

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 not willing to speak God's truth,
 And on his 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]

GENERATION HAS SOME QUESTIONS

(By Marcy Musgrave)

I am a member of the upcoming generation the one after Generation X that has yet to be given a name. So far, it appears that most people are rallying behind the idea of calling us Generation Next. I believe I know why. The older generations are hoping we will mindlessly assume our place as the "next" in line. That way, they won't have to explain why my generation has had to experience so much pain and heartache.

"What heartache?" You say. "Don't you know you have grown up in a time of great prosperity?" Yeah, we know that. Believe me, it has been drilled into our heads since birth. Unfortunately, the pain and hurt I speak of can't be reconciled with money. You have tried for years to buy us happiness, but it is only temporary. Money isn't the answer, and it is time for people to begin admitting their guilt for failing my generation.

I will admit that I wasn't planning to write this. I was going to tuck it away in some corner of my mind and fall victim to your whole "next" mentality. But after the massacre in Littleton, Colo., I realize that, as a member of this generation that kills without remorse, I had a duty to challenge all of my elders to explain why they have allowed things to become so bad.

Let me tell you this: These questions don't represent only me but a whole generation that is struggling to grow up and make sense of this world. We all have questions; we all want explanations. People may label us Generation Next, but we are more appropriately Generation "Why?"

Remember God's Word and its truth, in a time when people say the only truth is what I say at the moment is truth. God's word says, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." (John 14:6 KJV) Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

Jesus said, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me."

This week our congress sought to pass a declaration that would implore Americans to repent and turn to the Almighty, it was defeated, I am assured it will come up again and receive the support it so richly deserves, to call on the nation to humble themselves before the creator, to pray, to repent of their manifold sins. But alas there are those who do not believe there is sin, everything is o.k.

No the ills of America, can't be solved at the polls alone, but there is a need for Godly leadership, for Men and Women who will put principles before money and self, who will put America, before the economy of the world and other nations. It is time America, to wake up and heed the call, to faith, to faith in the one true God of our fathers. It is time America, to repent of accepting sin for normal behavior and call sin, sin. It is time America, to stand on the truth of God's word, his plan, not our own.

Let us Pray.

Reverend Ray N. Daniel, Jr. is an elder serving in the Mississippi Conference of the United Methodist Church, appointed to the Rose Hill Charge. He has been serving in town and country ministry since 1980. Rev. Daniel graduated from Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi, and obtained a Master of Divinity from the Iliff School of Theology, in Denver, Colorado.

RESPONSE TO MR. EDWARDS'
 REMARKS ON H.R. 3073

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, during our charitable choice debates on H.R. 3073, The Father's Count Act of 1999, I listened with interest to Mr. Edwards express his reasons why he believes the Constitution and the Founding Fathers would have objected to this Body providing opportunity for all people—including those in the community of faith—to participate equally in government opportunities and services. 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 Madison 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 overseas. He did not arrive in America until after the completion of these documents.

In fact, when a biography was written about President Jefferson, Jefferson sent a note to the author requesting that he change or delete one errant claim. Jefferson explained:

One passage in the paper you enclosed me must be corrected. It is the following, 'And all say it was yourself more than any other individual, that planned and established it,' i.e. the Constitution. I was in Europe when the Constitution was planned, and never saw it till after it was established.

Jefferson properly disqualified himself as a constitutional authority since he was not in America when the Constitution was framed and never saw it until after it was finished. 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 provision 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 Constitution.

Since Jefferson was neither one of the 55 individuals at the Convention who drafted 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 authoritative 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 himself 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 Constitution of the United States." This was not, like the fabled Goddess of Wisdom, the offspring of a single brain. It ought to be regarded as the work of many heads and many hands.

Interestingly, Mr. Madison—while undeniable 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. Additionally, the Constitution that Mr. Madison initially sought was far removed from the final document.

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. Madison (and on this occasion, Mr. Madison's position prevailed). When the Constitution arrived in Virginia for ratification, the State proposed the addition of a Bill of Rights and Mr. Madison again opposed the motion. 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 conventions—proposed its own version for a Bill of Rights. The religious protections sent from Virginia to the United States Congress were written 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 on the religion clauses 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, 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 does a disservice both to this Body and to the nation by singling 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 compromise the meaning of the Establishment Clause—the first 10 words of the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights—not out of disrespect to religion but out of total reverence to religion.

The ten words alluded to by Mr. Edwards state—and I quote: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free-exercise thereof."

Mr. Edwards believes that to allow charitable-choice provisions—that to allow people of faith to participate equally with those of non-faith in government programs and services—would violate the First Amendment! Mr. Edwards evidently believes that the First Amendment requires that the government discriminate against faith. He clearly disagrees with the Supreme Court decision in *Zorach v. Clauson* which declared:

When the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities . . . it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. . . . We find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence. . . . We cannot 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 opposite of 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 us an irreligious people . . . they did not intend to spread over all the public authorities and the whole public action of the nation the dead 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:

[A]t the time of the adoption of the Constitution and of [the First] Amendment . . . the general, if not the universal, sentiment in America was that . . . [a]n 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 if not universal indignation. . . . the real object of the [First] Amendment was . . . to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to an 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 with specified rites and ordinances, and national 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, 1789, report:

Mr. [Peter] Sylvester [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 even in assisting 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-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 legislative 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 official speeches 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—and I quote:

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 limit a minister's ability to voice 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 church bodies 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' “fire-wall” 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. Again, official records prove Mr. Edwards wrong.

The entire debates surrounding 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 of said something about it! None did.

For this reason, legal scholars committed to historical and constitutional accuracy rather than an activist judicial political agenda have correctly drawn attention to the type of blunder committed by Mr. Edwards. In fact, one judge accurately commented: “[So] 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 intentions 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 Constitu-

tion, the “separation of church and state” rhetoric so heartily embraced by Mr. Edwards was invoked in federal courts less than 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 COMMENDATION 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 there before and created new friendships.”

[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.

Sophia, 13 months old, and Sergei, 22 months old, arrived at Kennedy International Airport on Oct. 6 to a red-carpet welcome and were taken with their mothers to the Children's Hospital of the 1,100-bed Westchester Medical Center. A motorcade including the New York City Police and Fire Departments, the Westchester County police and dignitaries and businessmen, accompanied them. Those present included Kirill Speransky, senior counselor of the Russian Mission to the United Nations, Edward Mastal, director of the Highly Enriched Uranium Transparency Program of the United States Department of Energy, and Edward A. Stolzenberg, president and chief executive officer of the Westchester Medical Center.

The children's visit is sponsored by the Forum Club's Children of the World Foundation, a New York-based organization established by William Denis Fugazy, a limousine magnate and lobbyist, to give ailing youngsters in different parts of the world access to the most advanced medical techniques. The Forum Club, an organization of business and civic leaders, counts among its members Lee A. Iaccoca, the former chairman of the Chrysler Corporation.

The Siberian babies are the sixth and seventh to receive heart surgery in the United States under the sponsorship of Mr. Fugazy's foundation, which was formed last year.

Both Mr. Fugazy and Secretary Richardson said that because of the mutual humanitarian, economic and political benefits to both sides, American offers of medical assistance have been well received. The United States selected the two Russian children through the medical department of the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy.

In many cases, care at American hospitals specializing in pediatric heart surgery is the only opportunity for sick children like Sophia and Sergei to live normal lives, said Dr.