



Our National Treasure—Freemasonry Wall of Separation and Original Intent

Author Michael Glenn Maness – Maness7@att.net
An old closing chapter from previous edition

www.PreciousHeart.net/freemasonry

	<p>Character Counts Freemasonry USA's National Treasure and Source of Our Founding Fathers' Original Intent</p> <p>Character counting in Freemasonry is the U.S.A.'s <i>National Treasure</i> and predominant source of our Founding Fathers' original intent in our precious Constitution.</p> <p>Order Now</p>
--	---



The greatest virtues are those which are
most useful to other persons.

Aristotle 384-322 B.C., Greek Philosopher



[USA Founded upon Freedom, and the Greatness of the Fraternity is in
the Name, even *Free-masonry*](#)

[A. The Wall of Separation More than a Metaphor](#)

[B. Original Intent of Founding Fathers—Levy & Curry](#)

[First and Fourteenth Amendments](#)

[WEDGE 7. Leonard Levy & Thomas Curry—Restriction of Powers](#)

[C. Original Intent of Founding Fathers—Liberty & Equality](#)

[D. Our Founding Fathers Were Men of Honor and Faith](#)

[E. Freemasonry's Contribution to Christianity and to the USA](#)

[WEDGE 8. Character Counts *the Hammer that Chisels Credibility*](#)

In the land where honor lives and character counts,
liberty and equality and freedom of conscience become
National Treasures.

USA Founded upon *FREEDOM*, and the Greatness of the Fraternity is in the Name, even *Free-masonry*

Our country was founded upon *FREEDOM*, even the dire *need* for significant liberty, meaningful equality, and the growing need to address justice. Even today, we struggle with the meaning of freedom as a treasure *still* compounding interest and blessing all the Earth. Few have expounded upon *freedom* better than Rollo May. Only *inside* the context of May's book can one truly appreciate his sweeping statement, "*There is no authentic inner freedom that does not, sooner or later, also affect and change human history.*"¹ He and a few other depth psychologists like Victor E. Frankl have captured with intricacy of the meaning of *human* freedom. *FREEDOM*—Victor E. Frankl's profound and seminal insight that "the last of the human freedoms—to choose one's attitude in any given set of circumstances, to choose one's own way" was for him hewn from the bitter human quarry of misery in a Nazi concentration camp.²

The brilliance of these men and their profound insights indicate the value of *FREEDOM*, indeed the criticality of freedom to the soul and also the soul's greatest struggle itself as grappling with the freedom. The soul can only grow within some measure of freedom, and yet defining that measure is as difficult as measuring the heavens. Inside the Christian tradition, we look to heaven in many ways as a final consummation of freedom. Theologically, freedom has eternal dimensions as we struggle with our human free will versus God's providential guidance, and we find ourselves wanting.³

FREEDOM—we all know something, want more, and wonder at our limits. When given a chance to obtain freedom, lives will be sacrificed and sometimes taken. In the founding of the USA, the *want* of freedom drove our Founding Fathers, and they established the *first* government directed by and dedicated to freedom in the history of the world.

Now after all these pages, may I tell you again that the greatness of the fraternity is in its name—even *Free-masonry*, and that a *Free-mason* is trusted to use his *FREEDOM* as his conscience directs and also respect the *free* conscience of his brother. And all of the vast array of character counting symbols and allegories revolve around the building man's free will under his God, to his family, and to his country, even placing Freemasonry itself *under* those three.

We are Ancient *FREE* and Accepted Masons. Let's take this home.



A. The Wall of Separation More than a Metaphor

This is all about the integrity of our Founding Fathers, many of them Freemasons, and most of them were educated and experienced.

Of the fifty-five delegates in Philadelphia nearly 60 percent had attended college.... Nine had gone to Princeton, four to Yale, and three to Harvard. Virtually all ... had family or

¹ Rollo May, *Freedom and Destiny* (NY: Dell, 1981): 57. Italics his. See also his extraordinary *The Meaning of Anxiety, Man's Search for Himself, Love and Will, The Courage to Create, and The Discovery of Being*.

² Viktor E. Frankl's, *Man's Search for Meaning: An Introduction to Logotherapy* (NY: Clarion, 1970): 75.

³ Michael G. Maness, *Heart of the Living God: Love, Free Will, Foreknowledge, Heaven: a Theology of the Treasure of Love* (2005; 706p.). We struggled, and included in the appendices reviews of over 50 works by the major authors, most of them members of the Evangelical Theological Society. See William Lane Craig, *God, Time and Eternity* (Kluwer Academic, 2001), *The Only Wise God—The Compatibility of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom* (Baker, 1987; 157p.), and *The Cosmological Argument from Plato to Leibniz* (Macmillan, 1980; 1980; 305p.); Millard J. Erickson, *What Did He Know and When Did He Know it?* (Zondervan, 2003); Clark H. Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover—a Theology of God's Openness* (Baker, 2001; 202p.); William Hasker, *God, Time, and Knowledge* (Cornell Univ. Press, 1989); William Ockham (1285-?1349), *Predestination, God's Foreknowledge, and Future Contingents* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969; 136p.); and Alvin Plantinga, *God, Freedom and Evil* (Harper and Row, 1974; 112p.).

commercial connections in England and were at home with English ideas and politics.... It should be no surprise, then, that behind the godless Constitution crafted by the framers were ideas about church and state borrowed from the mother country.⁴

They knew what they were doing, and those universities had Christian roots.

Our Founding Fathers decided to stop rendering to Caesar what was Caesar's; they stopped believing in the right of kings to claim divine rights to oppression. Our Founding Fathers decided to follow the driving course of freedom screaming out from their inner bones, with—for several of them—their fraternity and faith lending support and motivation.

On our country's foundation, and outside the D.C. beltway politics, few things are more important in the USA than freedom of religion and freedom of speech. And cannot be distilled much more than in what the Constitution actually says and in Jefferson's metaphor, "Wall of Separation between church and state."

What is clear—among the vast ocean of literature—is that Freemasonry was there from the beginning on an island and two continents, and Freemasonry is nearly totally ignored by the Religious Right today. When some of the Religious Right do talk about Freemasonry, they are no better than the more focused anti-Mason in concocting Frankenstein rationales.

Among the top two hundred Founding Fathers, the single group that most of them belonged to was Freemasonry. Except for the actual ministers of the gospel, most do not appear to be anything like 21st century evangelicals. Some were solid and devout Christians, but some were deists and others were never found in church.

Most of them frequented the taverns—*most*.

The thing that united our Founding Fathers most of all—above all else—was the cause of freedom and how to obtain significant liberty, equality, and justice with the least amount of bloodshed. As the Constitutional ratification process ensued, we can say that the Founding Fathers concurred on freedom, both the federalists and anti-federalists, and Freemason George Washington presided over the Constitutional Convention and was elected the first president by unanimous decision—the first and last time that would ever happen.

Among that finite group, the majority of them were Freemasons over any other single group or Christian sect. Remarkable. And yet today, some call their fraternity evil without respect to the character of those mighty men. An agenda has overtaken us that is truly scary and that threatens the America we love when character has ceased to be definitive. The anti-Masons are interwoven with the Religious Right and with these constitutional struggles—inseparably—for no other organization has the roots to our Founding Fathers even remotely similar to Freemasonry.

So now we close this book with a chapter on the most important element of guidance to our country—our beloved USA Constitution. The need to address this is subtle at first. It does not appear like the Constitutional original intent issues have a bearing upon the credibility of Freemasonry or vice versa. And in one sense they do not. But if you are trying to discover what the original intent of the Constitution was, in *addition* to what our Founding Fathers wrote, then the credibility of Freemasonry impacts that original intent in profound ways.

We need to be careful with our precious Constitution and the First Amendment. We do not need or want an established religion, and *that* was our Founding Fathers' original intent. But we

⁴ Isaac Kramnick and R. Laurence Moore, *The Godless Constitution* (1996): 67-68.

are evolving. Our Founding Fathers were not so naïve to think that they had settled forever all of the problems. Leonard W. Levy wisely stated part of our future in 1986:

We should not want the ban on establishment of religion to mean only what it meant in 1789 or only what its framers intended. Oliver Wendell Holmes said, “historical continuity with the past is not a duty, it is only a necessity.” That Delphic statement can be construed to mean that we cannot escape history because it has shaped us and guides our policies, but we are not obliged to remain static. Two hundred years of expanding the meaning of democracy should have some constitutional impact. We are not bound by the wisdom of the Framers; we are bound only to consider whether the purposes they had in mind still merit political respect and constitutional obedience. History can only be a guide, not a controlling factor.⁵

Indeed—inspired though it may have been, nevertheless, the Constitution is not the Word of God. It’s precious but not solid, for we are still working on the fuller meaning of liberty and equality for *all*. So Levy continues,

If we followed the framers of the Constitution blindly, we would be duplicating the method of the *Dred Scott* decision by freezing the meaning of words at the time they became part of the Constitution.⁶....

Those who profess to be broad separationists ought to understand that popular government will continue to aid religion and show respect for it, and that not every accommodation with religion, deriving from incidental assistance, is necessarily unconstitutional.... Trying to insure that the wall of separation is really impregnable might be futile and dangerously counterproductive. Indeed, the cracks in the wall might be more numerous than at present without seriously harming it or the values it protects. A moment of silence in the public school for meditation or prayer ... would not really make much difference, if they were not omens that the cause of religion would be still further promoted by government. Accommodationists seem insatiable and use every exception as precedents for still more exceptions. The moral majority does not compromise. Consequently passionate separationists who see every exception as a disaster, tend to run around ... screaming, “The wall is falling....” It really is not and will not, so long as it leaks just a little at the seams. If it did not leak a little, it might generate enough pressure to break it....

Despite continuing complaints about the wall of separation between government and religion, that is the policy embodied by the establishment clause. The Constitution erected that wall.... Because the domains of religion and government remain separated, religion in the United States, like religious liberty, thrives mightily, far more than it did 200 years ago when the vast majority of Americans were religiously unaffiliated....

[Quoting from Roger Williams in 1644] “When they have opened up a gap in the hedge or *wall of separation* between the garden of the church and the wilderness of the world, God hath ever broke down the wall itself, removed the candlestick, and made His garden a wilderness, as to this day. And that therefore if He will ever please to restore His garden and paradise again, it must of necessity be walled in peculiarly unto Himself from the world....”

⁵ Leonard W. Levy, *The Establishment Clause* (1986; 236p.): 175-176, with quote from Roger Williams from *A Letter to Mr. John Cottons* (1643), in *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams* (1963, 391p.) following the modernized version by Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition* (1962): 98.

⁶ The *Dred Scott* case was argued in 1856-57 in the U.S. Supreme Court, which considered the whole issue of Federal power over slavery in the territories, including the free territory of Illinois in which Dred Scott wanted to remain, freed from the slavery of his Missouri origin. They ruled that Congress had no constitutional power to prohibit slavery, which helped inflame the anti-slavery issues growing in the North.

Thus, the wall of separation had the allegiance of a most profound Christian impulse as well as a secular one.... The wall of separation ensures the government's freedom from religion and the individual's freedom of religion. The second probably cannot flourish without the first.

Separation has other bountiful results. Government and religion in America are mutually independent of each other.... Government maintains a benign neutrality toward religion without promoting or serving religion's interests in any significant way except, perhaps, for the policy of tax exemption.... The joint chiefs of staff supposedly begin their meetings with prayer, as do our legislatures. The incantation, "God save the United States and this honorable Court" and the motto "In God We Trust" and its relatives are of trifling significance in the sense that they have little genuine religious content. Caesar exploits, secularizes, and trivializes, but leaves organized religion alone. Free of government influence, organized religion in turn does not use government for religious ends. Thus, history has made the wall of separation real. The wall is not just a metaphor. It has constitutional existence.... Despite its detractors and despite its leaks, cracks, and its archways, the wall ranks as one of the mightiest monuments of constitutional government in this nation.⁷

In the light of Leonard W. Levy, the idea of original intent as articulated by David Barton and a few in the Religious Right takes a blow.

Liberty and equality turn on freedom of conscience, and only a semi-permeable but solid wall of separation can truly insure freedom of conscience. We should be very afraid of those who would persecute Christianity and Freemasonry as they please and likewise be afraid of Christian revisionists who occult character, and desire to return to a time of legally regulating one's conscience.

The entire world owes an insurmountable debt to our Founding Fathers and Founding Mothers, the leaders and followers, generals and soldiers—all of them. Among that corpus was an avant-garde made up of a finite number, dozens easily discernable and a few hundred more, and they hailed from diverse religious and philosophical backgrounds. Some were just backwoods men with a strong right arm—like Joe Bob, without a lot of philosophic wit but also without a lot of Christian double-speak. But they all agreed on the *direction* of liberty. And of all of the discernable religious and philosophic systems and institutions, the majority of the avant-garde Founding Fathers were connected with Freemasonry over any other single system or institution. It assumed within its membership the broadest cross-section of various Christian sects and—importantly—some like Benjamin Franklin who did not align themselves with any church sect, and for whom *Christian* does not apply in any meaningful sense.

Given the above, that must mean that Freemasonry contributed to the original intent of our USA Constitution. Therefore, if one has a problem with what was written in the First Amendment and the metaphor of Wall of Separation used by Jefferson, and only then, one would need to look at their intentions, and Freemasonry from there from the beginning. Freemasons had been chopping the wood for the furnace of freedom for 50+ years in the colonies.

Let Freedom Ring as a divine and human right, and whether or not one is a Christian. Freemasonry lodge meetings held a larger diversity of faith groups, non-Christian deists, and

⁷ Leonard W. Levy, *The Establishment Clause* (1986; 236p.): 175-176, with quote from Roger Williams from *A Letter to Mr. John Cottons* (1643), in *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams* (1963, 391p.) following the modernized version by Perry Miller, *Roger Williams: His Contribution to the American Tradition* (1962): 98.

non-church goes than any other single group meeting *under* God. That is also crucial information for the detectives of original intent, if original intent is truly as pivotal as David Barton and others treasure hunt.

For those of us who *are* Christian, yes, we interpret the movement for a new nation and institution of freedom within the confines of God's own divine and providential actions and desires. Christians can see that God himself helped us write a Constitution that forced us to take responsibility for ourselves. God helped us—the *people*, the commoners—take a step up. And God helped us write a Constitution that prevented us from making God the veritable King *in absentia* so that His (?) spiritual leaders could speak for Him and institute laws on His behalf. God wrote Himself out of our beloved Constitution. Our Founding Fathers knew what they were doing in 1789, and so did God.

That Constitution was the first of its kind, where a nation could grow and where a Christian's freedom would be protected, and the opposite, where no church could not usurp control over the government (or its pastors or priests). The *people* would control who would govern them. The *people* would choose *their* president, *their* governors, and their *own* representatives. Thank God.

The church too can best prosper when those who join, join willingly and with the least political or business or monetary incentives. I want people to come to my church because God Himself through His Son Jesus Christ is *the* reason and most attractive element. Period. The very micro-second that partisan politics is allowed in the church, that church ceases to be a *church*. Only an abysmal understanding of human nature would think any church or churchman could duly avoid being confused with yet another political caucus at the very second partisan politics entered the door. Said in another way, there is no man or woman alive of such noble and pure sentiment capable of fairly and absolutely dissecting their own human heart, much less that of any political candidate.

Without that divine ability, there is no way for *any* church to carry on its holy cause and at the same time give a *holy* endorsement of any political candidate. And *any* endorsement is a holy one, for the church *is* God's work on earth.

Thank God for our Founding Fathers who constituted against church-state coalitions. Thank God for guiding them then. And no thanks to the church-state coalitions who were always more interested in their own self-preservation than they were in the commoners' welfare or freedom. The government should not support or detract from religion, and that was constituted. The government should protect us and our church's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and not interfere.

Our beloved Founding Fathers founded a government upon democratic principles that were an inherent and intrinsic part of Freemasonry in a fashion in which many of those principles were still being formulated in the colonial churches. Henry Leonard Stillson noted that Freemasonry judges itself,

by its own Constitution and Landmarks, which are unchangeable, and which are founded on equal justice to all. Freemasonry contains within itself the divine law of doing unto others as they would that others do unto them. In peace it is prosperous, in strife it is sympathetic, in adversity it is submissive. In this country [United States] it has had its times of prosperity and adversity. The ending of the Revolution marked a period of thankfulness for delivery from

bondage and an almost worship for the deliverer, General George Washington, whose death was mourned as no other man has been mourned in this country.⁸

Our Founding Fathers *founded* a government upon democratic and republican principles that were—amazingly—inherent and more fine-tuned in Freemasonry than in most of the churches in the colonies, most especially that church which came from England. Freemasonry is *the* example of a democratic institution *separate* from the church and *under* God. That *separation* from the church and *under* God—and not a religion—is the most public and common aspect of Freemasonry, next to the tradecraft of character counting, that is maliciously occulted by too many. Why hide that? Hiding that hides the *original* intent of the Constitution most of all. Many of the avant-garde and influential Founding Fathers were Freemasons, and they decided—under God and God guided many of them—to free the church, so that the church would live or die on its own accord. The true church did not need state taxes or state endorsement to exist. If the church be truly of God, even the gates of hell cannot prevail against the church.

A truly free church will prosper best in a truly free society. The true church needs no government to keep her alive, and that should be especially so in the USA where the original intent of our Constitution was *protection* of religious and civil liberty. Religious and civil liberty is the USA guarantee and comfort for the sincere believer in the true church—no matter how you define what is absolutely and exclusively *true* for you.

And the church has prospered in the United States like she has not at any other time in its history, truly prospered in membership, world clout, and of course in property and wealth, and other faith groups have prospered, too. Who will supply the footnote here on the trillions of dollars of assets and billions of dollars of cash flows of both the Catholic and Protestant churches, plus the billions in the other faith groups? *Prosper* is an understatement. This gargantuan prosperity of the church itself is one indicator of God’s blessings upon the Constitution and its original intent to charter a new institution of freedom and justice for all.



B. Original Intent of Founding Fathers—Levy and Curry

I scream at the idea of compulsory church attendance. I barf at the idea of being taxed to support the city’s Christian denominational preference or have to get a certificate showing proof of my attendance at a minority church to avoid the city denominationally-specific religious tax. Yet that was the law in many towns of colonial America prior to the Revolutionary War. *Compulsory* church attendance! Whoever thought that would make for better or more devoted Christian believers was a lunatic.

Listen—we are nearly through—so please see two harbingers of that lunacy today. The recent religious fiasco surrounding the Air Force Academy has ominous overtones for the radical fundamentalist Christian. Simply because he is in the majority, and usually a *he*, the fundamentalist feels no compunction to misuse authority, harass, and make very unpleasant the life of anyone who is *not* a fundamentalist Christian. Ayesha N. Khan and Richard B. Katskee of Americans United legal team uncovered more and sent their report to Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld and others. Among several of the grosser abuses: “when cadets declined to attend

⁸ Henry Leonard Stillson, et al, editor, *History of the Ancient and Honorable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons and Concordant Orders* (Boston & NY: The Fraternity Publishing Company, 1904; 904p.): 227, by Charles E. Meyer.

chapel after dinner during Basic Cadet Training, they were made to suffer humiliation by being placed by upperclass cadet staff into a ‘Heathen Flight’ and marched back to their dormitories.”⁹ Rob Boston reported that former three-year Regan White House attorney-advisor Mikey Weinstein was told by his son that he had been called a [expletive] Jew and that he could hardly stand the harassment any more. At that, the elder Weinstein initiated his own investigation that snowballed into a Colorado Springs newspaper report and Yale Divinity School study. Then Americans United got involved. Only *after* exposure of years of abuses—where the privileged class *was* the fundamentalist Christian—did the Air Force conduct a review and incorporate training.

Furthermore, Rob Boston reported that Academy Chaplain Captain Melinda Morton was pressured by the Air Force Chief Chaplain Whittinton to deny details of what went on as told to *USA Today*, reflecting that she did not think she had “much of a future in the Air Force”; she was relieved of her duties at the academy. Worse, even as the controversy spread, the Pentagon announced that one-star Brigadier General Johnny Weida, Academy Commandant of Cadets and participant in much of favoritism, is being promoted to two stars.¹⁰

Only after *repeated* exposure and not until *many* clear and present abuses were exposed did this get addressed. It was not a concern until the abuses multiplied and escalated. Then an academy chaplain speaks up and is relieved, and the general in charge is promoted even *as* the exposure unfurls. This is the 21st century in the United States of America. U.S. Air Force Cadets are being trained only *now* with a new 50-minute program called Respecting the Spiritual Values of all People only after the academy exposure. Up until the exposure forced notice like a crown of thorns—until that very time—the cadets were compelled to pay heavy psychological taxes to the federal-state church, a clear church-state coalition under a brigadier general. Dissident cadets were marked as inferior people and forced to march in “heathen flights” and denied equality and liberty and equal rights compared to their more favored fundamentalist cadets and overseers.

That *is* compulsory church attendance in the 21st century with a necktie. Only the U.S. Constitution prevented some of the cadets from being run out of the country—or beaten. And the brigadier general who permitted, participated, and charged many, well ... let’s see ... what do we do? He is promoted?

Is the U.S. *still* being charged \$400 for Ace Hardware \$15 hammers?

What is next? ... Oh, let me show you more about Frankenstein politics.

David Barton and other researchers of his ilk of the Religious Right pretend to contribute to Christian original intent in our beloved U.S. Constitution without a droplet on the vast array of established Christianity throughout the colonies prior to 1789. Many in the Religious Right pretend that the constituting of the United States was meant to be the establishment of a Christian nation, like the absence of *God* in our beloved Constitution was a mistake. They pretend like they do not know (or hide) just how profusely established the Christian religion was in the colonies. Christians banished, jailed, or killed other *Christians* who did not share the exact same *Christian* views.

⁹ Ayesha N. Khan, Legal Director, Richard B. Katskee, Assistant Legal Director, “Report of Americans United for Separation of Church and State on Religious Coercion and Endorsement of Religion at the United States Air Force Academy,” Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 5-28-05, 14p. On “Heathen Flight,” pg. 2. See www.au.org/pdf/050428AirForceReport.pdf.

¹⁰ Rob Boston, “Kingdom of Heaven: Fundamentalist Christian Crusade At Air Force Academy Sparks Official Military Investigation,” *Church and State* 58-6 (June 2005): 8-11 (128-131).

Compare, Pam Zubeck, “Air Force deems chaplain’s call appropriate,” *GAZETTE* (Colo. Springs), Apr. 27, 2005, which also obtained a copy of the July 2004 Yale report.

Our beloved U.S. Constitution was a departure and not an establishment of Christianity. Congress shall make “no law” is clear.

David Barton would have done a service if he had merely addressed the historical sections and rationales of Leonard W. Levy or Thomas J. Curry on the First Amendment.¹¹ Without mention of them, Barton’s agenda becomes confusing or deceptive—occulting at least. Whichever and regardless, the likes of Levy and Curry cannot be ignored and at the same time claim, as Barton does, to discern a Christian *original* intent of our beloved U.S. Constitution.¹² We will show you below how Barton, the Religious Right, and several SBC experts lambasting Freemasonry reveal their own original intent to revise history in how they treat Freemasonry—and deception bleeds through on every page of their work.

Intent is a ghost of a term by very definition, fickle and opposing absoluteness absolutely. Truly, *intent* is without content and without concreteness except for those who can divine or soothsay or read the very minds of men dead for 200 years. *Intent* cannot be clarified except by reading between the lines of a thousand pages and the debates on the 18th century over what the Founding Fathers actually wrote. David Barton fishes out a few Christian statements and hops over valleys to construe a Christian intent with a big bibliography.

In all of David Barton’s fishing and hopping, we cannot conceive that Barton merely missed the actual history of the Constitutional Conventions themselves. *No sir*, David Barton shows us enough table dressing to confirm he has been in the historical kitchen. That leaves us with Barton trying to deceive us with respect to what actually took place, and he especially deceives us regarding Freemasonry. There are no records of several states’ ratifications, and the records that do exist are scanty—but there nevertheless. There is no *intent* without considering Freemasonry. Freemasons Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and especially James Madison—the Father of the Constitution—were pivotal by all accounts.

We are talking about the First Amendment and all that has attended to it for last 200 years.

¹¹ Leonard W. Levy’s *The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment* (1986; 236p.), *Levy’s Original Intent and the Framers’ Constitution* (2000, 1st 1988; 525p.), and Thomas J. Curry’s *The First Freedoms: Church and State in America to the Passage of the First Amendment* (1986) vis-à-vis David Barton’s *Original Intent* (2000, 2004; 534p.).

¹² Leonard W. Levy, *The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment* (1986; 236p.) and *Original Intent and the Framers’ Constitution* (2000; 1st 1988; 525p.).

First Amendment. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.¹³

The First Amendment is tied to the Fourteenth Amendment.

Fourteenth Amendment. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.¹⁴

First and Fourteenth Amendments

To arrive at the original intent of those “rights” in the Bill of Rights, and the intent behind leaving *God* out of the entire Constitution, the closest we can get to seeing clearly the ghost of *intent*—the closest—is to look at all of the written proceedings of all of the national and state Conventions themselves, that is, when they wrote anything at all. Some portions of the constitutional conventions were in secret and sworn to secrecy, just like a Freemasonry lodge, but that is never revealed either. The conventional proceedings is Barton’s failure or more likely intentional deceit, and those proceedings are Leonard W. Levy’s and Thomas J. Curry’s mighty strengths.

Equating patriotism with Christianity is a big market today, and many times that equation of patriotism with Christianity and vice versa is a prostitution of patriotism itself. And that amalgamation is—dare I say—a sacrilege to Christianity. Both Christianity and patriotism are cheapened when they are linked, even wedded to partisan politics. The use of George Washington’s picture as illustrative of the founding of America as a Christian nation is *the* example of prostitution. George Washington was more honorable and not like any evangelical we know today.

Enter one mighty man among many—Leonard W. Levy and the first hundred pages of his *The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment*, and David Barton is the tailless mouse. Levy’s reputation and character alone should have been attractive, very attractive, if Barton had been interested in dealing with not-so-innocent people. Listen—as I studied this as an innocent myself, I could not believe it, but Levy published in 1986! My problem is that I had to *discover* Levy on my own, like a lot, because too so-called experts in the Religious Right never reveal what they ought to. They pretend to be knowledgeable and claim definitive knowledge, but they do not provide any substance that holds up on the academic highways.

¹³ The Constitution of the United States, 1789.

¹⁴ The Constitution of the United States, 1789.

They make the scariest claims—evil—about their own Frankenstein concoctions, but fail time and again to make Frankenstein credible and able-bodied enough to stand on its own. Frankenstein only frightens the innocent.

From David Barton’s book, there is no possible way Barton could have overlooked Leonard W. Levy or Freemasonry. The first fifty pages of Levy demand attention and rattle the brain with good sense.

The kind-hearted Professor Levy lays out the history prior to, during, and up to ratification of our precious First Amendment—all from the original sources and indicating precisely what was recorded and not recorded, pro and con, clear and plain. Establishment of religion was the order of the day in many colonies, but not all. Everyone knew what establishment of Christianity meant: in England it meant a state church, and in America there were multiple establishments by design in many of the colonies. And some like Rhode Island did not establish anything, also, by design.

WEDGE 7. Leonard Levy & Thomas Curry—Restriction of Powers

In the context of this book, Leonard W. Levy’s and Thomas J. Curry’s work are milestones of Constitutional contribution. More than David Barton, they sifted the original sources and focused less on the ghost of original intent and more upon the history of the Constitution itself. Whatever may have been the influence of Christianity or Freemasonry upon the minds and hearts and lives of the Founding Fathers, what deeds they did, what they wrote, and the history surrounding the establishment of religion—all of that led our Founding Fathers to the First Amendment being all about **restriction** of power and **away** from the First Amendment containing any kind of governmental empowerment. Theoretically—Levy and Curry become another hammering blow to the wedge of credibility between the anti-Mason historical Frankenstein and the clarity of the nobility of Freemasonry’s presence and advocacy of liberty.

Levy and Curry do not mention Freemasonry, and they do not need to in order for their case to be made. In more light, we can all see how nearly every anti-Mason Frankenstein of significance today is given life—as from lightning—from some corner of the Religious Right. The Religious Right seem to be united around the idea of discovering our Christian roots and loosely desire in one form or another to favor Christianity. That’s good for Christians, but it is unchristian to impute and paint onto the historical canvas a Christian intent that was not there. It is shameful to avoid the Christian persecution that the Founding Fathers clearly meant to write out—congress shall make “no law”—and it is malignant to avoid the pervasive influence of Freemasonry moral symbolism. (Dare I repeat here: it is deceptive *proPaganda* to impute paganism into 1776 or today’s Freemasonry.) Then along come Levy’s and Curry’s historical revelations that deliver another heavily hammered wedge of credibility to the whole affair—a

wedge occulted by David Barton. Better than just about anybody, Levy and Curry document how and why our Founding Fathers left *God* and *Christianity* out of our our precious First Amendment, in ways similar to Isaac Kramnick and R. Laurence Moore in their book, *The Godless Constitution: The Case Against Religious Correctness*.

That does not appear to be a *hammering* blow to the wedge credibility between the anti-Mason historical Frankenstein and Freemasonry's nobility of purpose—not at first light. If original intent is important at all, then Freemasonry must be a crucial part of discerning that intent; regardless, *intent* is truly ghostly and impossible to fully discern. In the light of Levy and Curry, the actual history of the process reveals attitudes that sync far more with Freemasonry principles. Coupled with what we showed above and what we know of Freemasonry's presence, coupled with the concrete witness of the U.S. Capitol's moral symbolism, and coupled with the Constitution's absence of the words *God* and *Christianity*—all these and more combine with Levy and Curry's historical documentary of the Constitution to lighten up the character and struggle and integrity of our Founding Fathers. Therefore, this pile-driven wedge between the anti-Mason Frankenstein and Freemasonry nobility of character is precisely in sync with the heavily hammered wedges of historians Steven Conrad Bullock and Margaret C. Jacob and so many more.

Levy gives a masterly cogent history of the formulation of the First Amendment, and so then the Bill Rights was historically—*intentionally*—given to restrict the powers of government. Because the Constitution gave no authority over religion to begin with, many felt a bill of rights truly superfluous. But to insure that a later government would not change, the Bill of Rights was added to further restrict any later government. After the history—just like Thomas J. Curry—Leonard W. Levy gives us a precise statement on the First Amendment being explicitly restrictive in his historical presentation. David Barton cannot stand here. Levy presents the history *without* speculating much upon the ghost of intention swirling around the Constitutional conventions. However Christianity or Freemasonry may have influenced the minds of our Founding Fathers, there is enough *history* present to document that they were men of integrity. After 80 pages of historical proofs and uncanny precision, Levy condenses his pith.

The history of the drafting of the establishing clause does not provide us with the understanding of what was meant by “an establishment of religion.” To argue, however, as proponents of a narrow interpretation do, that the amendment permits congressional aid and support to religion in general or to all denominations without discrimination, leads to the impossible conclusion that the First Amendment added to Congress' power. **Nothing supports such a conclusion.** Every bit of evidence goes to prove that the First Amendment, like the others, was intended to restrict Congress to its enumerated powers. Because Congress possessed no power under the Constitution to legislate on matters concerning religion, Congress has no such power even in the absence of the First Amendment. It is therefore unreasonable, even fatuous, to believe that an express prohibition of power—“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion”—vests or creates the power, previously nonexistent, of supporting religion by aid to all religious groups. The Bill of Rights, as

Madison said, was not framed “to imply powers not meant to be included in the enumeration.”¹⁵

Or more powerfully in his next book on original intent, Levy says,

The language of the establishment clause provides few sure conclusions. If, taken literally, the clause creates no wall of separation, neither does it refer to a national religion or to the concept of preference; it does not permit government preference for religion over irreligion, let alone of one religion or church over others. It does not even restrict itself to laws banning establishments of religion, because it applies, more broadly, to laws “respecting” establishments of religion. Therefore, a law that falls short of creating an establishment, whatever that might be, comes within the constitutional prohibition if it concerns an establishment or is a step in that direction. But the clearest proposition about the establishment clause is that it limits power by placing an absolute restriction on the United States: “Congress shall make no law....” Reading an empowerment from that is about as valid as reading the entrails of a chicken for the meaning of the establishment clause or for portents of the future.

The clause was added to the Constitution because the unamended text not only placed religious liberty in jeopardy; it seemed to allow for the implication that Congress might exercise powers not prohibited and might, therefore, create an establishment of religion—or so the Constitution’s opponents claimed [anti-Federalists]. To the supporters of the Constitution, such reasoning was specious because the proposed new national government would possess merely limited powers.... If no power existed, it could neither be exercised or abused. Of the many statements of this argument, the best known is that of Alexander Hamilton in *The Federalist*, where he concluded simply: “For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do? Why, for instance, should it be said that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained, when no power is given by which restrictions may be imposed?”¹⁶

Those few paragraphs appear as mere claims here. But after 80 pages in the first quote and 150 in the second, they are no longer claims; they are incisive and rock-solid conclusions demanding attention. Ironic in the context of this chapter, Hamilton’s next sentence in the last quote on the First Amendment is, “I will not contend that such a statement would confer a regulating power; but it is evident that it would furnish, to men disposed to usurp, a plausible pretense for claiming that power.”¹⁷

Again, the anti-Masons fumble and many of the Religious Right fumble—certainly Barton—truly fumble between clarity and revisionism. In the light of Leonard W. Levy, only Freemasonry history and character counting can help both the anti-Masons and the Religious Right regain any sense of balance within their own purposes. Without an apology, sincerely and

¹⁵ Leonard W. Levy, *The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment* (1986; 236p.): 84-85; later, 92, Levy poignantly says, “If, as nonpreferentialists [those believing the establishment clause only restricts aid to a single sect or prohibits a national church] suppose, the views of James Madison, the legislative history of the establishment clause, and its original meaning support the constitutionality of impartial government aid to religion, then the guiding light of history burns incandescently on behalf of nonpreferentialism. But they are wrong in thinking that they have a prop in Madison. They misconstrue the legislative history of the clause. And the mistakenly connect an establishment of religion with only a national church or religion.”

¹⁶ Leonard W. Levy, *Original Intent and the Framers’ Constitution* (1988, 2000; 525p.): 175, quoting Hamilton from *The Federalist Papers* #84 (1961, 2003; intro and notes by Charles R. Kesler, ed. Clinton Rossiter): 513.

¹⁷ Alexander Hamilton, *The Federalist Papers* #84 (1961, 2003; notes Charles R. Kesler): 513.

rationality, the wedge of Levy pushes them off the plank of historical credibility and into the ocean of mud of their own making.

It's dirty business occulting history and denying that character counts, and it's nasty to occult and prostitute character.

Bishop Thomas J. Curry casts this squarely inside the Christian framework in his book, *Farewell to Christendom: The Future of Church and State in America*. There are those who have endorsed the establishment of a Christian state and those like David Barton who have nearly done so. Then there are those who have been opposite to that in attempting to prevent any influence at all in the public sphere. Between the two versions—accommodationists (or the more feared and fewer Christian radical establishers) and the separationists—Bishop Curry has kindly, remarkably, and thoroughly challenged.

This dominant literalism is characterized by a preponderance of assumptions that the First Amendment was enacted by a people whose ways of thinking matched those of modern Americans and who dealt with the same Church-State issues that prevail in America today. As a result, studies of the amendment often treat it as a statement intended to provide answers at the time to specific questions in a distant future rather than as a proclamation of principle by a people unable to envision its application beyond the limits of their own experience.¹⁸

Bishop Curry proceeds to clarify how the First Amendment is a self-denying ordinance restraining government, “a mandate that the State will exercise no power in religious questions, that ‘Congress shall make no law’ in the domain of human experience”; therefore,

Religious freedom proceeds from government’s leaving people to decide on their own religious beliefs and practices. Some would, with the best of intentions for society, now have government return to the practice of sponsoring and promoting religious beliefs and observances. Others, equally well intentioned, would guard against the abuses of the established religions of the past by endowing government with power to corral religion, to locate the Church behind a wall or barrier of the State’s making.

In reality, the First Amendment is about the government’s lack of power. It is no more a mandate to promote religion than it is one to create a boundary defining the sphere or activity of religion. Rather, it embodies a new way of arranging government, the full understanding of which is still emerging. The gravitational force of Christendom, built up over more than fifteen hundred years, remains strong.... the great American experiment still challenges religious believers to realize that the denial of government power over the Church resulted not from a depreciation of religious belief but from a profound appreciation that religion was too important to be left to politicians, too precious and necessary to a vibrant society to be made the tool of government manipulation.¹⁹

The *Farewell to Christendom* as his title indicates is about the end of Christendom that came with the First Amendment of our beloved Constitution of the United States in 1789, and that end was seconded with the Catholic *Declaration on Religion* at the Second Vatican Council in 1965.²⁰ By *Christendom* and its end, Thomas J. Curry is referring to the dominating forces of

¹⁸ Thomas J. Curry, Auxiliary Bishop of Archdiocese of Los Angeles, *Farewell to Christendom: The Future of Church and State in America*. (NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001; 143p.): 4.

¹⁹ Thomas J. Curry, *Farewell to Christendom* (2001; 143p.): 5.

²⁰ Austin Flannery, O.P., ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1975): 799-812.

Christianity since the time of Constantine's 4th century embrace of Christianity and then official proclamation of toleration of Christianity within the empire; official establishment of Christianity would follow under later Emperors.²¹ From then until 1789, there was one form of establishment after another that has been the cause of many bloody battles. From there and for 100 careful pages, Bishop Curry clarifies better than any minister I have read the powerful and far-reaching influence of the First Amendment. Like Leonard W. Levy and in a likewise incisive conclusion, Curry says,

Failure to comprehend Americans' steadily widening and deepening understanding of the meaning of free exercise of religion has led historians and judges back to the pragmatic tradition of toleration....

Virtually all participants in the modern Church-State controversy imply that, consistent with the Free Exercise provision of the First Amendment, government may exercise power in religious matters if it does not coerce or prefer. They differ solely as to whether the No Establishment provision prohibits such an exercise of power. Only when they rediscover that Free Exercise means freedom from government sponsorship of religion or exercise of power in religious matters will they be able to connect accurately with the amendment's founding history.

In the *absence* of an appreciation of this radical, Reformation-inspired, religious conviction, the pull of Christendom reasserts itself. People are prompted to call upon government to assist religion. They contend that in failing to sponsor it, government demonstrates hostility toward it. Again, this argument proceeds from the notion represented in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 that since religion is useful to society, the State should sponsor it. In that context, religion is perceived as a moral system embodying a collection of tenets. However, for those who understand or experience religion as a matter of conviction, as a profound and personal relationship with God, use of the heavy hand of government to impose a utilitarian, moralistic view of religion is a fundamental violation of their right to the free exercise of it. Government's use of religion as a social tool, the imposition of a notion of religion "approved by" politicians or public officials, and the direction of contrived prayers to a composite god all vulgarize religion and deaden the spirit of true religious faith.²²

Those powerful lines help Thomas J. Curry bring his succinct treatise to a close. Then addressing the absoluteness of the *wall of separation*, Curry affirms that when the government refrains from interference in religion the government also respects the God-given freedom of individuals to follow their own chosen religious beliefs and practices.

When the *wall of separation* was absolute, that has led to governments evaluating laws in the light of whether the laws advance or impede religion, thereby the government assuming "to itself both competency and supremacy in religious matters" has "brought untold misery to humankind" when those regimes have "imposed their own orthodoxies and ideologies."²³ That fearsome absoluteness of the *wall of separation* has led regimes to determine "where, when, and how

²¹ Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (1953; 1,516p.): 91-92, for story by Eusebius on the vision of a cross to Constantine who was charged from heaven to "Conquer by this"; p.92, "The policy of Constantine was one of toleration.... not make Christianity the sole religion of the state. That was to follow under later Emperors. He continued to support both paganism and Christianity.... To the end of his days he bore the title of *pontifex maximus* as chief priest of the pagan state cult." Curry references Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom* (1996), Douglas John Hall, *The End of Christendom and the Future of Christianity* (1997), and Stanley Hauerwas, *After Christendom? How the Church Is to Behave if Freedom, Justice, and a Christian Nation Are Bad Ideas* (1999).

²² Thomas J. Curry, *Farewell to Christendom* (2001; 143p.): 112-113, italic emphasis mine.

²³ Thomas J. Curry, *Farewell to Christendom* (2001; 143p.): 114.

religion would be exercised”; they have used government “power to confine it and prevent it from competing with ‘official truth.’”²⁴ The more absolute the metaphor of *wall of separation* becomes, in totalitarian language between Church and State, that metaphor serves and strengthens the position of the most radical Christian and Religious Right to move more to religious establishment. Be very afraid—so the Religious Right warn—until the government returns to State sponsorship of religion and the Christian religion in particular, the State will continue to promote atheism. The Religious Right alludes to no value of the *wall of separation* and fears it may be absolute, and that often fails to understand just what the First Amendment is all about. So Thomas J. Curry most wisely opines:

Understanding that the First Amendment *prohibits* government from exercising power in religious matters—either by promoting government-sponsored religious exercises or, conversely, by walling off religion from the public sphere—will liberate America from the numbing controversies that have troubled it for decades. For religious believers, a clear comprehension of government’s lack of competence and authority in religious matters will lead to a rediscovery that religion is above all a matter of the spirit, not of the secular authority. Only those who possess a deep religious conviction founded in that spirit can bring to public life the religious values that have helped sustain—and will continue to nurture—the public realm. For those who serve the government, the realization that the First Amendment is designed to deprive them of power in religious matters will help them understand that it does not confer upon them authority to deny the free exercise of religion to individuals or groups, to determine what advances religion, to pronounce on the truth or falsity of religion, or, above all, to impose ideologies of their own using government authority.²⁵ [Italics mine.]

For those who love liberty and equality and religious freedom, those quotes from Leonard W. Levy and Thomas J. Curry are demanding. From the Christian perspective—even the Catholic, Protestant, and Anglican—those quotes have deep roots inside of mainline Christianity’s value of human dignity and the sanctity of human life, and *dignity* and *life* arise only in true freedom of conscience. Those quotes derange the tyrant and bigot alike.

That certainly has a bearing upon some of our Founding Fathers’ original intent about the entire Bill of Rights—never shared by the Religious Right today. Why not deal with this more openly, straightforwardly.²⁶

David Barton dances around it for hundreds of pages. If Barton had just dealt with those couple of paragraphs by Levy and Curry in *their* historical context, Barton’s *Original Intent* may have become more cogent and perhaps even a great contribution to the literature, instead of occulting so much and becoming—in the light—more of a political paddle to motivate those more innocent than not, with more trust in Barton than is due Barton.

Leonard W. Levy gives us a picture of original intent that we can see in 100 pages! The ghost of *intent* has as much corporeal substance in Levy and in Curry as it ever will have, as formless as it is, and far from the *Christian* intent foisted by Barton. Though formless still, in Barton the

²⁴ Thomas J. Curry, *Farewell to Christendom* (2001; 143p.): 114.

²⁵ Thomas J. Curry, *Farewell to Christendom* (2001; 143p.): 115.

²⁶ Leonard W. Levy, *Original Intent and the Framers’ Constitution* (1988; Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000; 525p.): 284-285, “Without records of the past that permit a reconstruction of it, we would have no way of ascertaining original intent. We cannot answer any question concerning the intent of the Framers without first determining whether evidence exists that will provide an answer.... The extent to which the past should govern the present constitutes a separate issue from the question whether the opinions of the past can be determined. Whether the records are ample enough to warrant a judgment about original intent forms still another question.” And Levy ascertains wisely the complications of original intent—the impossibility of a precise jurisprudence—as well as the the historical fact that we simply do not have all of what said. See Max Farrand (1869-1945), ed. *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787* (1911; 1937; 3v.).

ghost of intent is *called* Christian intent, and Barton does a hat trick that makes *intent* appear to have more form than it does; but to those who look closely, Barton's ghost has as much substance as cigarette smoke. And those not accustomed to cigarette smoke ... cough.

The original intent of the Founding Fathers was to write a Constitution that did not need a Bill of Rights, but they worked out ten Rights to start with, to *begin* with, as fears came to them of restrictions upon the future of their hard-wrought national liberty and civil equality. It was because of *distrust* in the future of the U.S. government that the Founding Fathers worked together to add the First Amendment that, in all of the controversy, *still* states clearly and decidedly and even in the most elementary terms that the "Government shall make no law." What is it about "no law" that is hard to understand? That "no law" says volumes about their *original* intent in our precious Constitution in the context of the entire Constitution that also does not use the word *God* or *Christ*. That makes weaklings out of Barton-like folks trying to peddle a Christian intent into the Constitution, for in that peddling they must also smuggle that our Founding Fathers were somehow intellectual negligent, who just *forgot* to write in God or Christ, but somehow *intended* it nevertheless.

The occulting and prostitution of character needs to stop.

The Founding Fathers truly wanted a limited government that insured liberty and equality, as unsure and as undefined as liberty and equality were then, as small as the unique tree of freedom was then. The Founding Fathers considered themselves deserving of as much liberty and equality as any person, noble, or clergy in Christian Imperial Britain; they declared such in 1776; and they began to constitute such in 1789 neck to neck with France. They risked their necks—literally. As a distinguished Virginia delegate, George Mason's concern about adding a Bill of Rights was not about the integrity of Hamilton and Jefferson and Madison as some of the Religious Right sneak upon today, but George Mason was concerned about the future:

"This Government will commence in a moderate Aristocracy," he predicted, and thought it was impossible to tell whether "in its Operation" it would produce a "a Monarchy, or a corrupt oppressive Aristocracy," it would probably "vibrate some years between the two, and then terminate in the one or the other."²⁷

Now that *is* a thought to consider. The SBC secret cabal under Paige Patterson's leadership *is* a precedent in many ways; however, the SBC's constitution is weaker than our U.S. Constitution, and it is harder if not impossible for our U.S. Senators and Representatives to meet in too many secret meetings.

Though secrecy is the matrix of a civil society, it can become troublesome.

Again, the anti-Masons fumble and many of the Religious Right fumble—certainly Barton—and they fumble between clarity and revisionism. In the light of historical masters like Leonard W. Levy and Thomas J. Curry, only Freemasonry history and character counting can help both the anti-Masons and the Religious Right regain any sense of balance. And they are wobbly. Without an apology, sincerely and rationally, the wedge of Levy and Curry push the scallywags off the plank of historical credibility and into the ocean of mud of their own making.

It is truly dirty business and down right malignant to occult history and deny that character counts. It's chicanery, at least, to occult and prostitute character. Please, occulting and

²⁷ George Mason quoted by Charles R. Kesler in *The Federalist Papers* (1961, 2003): vii.

prostitution in the church need to stop, and several leaders need to let Frankenstein return to the grave from whence he came.



C. Original Intent of Founding Fathers—Liberty & Equality

Does anyone in America today want to return to the days of *compulsory* church attendance? Is there anyone in America today who thinks that *compulsory* is good for anyone or even good for the favored church? Baptists were *jailed* and unlicensed preachers were *jailed* even up to 1774! David Barton and none of the Religious Right want anyone to know that. Worse—they appear to hide that, occult that. Just what do they want to *re-discover*? What do they think was established in 1789? Worse of all—what precisely are they wanting to *establish* today? Leonard W. Levy recounts,

Massachusetts law required that a Baptist obtain a certificate proving that he regularly attended a church of his own denomination to be exempt from ministerial and church taxes, which the towns enacted for the support of public worship led by “learned and orthodox” ministers (Congregationalists); but he had to pay a tax of four pence (the tea tax was only three pence per pound) for a copy of the certification or legal document that he needed to prove his tax-exempt status. “All America are alarmed at the tea tax; but we [Baptists] have no such liberty,” [Reverend Isaac] Backus complained, and, he added, conscience prevented payment of the certificate tax: government had no lawful authority over religion.... Backus spoke for the Baptist minority that felt persecuted by the Congregational majority. John Adams spoke for the Congregational majority when he stated that the establishment to which he gave his support was “but a slender one” that did not infringe religious liberty.

The Reverend Ezra Stiles, president of Yale College, who agreed with Adams, also ignored the fact that Massachusetts imprisoned Baptists and any others who refused to support obedience to the government in matters of support for religion. In Virginia and other southern colonies, Stiles observed, Baptists “not only pay ministerial Taxes for building churches but are imprisoned for preaching in unlicensed Houses.”²⁸

Did you know that many of the colonies tolerated multiple establishments of religion? Did you know that those in the majority in a given town voted upon what Christian church they would support with their taxes? Did you know that there were many towns that paid their town’s minister by taxes to support that minister’s faith specifically? One town could have a Congregational minister supported by taxes and another a Presbyterian. On very few occasions, the Baptists got the majority.

Christianity was all over the colonies, often radically and sometimes brutally enforced. So what in the world was *established* in 1789 according to Barton and his ilk? And for those more radical than Barton, just what are the Christian establishers wanting to *establish* today in the guise of a return to our *foundations*? Are they—seriously—are they really wanting to bring back the right of a minister and his congregation to invoke the death penalty by a church vote—the pastor officiating? That is not a stretch given the hate messages of some Christian radicals. There is enough hate to kill today, and several high-profile Christian leaders—in the SBC too—have

²⁸ Leonard W. Levy, *The Establishment Clause* (1986; 236p.): 2, quoting from Alvah Hovey, *A Memoir of the Life and Times of Reverend Isaac Backus* (1858): 215-221, from a copy of “Petition to the General Court, Dec. 2, 1774”; second quote from Ezra Stiles, *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles* (1901, 3 vols): vol. I, 475.

slipped up in the last decade and said some terrible things. Some want to establish Christianity, but they are unable or are unwilling to say precisely what they want to establish, much less where the line of tolerance should be drawn if not where the First Amendment has already drawn it.

Without truly dissecting the nature and difference between religious liberty for Christian Congregationalists in the colonies from those colonies' tolerance (and persecution) of minorities like Baptists—the *Christian* original intent in our beloved Constitution is a ghost, even ghastly, foisted on us against history and against the plain sense of the Constitution itself. And the anti-Mason is in lock-step with the ghastly when they call evil and support Frankenstein and oppose the history of how Freemasonry has supported freedom of conscience more than the church. Indeed, the foisting and trickery of a *Christian* original intent is against the more clear intention of the U.S. Constitution. In deed and in spirit, the foisting of a *Christian* intent upon 1789 is certainly not a move *away* from religious establishments that was the more certain history so ably brought out by many and especially by Levy and Curry.

David Barton pretends to make clear a Christian intent that is but a ghost of what actually happened, and he does that like he is unaware of the ghastly church establishments of the colonial era. Barton's work becomes ghastly historical revisionism, even an historical Frankenstein twin to the anti-Mason Frankenstein concoctions about Freemasonry. Christianity was dominant and sometimes ruthlessly dominating other Christians at the same time—all in the name of God. And some like Barton revise history and slam the only institution at that time that truly valued religious liberty and freedom of conscience—Freemasonry.

David Barton and the Religious Right are not being fair or Christian.

After the American Revolution (1775-1783) and when 1789 rolled around, our Founding Fathers were looking at how to create a new nation with liberty and equality—many of them *under* God—a new national institution in human history, even a nation founded upon the freedom. Freedom, liberty and equality turn on freedom of conscience, and they tried to insure that in a Constitution. They knew how to establish a country upon religion, for that is all they knew. Christian establishment—that is where they all came from, Christian Imperial England a lot of them. Religious establishment? What country in the world in human history did *not* have some form of religious establishment? They knew what religious establishment was, if anyone did. And they did not want that.

The United States of America was the first in human history to be constituted upon freedom, where freedom itself would become the institution. Freedom was the new institution founding in 1789. Our Founding Fathers truly worked together. They wrote a Constitution without the name of God, and then they added a Bill of Rights that forbade the establishment of religion and protected the free exercise of religion. The Bill of Rights was to clarify more restrictions upon the federal government. Our Founding Fathers determined to make freedom of conscience the first Right in “We the people” and then added a Bill of Rights to insure freedom.

Truly, most legislation is *moral* legislation and has some appeal to natural law, at least to fairness and to a common-sense need for general order. There need to be laws that govern elections to keep fairness and traffic laws to help keep order—that's civilization. Yet between free speech and in-your-face desecration, there are fine lines hard to find that still should respect others' beliefs as well as one's right to criticize any belief. Certainly, there is a large difference

between wearing a cross to work or reading a Bible on one's break on one hand, and on the other hand condemning and harassing a person's religion or the adherent of another religion.

There should be no discrimination.

There are levels of profanity that should be outlawed—I think. But how do you determine fairly what is *profane*? Freedom of speech should not be a freedom to harass, and laws against harassment should not mean that I (or you) should be prevented from strongly voicing our disdain. See one of the nation's leading First Amendment lawyers, Floyd Abrams, on the complexity.

Floyd Abrams, *Speaking Freely—Trials of the First Amendment* (NY: Viking, 2005; 306p). Synopsis in *Cato's Letter: a Quarterly Message on Liberty*, "Not under My First Amendment," CATO Institute (Fall 2005; 3:4); see www.CATO.org.

Case by case examination, Abrams incisively says they "would have lost every single one of those cases in England."²⁹ Hey! ... that is, in England *today*! Our precious First Amendment is about religious freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of press, *and* freedom to gather together to grieve the government. They are linked together because freedom of conscience was dear to our Founding Fathers. The government is to protect me in my own criticism of the government itself!

Now, working David Barton's version of Christian *original* intent into the *whole* first amendment is like trying to squeeze a round peg into a square hole—literally—since many of our Founding Fathers *were* Freemasons trying to square their actions by the square of virtue. (Just a little pun there.) The First Amendment was a move *away* from Christian privilege and censorship that was rooted and rampant up to 1776 in most all of the towns of all of the colonies. When it came time to address Christian Imperial Britain, the Founding Fathers looked at themselves as well as to the future. Legalized freedom of conscience was rooted more in colonial Freemasonry than colonial Christianity.

And the anti-Masons are oblivious. Remember that SBC expert Bill Gordon chose only two authors from the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry to sew together his Frankenstein pygmy. And he totally occulted that the Scottish Rite has been a defender of religious liberty and freedom of conscience forever; religious liberty is part of the Rite itself.

The problem remains. How do you determine fairly what is *profane*? Harder still, how do you make laws against harassment? Sex is a good indication of limiting, especially in the work place, as sex has been so abused and is also tied closely to most of the major religions of the world. The right to express my religion is precious to me, and I ought to be able to express it without harm in the public square—even in my state job. Yet it is frightening how some Christian leaders want to legislate Christianity rather than rely upon the attractiveness of Christ to change the world. They do not say that up front, which is all the more devious (or is innocent fire), but that is their original intent, the *intent* to legislate Christianity whether by devious and occulting means or simply from innocent heat and sometimes from level-headed offenses at the truly nasty.

There are some people today who are worse than the Pagans of old, who truly prefer the grossest of immorality. They would marry their horse or dog or pig if city hall would issue a license, and some would do some very profane things to their own dog in public if it were not

²⁹ Floyd Abrams, *Cato's Letter: a Quarterly Message on Liberty*, "Not under My First Amendment," CATO Institute (Fall 2005; 3:4); 6; see www.CATO.org and Abrams book that was the substance of this letter: *Speaking Freely—Trials of the First Amendment* (NY: Viking, 2005; 306p). Abrams is one of the nation's leading First Amendment lawyers.

outlawed. We need to guard some level of public decency as equal with civilization at least, just as we need to guard freedom of conscience and true religious freedom, even for both the Pagan and Christian.

As a Christian, I so firmly believe that a person comes to Christ *best* in the context of true religious freedom, where Christ is the attractive element and not when the law favors the church or makes the person fear the law if he or she is not a member of the favored church. And we do not want a person coming to church who is at heart a secret Pagan ... but, yes, we do; for that is where he or she truly *needs* to go. We just do not want Pagan activities in the church, any more than we want prostitution in the church.

Without accounting for the likes of Leonard W. Levy and Thomas J. Curry, who have done more work than many, David Barton and his ilk are not only woefully short of the original intent, but they are woefully short of and perhaps even intentionally occulting the fuller meaning of religious freedom. Regardless, too much history is thrown out the window by Barton and his ilk.

It is not obvious at first, certainly not to those unaware of Freemasonry, yet the slamming of Freemasonry goes hand-in-hand with the slamming of separation of church and state. The anti-Masons' claims go hand-in-hand with the Religious Right's desire to construct a Christian specter of original intent in our Constitution's First Amendment. The Religious Right's ignoring and at times deceiving folks by minimizing Freemasonry in our Founding Fathers go hand-in-hand with the Religious Right's claim that this country was founded upon Christianity. Hidden for the most part from the innocent, but plain to those who truly value liberty and equality, the leadership of the Religious Right just will not say what they mean. Many of them want to bring back an establishment of religion like that prior to our beloved Constitution in 1789—but without the messy divisions, under the illusion that *they* can administrate a Christian state better than the other failures for the last 1,500 years. They want to establish Christianity as the national religion with favoritism to Christianity and disfavor to all others—wafting in the smoke of an original intent that is as ghostly as it is ghastly and inscrutable.

That might be nice for Christians, especially if the country votes to establish *national* pastors like Rick Warren, Joel Osteen, Max Lucado, T. D. Jakes, or Billy Graham—men with hearts of gold. But that is not good for dissenters. And it could—down the line—lead to jail time for Universalists, Muslims, Buddhists, and atheists; even Baptists, Methodists, or churches of Christ. It would all depend upon the leadership of the national pastor or national religious committee. What if the United States is taken over by the Southern Baptist Convention? If that happens, Freemasons could share jail time with dissenting *Baptists*.

That is not a very large stretch or a joking matter. *Read* David Barton. Just what kind of a *Christian* government is he wanting to establish? It cannot be that complicated to outline the *intent* of what they want to establish. Proving some Christianity in the Founding Fathers is one thing. But to try to prove a Christian intent and *exclude* Freemasonry in the Constitutional struggles of 1789—cough, cough—that is ugly revisionism clear and plain. When placed in the light. Barton and others occult too much, and they seek to establish their version of a Christian country upon hiding, occulting character, and the prostitution of their evangelical-look-alike version of George Washington as opposed to the real Freemason George Washington who presided over the Constitution and gave the vision for Washington, D.C., the seat of the greatest country the world has ever seen.

If anything is axiomatic and obvious, it's this: at the very point of favor to one, all others are in disfavor. If one is *tolerant* of another, the very word *tolerant* implies inferior to the *tolerated*; the Constitution made pluralism legal. George Washington could be a Christian with the same inalienable rights as non-Christian Benjamin Franklin. They did not have to agree with each other to be friends, and they did not *tolerate* each other; rather, in a pluralistic country, they genuinely respected the freedom of conscience of each other. The USA became the first institution of freedom in the world, the first post-*tolerant* and first truly pluralistic nation in earth history—just like Freemasonry in many ways.

If anything is axiomatic and obvious—I repeat—it's this: at the very point of favor to one, all others are in disfavor. For a perfect example, listen to this.

The White House provided the AP [Associated Press] with a list of “faith-based” organizations receiving funds and the amount they received. According to the list, the federal government gave more than \$1.7 billion to “faith-based groups in 2003.”³⁰

Though over 80% of those had received money in the past, presumably under the old rules of constitutional guidelines, yet two of the programs accounted for about half: Head Start and the other Housing and Urban Development. That is not leveling the playing field—not at all—and how one gets into the faith-based cash drawer is still unclear. What does “level playing field” mean? Whatever “level playing field” truly means, it is obvious that the meaning itself is still confusing, though that should have been the first item the Feds clarified. In a country *founded* upon liberty and equality and justice for *all*, “level playing field” should be clear and made *level* for all. Moreover, “The White House admitted to the AP that the list contains organizations that do not identify themselves as faith-based but merely had names sounding religious.”³¹ Talk about confusing! Not only is that sloppy governmental reporting, it is deceptive, twists the meaning of faith-based itself, circumvents the program's purpose, and makes our case concrete.

It is a mighty pompous policy that pretends to be able to have the divine power and wisdom and scrutiny to give support to *all* religions equally—as nonpreferentialists claim to be possible. Who believes that anyone except Jesus Christ has such a grand capacity as that? And for Jesus, it *still* took a miracle to feed just 5,000. At least, that means that those churches with the legal machinery and grant-writing finesse *shall be* in favor—like big church schools and Sun Myun Moon's marriage program. All the other shoe-string soup kitchens are left out, in some cases because they had no tuxedo to attend the local faith-based government “information” dinner. In other cases the soup-kitchen supervisor was too busy cooking soup to come, or missed the invite because he or she does not read the national newspaper advertisements regularly. I've not seen any TV or newspaper ads yet ... yet ... ah ... Is not the faith-based money *supposed* to be available to all? But here we are: how in the world can the government give to all religions fairly? That is a monstrous question for a small country or even a single small U.S. state. When the mission of “giving fairly to all religions” is directed to the mighty United States, that is truly an impossible mission.

If anything happened in 1789, it was the movement *away* from church-state coalitions and the movement *away* from compulsory church attendance. The First Amendment was about restriction, not empowerment of any kind: “Congress shall make no law.” Whatever does David

³⁰ K. Hollyn Hollman, “Hollman Report,” *Report from the Capitol* 60:2 (02-2005; Baptist Joint Committee): 6.

³¹ K. Hollyn Hollman, “Hollman Report,” *Report from the Capitol* 60:2 (02-2005; Baptist Joint Committee): 6.

Barton mean by *original* intent when there were many examples of jailed Christians next to a profusion of religious establishment in the colonies up to 1789? What does the Religious Right mean by *bringing back* our country to the religious foundations of our Founding Fathers? The idea that this country was founded as a Christian country is false. The colonies were Christian before the founding in 1789, and often they jailed other Christians. The religious foundations prior to 1789 were great for the majority and often jail time for dissenting Christians—Christians jailed *Christians*. And it was life threatening to be of any other religion.

Freedom meant *freedom* of conscience or it meant nothing at all in 1789.

Today, freedom means freedom of conscience or means nothing at all. This country was established and constituted upon liberty and equality, and liberty and equality turn on freedom of conscience. And contrary to the Religious Right—even a devote Christian myself—it is deceptive malignance to deny Freemasonry’s influence on our Founding Fathers and on the founding of the United States of America. More than any other institution or church sect in 1789, Freemasonry principles supported the founding of our country *under* God without the need to constitute God, for there was no other institution that clearly or as consistently supported how liberty and equality turn on freedom of conscience.

Now what—precisely—was our Founding Fathers’ original intent in framing our beloved Constitution of the United States? Surely, there is some merit to our U.S. Supreme Court ascertaining some measure of our Founding Fathers’ original intent. To some extent, David Barton is right in the assertion of some Christian foundations, but he strains to make Christianity the dominant assertion, and he blinds us from Freemasonry’s institutional precedents just as he derides the Enlightenment struggles. Moreover, and most important, if any—any at all—if *any* of Barton’s rationale applies in the assertion of Christian original intent, then by Barton’s own rationale Freemasonry’s principles were more potent than Christianity to our beloved Constitution’s original intent. That is, if Barton is right about all of his assertions about Christianity’s influence—the little that he does document—then in the same manner, Freemasonry is many times more influential upon our Founding Fathers.

After Leonard W. Levy and Thomas J. Curry’s historical and vastly superior cataloguing, it is clear that our beloved Founding Fathers were not ignorant, they did a new thing, and they did not bind themselves or their descendents. While original intent has an applicability, it is clear that there is a living element to our beloved Constitution as we today strive to grapple with this still new experiment. As truly inspired as our beloved Constitution is, even by God to a degree, still—hear ye, hear ye—the Constitution is *not* the Bible; nor is the Constitution as inerrant, inspired, infallible, or authoritative as the Bible. Not for a true Christian. Moreover, we have to believe that Barton was aware of Levy and Curry, which shames Barton all the more and casts a foreboding shadow over Barton’s own original intent. Levy and Curry are very strong and public men in this debate. They are not hiding or occulting anything. Dodging them is cowardly, and failing to reference them is occulting.

Original intent is of supreme importance to David Barton, and his case is made or broken within the validity of Christian original intent. Yet the actual original intent of the Constitution is vacant without Freemasonry history, even as ghostly as *intent* is by nature, and Barton’s

construal of the First Amendment crashes against the shore of the history within Levy and Curry.³²

The tree of freedom was planted in good soil—Constitutionally—and her two main branches of liberty and equality needed the pruning of slavery and bolstering of women’s rights as the tree grew. She is *still* growing, and the tree is stronger today than ever before. She needs protection and care. And however the tree of freedom shall grow, that growth shall turn on freedom of conscience.



D. Our Founding Fathers Were Men of Honor and Faith

Many of the Founding Fathers were honorable Freemasons, and they kept their oaths and were faithful to their fraternity. As such, we shall never know the full impact of Freemasonry upon them or the forming of the new nation. Some of the original intent of our Constitution will remain ghostly, and to prevent it from becoming ghastly we need to respect liberty, equality, freedom of religion, and freedom of conscience with all of our might. For our God, church, country, and family—we need and dearly want freedom and freedom of conscience.

The church shall be the bride of Christ, and Freemasonry shall pass away when we enter our heavenly home. No Christian Freemason is confused about that. Until that time, men and women will have friends and fraternities that are more or less exclusive—whether it be on the battlefield, in the community, in the fishing boat, in the hunting blind, and even in the church. Whether that fraternity be a gathering of a few friends or organized, the gathering itself shall be determined good or bad depending on that gathering’s purposes. Freemasonry seeks to build, and anti-Masons seek to destroy—that’s the primary and historical difference between both fraternities for several hundred years. Yet within Freemasonry, we also have something the anti-Masons do not—a majority of the Founding Fathers of the greatest country in the history of humanity, a majority over every other single organization or religious sect.

If all of the recent documentation on the Christian faith of our Founding Fathers be true—in the lucrative Religious Right market—then we must know that the Christian Freemason’s faith and fraternity were there from the beginning of this country. Few people have been as influential as David Barton in cataloguing and marketing the faith of our Founding Fathers, and to a faithful Bible-believing evangelical Christian, Barton warms the heart in light of some of these Pagan initiatives. If only Barton were that simple, and Barton’s version was *all* of the story. Where is Freemasonry? What *was* the cultural milieu of the 1700s? As of January 2006 when you go to Barton’s web site it is obvious how important George Washington is—Washington’s picture is everywhere.³³

Why is Freemasonry left out? Is Freemasonry left out because of the anti-Mason fervor? The SBC is Barton’s market—a big market. That is a question hard to pass over lightly. That is a question a million Christian people should ask both David Barton and Paige Patterson. Some people leave out Freemasonry because they fear Paige Patterson more than they value history, because they value their market more than they value the truth—the whole truth, and even

³² Levy’s *The Establishment Clause* (1986, 236p.) and *Original Intent and the Framers’ Constitution* (1988, 525p.), and Curry’s *The First Freedoms: Church and State in America to the Passage of the First Amendment* (1986, 276p.) and *Farewell to Christendom: The Future of Church and State in America* (2001, 143p.).

³³ See www.wallbuilders.com, see also, *Celebrate Liberty, Original Intent, Benjamin Rush, The Bulletproof George Washington, Ethics: And Early American Handbook, Documents of Freedom* (with George Washington’s picture on the front), *Lessons from Nature for Youth* (which illustrates lessons from symbols of nature). David Barton has also received the George Washington Honor Medal.

liberty, equality, and justice for all. People like David Barton and Tim LaHaye have made a lot of money off of a narrow slice of the truth that has left out a lot. They have left out truckloads of more obvious material than the material they collected and pruned. How can those who forward a Christian America and the anti-Mason critics *both* applaud and nearly enshrine George Washington's faith on one hand and then—as in the SBC documents and Barton's diminutive innuendoes—on the other hand declare Freemasonry non-Christian and Pagan and “incompatible” or leave it out altogether? That is incompatible.

That is ugly historical revisionism.

Given the huge Christian market, that market is one thing that propels sales, and we cannot help thinking about market-based history. Freemasonry is a significant and noble part of the history, and most of the Christian leaders writing or commenting on these issues deny Freemasonry a droplet; then they deny the character counting quality therein as well. That denial is a whip that kickbacks and slaps them and their theses silly. So then, *are* George Washington and George W. Truett dupes? If so, are Barton-like folks and other anti-Masons the great discoverers of Washington's and Truett's error? Hardly. Hear the whip crack and see the welt rise. The more they deny and occult Freemasonry—and refuse to deal with history—the worse it appears in the light.

Was not George Washington able and capable of discerning between the Bible and Paganism? Listen to David Barton and others here. Washington and other patriots were very able-minded men. Whether or not Patrick Henry was a Freemason, he was courageous enough—“give me liberty or give me death”—to declare an inconsistency, especially if he believed Freemasons were Pagans!³⁴ All of the Freemason Founding Fathers were able to discern between the forces of their fraternal bonds and their religious faith in God. None of our beloved Founding Fathers had a conflict even remotely similar to the simple-minded Frankenstein concoctions constructed by the SBC expert and lackey Bill Gordon, SBC smoker James L. Holly, theological sensationalist John Ankerberg, and other Christian powerbrokers.

Our Founding Fathers—all of them, Freemasons included—were men of honor, and of more honor than most of all Freemasonry's critics today. Yes, they had more honor because of the Christian faith maintained by Barton, whatever Barton's specious rationale be for leaving out so much, and then occulting and degrading Freemasonry's contribution. Truly, David Barton appears to be a man of courage, portraying himself and his ministry as *standing up* for Christian values, but in more light Barton becomes more of a political pawn capitalizing upon the Christian market. Barton makes a million dollars on a few slice of truth—with Freemasonry's integral contributions sliced off, as Barton slices truth and occults the larger influence of Freemasonry upon our beloved Constitution's original intent. Barton accomplishes that only with a dependence upon the innocence of his reader, and when knowledgeable people help him by occulting Freemasonry's influence.

Is that rape? The DNA left at the scene of the crime indicates Barton's man-handling and occulting and peddling. Barton tried to peddle Christianity at the *expense* of Freemasonry and prostitute Washington's character to boot.

³⁴ You can get a copy of Patrick Henry's “Liberty or Death” speech at www.wallbuilders.com, as well as a copy of the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, the Mayflower Compact of 1620, and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. But you will find nothing on Freemasonry. For free copy of Patrick Henry's speech, see Google.com—there are dozens online.

Said in another way, if George Washington's and our Founding Father's Christian faith was anything like David Barton has researched and illustrated, then they—of all men in the history of the human race—would *not* have tolerated Paganism in their Freemasonry fraternity. Instead, because of their Christian faith and because of Freemasonry's support of their Christian faith, and the integrity of the Founding Fathers themselves, Freemasonry membership grew after the Declaration of Independence and after the signing of the Constitution of the United States. Freemasonry grew precisely because of the fraternal and precisely because it was not a religion and because it supported very well *every* Freemason's faith. Freemasonry supported each man's faith no matter what the sect, and therein was another avenue of virtue and unity among the Founding Fathers. Freemasonry even supported those Founding Fathers with a vague and historically hard-to-determine-if-any faith like that of Benjamin Franklin, who was even more than a Founding Father and more like a Founding Mentor.

David Barton certainly has tried to influence at the *expense* of Freemasonry, as he dodged it around every corner of his research on the 18th century. Barton's single ugly sentence in his *Original Intent* makes friends with Paige Patterson and was calculated for him and other religious powerbrokers against Freemasonry. Barton's single sentence against Freemasonry was capitalist marketing, pure and simple-minded. Barton colludes in occulting history and in the prostituting of the Christian character of the several Freemason Christian men he finds—Washington especially—when he derides and excludes Freemasonry in his revisionism to bloat and float Christianity's influence that actually obscures the *original* intent of our Founding Fathers. One sentence! Barton becomes the scallywag with his single sloppy sentence against Freemasonry *in* the light of his own tonnage of research as well as in the light of the tonnage Barton occulted and had to avoid on Freemasonry around every historical corner.

There is a large difference between David Barton's Christian George Washington and the real George Washington, and yet what Barton does with a slice of the real George Washington is document some of the differences between Washington and the real Benjamin Franklin. One of differences—thanks to Barton—is that Washington did have a Christian worldview, and Barton could *not* find one in Benjamin Franklin. Barton left out and occulted what Washington and Franklin *shared*. They shared many Freemasonry principles that found their way into the Constitution and into the concrete of Washington, D.C., and the U.S. Capitol in a huge preponderance over clearly Christian words and direct concrete emblems. Leaving that out and slamming Freemasonry—David Barton becomes more of an occultist resembling the anti-Masons SBC expert Bill Gordon and James L. Holly and their ugly Frankenstein concoctions than not.

The occulting and prostitution should stop. Let's bring all of this together.

The real question then—in 1776—is nearly the same today. The real question is about honor—character—tied inextricably to the true value of liberty and equality, to the cause of justice for *all*, and to a real freedom of conscience. It is deceptive that the SBC leaders and countless others in the Religious Right would hold up George Washington's faith on the one hand and then to declare him and legions of legends so abysmally ignorant of Paganism. David Barton, Tim LaHaye, Pat Robertson, and others in the Religious Right leave out Freemasonry in *their* versions of history. Then they select snippets of history to suit their own pleasure and desire.

Relatively few if any of our Founding Fathers were like any fundamentalist evangelical today. Most of them frequented the taverns. Accordingly, we have two choices today.

1. George Washington and George W. Truett and legions of legends were dupes or duplicitous Pagans, and the anti-Mason Frankenstein of Paige Patterson, the SBC documents, John Ankerberg, and James L. Holly are truly something to fear,

~ or ~

2. Washington and Truett and legions of legends were truly honorable heroes and Freemason Christians, even bulletproof and immune from simple-minded character attacks; and Patterson and Holly and Ankerberg and their Frankensteins are the persons to fear for their lack of concern for the occulting of both history and character counting, even prostituting character when it suits them.

Two choices. It is that simple, and Paige Patterson and James L. Holly ought *not* be allowed to run from the character of a million men. Character counts the most here and tips the balance heavy in favor of Washington and Truett being truly honorable heroes. Honorable by any definition of honor in human history and international cultural variance. And the only ones trying to tip the balance in favor of Paganism are the anti-Masons. Some ignore the counterbalancing of character counting and try to revise that out of history—like David Barton—or just publish strange brews like James L. Holly. But they need more weight. They need to pump iron before they will be accepted on the playing field of academia or allowed to set up camp in the land where honor lives.

Frankenstein truly needs to go back to the graveyard. The SBC expert Bill Gordon's wobbling blind faceless brainless cowardly Frankenstein pygmy needs to fall, and its old bones returned to their proper owners. And many powerbrokers need to *let* it fall, because it cannot stand alone without the prostitution of character to keep it standing. For the SBC Frankenstein cannot stand alone, it is too ugly and decrepit—in the light.

Goodness, occulting and prostitution need to stop in the church.

We do not see Washington as actually bulletproof or as anything like a real *evangelical* today. His Freemasonry activity is distinguished—though incredibly busy about building the greatest country the world has ever seen—and some Christian leaders today regret that and hide that, as though they were better and more intelligent and more courageous men than Washington. Honorable Christians give honor to whom honor is due. George Washington and George W. Truett were highly moral and incorruptible men with a great degree of solid character. Honor is due them like few in history, and they did become legends in their own time. Their *character* endeared them to all they led, and that is history.

Who is being duped here?

Our Founding Fathers' *character* is a deep well out of which several Christian powerbrokers cannot climb. In the aftermath, the SBC documents become embarrassing to all SBC persons and embarrassing to the rest of the religious and non-religious academic world.

Our Founding Fathers and Founding Mothers led to the formation of the greatest country in the history of humanity. Many of them were Freemasons, and Freemasonry's principles were around every *founding* corner in 18th century America and France. The moral integrity of Freemasons caused a rapid increase in membership in the first hundred years of the new nation.



E. Freemasonry's Contribution to Christianity and to the USA

In the movie, *We Were Soldiers*, Mel Gibson portrayed Lt. Colonel Hal Moore in charge of a newly formed air cavalry unit preparing to fight in the jungles of North Vietnam.³⁵ The setting is the Ia Drang Valley, and we are given the impression that this was one of the first major battles of the Vietnam War. The drama unfolds between his wife left behind and the battle hours in the Ia Drang Valley. At the beginning of the movie and right before they ship out to fight, Lt. Colonel Hal Moore (Mel Gibson) gives a parting speech to his men standing on the parade ground and their families in the bleachers. He does not paint a rose garden, but Colonel Moore gives them his assurance that on the battlefield they will become one for America. The differences between race, economic status, rank, and even religion evaporated—differences always evaporate in the face of deadly missions. The camera pans the several nationalities. Then Lt. Colonel Hal Moore says to his men exclusively in ear shot of their families, though he cannot promise that all will come home, he said resolutely and credibly, “I will be the first to step into battle, and I will be the last to leave. We will *not* leave anyone behind ... dead or alive.”

As the violent movie traces the battle realistically—and the tragedy of death notification back home—we see the courage of Colonel Moore as he proves his words true on the battlefield. He had only spoken those words before. Words mean something only if the man has the character and reputation to back them. Otherwise, the words are wicked and deceitful. Colonel Moore proves his word *in* and *throughout* the battle in North Vietnam. When the battle was at its worse, his superiors wanted to evacuate him—only him (they did not want to lose a colonel)—but he said he was too busy and would not leave his men. Besides ... they had a battle to fight. At the end, Colonel Moore—true to his word—was the last man to step up into the helicopter and leave the scene of the battle.

That is strong character with many of the virtues we admire in leaders.

Mouthings against Freemasonry are dependent upon one's own character. Absent of substance, that is prostitutions of one's own character to support one's words that—in the light—have to fly against many of history's sterling example of good character, even legions of legends. Without rock solid substance, that is not strong character or Christian character by any standard known to the human race in the history of the human race. They fail character counting 101.

They are cowards on the field of battle by their own weakling words. Paganism is helped when character does not count and good men are called evil—especially with weakling attacks and most especially by the prostitution of character. The occulting and prostitution in the church has to stop.

George Washington and George W. Truett and others—like Sam Houston—are lights too bright to be dimmed by such shallow work. The more light that is shed on character, on the meaning of character, and on how much character counts, the better. The *more light* the better.

³⁵ *We Were Soldiers*, starring Mel Gibson, Paramount Pictures & Icon Production, 2002; rated “R.”

—♦♦♦♦♦—

In the light, character counts to the uttermost and decides honor. Our country was founded upon character counting and all of the virtues that make up good character—faith and family most of all, and the protection of liberty and equality that support them. Character counting is what makes Freemasonry our *National Treasure* as the predominant influence upon our Founding Fathers above every other entity and any single religious denomination.

The *people* should decide who should run the government. In our U.S. Capitol and Supreme Court there are statues of *virtues*, and they do not refer to Greek or Roman gods—and never have. The statues are emblematical of the virtues themselves that the diverse Founding Fathers (Christian and otherwise) felt best to drive the new country. And—thank God—liberty stands on top of the U.S. Capitol.

—♦♦♦♦♦—

The church should address her people and their issues and stay out of partisan politics. Our Founding Fathers were less concerned—perhaps not concerned at all—that there would ever come a time when non-Christians would outnumber Christians in office, because—intuitively again perhaps—the growth of the church should never depend upon government in the first place. If the church failed, then it is because the *people* of the church failed and not that God failed. So the Founding Fathers constituted a new institution on freedom, a new government without God *written in* and with the church and religion *written out*, all in faith that God was guiding and would guide and *under* God for many of them.

Lawful liberty and meaningful equality (as infantile as those concepts were then) were the *raison d'être* and guiding light. The light of liberty and equality pulled at the hearts of our Founding Fathers. The light is still pulling. The avant-garde Founding Fathers envisioned and then tried with the utmost of their ability—some of them praying—to constitute a government structure that would have permanence and strength, checks and balances, with *written in* temporal and earthly responsibility that was understandable and predictable—dependable—with freedom, liberty, equality, and justice for *all* no matter what their faith or religion or non-religion. In the back of their minds in writing the Constitution in 1789—like a pesky ghost—I have little doubt that the Founding Fathers wanted to avoid what they knew of history for the previous ten thousand years. Sooner or later, they all knew that church establishment would become a bear trap that would ensnare the people if the umbilical cord between the church and state was allowed in the Constitution. Such an umbilical cord would allow the church (or some other religion) to legalize its own religious code and outlaw all other religions. That had been the history of church-state coalitions forever.

Our Founding Fathers saw the light of freedom and never turned back. The more you looked at freedom of conscience, the more sense it made; it became intoxicating. As best they could, they actualized the light of freedom and planted her like a live-oak tree and without precedent in human affairs. And Freemasonry was there from the beginning like a nursery husbandman.

WEDGE 8. Character Counting *the* Hammer that Chisels Credibility

Freemasonry is unique in history, as no other has these two polar extremities, two antinomies of social interpretation, even an infinite distance between the two cliffs of a wide valley. The anti-Masons with their Frankenstein concoctions dwell on one cliff, and across the valley and on the higher side, there is Freemasonry as the fraternity on the tradecraft of character.

To the very degree that the anti-Masons run from or occult character counting—to that very degree, the anti-Masons become great occultists themselves. They claim to be servants of God, while they deny the most simple truths of Freemasonry. When they occult character counting and prostitute character, they shame legions of legends without a droplet on the legions themselves.

We have given seven heavily hammered wedges of credibility between Frankenstein and Freemasonry thus far, with the help of several mighty men and women. This entire book was my attempt to pile drive a wedge of credibility between these two polar extremes, between those two cliffs of social interpretations, between the nobility of Freemasonry's goals and the anti-Mason Frankenstein. There were hundreds of other hammerings, and the hammering upon the wedges of credibility continues today by legions of legends and millions of other good men.

**The Hammer of Character Counting
Drives the Wedge of Credibility**

The eighth wedge of credibility between the two cliffs is simply, even gloriously, all about the hammer itself—Character Counting—and the *force* for all of the other wedges of credibility. Without the hammer, there is no pounding or true force. Only with a good hammer can you pound a wedge into the rock-hard scull of Frankenstein, a wedge of credibility that is fatal to the electrified monster, driving all the others in the light of reason, history, rhetoric—even in smoking lampoon.

The eight wedges of credibility are chiseled by the hammer of character counting. Character is the bedrock of the human heart for all men and women. The more light shed upon character counting the better.

Character determines the difference between the good and bad, the honorable and dishonorable. Often stronger and quicker than reason, rhetoric, and lampoon—character

determines the credible man or woman from the incredible. Except for the anti-Masons—that is the way of all men and all women for all ages in all countries, where the man himself and his character cannot be moved in the eyes of his family and friends. No matter what is said or how well it is said, whatever is said is always measured by what the observer sees with his or her eyes and what he or she knows in heart and soul. That is even true in a measure about this book regarding those who venerate Paige Patterson.

So then, character counts—no matter the occulting or light given—for an innocent outside of the ability to search the archives will go with the character he or she knows in their own home. If you *know* the man or woman, then you *know* the truth of whatever is said. Only *more light* can make a difference.

If you *know* the Freemason ... the anti-Mason Frankenstein *will* go back to the graveyard. What matters most here, is that character counts, and the battle between the anti-Mason Frankenstein and the nobility of Freemasonry shall truly be between those willing and honorable enough to stand out on the good ground and in the light. There is only one truth between the anti-Mason Frankenstein and the nobility of Freemasonry. Only one of them is truly honorable and the other is not honorable. In spite of all of the reason, reference, rhetoric, and lampoon—in spite of all the books and all the mouthings—character counts most of all for both sides and decides the day and decides irrefutably. A person who knows or is friends with Paige Patterson (and Ankerberg, Gordon, Holly) but knows nothing of Freemasonry and does not know any Freemasons of good report—well, the case is closed in that innocent person’s mind, for Patterson’s words are *the* truth for that person. *Finis*. Likewise for the family of the good Freemason SBC church pillar, who will choose their father and deacon over Patterson’s portrayal.

You know, by now, that the *only* difference between the two is where character counts in *more light*. A character collision takes place, for that is human nature at its best (and worst). Character counting is the *hammer* driving the wedge of credibility, and it always will.

In spite of the long haul and these hundreds of pages, there is no amount of reason or rhetoric that can overcome character. Not this piece and not ultimately. That is why we left no stone unturned and tried to bring everything to light. If you *know* the Freemason ... the anti-Mason Frankenstein *will* wobble back to the graveyard or fall from fatigue. In the land where character counts, you cannot shed too much light on character.

Character counting is so important in this world filled with conflict, and love truly is the greatest and will be the greatest part of the Christian’s inheritance in heaven. It is as simple as a choice between two. Between some powerbrokers on the one hand; and on the other hand George Washington, George W. Truett, and legions of legends—between the anti-Mason and the Freemason, the final balance and measure shall come from each person’s and each reader’s judgment of their character.

Character counts to the uttermost. So then, the more light that is given to character counting the better we all are.



In closing then, the rallying cry supporting the formation of our beloved Constitution was for freedom—*freedom* from the mountain-tops and from the lowest vales of the land. If the hearts of our Founding Fathers could be searched, *freedom* was the primary motivation, the original intent, and they sought for freedom’s support from every corner of their lives. With both their faith and

fraternity being living fountains of strength, they at the same time invoked both God and their fraternal bonds for help. Our Founding Fathers wanted to be *free* and *equal*, and they pledged their lives and sacred honor upon that free equality. Freemasonry supported that freedom in more ways than their Christian faith did, and Freemasonry united people of different faith backgrounds more than any other organization or church body. More than any single organization in the 18th century, Freemasonry was the husbandman of freedom in England, America, France, Europe, and South America. It still is today the world over.

Liberty, equality, and fraternity turn on freedom of conscience. They still do today—thank God. Freemasonry’s contribution to Christianity is about the tradecraft of character and how much character counts *under* God. Freemasonry’s contribution to the United States of America is conceptual as *the* grand champion of virtue and character counting from the beginning, being *the* husbandman to the live-oak tree of freedom and two branches of significant liberty and meaningful equality that spread the cool shade of freedom of conscience to all who come under her. Like no other institution or church, especially like no other church-state coalition *ever*, Freemasonry valued freedom of conscience then and today—for 300 years now.


Character counts to the uttermost and decides history in the light of day, and Frankenstein cannot live in the light of character counting. Indisputable and valuable beyond measure, character counting is what makes Freemasonry our USA *National Treasure* as the predominant influence upon our Founding Fathers above every other institution and above any single religious denomination in the history.

So, credibility shines best in the land where honor lives and character counts. Character counting needs more light today—much *more light*.



Author Michael Glenn Maness – Maness7@att.net
An old closing chapter from previous edition

www.PreciousHeart.net/freemasonry

	<p>Character Counts Freemasonry USA's National Treasure and Source of Our Founding Fathers' Original Intent</p> <p>Character counting in Freemasonry is the U.S.A.'s <i>National Treasure</i> and predominant source of our Founding Fathers' original intent in our precious Constitution.</p> <p>Order Now</p>
---	---

