

Religious Motivation of the Colonists: Carson's "The Colonial Experience"; Founders Create Limited Government: Amendments 9 & 10 of the Bill of Rights; Ignored by 20th-Century Supreme Courts

This is a satanic concept. We can see this mistake being played out in our nation today. The early European settlers of North America braved the Atlantic to start a new life free of British control. This culminated in the desire for independence which was won at Yorktown in 1781. The development of the Constitution made it possible for U.S. citizens to prosper in an environment of freedom for well over two centuries.

One of the three major areas of oppression that inspired Christians to consider fleeing England was religious which began in earnest with the House of Stuart's King James I:

Not all the English colonies in America were settled because of oppression, but that was the dominant reason for most of them. It should be noted that people do not always, or even usually, resist oppression. In fact, if they have become used to it over a long period of time they may not even think of it as oppression. It is just the way things are, and most do not spend time imagining them as different. The sense of oppression is usually awakened by changes, and leads to action when there are opportunities for doing something about it. Both of these conditions existed in 17th century England. One thing that was happening was that Puritans and religious dissenters were becoming an increasingly important element. As persecution of these mounted, so did the resistance and the determination to do something about it. The possibility of settling in America afforded one of the opportunities for doing something about it. (pp. 43-44)

The religious oppression of Stuart England is best known to Americans, however, because it was this that drove Pilgrims, Puritans, Baptists, Quakers, and Catholics to migrate in considerable numbers to the New World.

The Church of England was established by law for all who lived in England. It meant that everyone "had to attend services in his parish church every Sunday, and was liable to legal penalties if he did not. He had to pay tithes, one-tenth of his produce or his profits, to a clergyman whom he had no say in choosing, and of whom he might heartily disapprove. He was liable to the jurisdiction of Church courts, which punished him not only for 'heresy,' nonattendance at church, or sexual immorality, but also for working on Sundays or saints' days, for nonpayment of tithes, sometimes even for lending money at interest. Books were strictly censored, and the censorship was in the hands of the Bishops. Education was an ecclesiastical monopoly. ... No person might teach in a school or private family unless licensed by his Bishop."¹

¹ Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1961), 75-76.

Anyone who differed from the established church was apt to get into trouble. Dissenters from it, both Protestant and Catholic, were persecuted. An act of 1581 made it a high crime to attempt to convert a subject to the Catholic faith, and set forth penalties for saying or hearing a Mass. During her [Elizabeth I's] reign more than 200 Catholics were put to death.

Dissenting Protestants were not spared under Elizabeth either. Some who were not satisfied with the official religion began to hold study meetings. The meetings were called Conventicles.² An act of 1593 provided imprisonment for anyone who attended one of these meetings, banishment from England for a second offense, and execution for those who returned to England after having been banished. Matters did not improve much under James I. The Puritans especially hoped that they would, for James had ruled Scotland before becoming king of England. Scotland was Presbyterian, and English Puritans held similar views with them. But James let them know right early that he had had enough of such religion.³ (p. 46)

The road to freedom led Christians to the rugged, undeveloped frontier called America where it was hoped one could live in accordance to his own beliefs, not those imposed and regulated by law:

Religion played a large role in the settlement of America, more in some colonies than others, but it was an important factor in all colonies. Interest in and concern about religion was especially strong in the 17th century. The Puritans were gaining in numbers and influence in the first half of the century; religious wars raged in Europe in the 1630s and 1640s; and several splinter denominations were gaining followers in England. Religious oppression led many to seek refuge in America. Many came for freedom to practice their particular religious beliefs. It would not be correct, however, to describe this as coming for religious freedom in general. At the beginning of the century, hardly anyone thought it would be possible to have a community in which people held different, or no, religious beliefs. There was little enough desire for religious toleration at the time, much less religious liberty. What those settlers came for, then, who sought religious refuge in America, was to form communities in which they would worship and live according to their beliefs. But whether they were dissenters from the Church of England or not, religion played a prominent role in the lives of settlers.⁴ (p. 63-64)

It is the liberty to live according to one's own beliefs that makes a society truly free. The factor that gradually erodes this environment is the intrusion of government, e.g., seventeenth-century England.

² "Con-ven'ti-cle, [L. dim. of *conventus*, an assembly.] **1.** A religious assembly; especially, a secret or illegal one. **3.** In English history, a prohibited meeting of any religious sect that disputed the authority of the Church of England, as of certain Protestants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" (*Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*, 2d ed., s.v. "conventicle").

³ Clarence B. Carson, *The Colonial Experience: 1607-1774*, vol. 1, *A Basic History of the United States* (Wadley, AL: American Textbook Committee, 1983), 43-44; 46.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 63-64.

Where does authority lie in the United States of America? Who submits to whom? Rebellion is opposition to the one in authority. Who holds that authority in our country? The first three words in the Constitution are “We the people.” The Ninth and Tenth Amendments clarify who retains power and to what degree certain powers are delegated:

Amendment 9: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The president of the United States takes the following oath upon entering office:

“I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

The true authority in the United States is the Constitution which delegates authority down to the three branches of government each of which is bound by the limited powers that the document cites. The president is bound by oath as are officials of the other two branches to “preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.”

The traditional view of the Ninth Amendment contends that it guarded against the well-understood rule of *inclusio unius est exclusio alterius*, (the inclusion of one thing necessarily excludes all others), whereby the very listing of certain rights as immune from congressional regulation would necessarily imply a grant of general legislative power in Congress to legislate over all others.⁵

The Tenth Amendment expresses the principle that undergirds the entire plan of the original Constitution: the national government possesses only those powers delegated to it. Because the Constitution created a government of limited and enumerated powers, the Framers initially believed that a bill of rights was not only unnecessary, but also potentially dangerous. Because the *federal* government could not reach objects not granted to it, the Federalists originally argued, there was no need for a *federal* bill of rights. Further, the Federalists insisted that, under the normal rules of statutory construction, by forbidding the government from acting in certain areas, a bill of rights necessarily implied that the government could act in all other areas not forbidden to it.

⁵ Edwin Meese III and others, eds., *The Heritage Guide to the Constitution* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2005), 367.

Obviously, the nation chose to include the Bill of Rights, but only with the Tenth Amendment as a bulwark against implying any alteration in the original scheme of enumerated powers. If Congress was not originally delegated power to regulate speech or the press, no such power is granted or implied by adoption of the Bill of Rights.⁶

Over the course of our nation's history these carefully worded amendments have suffered distorted interpretations from the Supreme Court and Congress allowing for an unconstitutional arrogation of power away from the states and from the people over to the government.

An uninformed and propagandized population has been indoctrinated into accepting liberal/socialist interpretations of the Constitution, the result of which is an unwitting rebellion against the Constitution, the very foundation of our Republic. The accompanying transfer of personal freedoms over to the Federal government gives it power to regulate the lives of its citizens and individualism is replaced by collectivism.

As we have learned in our studies of *Clanking Chains* and *The Church of the Living God*, the inability of people under fifty years of age to comprehend the gravity of the country's historical downtrend is the result of a half-century of Progressive propaganda orchestrated by the ruler of this world. This article, although hard for me to bear, points out how widespread the success of their indoctrination has been.

⁶Ibid., 371.