

Essay 10.] It is, that in a democracy, the people meet and exercise the government in person; in a republic they assemble and administer it by their representatives and agents. A democracy consequently will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region.

To this accidental source of the error may be added the artifice of some celebrated authors, whose writings have had a great share in forming the modern standard of political opinions. Being subjects either of an absolute, or limited monarchy, they have endeavored to heighten the advantages or palliate the evils of those forms; by placing in comparison with them, the vices and defects of the republican, and by citing as specimens of the latter, the turbulent democracies of ancient Greece, and modern Italy. Under the confusion of names, it has been an easy task to transfer to a republic, observations applicable to a democracy only, and among others, the observation that it can never be established but among a small number of people, living within a small compass of territory.

Such a fallacy may have been the less perceived as most of the governments of antiquity were of the democratic species; and even in modern Europe, to which we owe the great principle of representation, no example is seen of a government wholly popular, and founded at the same time wholly on that principle. If Europe has the merit of discovering this great mechanical power in government, by the simple agency of which, the will of the largest political body may be concentrated, and its force directed to any object, which the public good requires; America can claim the merit of making the discovery the basis of unmixed and extensive republics. It is only to be lamented, that any of her citizens should wish to deprive her of the additional merit of displaying its full efficacy on the establishment of the comprehensive system now under her consideration.

As the natural limit of a democracy is that distance from the central point, which will just permit the most remote citizens to assemble as often as their public functions demand; and will include no greater number than can join in those functions; so the natural limit of a republic is that distance from the center, which will barely allow the representatives of the people to meet as often as may be necessary for the administration of public affairs.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we all know that on Wednesday, in a 2-to-1 decision, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the United States Pledge of Allegiance was unconstitutional. The court held that the pledge was unconstitutional because in 1954 the Congress had the audacity—imagine that—to include a reference to God in its provisions.

Some say these are just mechanical, ceremonial provisions. Get out of my face. That may be what some people think, but the majority of people in this country I don't believe are thinking in terms of ceremonial language.

I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives at that time. I am the only Member of Congress today in either body who can say that I was a Member of the House of Representatives on June 7, 1954, when the words

"under God" were included in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Now I see in the morning paper that the next thing these misguided atheists are wanting to do is to challenge the words "In God we trust."

I was a Member of the House of Representatives on that same date, coincidentally, June 7, 1 year later, 1955, when the House voted to add the words "In God we trust" to the Nation's coins and currency. Every time you take out a dollar bill—that is a pretty popular bill in my lifetime, a dollar bill; here it is—on it we read the words "In God we trust." It is all there. It is on the coins.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives when Congress voted to make that the motto, and here it is, inscribed, which is said in marble, "In God we trust," right here over this door to the Chamber.

Over to my left are those words, "Novus Ordo Seclorum," a new order of the ages.

"E Pluribus Unum," all in one, one in all.

Over here, "Annuit coeptis," God has favored our undertakings.

Here are these inscriptions. Bring in your stone masons and take these off the walls. That is what these pernicious atheists are saying. They want everything to suit themselves.

God have mercy on them. But if they have their way, we will have to have stonemasons come into this Chamber and chisel off these words.

They are not going to have their way. The people of these United States are not going to stand for this. And the courts had better take notice and kind of draw back a little bit. After all, if the American people do not believe in it and if they do not support it, that court decision is not going to be obeyed.

The courts, starting with the Supreme Court, need to take a new look at this first amendment. If anything will ever result in amending the first amendment, then continue to go down this road, I say to the courts. They ought to draw back just a little bit distant from going down the road they are presently on.

I am proud to inform my colleagues that I was in the House when Joint Resolution 243, which was entitled "A Joint Resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America" was enacted. That resolution was approved by the House on June 7, 1954—almost half century ago.

The plaintiff in the case that was just decided is a self-described atheist. His daughter attends elementary school in California. The public schools there, as elsewhere, begin each school day with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. If this court's outlandish and ill-conceived decision is allowed to stand, it will mean that children in public schools in at least nine states will no longer be allowed to recite the pledge of allegiance by referring to

America as "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

That is too much power.

Specifically, the court in this case has held that the words "under God" are unconstitutional because they support the existence of God but deny "atheistic concepts." Unbelievably, the Court has held that this runs counter to the intent of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, because, according to this court, the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment prohibits the government from endorsing any particular religion, including a belief in one God—which the court calls "monotheism"—at the expense of atheism.

Take a look at this Bible, which I hold in my hand. Here it is, the Holy Bible. It is the King James version—King James of England. Here is what it says in Psalm No. 127:

Except the Lord build the House, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

Those are the words written long before the U.S. Constitution was written—written by wise men in many instances, Solomon, Son of David—long before the Constitution was written, long before the court system was established in these United States. Those are the words:

Except the Lord build the House, they labour in vain that build it.

Hear me, Judges!

In reading the court's decision, I was astonished by the tortured reasoning of the majority as opposed to the lucid opinion recorded by Judge Fernandez, the lone dissenter. In responding to the arguments of the majority, Judge Fernandez did not see fit to hold that the phrase "under God" violates the Constitution of the United States.

How silly, how lucidly silly.

If the schoolchildren of America were to be required to commemorate to memory, as they used to be required to commit many things to memory, the Declaration of Independence, would that ninth circuit judge render such an absurd decision concerning the constitutionality of the Declaration of Independence?

Let's just select three or four phrases from the Declaration of Independence.

The Declaration refers to "Nature's God." The Declaration also refers to "the Supreme Judge of the world," meaning God. The Declaration refers to "a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence." This is the Declaration of Independence. It was not written by Congress in 1954, as the words "under God" were inserted into the pledge. This Constitution was not written then. This Declaration of Independence was not written then. And who wrote it? In the main, it was written by Thomas Jefferson, along with John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Philip Livingston, and one other. But there are at least four or five references to "Providence," to "the Divinity," to

"God," to "the Supreme Judge of the world" in the Declaration of Independence.

Now, would the same judge render such a misguided, absurd decision concerning the Declaration of Independence?

Let's see who signed that Declaration of Independence. John Hancock—there are several signers. I will just select a few: John Hancock; George Wythe; Richard Henry Lee; Thomas Jefferson; Benjamin Harrison, who later would become President; Robert Morris, the financier of the American Revolution; Benjamin Rush; Benjamin Franklin; George Clymer; James Wilson of Pennsylvania; Samuel Adams; John Adams; Elbridge Gerry and Roger Sherman. What would they think? What would these signers of the Declaration think?

What would the signers of the Constitution say if they could speak today? What would they say about this pernicious decision we have just read about?

What would Roger Sherman think? What would William Livingston think? I am wondering, if they could speak today, what would they think? What would Benjamin Franklin say? What would Robert Morris think, George Clymer? These are also signers of the Constitution. What would James Wilson think? How about George Read? How about John Dickinson, what would he say—John Dickinson of Delaware, who signed this Constitution?

What would George Washington think? He presided over the Constitutional Convention. What would he say? What would John Rutledge say? What would Charles Cotesworth Pinckney say? What would Charles Pinckney say? What would Pierce Butler say? If they could speak to this—I will use a word that is pretty widely used—god-awful decision, what would they say?

Well, Judge Fernandez said we should recognize "that the religious clauses in the Constitution were not designed to drive religious expression out of public thought; they were simply written to avoid discrimination."

Judge Fernandez acknowledged further, that, "we can run through the litany of tests and concepts which have floated to the surface from time to time." But, he said, "when all is said and done, the danger that the words 'under God' in our Pledge of Allegiance will tend to bring about a theocracy or suppress somebody's beliefs is so minuscule as to be de minimis." He concluded his dissent by finding that there is nothing unconstitutional about the Pledge of Allegiance, because any danger presented to first amendment freedoms by the phrase 'one nation under God' is, in his words, "picayune."

Well, to that, I would say, "Amen."

Mr. President, over my many years in office, I have known other critics, like the majority of this court, who have attacked the words "under God" as they exist in the Pledge of Allegiance. They have implied that the Founding Fathers were essentially

"areligious" or "neutral" about religion. Some of these critics even claim the Founding Fathers were antireligious, that they were bent on establishing a completely secular state in which God has no place. These individuals assert that America's fundamental origins are basically devoid of religious meaning, and that this was the intent of the Founding Fathers.

Well, nothing could be further from the truth.

If we read the Federalist essays, if we read other documents, we know that the intent of the Framers was to keep the new government from endorsing or favoring one religion over another. It was never meant to prohibit any voluntary expression of religious faith. I believe that this court's decision is wrongheaded, destructive, and completely contrary to the intent of the Founders of this great Nation. Instead of ensuring freedom of religion in a nation founded in part to guarantee that basic liberty, a literal suffocation of that freedom has been the result. The rights of those who do not believe in a Supreme being are being zealously guarded, to the denigration, I repeat, the denigration, of the rights of the millions of people in this country who do believe.

The American doctrine of separation of church and state forbids the establishment of any particular religion by the state, but it does not forbid the influence of religious values in the life of our Nation. Religious faith has always been a basic tenet of American life. This is evident throughout the history of America.

The history of the first amendment in particular is one of the great legacies of faith bequeathed by the Founding Fathers, but it is one that is little understood and sometimes distorted—as it was in the recent court decision. In 1791, Congress passed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. We refer to these 10 amendments as the Bill of Rights. The very first amendment recognized the importance of religion in American life, stating that, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, which the second phrase is just as important and has equal weight with the preceding clause. The purpose of this tenet was to allow religious faith to flourish, not to suppress it, not to hobble it.

In fact, even earlier—before the passage of the First Amendment—Congress had clarified its attitude toward religion when, on August 7, 1789, it officially reenacted the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which included an explicit endorsement of religion. Article III of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of learning shall forever be encouraged."

At that juncture, most schools were church enterprises. Congress recognized this, and expected—and I want to

emphasize this—expected that the schools would teach religion and morality.

Against this backdrop, the First Amendment is especially enlightening. James Madison, the principal sponsor of the Bill of Rights and later himself President, was a lifelong Episcopalian who had studied theology at Princeton with apparent plans to enter the ministry. However, on his return to Virginia after college, he changed his mind and went into politics primarily because he was deeply disturbed by the persecution of Baptists and other non-conformists in the Old Dominion. He therefore entered politics to become an ardent advocate of religious tolerance.

Madison declared that, "the religion of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man." Thus, in consultation with John Leland, the leading Baptist clergyman in Virginia, Madison hammered out the church/state principles that were eventually embodied in the first amendment.

As a result, the institutions of Church and State were officially separated, but the exercise of religion and its influence on society were encouraged—not discouraged.

One of the most perceptive observers of the early American scene was the celebrated Alexis de Tocqueville. De Tocqueville, in summarizing the condition of religion in the United States in the 1830s, wrote:

On my arrival in the United States the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention . . . In France I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom marching in opposite directions.

That is what this court would have us do in this country. But, continued de Tocqueville:

But in America, I found they were intimately united and that they reigned in common over the same country . . . Religion . . . must be regarded as the foremost of the political institutions of the country—

Meaning this country—

for if it does not impart a taste for freedom—

We hear the word "freedom" kicked around everywhere today—

it facilitates the use of free institutions.

De Tocqueville grasped what millions of Americans have known, past and present. God has been and continues to be an intimate and profound participant in the ongoing history of these United States. Keep that in mind. God has been and continues to be an intimate and profound participant in the ongoing history of America.

Remember the Scriptures: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." The American people believe that.

Through the decades, most Americans have come to discover the truth of de Tocqueville's conclusion when he asserted that, "Unbelief is an accident." Hear that, ye atheists: "Unbelief is an accident, and faith is the only permanent state of mankind."

In the context of this heritage, then, it is not surprising that the United

States—a nation that evolved out of the American Revolution—should be, at root, a religious nation, from the beginning, from the Mayflower Compact, which in at least four instances refers to God.

Indeed, most of the men who have been President of the United States have been men of exceptional faith. Two Presidents other than James Madison John Adams and Benjamin Harrison had considered entering the ministry. James Garfield was a lay preacher in the Disciples church. And Theodore Roosevelt, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, and James Earl Carter were all Sunday School teachers at various points during their lives.

Of all of the Presidents, Abraham Lincoln was among the most theologically astute and Biblically influenced. Paradoxically, he never formally joined any particular church. Nonetheless, he said the Bible—this is what Lincoln was talking about, the Holy Bible—was “the greatest gift God has given to man.” Hear me, Judge Goodwin of the Ninth Circuit. This is Lincoln speaking, not Robert C. Byrd. Lincoln said the Bible was “the greatest gift God has given to man.” And he was an avid reader of the Bible. He kept a battered old family Bible with him in the White House, and his speeches were laced with Biblical quotations. Reporters of his day stated that his delivery reflected the cadences and rhythms of the King James Version of the English Bible. The first Bible was the Coverdale Bible, written in 1535, the same year Thomas Moore was executed.

But Lincoln was not alone among the Presidents who bore public witness to their personal faith. Every President, from George Washington through George W. Bush, has included some reference to God in his inaugural address. I have gone through all the inaugural addresses. I think there might have been one President who was pretty weak in his references to the Supreme Judge of the world. But in most cases they didn't have any hesitancy about referring to providence, to God.

In his First Inaugural address, Washington declared, “No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency.” George Washington also instituted another custom that has been followed by every President since, by proclaiming a national day of Thanksgiving in late November of 1789.

Jefferson, specifically included in his plans for the University of Virginia the proposal that “proof of the being of God, the Creator, Preserver, and Supreme Being of the Universe, and Author of all morality, and the laws and obligations these infer, will be the province of the Professor of ethics.”

However, nowhere, perhaps, did Jefferson's religious faith have a greater influence than in the words of the Declaration of Independence. At one point, Jefferson wrote, “Religion is the alpha and omega of our moral law.” He also pledged that he had “sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.” In the Declaration, which he wrote, Jefferson made it clear that religion is not only the root of our moral law but of our political rights. The Declaration of Independence contains five synonyms for the word “God,” and maintains that freedom itself is a gift from God as an element of man's being.

As, hopefully, we all recall, the Declaration of Independence states, with respect to God:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. . . .

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions. . . .

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor. . . .

These are various and sundry excerpts from the Declaration of Independence.

Based on this foundation established by Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers, archaeologists in future millennia will have little difficulty reading the evidence of the religious faith and traditions that have been part and parcel of American history. Every nook and cranny of this Capitol—and I might add, of this Capital City—provides such evidence. In fact, wherever one may go in this great national city, he or she is constantly reminded of the strong spiritual awareness of our forefathers who wrote the Constitution, who built the schools, who built the churches, who hewed the forests, who dredged the rivers and harbors, and who created this Republic.

Here in the Senate, for example, the services of an ordained clergyman have been employed since 1789. The Senate Chaplain is the embodiment of a corporate faith in God and the symbol of the eternal judgment that we Senators recognize exists over our legislative and personal actions. Moreover, the institution of the Senate Chaplaincy is itself the result of a historical process that reveals much about the long development of American values.

For example, the first prayers offered in Congress were uttered on September 7, 1774. At the initial meeting of the First Continental Congress, Samuel Adams requested that the convention begin with prayer. As the Revolutionary War continued, the Continental Congress issued calls for periodic national days of prayer and fasting, asking the populace “to reverence the Providence of God, and look up to

Him as the Supreme Disposer of all events and the arbiter of the fate of nations.”

These religious expressions were not just pretense, they were not just ceremonial verbiage. Heavens no. Prayer and worship were held in high regard by the remarkable men who led the American Revolution, and the Chaplaincy of today's Senate is derived directly from the guidance provided by those great men. During the rocky sessions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, the various representatives of the several States were locked in heated disagreement over petty prerogatives with little concern, apparently at that moment, for the national well-being. The weather had been very hot—probably as humid as it gets here in Washington at times—and the delegates to the Convention were tired and they were edgy. The debates were stymied and a melancholy cloud seemed to hang over the Convention.

Suddenly, old Dr. Franklin stood to his feet and faced the chair in which sat GEN George Washington. His famous double-spectacles were low on his nose, and he broke the silence when he addressed George Washington. Franklin reminded the Convention how, at the beginning of the war with England, the Continental Congress had prayed for Divine protection in that very room. “Our prayers, sir, were heard,” he declared. “They were graciously answered. . . .” He then asked, “And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance?”

He continued on saying:

I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?

We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that “except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.”

He selected the same portion of Scripture that I picked today, didn't he? This is Benjamin Franklin talking. He went on to say:

I firmly believe this: and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. . . .

Well, today, we follow the Senate tradition of morning prayer. The Chaplain was among the first officers elected in the Senate upon adoption of the Constitution. In my volumes, “The Senate 1789–1989,” Senators will find a chapter on the Senate Chaplain. I hope they will read it again. To this very day, the first daily order of the business in the Senate is a prayer for Divine Guidance by the Chaplain.

This, of course, was not perceived by the Framers as an attack on the first amendment requiring separation between church and state, for the simple reason that no single church has anything to do with it.

It is not simply prayer in the Senate that reaffirms the religious history of the American people. Let us speak

briefly of some of the other reminders in Washington that reaffirm the proposition that our country is founded on religious principles.

On the Washington Monument, one may read three Biblical quotations on the 24th landing. One was donated by the Sunday school children of the Methodist Church of Philadelphia who contributed a stone bearing an inscription from the Book of Proverbs which states:

Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it.

Another inscription on the Washington Monument, which was contributed by the Methodist Church of New York, is also taken from Proverbs and reads:

The memory of the just is blessed.

That comes from chapter 22 of Proverbs, verse 6.

And the third stone bears these words of Christ from the Book of Luke:

Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

Near the Washington Monument, of course, is the Lincoln Memorial. This massive shrine pays homage to the greatness of this simple and heroic man whose very life was offered on the altar of liberty. We know of his knowledge of the Bible and his gentleness, his power, his determination, and we know that determination of Lincoln came to us clearly through his features chiseled in granite by the sculptor.

We can almost hear Lincoln speak the words which are cut into the wall by his side. Mr. President, we need to get some stonemasons to go down to the Lincoln Memorial. If this judge with his pernicious ruling and if the atheists are successful in having these words stricken from this Chamber—"In God We Trust"—and from the Nation's currency, we will have to have a lot of new dollar bills printed and a lot of new coins. We have to strike those words "In God We Trust" now from the bills if these pernicious suits by atheists are upheld by some misguided judges, like the one who rendered this decision. We had better hire some stonemasons. That might be a pretty good job, come to think of it. Maybe I should just retire at the end of this term—I would be about 89 then—and then I can perhaps get myself a job as a stonemason. I could go down here to the Lincoln Monument—I would not do it—at least I could think in terms of being a stonemason and take these words off that Lincoln Memorial.

Listen to what Lincoln says, according to the inscription on the Lincoln Memorial. Can you just witness those stonemasons going down there and chipping with chisel and hammer, chipping out these words? Listen, these are words that are cut into the wall by the side of Lincoln on the Lincoln Memorial:

That this Nation under God—

Praise God, hallelujah, there they are. That is Lincoln, that is what he said.

That this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom. . . .

Hear that, judges of the Ninth Circuit. Hear that, Judge Goodwin of the Ninth Circuit. I have a great judge in West Virginia named Goodwin. He is a Federal judge. He is Judge Goodwin. But I daresay he would not have rendered that kind of a foolish decision. Here are the words that are cut into the wall by the side of Lincoln:

That this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

In his second inaugural address, this great President—a Republican, by the way. See, I do not hold that against him—in his great second inaugural address, great President Lincoln made use of the words "God," "Bible," "prayer," "providence," "Almighty," and "divine attributes," and then his address continues:

As was said 3,000 years ago so it still must be said, [that] "the judgements of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

That was Abraham Lincoln.

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God—

This is Lincoln talking, Abraham Lincoln talking—

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the brunt of the battle and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all nations.

Before leaving Washington, a visitor might make a final stop at the National Cemetery in Arlington, VA. Here are the peaceful ranks of crosses, stars of David, other religious symbols reminding us that our Government has given its fallen men back to the God who gave them life. The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands for all those who have fallen in battle who could not be identified—members of all sects, faiths, and religions. And here, once more, we find the acknowledgment of God's divine power in the eloquent words:

Here lies in honored glory, an American soldier known but to God.

Can you imagine, we may have to someday get stonemasons to go over there and take hammers and chisels and take those words off that monument.

Thus, the connection between God and the United States of America is long established in the minds of most Americans. If we begin now to erase the connection between God and schoolchildren under the pretense of protecting the so-called constitutional rights of nonbelievers or atheists, as the Ninth Circuit did, will it not be necessary to go a little further, or perhaps a great deal further, in the future?

Will we next be forced to remove the name of God from all official docu-

ments, historic edifices, and patriotic events for fear of possibly offending what is a nonbelieving minority?

Must we do so when even the possibility of offending such a minority is, in the words of Judge Fernandez, picaresque?

What will the court crier say—"God save this honorable court"? He will have to stop there, will he not? He will have to say something else. Would he say, "President Bush save this honorable court?" Would he say, "President Clinton, save this honorable court?" One can see how silly such a decision was and how foolish it is to pursue that line in this country with all of its history.

Obviously, in establishing and maintaining a secular government, the American people never intended to foster an atheistic or a faithless society. In this light, in closing, I recite perhaps more sincerely than ever the prayer that climaxes one of our greatest national hymns:

Our fathers' God to Thee,  
Author of liberty,  
To Thee we sing;  
Long may our land be bright  
With freedom's holy light;  
Protect us by Thy might,  
Great God our King.

#### INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Nation will honor its birthday on the forthcoming July 4. That was the day on which, in 1826, both Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died. They both died on the same day, 50 years exactly from the date on which Thomas Jefferson wrote that Declaration of Independence and the Congress approved it. What a coincidence. God works in miraculous ways, his wonders to perform, does not he?

As I look forward to that Fourth of July, I know the Senate will not be in session. But before we depart, I want to talk about the event that Senators and Members of the other body will be celebrating next week back in their home States and districts: Independence Day.

As I think of Independence Day, I think of Henry Van Dyke's poem, "America For Me."

'Tis fine to see the Old World, and travel up  
and down  
Among the famous palaces and cities of renown,  
To admire the crumbly castles and the statues of the kings,—  
But now I think I've had enough of antiquated things.  
So it's home again, and home again, America for me!  
My heart is turning home again, and there I long to be,  
In the land of youth and freedom beyond the ocean bars,  
Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars.  
Oh, London is a man's town, there's power in the air;  
And Paris is a woman's town, with flowers in her hair;  
And it's sweet to dream in Venice, and it's great to study in Rome;