



# The Declaration of Independence or America's Christian Philosophy of Government

By Dr. Phil Stringer



## INTRODUCTION

While in the United States to accept the Philadelphia Liberty medal, Czechoslovakian President Vaclav Havel said, "The Declaration of Independence states that the Creator gave man the right to liberty. It seems man can realize that liberty only if he does not forget the One who endowed him with it."

Following his speech, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal said: "As a writer and thinker, Mr. Havel has had certain advantages not given to American intellectuals. That is, he has lived under a genuinely oppressive system, been imprisoned and actually endured state punishment for the expression of his art and views. Our own artists and intellectuals must content themselves with manufactured fantasies of state oppression and assaults on freedom." No American historical document is the source of more debate than the United States' first historical document — the Declaration of Independence.

## THE DEBATE OVER THE DECLARATION

For most of the history of the United States, it has been asserted that the Declaration of Independence proves that the United States is a Christian nation. However, this idea has come under heavy attack for the last forty years. The attack has come from two very different sources.

Liberals assert that the Declaration of Independence was written by "secular-minded men" with "secular ideas" to give birth to a "secular nation". That such an idea is so very prominent today is proof that few people have even casually read the Declaration of Independence. References to the Creator, the law of nature's God, the Supreme Judge of the World, and Providence are clearly not "secular concepts". Such a rewriting of history could only occur in a society where they educate most children in "political correctness" rather than in basic first source history.

The second attack against the Declaration of Independence has come surprisingly enough from evangelical Christians. The argument goes something like this: John Locke heavily influenced the Founders, John Locke was a Deist, consequently the Declaration reflects a non-Christian Deist view of government. This view has been widely spread and accepted. Books such as The Search for Christian America by Noll, Hatch and Marsden and A Theological Interpretation of American History by C. Gregg Singer have spread this view.

## JOHN LOCKE AND DEISM

According to Webster's Dictionary, Deism is "the belief, based on the testimony of reason, that God created the world and set in motion, subject to natural laws, but takes no interest in it or its inhabitants." However the idea

that John Locke was a Deist is absolutely a myth—he was not a Deist nor did his ideas in anyway resemble Deism.

In The Reasonableness of Christianity, p. 223 (Signet Edition) Locke said:

To the who is once persuaded that Jesus Christ was sent by God to be a King and a Savior of those who do believe in Him, all His commands become principles. There need be no other proof for the truth of what He says, but that He said it. Then there need be no more but to read the inspired Books, to be instructed. All the duties of morality lie there, clear and plain and easy to be understood.

In An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, (Dover Edition, introduction) Locke wrote:

The Holy Scripture is to me, and will always be, the constant guide of my belief, and I shall always hearken to it, as containing infallible truth relating to things of the highest concernment. And I wish I could say there are no mysteries in it. I acknowledge there are to me, and I fear will always be. Nevertheless, where I lack the evidence of things, there is ground enough for me to believe, because God has said it; and I shall immediately condemn and quiet any opinion of mine, as soon as I am shown that it is contrary to any revelation in the holy Scripture.

He further wrote in Reasonableness of Christianity, (Stanford Edition) p. 52:

Not that any to whom the gospel hath been preached shall be saved, without believing Jesus to be the Messiah, for all being sinners, and transgressors of the law, and so unjust, are all liable to condemnation, unless they believe, and so through grace are justified by God for this faith, which shall be accounted to them for righteousness.

Locke never identified with the Deists during his lifetime! He was clearly an evangelical Christian, though both Armenians and Calvinists sometimes criticized him for not completely agreeing with all points of their doctrine.

To causally assert that Locke was a Deist, as so many evangelicals do, is to repeat a myth and do an injustice to a serious dedicated Christian.

First source reading of their writing will further demonstrate that George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Ben Franklin, and James Madison were not Deists, even though it is often alleged that they were. In fact, Washington and Madison were clearly believers in Christ and genuine evangelical Christians. While Jefferson and Franklin were not believers, they both rejected Deism and accepted the Scriptures as a source of wisdom in many areas, including philosophy of government. Ad-

(Continued on page 2)

*(Continued from page 1)*

Adams was a professing Evangelical most of his life though he adopted Unitarianism in his later years.

Probably the only real Deist prominent in the discussion of the Declaration of Independence is Thomas Paine. He aggressively campaigned for acceptance of the Declaration of Independence though he played no part in writing or ratifying it.

## HISTORICAL SETTING

In 1776, the colonists had been complaining about British tyranny for twenty years. The American colonies had gradually been tricked into giving up self-government. Their anger had been spilling out into civil disobedience, smuggling and isolated acts of violence. The individual colonial militias had been preparing for conflict with Britain (in the past they had prepared for the French and Indians). Armed warfare had broken out between colonial militias and the British army.

The Continental Congress assigned a five-man committee, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Robert Livingston to write a Declaration of Independence. They were to explain both to the American people and the governments of the world the grounds for declaring independence and forming a new nation. They assigned Thomas Jefferson to write the rough draft and each of the other four would go over each word and discuss every sentence. Then the entire document would be gone over by the whole Congress.

The Congress, on July 2, 1776, accepted the final draft and it was made effective on July 4, 1776.

## POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

The request formally to declare for independence had been made by the Massachusetts colony and it said in part:

For these reasons, as well as many others which might be produced, we are confirmed in the opinion that the present age would be deficient in their duty to God, their posterity, and themselves if they do not establish an American republic. This is the only form of government which we wish to see established; for we can never be willingly subject to any other king than He who, being passed of infinite wisdom, goodness and rectitude, is alone fit to possess unlimited power. We have freely spoken our sentiments upon this important subject, but we mean not to dictate; we have unbounded confidence in the wisdom and uprightness of Continental Congress; with pleasure we recollect that this affair is under their direction; and we now instruct you, sir, to give them the strongest assurance that, if they should declare America to be a free and independent republic, your constituents will support and defend the measure to the last drop of their blood

and the last farthing of their treasure.

The relationship between the political philosophy and the Massachusetts representatives and the common Christian beliefs of the people is clearly seen in this statement.

John Adams, one of the drafting committee members (and the second President of the United States) expected the signing of the Declaration to be celebrated as a religious holiday.

The second day of July 1776, will be the most memorable epoch in the history of America, to be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival, commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty from one end of the Continent to the other from this time forward forevermore. You will think me transported with enthusiasm but I am not. I am well aware of the toil, the blood, and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these states; yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of light and glory; that the end is worth all the means, that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction, even though we shall rue it, which I trust in God we shall not.

A careful look at the wording of the Declaration of Independence makes it clear that it expresses the common ground of Christian thinking about government.

## COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT

**“When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds that have connected them with another...”**

The Founders did not consider “political bonds” absolutes as most political systems did. The children of Israel had left Egypt and later the Persian Empire. The will of God and the proper role of government were more important considerations than pre-existing political bonds.

**“And to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station...”**

The Founders were clearly intent on founding a new nation.

**“...to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them...”**

This is a very important phrase. The Founders appeal to two authorities. They distinguish between the laws of nature (an obvious phrase for the concept of natural law) and the law of nature's God. If the “law of nature's God” does not refer to natural law then it is important to know what it does refer to. In fact this was a common phrase for the Scriptures. William Blackstone, the highly regarded British legal authority had written in 1765, “Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws!” The phrase “the law of nature and the law of God” was a common phrase from such religious writers and John Calvin and Matthew Tindal. Secular thinkers of the 1990's may have

*(Continued on page 3)*

*(Continued from page 2)*

trouble understanding this phrase. The average American in 1776 would not have had any trouble understanding it.

Note that while Deists believed in the “law of nature” they definitely did not believe in the “law of nature’s God.” Rather than being a Deistic statement, this is a statement that represents Christian thinking contrary to Deist thought.

Some have complained that the phrase “the law of nature” is not a Christian one. However this phrase was common among Christian writers and was based upon such Scriptures as, Romans 2:14, “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves.” And Psalm 19:1-4, “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world. In them hath He set a tabernacle for the sun”. This phrase was a common expression for a basic doctrinal idea held by many Christian groups (as well as the Deists).

Calvinist author Samuel Rutherford, writing in 1644, had insisted that a political philosophy had to be based upon both the law of nature and the law of God, the Bible. His book “Lex Rex”, along with the writings of John Locke and the legal commentaries of William Blackstone were the most widely read, quoted and influential books in the colonies (besides the Bible). Rutherford, Locke, and Blackstone were all Bible believing Christians who testified to their personal faith in Christ. Since they were all human beings there were slight differences in their political philosophy but there was a great deal of common ground. The Congress very carefully worded the Declaration of Independence to reflect the thinking of all three writers while corresponding with basic Bible doctrine.

Those who find the law of nature and the law of nature’s God offensive cannot claim to be reflecting the thinking of the Founders of America.

**“...a decent respect to the opinions of mankind require that they should declare the causes that impel them to the separation.”**

Notice that the Founders did not ask the permission on other nations to declare Independence, they simply felt an obligation to inform them.

**“We hold these truths to be self-evident...”**

The belief in “self evident” truths was based upon Romans 1:18-20, “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the old are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and God head; so that they are without excuse.” The self-evident truth referred to 1 Romans 1:18-20 is that creation demands a Creator. The self-evident truths were those truths made known to men by the direct action of God on man’s conscience or intuition and by God’s use

of nature to teach basic truths to man.

There is no recorded debate among the Founders about the concepts of natural law, creation or self-evident truths.

**“...that all men are created equal.”**

The political philosophy of the Founders is clearly rooted in the doctrine of creation. The concept of equality deserves a special note. This was considered a condition of creation. All men were created equal before the government. All men were not equal in circumstances. Columnist Paul Greenberg wrote:

What was the magic in Jefferson’s word that they should still rivet and inspire? Clearly the Declaration was not a description of America as it was in 1776. It was largely limited to citizens of property, and they generally excluded women from any formal role in the political process. And most notable in a land that declared its independence with a “firm reliance on the Protection of divine Providence,” the very image of God was daily bought and sold on the auction block. No, Jefferson’s Declaration was not a description of America that was, but the America that could be. It is a promise still. And a warning that liberty is indivisible.

Former President Richard Nixon, (*Beyond Peace*) described the concept of equality referred to in the Declaration this way:

The Founding Fathers believed that civil rights belonged to individuals, not groups. The principle of natural rights embodied in the Declaration of Independence defined our goal as equality of opportunity, which rejects distinctions of legal status and privilege defined by race, religion, ethnicity, tribe, language, or sex. Everyone is the same in the eyes of the law. Nevertheless, insisting on equality of opportunity is the opposite of demanding equality of a result.

**“...that they are endowed by their Creator.”**

Again it is clear the Founders based their political philosophy on the doctrine of creation. They clearly believed that men’s rights come not from government but from God. John Adams write, “You have rights antecedent to all earthly governments; rights that they cannot repeal or restrain by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe.” Those who wish to remove God today from all discussion of our rights must strip away the foundation of those rights in order to do so.

**“...with certain unalienable rights.”**

The Founders clearly connected the concept of human rights with the doctrine of creation. They believed that men were equal because they had all been created by God. Governments had no power to take away the rights of men because those rights did not come from government but from God.

Those who believe that the concepts of freedom involved in the Greek city-states was the basis for the Declaration have a real problem with this statement. The Greeks had no clear concept of a Creator God and they

*(Continued on page 4)*

*(Continued from page 3)*

believed that rights were granted by the government. The Founders stated that the Creator God granted their rights.

**“...that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”**

While attempting to provide an exhaustive list, the Founders thought three rights needed special mention. The first is the right to life. Because man was created by God, his right to life came from God and not government. Only those who believe that the right to life comes from government believe that governments can arbitrarily take away or grant the right to take away life. This is the heart of the modern debate over abortion.

The second is the right to liberty. Liberty was considered an “unalienable” right—No one, no government or government agency has the right to arbitrarily take liberty away. Individuals do not have the right to surrender their liberty to government in exchange for special benefits from the government.

The third mentioned right is the pursuit of happiness. This was a quote from the commentaries of Blackstone and Virginia Constitution. In Blackstone’s Commentaries on the laws of England (1765) he refers to man’s happiness as coming from “his sence of well-being and blessedness, in his earthly existence that comes from obeying the laws of his Creator.” This is the same concept as that found in the King James Version word blessed (see Matthew 5).<sup>1</sup>

Notice the Founders did not believe that everyone had a right to happiness. They certainly did not believe that the government could or should make everyone happy! They believed that every man had a right to pursue happiness for himself!

**“That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men...”**

This important phrase very clearly reveals the Founders’ vision of the purpose of government. Government was to exist to protect the rights given by God to men. This is exactly the Christian doctrine of government. According to Romans 13, God ordained rulers are a terror to evil works but are not a terror to good works. According to 1 Peter 2:13-14, it is the role of kings and governors to punish evil doers and to praise those that do well. Outside of those cultures influenced by the Scriptures, no culture in the history of mankind has presented this philosophy of government.

The position of the Founders was clear—when a government ceases to be a terror to evil and becomes a terror to good, it loses its right to be considered a government. It is no longer ordained of God. And they felt that the government of Great Britain had become a terror to good and not to evil.

Of course, some Christians teach that any organization that claims to be the government or that exercises rule is a legitimate government and must be obeyed. This idea was expressed in the Divine Right of Kings’ theology of past ages, in the Tory refusal to support the War for Independence in the 1770’s and is expressed by some today. Some Christian writers like Gregg Singer have concluded that the War for Independence was unjust and un-

biblical.

However, the Founders felt that they were acting consistently with Romans 13. Romans 13:1-7 reads:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves a damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the word in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

The Founders felt that Romans 13 bound civil government and the agents of civil government to the role that God had given them. They were ordained of God, were the ministers of God and were subject unto “higher powers” (higher than human authority or political power). The primary purpose of Romans 13 was to bind government (this was also the purpose of the Constitution). Romans 13 also teaches the obligation of the individual to obey civil government, as it carries out its proper functions.

Again the Founders were clear the government of Great Britain, both King and Parliament, had forfeited the privilege of being considered the ministers of God, of being a legitimate civil government. The government had become a terror to good and a support of evil.

**“...deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”**

The Founders distinguished between a legitimate government and gangsters well-armed enough to inflict their rule by force. The development of feudalism, which formed the European nation-states, was based upon a series of contracts between the people and rulers, rulers and other rulers. If the people violated their part of their contract, they could expect retribution from rulers. If rulers violated their part of the contract, they could expect to be overthrown. They would lose their right to the rule. The Founders felt that the government of Great Britain had violated its contract with the people and forfeited its right to rule. The original colonial charters had been overthrown by the king and replaced with royal charters (without consent). Furthermore, the king was not even living up to his obligations in the royal charters.

First the Articles of Confederation and later the Constitution represented the attempts of the Founders to develop a workable contract with the American people.

**“...that whenever any form of government be-**

*(Continued on page 5)*

*(Continued from page 4)*

**comes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it...**"

The Founders clearly saw the people as the authority over the agents of government. When civil government failed in its purpose, or violated its contract with the people, they maintained the right to correct or abolish their form of civil government. The point was simple, a government in rebellion against God should be replaced with one which is not.

**"...and to institute a new government..."**

The Founders did not promote anarchy—they simply wanted a government that fulfilled its proper role—the role taught for government in the Bible. The Founders may not all have gotten their philosophy of government from the Bible (though many testified that they did) but they all had a philosophy of government that was the same as the Christian doctrine of government.

Whether on purpose (most) or accidentally (perhaps a few) they were forming a nation based upon the Christian doctrine of government.

**"...laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."**

The Founders recognized that government could not be trusted to discipline itself and it must be carefully restricted by the power of the people.

**"Prudence, indeed, will dictate governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes..."**

The Founders did not feel that every failure of civil government required a change but that clear pattern of abuse was necessary before a government was changed.

**"...and accordingly all experiences hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."**

The Founders knew that people didn't enjoy paying the price necessary to overthrow the rule of Great Britain—if there had been another way to correct the situation they would have taken it. They simply had no other remedy but the use of armed force.

**"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evince a design to reduce them under absolute despotism it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."**

This passage makes the point that the colonists had experienced a very definite and clear pattern of abuse. It also makes another very important point—that is the duty of a free people to overthrow a tyrannical government that cannot be corrected by any other means. **"Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government."**

The Founders did not call their own efforts the "American Revolution". They felt that the government of Great Britain was in rebellion against the proper purpose of government! They considered their efforts as the War

for Independence. That should be its proper title.

**"The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states."**

King John had been forced to sign the Magna Charta over just such complaints. The English Civil War (and the beheading of King Charles) had taken place over the same kind of concerns. The English people had long been influenced by the teaching of the Scriptures. The English people had constantly asserted their rights as individuals and fought against the absolute right of kings.

**"To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world."**

Following this statement there are 26 examples given of the English government becoming a terror to good rather than a terror to evil. These examples prove that rather than protecting life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness the English government had become the chief threat to the life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness of the colonists.

Among the many issues that are mentioned, three deserve special note. The British government had sought to destroy all separation of powers. All judicial systems had been subjected to the rule of the king. All possible courses of remedy for the colonists had been abolished.

The Bible clearly teaches a separation of powers. Even under the Old Testament economy the role of civil government and the role of the priest were distinct. King Saul was punished by God for taking upon himself the role of the priest. Ahaziah and eighty priests withstood King Uzziah when he tried to take over the temple worship. The separation of government powers is absolutely necessary to restrain the power of government. This is a Biblical concept held to by the Founders of America.

Secondly the British government had begun to sue physical force against peaceful colonies. These colonists possessed the right to defend themselves against government force and to organize to make their defense more efficient.

Thirdly, the ninth protest of British power reads: **"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers, to harass our people and eat out their substance."**

The British king and Parliament were constantly creating new government agencies with powers to tax, fine and regulate. The government agents employed by these agencies had to justify their existence by taxing, fining and regulating. Rather than protecting the people, the government was now interfering in almost every area of the people's lives.

After giving twenty-six examples of British tyranny, the Founders continued: **"In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated petitions have been answered only repeated injury."**

The Founders again clarify that they had looked for another solution to this problem other than declaring independence.

*(Continued on page 6)*

*(Continued from page 5)*

**“A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.”**

Again, the Founders repeat the point that the King has failed to fulfill the proper role of a ruler of civil government. He was not acting as a minister of God in being a terror to evil. He was acting as a rebel towards God in being a terror to the good.

The next six sentences refer to the attempts that the colonists made to appeal to the people of England. **“Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our immigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and held them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends”.**

**“...now, therefore, the representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in General Congress assembled...”**

The Founders were not advocating anarchy or rebellion but they had created a new nation.

**“...appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions...”**

In making reference to the title for God referred to in Genesis 18:25 and Judges 11:7 the Founders obviously were not making a “secular” statement.

They also were not making a Deist statement because Deists did not believe that God was the “Supreme Judge of the World”. They believed that God had left His creation to operate solely under natural law and that there was no supernatural judgment. Rather than promoting Deism, once again the political philosophy of the Declaration refutes it.

The members of Congress were conscious of the fact that they were not acting as the “ministers of God” and that they would answer to the one whom they served as agents of civil government. They also felt that they could appeal to God for help on the grounds that they were trying to establish a Biblical form of government.

**“Do in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies solemnly publish and declare, that the United Colonies are, and of right out to be, FREE and INDEPENDENT STATES, that they are absolved from all allegiance, to the British crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved, and that as FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES, they have total power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce and to do all other acts and things which INDEPENDENT STATES may of right do.”**

This clear statement announces that a new nation has been formed and that it will carry out all the legitimate functions of a new nation.

**“And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protections of Divine Providence...”**

This again was not a secular statement. Those who protest that statements like “One nation under God” or “In God We Trust” have no place as recognized government statements must ignore the attitude of the Founders. Because their purpose in government was the same as God’s purpose in government, they felt that they could appeal to Him for aid. Providence was a common term for God used by John Calvin and others.

**“we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.”**

The Founders were aware that liberty could have a great price tag attached to it. Their lives and their fortunes were indeed at risk. The British army paid special attention to finding and punishing signers of the Declaration of Independence.

John Hart of New Jersey was forced to flee into the woods and hide. His farm was destroyed. The experience broke his wife’s health and she died. Within three year Hart was also dead. Richard Stockton of New Jersey was captured, imprisoned and his home burned. He became an invalid, dying in 1781.

William Ellery of Rhode Island had his home burned. Francis Lewis of New York had his home destroyed and his wife and son imprisoned. Both died under British captivity. William Floyd of New York had his home seized and used as a British barracks.

The New York home of Philip Livingston was destroyed as was the Philadelphia home of George Clymer. Arthur Middleton, Edmund Rutledge and Thomas Heyward Jr. of South Carolina were all imprisoned by the British.

Cesar Rodney of Delaware had been planning to travel to England for life-saving surgery. His role in the Declaration made that impossible and he died before the war was over. Many other signers paid a great price for their role in bringing about freedom.

## CONCLUSION

The Founders of our country consciously tried to create a type of government based upon the concept of the Creator God and the role of government described in the Bible. Most understood that the Bible was the infallible Word of God. All agreed that the Biblical doctrine of government was the best one.

The United States was not formed as a Christian nation in the sense that it was the federal government’s job to teach, impose or regulate Christianity. Christianity is a religion of the heart and real Christianity cannot be taught, imposed or regulated by the government. The United States was formed as a Christian nation in several senses of the term. The majority of the Founders were Christian. The majority of the People were Christians. The Christian doctrine of government was adopted as the Political phi-

*(Continued from page 6)*

losophy of the government. We must teach again the Christian foundation of our system of government if we ever wish to return to the system of government which was originally built upon this foundation.

The early blessings upon the United States were not accidental. They were the natural and supernatural result of a system of government based upon the truth of a Creator God and upon the revelation given by their God.