a rabbi in *Lee v. Weisman* (1992) was biting and far-reaching, and his written opinion for the majority declaring a constitutional right to sodomy in the case of *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) reached giddy lyricism in support of the homosexual lifestyle. He not only departed from the Constitution, he declared that the reasoning of former Justice Lewis Powell in the previous Supreme Court case of *Bowers v. Hardwick* (1986), upholding a Georgia law against sodomy, was incorrect and should be reversed. In the process, he reached across the Atlantic to decisions of European courts in order to justify his abhorrent reasoning and nebulous concepts of personhood.

In many cases, such as those involving regulations restricting abor-

tion protests and regulations against school Bible clubs, Kennedy forms part of a conservative bloc on the Court. In short, Kennedy is often driven by misguided liberalism and then on other occasions is motivated by a refreshing gust of common sense and justice.

When Ronald Reagan was contemplating the appointment of a woman to the Court, he settled on a Stanford Law schoolmate of Justice Rehnquist who had served as a Republican in the state senate of Arizona and later in the Arizona judiciary. Surely someone from Barry Goldwater's state would be conservative, but this was not the case.

I joined Paul Weyrich, the head of the Free Congress Foundation, for a private lunch with James Baker, Reagan's chief of staff. We sought to convince Baker that Sandra Day O'Connor was neither pro-life nor a strong conservative. Baker assured us that this lady was a "woman for all seasons" and that she would prove a splendid justice who enjoyed the full confidence of the president.

Baker was wrong. Justice O'Connor is pro-choice, and she is always a question mark or a vote against traditional values on religious issues. Justice O'Connor reportedly desires to step down from the Court and return to Arizona with her husband. If she is replaced with a strong judicial conservative who is dedicated to upholding the original intent of the Constitution, there will then be four solid votes for freedom from tyranny.

On the left is Justice Ginsberg, who was a former general counsel of the infamous ACLU. It boggles comprehension that a Senate controlled by Republicans could have allowed President Bill Clinton to appoint to the Court an avowed enemy of traditional values. Such an appointment is so egregious, and such a confirmation by the Senate so lacking in principle, that I find it hard to believe that there was not undue pressure behind the scenes.

Justice Stevens is eighty-three years old at this writing. His visceral hatred of our Christian religious tradition is clear from his

written decisions. Were he to retire and be replaced by a justice with the conservative judicial philosophy of a Thomas or a Scalia, a host of erroneously decided cases could be reversed and this nation could finally be free from the tyranny of the judicial oligarchy.

REBUILDING THE SUPREME COURT

Since so much is at stake, the fight over the next three Supreme Court justices is going to be bitter and bloody. Ultra left-wing groups like People for the American Way, National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, the National Organization of Women, the ACLU, and the Gay-Lesbian Alliance will use every dirty trick imaginable to smear the reputation of conservative nominees to the Court. The issue will depend on whether America's evangelical Christians and their allies have the stomach for a protracted and costly battle. Ronald Reagan once said, "In dealing with Congress, it is not necessary that they see the light, but that they feel the heat." Republican and Democrat members of the Senate need to realize that if they vote against confirmation of conservative judicial nominees, they will not be returned to office. There needs to be no quarter and no compromise.

We Americans have a great respect for law and order. The great Samuel Rutherford wrote *Lex Rex*: "The Law Is King." I once sat next to former British prime minister Margaret Thatcher at a private dinner in London. I asked, "Lady Thatcher, what should be done to correct the turmoil in Russia?"

Her answer was immediate. "They need English judges to teach them the rule of law."

We prize an independent judiciary, free from political pressure, to render dispassionate decisions that are guided by law and reason. The American people assume that judicial decisions are made fairly and according to the law. We do not have an arbitrary monarch claiming to rule by divine right. Our entire system of free enterprise is based on

the concept of the rule of law, which upholds contract obligations and protects citizens from the arbitrary exercise of power by the strong.

Yet now in America the law is not king; judges have become king. What the Europeans call “the American disease” must be cured, and the people of America must again assert their authority.

A RADICAL SOLUTION

If appointments do not take place, the final course is to nullify the decisions of the Supreme Court. The Court has been given no army, no enforcement mechanism, and no ability to raise money. Supreme Court decisions carry weight only because they are given weight by the chief executive and his attorney general, and by federal marshals. The Supreme Court can't function if the Congress refuses to appropriate it any money beyond the salaries mandated by the Constitution.

If the chief executive declares that judicial decisions have overstepped constitutional limits and refuses to enforce them, then the decisions will have no effect except upon cases brought in lower courts. If Congress refuses to allow the Court to overturn laws that it has passed, then those laws will remain in effect. If Congress wishes to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over an entire class of cases, it may do so under the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has taken power unto itself because the other two branches of our government have refused to act. It will not precipitate a constitutional crisis if an arrogant usurper of power is forced to abide by the limits set for it by our founding fathers. Our existence as a free nation is at stake. Are we willing to act?

Now I turn from man-made law to the law of God, the Ten Commandments, which are being driven by the judiciary from our public square. What are these commandments, and why, to many, have they become “The Ten Offenses?”