

American Government for Christian Homeschoolers

Answer Key to Review Questions

By Scott Clifton

Web: www.homeschoolpartners.net

Email: scott@homeschoolpartners.net

For a FREE two-week sample of *Classic Literature for Christian Homeschoolers*, *World Literature for Christian Homeschoolers*, and a free copy of *The First Book of Homeschool Follies*, [click here](#).

1.1

1. Pray that the Lord would bless your parent(s), the President, your two senators (Find out their names!), and your local representative (Ditto!). Pray for your government officials' salvation. When you see the 🙏 emoji from now on, take a minute to pray to God for those persons.
2. What is the proper way to approach the study of government—or anything?
To find out what the Bible says about it, and judge what happens by the Bible's standards.

1.2

1. Fill in the blanks: The Bible teaches that the proper duties of government are to remove ___ and ___, to be a "terror" to ___, and to execute ___ and ____.
Violence, spoil; evil; judgement, justice.
2. Tell whether the following acts are matters that a government should punish: (a) breaking someone's arm in anger; (b) calling someone insulting names; (c) getting drunk; (d) crashing into a car while driving drunk; (e) failing to finish a job after being paid to do it; (f) lying on a job application.
(a) Yes—that's an example of someone committing violence against someone else; (b) no—it's rude and sinful, but not physically harmful to that person; (c) no—it's sinful, but harms no one; (d) yes—it's an example of "violence" (damage) against someone's property; (e) yes—it's an example of "spoil" (robbery) against someone else; (f) that depends upon if anyone is defrauded (robbed) because of it.

1.3

How do these ideas compare to the Bible's teaching on government?

Favorably. They underscore the true, Biblical purpose of law: to protect others from violence perpetrated by others, and to punish those "violent evildoers."

1.4

1. Sum up the origin of the phrase "separation of church and state."
Jefferson wrote a letter to the Danbury Baptists sympathizing with their persecution, and saying that he believed there should be "a wall of separation between church and state." By that he meant that the government should stay out of matters of religion.
2. How are the functions of the Christian church and the state different?
The church's is to judge Christians, and to forgive outsiders; the state's is to judge and punish evildoers.
3. Give an example in which someone wrongs another in the same church, and the dispute falls under the church's domain to resolve, not the state's. *(Answers will vary: "AWV.")*

2.1

1. What does Roger Williams say are a magistrate's duties toward (a) what he believes are true religious beliefs, and (b) what he sees as false ones?

(a) To have an "honorable testimony" and a "tender respect of truth," to submit to Jesus Christ, and to protect Christians from violence, and (b) to allow non-Christians the right not to worship God, and the same thing offered to Christians—to also protect them from violence.

2. How does allowing "freedom of conscience," as William Penn allowed in Pennsylvania, raise the overall environment of a colony or nation?

Its residents aren't constantly worried that they'll be persecuted for their religious beliefs, and therefore are more likely to live in peace with others. Also, it reduces the likelihood that non-Christians will be angry with Christians, whom they might see as oppressors, forcing their beliefs on others via the force of government. This would increase the likelihood of converting non-Christians as well!

2.2

1. Imagine yourself as a parent who constantly ridicules and mocks government officials. What kind of message do you think you're sending to your children—not about the government, but about God Himself?

That God is wrong or foolish for allowing certain government officials—wrong as they might be about the true purpose of government, or hateful as they might be toward God.

2. Give an example (besides the one in this section) of when a Christian would have to choose obedience to God over obedience to the government. AWW.

2.3

AWV, but might include something similar: Christians aren't against the poor's having food, money, and medical care, obviously. But that's not a just function of government, since it's the government's job to prevent theft, not participate in it. Godly persons "considereth the cause of the poor" (Proverbs 29:7), remember that those who can work but don't work shouldn't eat (2 Thessalonians 3:10), "remember the poor" (Galatians 2:10), help widows who don't have families to help them (1 Timothy 5:3-4), and treat the poor with respect (James 2:1-6).

2.4

Ask your Mom or Dad this question, and write down the answer: "Could you give me an example of a law you know about that *shouldn't* be a law?" AWW!

3.1

1. How is this article an example of the (somewhat) proper role of government?

At least the government did something, or seemed to try to do something, about the man who was injured and whose car was totaled.

2. How could the judge have better executed *justice* in the case? (See Section 1.2's subheading "Violence and Spoil, Judgment and Justice.")

Justice would have been better served by requiring the man who totaled the victim's care and injured him to buy the victim a replacement car and pay him the salary he lost. What good does it do for the violator to sit in jail for nine months? That doesn't help anybody.

3.2

1. How is Israel's history a warning not to give rulers too much power?

They can be wicked and drag a nation down with them, so limiting their power limits their potential for damaging "their" nation.

2. Give an example of how an earthly ruler's sin could harm the nation he rules. AWW.

3. What do Ephesians 2:19 and Philippians 3:20 say about Christians?

They are "fellowcitizens...of the household of God," and their "conversation [citizenship] is in heaven."

3.3

1. How do you think that the ancient Greeks' idea that law should also apply to *rulers*, not just citizens, influenced American political thinkers?

We don't have a king with unlimited powers, or a legislature that is supposed to be allowed to make any kind of law it wants.

2. Explain briefly how each one of the "three government types" has the potential to be (a) beneficial, and (b) harmful.

A monarchy can benefit a nation if the king is wise and just, but can tyrannize a nation if he's unjust or wicked. An aristocracy can represent a nation well, and be more sensible than the average person about how to rule, but it can also be a small group of power-hungry tyrants. A democracy can result in a vote on behalf of what's best for society, but can also oppress the minority just because a majority votes to steal from them or take away their liberty.

3. Define *rationalism*, and explain how Christians should view it.

The belief that using reason is more important than anything else. There's nothing wrong at all with using reason, but it doesn't supersede God's Word.

3.4

How do you think that rule by one all-powerful ruler or group of rulers can lead to the destruction of a nation? Give one *specific* example of how this could happen.

They can simply rule according to their own wishes, or to enrich or empower themselves, to the detriment of the people. Examples of how this could happen will vary.

4.1

Take Quiz 1!

4.2

1. How can *individualism* (a) benefit a nation and (b) harm a nation?

It can benefit a nation by emphasizing personal responsibility and respect for the rights of everyone, but it can harm a nation by elevating the individual's wants above the commands of God.

2. How do those who favor a state religion miss the whole point of what the Bible says about government's purpose? (See Jeremiah 22:3, Ezekiel 45:9, Romans 13:3-4, and 1 Peter 2:13-14.)

Those who favor a state religion ignore (or are unaware of) the Bible's standards for good government—that it should simply punish violent evildoers and provide justice. There's nothing whatsoever in the New Testament that endorses a "Christian government," or a government that forces individuals to follow practices of the Christian faith.

4.3

1. How do Christians often see scientific discoveries differently than others?

They see them as confirmations of the order in God's glorious creation, rather than others who see them as proof of the greatness of mankind and his independence from needing God.

2. Explain how a government's trying to "run the economy" violates the Biblical teaching of the purpose of government.

The government has no moral business inserting itself in how free persons buy and sell with each other. The government's purpose is to punish violence and spoil (theft), and when voluntary trade occurs, what's the problem? There's no need for government to get involved at all.

3. Give an example of how granting one branch of government the power to write, enforce, and judge on laws would lead to tyranny.

It would lead that branch to act in a way in which there were no limits on it at all, and to do whatever it felt like doing, lawful or not, moral and just or not. It would also attract the wrong kind of person(s) to wanting that job, since only morally weak or wicked persons would be attracted to a "job" in which nobody restrains them, and they wield absolute power.

4.4

1. How would a Christian disagree with the claim—like what the nobles told King John—that "The government can't tax me without my consent"?

Christians are to obey the government that God has placed them under, unless that government commands them to do something that violates a command of God. Paying taxes doesn't violate a command of God.

2. Why do you think judges who rode circuit in a certain territory were more *just* than lawmakers who write statutory laws for a whole nation or state?

Circuit riders would tend to know the territory they covered well—its people, its customs, its way of life—and would better be able to execute justice. Lawmakers who create laws for an entire nation often are more isolated from the people and don't know (or don't care) if their laws are just.

3. Why do wars require money? What are the advantages of having a lawmaking body like the English Parliament control the flow of money that pays for a war?

Soldiers and weapon/airplane/uniform manufacturers don't "work" for free! The advantage of having a legislature controlling the money is that a king can't just order up this war and that war based on his whims—another governmental body that debates the issue more thoroughly has to approve it. This ideally keeps a nation from going to war more often.

5.1

1. For what two purposes does the Virginia charter state that it was formed (one is in the second paragraph, one in the seventh paragraph)?
To convert the Native Americans to Christianity, and to mine precious metals.
2. What type of authority does the charter set up to govern the Virginia colony?
A 13-person council in the colony, and a 13-person “Council of Virginia” in England.
3. What promise to the Virginia colonists does the last paragraph guarantee?
They will enjoy all the rights and privileges of being English citizens.
4. Under whose authority was the Virginia colony created and agreed to by its residents? If you were a Christian at the time of the American Revolution, how might this affect your willingness to revolt against England’s government?
The Virginia colony was created under the authority of the king of England. If you were a Christian during America’s revolt, you should have been unwilling to violently revolt against England, since the English government was the lawful government of the colony of Virginia, and every other colony.

5.2 (Habeas Corpus Act)

1. What does Parliament accuse many gov’t officers of in the first section?
Needlessly, wickedly delaying in answering writs of habeas corpus, and keeping those whom the king doesn’t like in jail, without giving them a fair trial.
2. What order in Section II is designed to speed up the process of trying prisoners?
Ordering jailers and sheriffs to answer a writ of habeas corpus within three days of having received it.
3. What trick of government officers is Section IX designed to stop?
It is designed to stop the trick of jailing someone, and then avoiding having to answer a writ of habeas corpus for that person by moving him around to another jail—basically hiding that person so a judge/court can’t find him and order that he be formally charged with a crime and given a trial date, or freed.

5.2 (English Bill of Rights)

1. Why do you think the English Bill of Rights includes a ban on “raising or keeping a standing army...in time of peace”?
Having a standing army is dangerous to the peace and security of a nation. Those in charge of a standing army would be likely to find something for them to do—and that might lead to their using the army to oppress the English people, or push for war with another nation.
2. Look up the words “bail” (found in the fifth item above) and “redress” (in the sixth item), and write what they mean in the context.
Bail is money paid and kept in holding by a court in exchange for freeing an accused person until his trial date. “Excessive bail” means an amount that is ridiculously high, considering the supposed crime that the accused committed, and excessive bail would be much harder to raise, keeping the accused person in jail until his trial. “Redress” in context means addressing and resolving or correcting injustice, which is why the section says that Parliament ought to meet frequently, so not too much time passes until bad decisions or injustices are fixed.

5.3

1. Give brief “pros and cons” of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. In your own words, explain Jefferson, Madison, and Calhoun’s view of democracy.

MONARCHY PROS: speed at getting things done, keeping plans secret, keeping out silly opinions of the people, and keeping others from fighting for the position (since monarchies typically continue through a line of descendants).

MONARCHY CONS: the tendency of monarchs to be tyrants, tax unfairly, go to war more often and unnecessarily, and have outside opinions telling them what the people want and need.

ARISTOCRACY PROS: wisdom of aristocrats they gain from their education and experience.

ARISTOCRACY CONS: disagreements among members, the tendency of aristocrats to oppress the common people and make laws that benefit themselves at the expense of others.

REPUBLIC PROS: equality, participation by many, a lack of desire to go to war or spend too much government money, giving more people a chance to assist in governing (even though they’re not born into aristocracy), and making laws in public more than in secret.

REPUBLIC CONS: disagreements, attracting power-seekers to wield power over others, too many people weighing in with their opinions, and stupid laws.

2. How does the U. S. government combine the three basic government types?

The President compares to a monarch (but with fewer powers and without a lifetime appointment), the Senate compares to an aristocracy (but is appointed for only six-year terms), and the House of Representatives compares to a democracy (elected by the people, but only to two-year terms, and with the “power of the purse” so the other branches can’t wield unlimited power to spend and go to war).

5.4

Does a person’s not wearing a seat belt fit these requirements for the Biblical, moral purpose of the government? Explain to the other jury members in a few sentences why or why not.

AWV, but according to the Bible, this is an unjust law. The purpose of the government is to punish violence against others. A person’s not wearing a seat belt harms no one at all—even if he gets into a crash, he only harms himself.

6.1

1. Write a one-sentence summary of Section 1's main idea. By what name does the writer refer to God? What can you deduce from this?

Americans who want to revolt need to explain to the world why they want to revolt. The reference to God is to "nature's God." It means that the writer is not a Christian believer in the God of the Bible, but a believer in a creator, however.

2. From whom does Section 2 say governments derive their power?

From the "consent of the governed"—the people. The Bible, however, says that governments derive their power from God.

3. What does Section 2 say this "whom" may do if they dislike their government? Compare this to Romans 13:1-2 and 1 Peter 2:13-17.

They may overthrow it. Romans 13:1-2 and 1 Peter 2:13-17, however, command Christians to obey their government (obviously unless they command Christians to disobey God).

4. Among the complaints against King George III (Sections 3-21), are there any that would justify a Christian's participating in a violent revolution against him?

Not one of the complaints against King George mentions anything about his forcing Christians to disobey one of God's commands, so the answer would have to be "No."

5. What two hints at God are given in Section 24? In the same section, by whose "authority" does the DOI say the states are separating from England?

God (or at least, "nature's God") is referred to as the "Supreme judge of the world" and "Divine Providence." That section says that "by the authority of the good people of these colonies" that they are revolting from England.

6.2

1. What did the thirteen state constitutions generally include?

Complaints against England's government, government guidelines, and bills of rights guaranteeing rights like freedom of religion and speech.

2. Give some proof that the thirteen states, after their successful revolt from England, were actually thirteen *nations*.

During the Treaty of Paris, thirteen French ambassadors attended, Britain's government acknowledged thirteen nations in its treaty, all thirteen states had a system of government and a constitution/charter.

6.3

1. Is Jefferson right when he says that God "chose not to propagate [religion] by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do"? Why or why not?

Yes. The Bible never teaches Christians to use force to try to spread Christianity. Neither Jesus nor the disciples nor the early church ever used force or taught anyone to do so.

2. Name several actions that Jefferson opposes in this document.

Forcing anyone to practice a certain faith, taxing a state's residents to pay religious ministers or churches, taking away rights of the people based on what they believe, etc.

3. What does Jefferson say results from only allowing those who profess certain religious beliefs to hold public office?

Corruption, since it will make some men liars, claiming they believe a certain way, just to get into office; and this practice cheapens the very faith that it's supposed to help, since it gives earthly benefits to those who practice that faith—even though those who practice the faith shouldn't be striving for earthly treasures!

6.4 Review for Quiz 2! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

7.1

Name some ideas expressed in this news story that you would disagree with, both as a Christian *and* knowing what you know about the purpose of government.

As a Christian, we would disagree that the purpose of government is to provide “an education.” The Bible says the function of government is to punish “violence and spoil (theft)” and to “execute judgement and justice.” Providing an education has nothing to do with any of those functions at all. Generally, since a government’s moral, true function is to protect the life, liberty, and property of others, “providing an education” would involve taxing some without children who attend government-run schools and giving the money to others to run the schools. That’s theft, and that completely perverts the governments true job, which is to punish theft!

7.2

1. How would you answer the question in this section’s second paragraph?

AWV, but...I hope not. Why would anyone want to live under a small group that had increased power over the neighborhood, rather than work out relatively minor problems?

2. Why are “weak” governments criticized, and why shouldn’t they be?

AWV, but many modern Americans have the idea that a government needs to be “strong” and go “get things done,” not realizing that the same government they want to have the power to “get things done” also has the power to oppress them. Those in governments also don’t like the idea that the government they’re “serving” can be seen as “weak,” thinking that it reflects badly upon them.

7.3

1. What bothered many Americans about the writing of the Constitution?

The delegates were supposed to simply revise the Articles of Confederation, but they wrote an entirely new constitution. They also kept their entire meeting time secret, and they created a new, central, national government, instead of updating their agreement among the states.

2. Define *federalism*. How are “Federalists” and “Anti-Federalists” misnamed?

Federalism is the balancing of powers of a national government and state governments. Anti-Federalists were misnamed, because of the two groups (their group and the Nationalists), the so-called “Anti-Federalists” were the group that wanted to retain more of a balance between states’ powers and national government powers. (The Nationalists wanted the national government to dominate the states.)

3. What do you think a “broad” view of the words of the Constitution will lead to?

A “loosey-goosey” way of looking at the Constitution, which means that it will lead to granting the national government more powers than the Constitution allows for.

7.4

1. In general, why did “Anti-Federalists” (the true Federalists) oppose the new proposed constitution?

They believed it gave too much power to the national government and would be used to run over the powers of the states.

2. What specific suggestions to include in the new constitution confirmed the fears of the “Anti-Federalists”?

Giving the national government the power to veto state laws and appoint state governors, creating a permanent President and national Senate.

3. Looking at our *current* government, how have the concerns of the “Anti-Federalists” been proved correct?
AWV, but our national government is huge, runs over the states, spends trillions every year, and regulates nearly every aspect of our lives.
4. Fill in the blanks: The Bible teaches that government’s proper duties are to remove ___ and ___ (Ezekiel 45:9), to be a “terror” to ___ (Romans 13:3), and to ___ ___ (1 Peter 2:14).
Violence, spoil; evil; punish evildoers.

8.1

In the “neighborhood scenario” at the beginning of this section, what do you think the households should *do* about the decisions of The Managers to forbid any criticism of them and force everyone to plant trees? What kind of danger would there be if The Managers had a large group of armed troops under their control?

AWV, but the households could decide to leave the neighborhood, join up a bunch of households to oppose The Managers, refuse to abide by The Managers’ orders, etc. This, of course, would be dangerous if The Managers had a group of armed troops, because they could send them to the households to enforce their mandates.

8.2

1. Sum up the first paragraph of “Objections to the Constitution.”

It lacks a bill of rights, and the national government is more powerful than the states.

2. What problems does Mason have with (a) the courts and (b) the President?

The U. S. courts are too powerful, and they’ll dominate the states, ruin justice, and allow the rich to rule the poor. The President’s ability to pardon those convicted of crimes might lead to his pardoning someone whom he encouraged to commit that crime.

3. What does Mason say the Northern states will in time do to the Southern states?

Use their status as a majority of states to run over the South, making laws that benefit their industries at the expense of the South—basically, to steal from them legally.

4. Sum up Mason’s problem with the “general clause” in the Constitution.

He says Congress will take the clause to mean whatever they say it means, and then pass all kinds of bad laws, some of which violate the other parts of the Constitution itself.

8.3

1. In short, what is the problem with “interpreting the Constitution”?

There shouldn’t be any problem, but there is, because people “interpret” the Constitution according to their biases of what is better—limited government with few powers, or powerful government with many powers. The problem with big-government officials “interpreting” the Constitution is that they interpret it to empower themselves.

2. If all government officials followed the Bible’s guidelines on the proper purpose of government, why would it matter much less about who won elections?

Because they’d all be bound to follow a government that was strictly limited to removing violence and theft, executing judgement and justice, terrorizing and punishing evildoers, and that’s about it. Their actions shouldn’t differ much at all.

3. Take a few minutes to pray for your local representative, mayor, and sheriff. They might be facing pressure from someone else to make a decision as a government official that goes against their conscience and their belief on what a good government should do!

8.4

AWV, but they should reflect the defendant’s harming others’ property. He has the right to poison his own water or land if he wishes, but as soon as it begins to affect the lives, liberty, or property of others, he’s liable and should have to make restitution.

9.1

1. As we saw, the Constitution originally provided for one representative for every 30,000 residents. Do the math: Since the U. S. has about 330 million residents, how many representatives would we need to match that ratio of 30,000 to one? (Then compare that number to how many representatives we have now.)
330,000,000 divided by 30,000 = 11,000 representatives, instead of the 435 we have now! That's more than 25 times the current number.
2. What is strange about the Constitution's listing powers of Congress in Section 8, then listing *prohibitions* in Section 9? *If Congress only has the powers listed in Section 8, what's the point of saying in Section 9, "They're not allowed to do this and that"? Doesn't listing specific powers in Section 8 automatically mean that's it?*
3. Answer these claims about the Constitution someone makes: (a) "The 'general welfare clause' means Congress can provide for schools, since schools benefit everybody"; (b) "Congress should make more laws dealing with trade among the states—they have the power to do it, according to the 'commerce clause'"; (c) "Congress needs to make a law forcing everyone to be vaccinated against the belona plague—it's 'necessary and proper' for the nation's health."
AWV, but might sound similar to this: (a) "No, schools are specific welfare, given to those who have children whom they want to send to government schools." (b) "No, they shouldn't; "regulate" trade means to "make it regular"—to make sure trade laws are open and fair. Besides, how much can a group of government officials know about the infinitely complex buying habits and decisions of hundreds of millions of Americans?" (c) "You have obviously been drinking heavily." Or possibly, "Wrong. the 'necessary and proper clause' only allows Congress to make laws to help them carry out the list of powers they're specifically granted in Article I, Section 8. Do you see the power to force everybody to be vaccinated in that list of powers? Me either."

9.2

1. Why should a President be prohibited from *making* laws?
No one person should. The power to do so would corrupt almost anyone in that office, and before a law is made, there should be much discussion and debate, not just happen because of the whims of one person. If a President had that power, it would attract an even worse group of candidates to the office—those who would like to wield almost absolute power over others.
2. Name the requirements for a President.
A President must be 35 years old, a U. S. resident for 14 years, and a "natural-born citizen."
3. How does the Electoral College protect the residents of many U. S. states?
It keeps a majority of the nation from deciding for the minority by giving "points" to smaller states instead of simply counting votes. Heavily populated areas of the nation—which might mostly think a certain way about government, or have special interests—would be able to dominate the rest of the nation.
4. How does the list of granted presidential powers compare to the common view of who the President is?
It's drastically lower.

9.3

1. Answer this claim made by your friend (assume it's true): "The Supreme Court ruled in a 1976 case that a bank has to lend money to someone, even if he has a criminal record. How can you disagree with that? It's the law of the land!" In

your answer, address (a) the Bible's view of what the law should be, as well as (b) a reasonable view of the Supreme Court, as we saw in this section.

(a) This use of the law is unbiblical, because forcing someone to lend money to someone else he doesn't want to doesn't even come close to qualifying for what the Bible says is the purpose of government: to execute judgement and justice, to punish evildoers, and to stop violence and theft.

(b) The Supreme Court can offer its opinion on the Constitution, but so can the President and Congress. The court's word doesn't hold any more weight than theirs, especially when you consider that other justices voted "No" on that issue.

2. What can Congress do to limit Supreme Court decisions over the states?

Use Article III, Section 2, and make a list of kinds of cases they're not allowed to rule on.

3. Why shouldn't we view the Supreme Court as "The Final Decider" on matters of the Constitution? What is dangerous about their positions in government?

They're just one branch of the U. S. government. Their positions are dangerous, as Jefferson pointed out, because they can only be removed for treason or bribery or another crime, and their positions are for life.

9.4

Review for Quiz 3! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

10.1

Why do you think amending the Constitution involves not just a majority of states and/or Congress agreeing, but “super-majorities” like two-thirds and three-fourths?

The Articles of Confederation did it better, by forcing all states to agree to amend the AOC, but at least the Constitution forces more than just a simple majority to amend the Constitution, to make sure the new amendment benefits more than just barely half the nation’s states.

10.2

1. You hear a news anchor say, “These states have no right to ignore the new law passed by Congress, since the ‘Supremacy Clause’ means the states must obey a U. S. government law—it’s the supreme law of the land.” Respond to this.

Only laws “made in pursuance thereof” (passed while following the Constitution’s words) are legally laws at all. Laws made by Congress that violate the Constitution shouldn’t be laws at all—obviously!—so the states should be free to ignore or reject them.

2. List at least one “pro” and “con” of *not* requiring a religious test to be eligible to hold office in the U. S. government.

Answer will vary, but here’s one of each. Pro: It might lead to more Christians (or at least, those who believe in a God) being in office, and ideally, they would be more likely to obey the Bible’s guidelines on what a moral, just government should do. Con: It might lead to officials falsely claiming they were Christians or religious just to get into office.

10.3

AWV, but several things come to mind: First, Why are American battleships on the coast of Kliftonistan? Isn’t that taunting or threatening to that nation? How would Americans feel if Kliftonistan put battleships on our coastline? Second, they only threatened the battleships; they didn’t attack them. Third, can’t anybody try to call them and work this out without resorting to bombing? Fourth, why bomb the capital city? What do average people have to do with their government’s decision to threaten battleships on their coast? Fifth, the President doesn’t have the right to declare war on Kliftonistan. There was no imminent threat to the United States, so that kind of action grossly oversteps the President’s powers and authority.

10.4

1. Is the BOR a list of rights granted to the people? Why or why not?

No, it’s a list of restrictions on government powers.

2. Explain the “babysitter” comparison to the dispute on whether the U. S. Constitution needed a BOR. What could Johnny’s babysitter have done to clear up any confusion on what he was allowed to do?

Some Americans said, “The Constitution doesn’t need to list powers the government is not allowed to wield. If we make a list like that, then if a certain power isn’t on the ‘Not Allowed List,’ somebody will claim that the government has the power.”

Other Americans said, “We have to have a ‘Not Allowed List.’ If we don’t, the government will start saying, ‘There’s nothing in the Constitution that says the government can’t do this, so I guess we can do it!’”

AWV on the second question, but Johnny’s babysitter could have said, “Let’s ask your parents.” Then she could have asked them, “Are these the only things Johnny is allowed to do, or are there others?” and “Is this ‘Not Allowed’ List the only things Johnny’s not allowed to do, or when he asks if he’s allowed to do something, should I just point to the ‘Allowed’ list and say, ‘No, it’s not on this list?’”

Or she could just send Johnny to the basement with a plate of cold gruel.

11.1

1. Explain why the U. S. Bill of Rights applies *only* to the U. S. government.

Its own preamble says it does; it didn't stop states from having state religions and nobody batted an eye; John Marshall's Supreme Court ruled that it only applied to the U. S. government; and when James Madison tried to make it stop the state governments from restricting religion, free speech, trial by jury, and so on, his idea was rejected.

2. What *harmful* result could have occurred down the road by accepting the idea that a President could/should have the power order state governors to reopen their states? (Use Reasons #1 and #2 to guide your answer.)

We don't want the U. S. government wielding more power over the states, and if we start accepting the idea that Presidents can just hand down orders to the states when we want them to, what's to stop a President from handing down an order that violates our freedom? How can we reasonably complain about it then?

3. Let's say a state bans freedom of worship. What could the people of that state do to make a difference, if they hated that law or another law like it?

AWV, but they could move to another state, or demand the law be rescinded.

11.2

AWV, but they'll probably include something like this: The Bible nowhere teaches that fiddling with the price of food is a proper function of government. Instead, it teaches that the proper purpose of government is to stop violence and theft, execute judgement and justice, and punish violent evildoers. And the "General Welfare Clause" doesn't give Congress any extra powers other than the ones listed in Article I, Section 8. Even though everyone needs food, the clause says, as the poster points out, "the general welfare of the UNITED STATES," not the "general welfare of the PEOPLE." That clause indicates that the U. S. government is supposed to protect the powers and needs of the states. Otherwise, you could argue that the government should just take over everything: food, drink, medical care, hot water, etc.

11.3

1. How do we know that the First Amendment does *not* apply to the states?

The BOR doesn't apply to states (see Section 11.1), and the first phrase of the First Amendment says, "CONGRESS shall make no law...."

2. Sum up Benjamin Franklin's points about the value of printing lies.

First, if it's made public, its weakness is exposed, since readers can compare it to the truth. Second, it keeps the writer/speaker from saying, "The only reason people didn't to agree with my view is because the newspapers kept my view from being published!"

3. If a government were given the power to stop the people from speaking or printing "lies," how could the government use this to its own advantage?

It could stop someone from printing or speaking against the government, then claim, "We had to stop him, because he was lying," even though he wasn't necessarily lying. Probably the last institution on earth we want to be judging what's true and untrue is the government!

4. You're a juror in a *state* case where a man sues a company he's working for because the company institutes a new policy in which all employees must work one Sunday a month. The man says this violates his First Amendment right to freely exercise his religion. Give *two* reasons why you should reject his claim.

First, the company is not the U. S. government, so the First Amendment doesn't apply to it! Second, even if the First Amendment did apply to the company, it has the right to ask employees to work when it needs them to. The man is not being forced to stop worshipping God; he can still worship God freely. If he thinks he has to be at a certain place every

Sunday, then he can find another job! The company has every right to freely hire and fire whom they choose, and to make requests of all their employees.

5. You're a juror in a state case where a woman sues an Internet blogger who wrote several outrageous things about her turned out to be untrue. The victim lost her job as a result, and no one will hire her now. How should you decide?
AWV, but it seems just that the Internet blogger should be held somewhat liable for his words. The woman lost her job and money due to lies told by the blogger, and her reputation was damaged. When the Bible says rulers are to "remove VIOLENCE and spoil" (Ezekiel 45:9), the word violence can mean "falsehood," like a witness lying in court.

11.4

1. In the second paragraph, what does Hamilton say would happen if men were kept from speaking or writing about the "conduct of men in power"?
Then they might become slaves, since they would be unable to suffer injustice and oppression without having the right to complain about it.
2. What does Hamilton say in the third paragraph about the accusation that criticism of governors will bring contempt upon them and harm the rule of law?
That it isn't the criticism itself that brings contempt upon rulers and harms the rule of law, but the governors themselves, who commit oppressive and unjust acts.
3. What is Hamilton's point about "libel" and the accounts of Moses and Isaiah?
To accuse someone of "libel" is a broad and iffy accusation, since practically anyone can be accused of it. Moses "libeled" the proud Cain, making Cain look bad since Moses was such a meek, humble man; anyone who rails against the devil could be accused of "libel"; Isaiah, who pointed out that evil rulers lead the people astray, could be accused of "libel" as well.
4. What does Hamilton urge the jury to do? What bigger point does he make?
Find Zenger "not guilty," since he spoke the truth. The bigger point Hamilton makes is that it's important to support the liberties of the people against government tyranny, and it's dangerous to allow that tyranny to flourish. The jury is not deciding simply on one printer's freedom, but of all who come behind him.
5. How could a Christian speak out against a wicked governor while making sure not to "speak evil" (2 Peter 2:10) of him?
He could respectfully point out the wickedness that the governor is doing, without insulting, mocking, or cursing him.

12.1

1. Sum up the “Two Key Facts” at this section’s opening.

The Second Amendment doesn’t grant the people the right to bear arms; it restricts the U. S. government from infringing upon that right. Even without a Second Amendment, the U. S. government has no right to infringe upon the right to bear arms, because that’s not a power granted to them in Article I, Section 8.

2. What did many Americans believe about standing armies?

They mistrusted and loathed them, because they considered them dangerous to the liberties of the people, while pretending to be defending them, and tools of tyrants.

3. Prove that the term *militia* in the Second Amendment refers to the people. What was the purpose of the militia?

The Second Amendment refers to the identity of the militia by saying, “the right of the PEOPLE to keep and bear arms.” Numerous “founding fathers” referred to militias as simply being the people, armed. It’s ridiculous to claim the militia is a state national guard or something, because the reason for the BOR is to protect the rights of the people, not a government force! Their purpose was to be able to fight back against tyranny—as Jefferson said, “to dispense with a standing army.”

4. How many gun laws is Congress legally allowed to pass? What about state gun laws? Are these gun regulations good ideas? Why or why not?

Zero. States are allowed to pass them, although they don’t work, because criminals, by definition, do not obey laws!

12.2

What condition at the end of the Third Amendment gives the government a little “wobble room” in taking additional powers?

The phrase “but in a manner prescribed by law” gives a little room, because a government official that interpreted the Constitution “broadly” could make that phrase mean whatever he wanted.

12.3

1. What is troublesome about the word “unreasonable” in the Fourth Amendment? (Think about it for a minute!)

The people’s rights against “unreasonable” searches and seizures is prohibited, but who gets to decide what’s “reasonable” or not? It’s not too hard to picture some time where a U. S. agent does a search that anyone in his right mind would say is “unreasonable,” but for whatever reason the court looking at the case decides that it wasn’t unreasonable! (Just like the U. S. government can rule that the Second Amendment allows whatever gun laws they want.)

2. Which side do you lean on when it comes to whether illegally obtained evidence should be allowed in court? Why? AWV.

3. What dangers are there in a government’s spying on citizens without a warrant? How do you think this lowers the quality of government in a country?

AWV, but might include things like lack of privacy, getting material that could be used to blackmail others, and so on. It lowers the quality of government because it makes government officials believe that they’re above the law, and when word gets around they’re doing this, it attracts the wrong kind of person to becoming a government official—somebody who likes getting away with spying.

12.4

Review for Quiz 3! (Take the quiz if you’re *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

13.1

1. Should the Fifth Amendment apply only to U. S. *citizens*? (Read the first part of the amendment carefully!)
No, the amendment says, “No person,” not “No citizen.”
2. Why do you think it’s dangerous to give politicians the ability to execute supposed criminals without those accused persons having “due process of law”?
Because an accused person might have some information that proves a politician is guilty of a crime, and the politician could just have the person executed to shut him up.
3. Define *eminent domain*. How are the terms *public use* and *just compensation* not very clear, and therefore potential sources of harm to a property owner?
The idea that the government can force you to sell your property if they claim they “need” it for “public use” and will give you “just compensation.” The problem is: Who gets to define those terms? Everybody seems to disagree about what “public use” is, and what the government offers as “just compensation” is often pathetically low compared to what the person could get on the open market, so government often basically just steals property.
4. Should a government even have the right to eminent domain at all? How does this power fit (or not fit) within the Bible’s definition of proper government?
No. Again, it’s not even close to a proper function of government according to the Bible—executing judgement and justice, punishing violent evildoers and thieves, and so on.

13.2

AWV, but it’s hard to justify finding Artanis guilty. First the part of the law saying he’s not allowed to own a gun if his wife files a restraining order against him violates the Second Amendment by infringing upon his right to “keep and bear arms.” Also, morally it’s wrong: So what if his wife filed a restraining order against him? That’s not proof that he did anything wrong; it’s just an accusation! Second, it violates the First Amendment to prohibit someone from making an “offensive” post on social media; Congress clearly is prohibited from doing this. And who gets to determine what’s “offensive,” anyway? (By the way, these examples are based on the “Violence Against Women Act” passed by Congress in 1994.)

13.3

1. How can being an innocent person who is accused of a crime be a difficult and nerve-wracking ordeal?
An innocent person can feel the weight of the whole government court system pushing at him, trying to get him convicted of something he didn’t do, and he knows that no matter if he’s guilty or not, many will think that he is, simply because he’s been put on trial.
2. What is the importance of a trial’s being *speedy* and *public*? What problem can you see about defining an *impartial* jury before a trial?
Speed is important, so the accused doesn’t rot in jail to the glee of those who might have falsely accused him, and publicity is important, so the world knows what’s going on and can report on any tricks the prosecutor or judge try to pull. An “impartial” jury is hard to define, and sometimes innocent persons have been convicted because jurors have claimed not to know anything about an accused person, but been biased against him.
3. Give a brief example of how a local jury of an accused person’s peers could prevent a group of government outsiders from framing that person unjustly.
A local jury knows an accused person more likely than a remote one, and is more likely to know his character, and whether he’s capable or likely to have committed the crime he’s accused of. They can find him “not guilty” if they suspect he’s being framed.

13.4

Name some ideas expressed in this news story that you would disagree with, as a Christian who knows the Bible's guidelines for the true purpose of government. What is also bizarre about the entire judgement itself? (See Section 8.1.)

AWV, but students might mention that it doesn't really seem like a tax on Americans, like the Supreme Court claimed—it's a penalty for not buying something! But the way Congress taxes and taxes and the Supreme Court upholds their acts, it's not surprising. And needless to say, this ruling totally violates the Biblical standard for just government. What's bizarre about the whole ruling is that the U. S. government is going to court in a case decided by...the U. S. government! Why we think, like Section 8.1 points out, that the government will decide against itself regularly is bizarre, too. (This news story is based on the actual 2012 ruling in the case National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, which upheld "Obamacare.")

14.1

1. Can you see any way that the Eighth Amendment can be manipulated by government officials, based on their *interpretation* of some of its words?
They could do something that the average person would recognize as “cruel” or “unusual,” but then claim that it wasn’t.
2. What does the Bible say about the death penalty in Genesis 9:5-6?
It’s instituted by God because of the value of life: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made He man.”

14.2

1. Briefly explain the meanings of the Ninth Amendment and Tenth Amendment in your own words.
The Ninth Amendment says this: “Just because the Constitution doesn’t say, “The U. S. government can’t violate the people’s right to do A, B, and C doesn’t mean the U. S. government can violate the people’s rights to do A, B, and C.” The Tenth Amendment says that the U. S. government can only take powers that are specifically granted to them in the Constitution. If they’re not specifically granted a power, that power, if it’s even wielded at all, goes to the state government.
2. Given what has happened to the power of the U. S. government over time, what do you think would have happened had there *not* been those two amendments?
It probably would have been worse!

14.3

1. Give (a) a Biblical argument and (b) a constitutional argument that the United States government has no business opening a national bank.
Operating a national bank doesn’t meet the Biblical guidelines for a government’s true purpose, and it’s also unconstitutional, since Article I, Section 8 does not even come close to granting the U. S. government the power to open and operate a national bank.
2. What kind of corruption (give an example or two) could infest a government that says, for example, “We’re going to use our power to encourage the growing of corn and the manufacturing of steel”?
AWV, but might go something like this: Corn farmers might bribe government officials into favoring their industry, so the government might (a) add tariffs to foreign corn, or (b) buy a lot of corn it doesn’t need just to enrich the corn farmers. The same kind of thing could happen with the steel industry.

14.4

1. If you were a Federalist and not a Nationalist, how would you react to this Supreme Court ruling, especially if you combined it with the actions of Alexander Hamilton and the first U. S. Congress?
AWV, but will probably reflect the idea that a Federalist would be very upset, because it’s exactly the kind of thing Nationalists kept promising would never happen if the Federalists ratified the U. S. Constitution.
2. Imagine you’re a Federalist. Do you have a suggestion on what the states could do to combat the Supreme Court’s exceeding its constitutional limits?
AWV, but they could ignore them, fight back with their state militias if U. S. government officials tried to enforce the Supreme Court’s overreaching its legal powers, or even secede from the union.

15.1

What message is the Eleventh Amendment sending? If this message isn't clear, how many more amendments do you think would have to be passed?

It's sending a message to the Supreme Court to keep its nose out of types of cases that the Constitution doesn't explicitly grant it the power to judge upon. It's impossible to list all the kinds of cases the Supreme Court isn't allowed to rule upon, so if the message weren't clear, there would have to be thousands of amendments added to the Constitution, all listing types of cases the Supreme Court may not rule on. Yeesh!

15.2

Sum up Washington's thoughts on (a) the union of the states, (b) political parties leading to tyranny, (c) "religion and morality," and (d) foreign alliances.

(a) He urged states to stay together so they'd be greater;

(b) he warned about breaking up into political parties, which he said would split along geographic and industrial areas, leading to one side's "winning" at the expense of the other, and oppressive government, since parties would seek a strong leader (likely a power-hungry person);

(c) religion and morality were key to character, "political prosperity," and secure property rights;

(d) to have good relations with all nations, to stay out of their affairs, to avoiding alliances, since it would put the U. S. at the mercy of those nations' governments' sometimes stupid and selfish decisions ("steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world").

15.3

1. Going back to "Sam's Neighborhood Disaster," give one more result that I *didn't* include that you think could happen because of Sam's actions.

AWV, but might include other neighborhoods jumping into the fray and taking sides, someone threatening to harm/kill Sam's wife and children, Sam going bankrupt, creating more and more disputes among the neighbors, and so on.

2. Of the four reasons listed why we should stay out of foreign alliances, choose *one* and come up with an additional example showing why it's true. *AWV.*

3. Briefly respond in your own words to someone's calling you an "isolationist."

AWV, but "I'm not an isolationist; I believe in trading and being friendly to all nations—just not attacking with them if they don't do exactly what our government demands them to do."

15.4

Review for Quiz 4! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

16.1

As a juror, should you find Gamma Airlines and/or PhizTome guilty...or not guilty? (And why?) As you think about each one, remember (a) what the true moral purpose of the law is, and (b) what we've learned about the Constitution.

AWV, but probably (I hope) "not guilty." Both Gamma Airlines and PhizTome have the right to run their businesses their way, since the airplanes and web sites are their property. Besides, the First Amendment applies to Congress, not to private companies!

16.2

1. Often in our day, government officials complain loudly about criticisms of them published on the Internet; they say that an organization "needs" to "fact-check" these Internet publishers. Briefly skim (if necessary) Benjamin Franklin's thoughts in Section 11.3 (the subheading titled "The Value of Publishing Lies"). How would you respond to these government officials' complaints?

AWV, but in a nutshell, "Deal with it!" Certainly Christians shouldn't insult or curse government officials, but officials should be able to deal with criticism. The First Amendment prohibits the U. S. government from abridging the people's freedom of speech. People can say anything they want about public officials, and if the officials don't like it, they can write, post, or speak out as they wish to defend themselves. If they think something's a lie, fine—prove it with your own post or speech!

2. Go back and read the portion of text from the Sedition Act on top of this page. What important U. S. government official is left out of the law? What is funny/sad about this? (If you can't figure out who it is, reread this section's third paragraph under the opening subheading titled "The Setup.")

The Vice President, Thomas Jefferson, was left out! Since he was not a "Federalist," the Sedition Act's writers purposely left him out, allowing criticism of him, but not the Federalist President or Congress or the rest of the government of the United States!

16.3 (Virginia Resolution)

1. What does Madison say states are "duty bound" to do when the U. S. government violates the Constitution?
To "interpose," or step in and fight against it.
2. When Madison says the U. S. government is trying to "consolidate the states...into one sovereignty," what does he mean?
That the U. S. government is trying to completely create a "superstate" in which the national government totally rules over the states, like they are simply counties under it.
3. What does Virginia's government "declare" at the end of the resolutions?
That the Alien and Sedition Acts are unconstitutional, and Virginia's government won't obey or enforce them.

16.3 (Kentucky Resolution)

1. What kinds of laws in general does Jefferson say are "unauthoritative, void, and of no force"?
Unconstitutional laws like the Alien and Sedition Acts—acts for which the government in its Constitution has been given no power to do.
2. Why does Jefferson say in Resolution #3 that the Sedition Act is illegal, and the states should ignore it?
Because it clearly violates the First Amendment prohibition on the U. S. government from infringing upon anyone's freedom of speech.

3. In Resolutions #5 and #6, why does Jefferson say that (a) keeping immigrants out of the country and (b) imprisoning them on accusation of being a “danger” are unconstitutional?

(a) *Because the Constitution clearly states that “the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808,” so it’s not legal to tell certain persons the states approve of coming in that they can’t come in. (b) To imprison someone without a trial as being a “danger” violates the Fifth Amendment’s provision that they are to receive “due process of law.” It also violates the Sixth Amendment, which guarantees a public, speedy trial by jury, the opportunity to defend himself and call witnesses, and the right to challenge the prosecution’s claims of his guilt. Also, for a President to claim judicial power of this kind violates Article III, which says that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in courts.”*
4. What does Jefferson say about (a) nullification and (b) rulers in Resolution #8?

(a) *Nullification is the “rightful remedy”—the exact thing needed to stand against unconstitutional laws like the Alien and Sedition Acts, and that all states have the “natural right” to nullify unconstitutional laws passed by the U. S. government. (b) Jefferson says that rulers should not be trusted, but watched carefully, to catch them trying to break laws and to give themselves more powers over the people: to “bind [them] down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.”*

16.4

1. Finish this quote from the Bible on the true, moral purpose of the government: to “remove ___ and ___, and execute ___ and ___” (Ezekiel 45:9).

Violence, spoil; judgement, justice.
2. How is nullification—both by state governments and by juries—a very proper and sensible way to deal with injustice?

It’s the fair, right, just thing to do. If a government breaks the law it’s supposed to uphold, its very actions are illegal, and state government and juries have every right—even an obligation—to resist it.
3. If Christians don’t like paying income taxes, are they justified in “nullifying” the taxes by hiding some of their income from the government?

No, if a tax is passed, that’s a legal act by a legislature. Jesus said to pay your taxes. There are possible issues more complicated than that, but we’ll leave it at that for now!
4. A state governor claims that “her” state faces a “health crisis.” She announces that residents aren’t allowed to leave their homes for 60 days, even though her order wasn’t passed by the state’s legislature, and she has no legal right to do so. Give reasons why a Christian father could be justified in personally “nullifying” the governor’s order. (See 2 Thessalonians 3:10, 1 Timothy 5:8, and Hebrews 10:24-25.)

A Christian “ought to obey God, rather than men [or women]” (Acts 5:29). The Bible also says that “if any would not work, neither should he eat (2 Thessalonians 3:10), that “if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel” (1 Timothy 5:8). Christians are also to “consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is” (Hebrews 10:24-25). How are Christian fathers who can’t work at home supposed to earn a living for their families, if they don’t leave their homes? How are Christians supposed to assemble themselves (physically gather together in one place) with other believers if they refuse to leave their homes?

17.1

1. If you were elected President of the United States, name one specific act you would do to reduce the power and money-spending of government. (This could be some bill you suggest to Congress that they pass and you sign.) *AWV!*
2. What do you think Virginia, Jefferson's home state (and other states) might have done if the Federalist House of Representatives had made a deal with Aaron Burr and given the presidency to *him*, instead of to Jefferson?
AWV, but they might have seceded from the union.

17.2

1. If you were a candidate for President, what qualities in a Vice President would you seek for your running mate? *AWV!*
2. If three U. S. presidential candidates get 150 electoral votes, 70 votes, and 65 votes, is there a clear winner, or does the election go to the House?
The candidate with 150 electoral votes is the winner: $150 + 70 + 65 = 285$, and 150 is more than half of 285.

17.3

1. Explain why tariffs that protect certain industries and "internal improvements" are actually types of theft.
Tariffs to protect industries force buyers to pay more for goods instead of getting better prices on items they could buy from other countries. It's a way of stealing from the buyers to benefit the producers. "Internal improvements" are often what tariff monies are spent on—and they are often spent in one area of a nation more than another area. In the case of the U. S., internal improvements were made much more in the North, at the expense of the South.
2. What things did the original Republican Party stand for? What two promises did Republican President Abraham Lincoln make in his first inaugural speech?
High tariffs, internal improvements, a national bank, and slavery where it already existed.
3. Explain a good way for a Christian to answer this question someone might ask: "Are you a Republican or a Democrat?"
AWV, but I hope you'd say, "Neither!" We should believe in the kind of government that God's Word approves of—limiting itself to protecting life, liberty, and property; executing judgement and justice; and punishing violence against others.

17.4

1. Briefly explain what you would say to someone who says to you, "The Supreme Court is the *final* decider on what the Constitution means."
There's nothing in the Constitution that says that; all three branches may interpret the Constitution. If one branch disagrees with the Supreme Court, it may refuse to carry out a decision by the Supreme Court.
2. Imagine you're President, and Congress passes a law forcing everyone to buy bicycles. You veto it, but Congress passes it over your veto. How could you negate this unconstitutional law?
Simply by announcing that you will not execute or enforce the law, which is your right as President. Your job is to interpret the Constitution, and if you don't see any power granted to Congress to force people to buy bicycles, then you shouldn't enforce the law.

18.1

1. What basic reason in Paragraph 2 does Madison give for vetoing the bill?
The power to spend money for roads and canals is not one of the powers granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8...so it's not a power of Congress!
2. What constitutional clause does Madison refer to in Paragraph 3?
The "Commerce Clause."
3. Explain Madison's general point in the last paragraph.
He says that he knows roads and canals are important, but there's simply no power granted to Congress in the Constitution to pay for them. Therefore, he has to veto it.
4. What do you think would happen today if a President vetoed a bill with a note to Congress that said, "I can't sign this bill. The power to spend money for ___ is not granted in the Constitution"?
Many Americans and government officials—especially those who would benefit from spending money on ___—would probably blow an artery with shock, since that hardly ever happens anymore. In a worst-case scenario, the world would explode into tiny pieces.
5. Can you name another item the U. S. government spends money on that is unconstitutional, but would raise a ruckus if they stopped spending on it?
AWV, but some ideas: education, health care, student loans, libraries, welfare, etc.

18.2

1. Quickly review Section 9.1's last part ("The Necessary and Proper Clause"). What is the normal, sensible way to interpret that clause?
Congress has a list of powers they're allowed to exercise. If they need to do something additional to exercise one of those powers only (if it's "necessary and proper"), then they can exercise that additional power to carry out their constitutional power.
2. Now let's perform a normal, sensible application of the "Necessary and Proper Clause." Since in the above babysitting example little Johnny Marshall is allowed to ride his bike, name two "necessary and proper" actions (not on the list) that he'd be allowed to do to make it possible for him to ride the bike.
Even though they're not on the list of things he's allowed to do, Johnny would be able to go downstairs to get his bike, pump up his tires, and reattach his seat if he needed to, since he wouldn't be able to ride his bike without doing those things.

18.3

1. How do protective tariffs measure up to the Bible's standard of the true, moral purpose of government? How, exactly, are they unjust?
They fail. They engage the government in the practice of theft, when one of the true, moral reasons for government, according to the Bible is to prevent theft ("spoil" in Ezekiel 45:9). They're unjust because they use the power of government to rob some and give to others.
2. Why are protective tariffs unconstitutional?
They're not designed to produce revenue for the U. S. government to use to "pay debts"; instead, they're designed to protect certain industries from foreign competition.
3. What do you suspect can a politician expect from an industry like steel, after he finagles it so the steel industry makes millions or billions of dollars because of preferred treatment by the government? *AWV, but probably a gift or bribe.*

18.4 Review for Quiz 5! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

19.1

1. What does Calhoun repeatedly say (starting with Paragraph 1) that the purpose of the tariff is, rather than for raising money for the “general government”?
“The protection of one branch of industry at the expense of others.”
2. What’s the only reason Congress may collect tariffs (imposts), according to the Constitution, which Calhoun points out in Paragraph 2?
To raise revenue for the operation of the U. S. government. The phrase in the Constitution reads this way: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”
3. Why does Calhoun call the South “serfs” in Paragraph 4?
They are being forced to pay tariffs to benefit the North at their expense. It’s like being a serf who works to benefit not himself, but a nobleman.
4. What does Calhoun say the tariff does for the North and against the South (Paragraph 5)?
It forces the South to buy goods from the North, at higher prices, than they would have to if they simply enjoyed free trade.
5. What “two great parties” does Calhoun say America has been divided into (Paragraph 8)?
The sovereign (the North, which rules the South via trade policies and tariffs), and the subject (the South, which serves the North like a subject serves a king).
6. What right does Calhoun say the states have when the general government oversteps its rightful boundaries (Paragraphs 11 and 12)?
To “veto” and “interpose”—in other words, to step in and nullify the general government’s illegal actions.

19.2

If you had a government position in which your responsibility was to help “regulate commerce,” how would you limit yourself so that your actions followed the Biblical guidelines for the true, moral purpose of government?

You could make sure that nothing you did was a type of theft from one group to give to others, like a tariff that protected businesses. Nothing you did should interfere with free trade or favor one group at the expense of another. Everything should be limited to executing judgement and justice, punishing violence and theft, terrorizing evil, and so on—things like enforcing contracts, preventing one company from ripping off another, and so on.

19.3

First, adding a tariff just to force customers to “buy American” is an unjust law. If American toy makers can’t compete, then they can’t compete! It’s not moral to force others to buy your products just because you don’t want them to buy your competitors’ products. Second, adding a tariff to products to protect industries is not constitutional. Imposts (tariffs), according to Article I, are allowed to be added only to help the U. S. government pay its debts and provide for the “general welfare.” Hurting buyers and helping producers of toys is specific welfare.

19.4

Should Governor Downman have the right to keep people in their homes to “protect them”? If so, what else could he order them to do...or *not* to do? How could his claim of this supposed power be exploited by the government for its own gain?

No, it's not a legitimate government power to order someone to do something or not do something because it might affect him badly. AWW, but if that's true, then the government could order people to exercise every day, not eat sugar or smoke or drink, not drive in cars, get eight hours of sleep per night, and so on. AWW on the last question, but a governor could order people to stay home to cause chaos before an election to disrupt a political opponent, for example.

20.1

1. Give two reasons why secession is constitutional.

AWV, but choose among these: Article I, Section 8 doesn't give the U. S. Constitution the power to stop secession; Article I, Section 10 doesn't prohibit the states from seceding; the Ninth Amendment says the people have many more rights not listed in the Constitution, which would surely include secession; the Tenth Amendment says that the U. S. government's powers are limited to the ones listed—and stopping secession isn't one of them; Northern states discussed secession, and nobody—not even Presidents at the time—considered trying to stop them from leaving.

2. Why is supporting secession not the same as supporting slavery?

Because it's not the same! Many people who support secession don't support slavery. Just because southern states seceded and had slaves doesn't mean the two are the same thing.

3. Think of an example that occurs in everyday life in which a person or persons who freely join a group or partnership should be left alone if they change their minds about being in that group or partnership. *AWV, but maybe an employee at a company, a musician in a group, a person who foolishly joins a cult, and so on.*

20.2

1. How was the issue of slavery in the U. S., while certainly a moral issue, not the way it's often simplistically portrayed—the “good guys” vs. the “bad guys”?

Because people all over the country opposed slavery and supported it—or at least, people all over the country oppressed African Americans in various ways. Many southerners fought to end slavery, and many northerners violated the rights of free African Americans in the north.

2. Why did Taney rule that limiting slavery in the U. S. was unconstitutional?

Because the Constitution protected slavery as written, and the power to end slavery is not one of the powers granted to the U. S. government in the Constitution. To end slavery, the Constitution had to be formally amended.

3. What about slavery, instead of the moral issue, did many politicians on both “sides” worry more about?

How much their “side” would be represented—slave states or non-slave states, in national elections and power struggles within the U. S.

20.3

1. What's the difference between chanting that “America Is Racist and Evil and Horrible!” and pointing out American politicians' constitutional violations?

The first is just an anger-based reaction and hatred of some of the freedoms and relatively limited government America has experienced over its history, as well as some of its Christian-friendly laws and principles. The second is just being honest—many U. S. politicians just flat-out ignored and ran over the law they swore to uphold.

2. Give one piece of proof that the North/South War was *not* fought to end slavery.

AWV, but students might list (a) Lincoln's promise to the South not to interfere slavery if they would return to the union; (b) his promise to support a constitutional amendment to establish slavery forever if they would return; (c) his letter to Horace Greeley that all he wanted to do was keep the South from leaving, whether or not it involved slavery; the U. S. Congress's declaration that the war had nothing to do with “overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those states.”

3. What does the willingness to violate the law say about a politician's character?

AWV, but it puts him in a very poor light. A U. S. government official, for example, swears an oath to uphold the Constitution, and ignoring it is bad enough. But a politician who violates the law views himself as above the law. And often a politician who violates the law does it for his own gain, or ends up economically or even physically harming others—so in those cases it shows he doesn't care about those God has placed under his protection.

20.4

1. Is Zachariah Chandler correct? Does a “rebel” surrender all his rights to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness? Why or why not?

No. A civilized government and society, especially one that has a written down Constitution, should protect those rights for all residents. Obviously, there are exceptions, like those who are guilty of crimes, who are in prison or to be executed. And who gets to decide what a “rebel” is, anyway?

2. List several of the first things you could do as a Christian to help restore a nation like the Confederate States of America back to its feet—besides the obvious ones like “provide food and shelter.”

AWV, but providing moral support, spiritual help, prayer, helping to rebuild businesses, etc.

21.1

AWV, but (a) it's a logical fallacy, because even if you're wrong about slavery, you could be right about secession; (b) secession is constitutional because the Constitution doesn't grant the national government the power to stop it; it doesn't prohibit the states from seceding; and it includes the Tenth Amendment, which says all powers not granted to the U. S. government are retained by the states.

21.2

1. If the U. S. government rules that a baker must make a “wedding” cake for a homosexual couple, the government is violating which amendment(s)?

At least the First Amendment, which prohibits the government's infringing upon a person's right to exercise his religion, and the Thirteenth Amendment, which prohibits “involuntary servitude”—that is, if a person doesn't want to voluntarily make a cake for someone, he shouldn't have to.

2. The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits state governments from violating the liberties of freed slaves. Should restaurants, clubs, and other private organizations have the right to keep patrons out, even if it's dishonorable to do so?

Yes. It's their property, so they should be able to allow whom they wish in, even if they are prejudiced and discriminate against some in a distasteful way.

21.3

1. In Paragraphs 2 and 5, what excuse does Congress give for saying they *have* to put the South under military rule? What does Johnson say is the *real* reason?

The Republican Congress claimed that they had to put the South under military rule because the southern states had no operating, legal governments, which is a lie; they did. Johnson says the real reason the Congress put them under the military is to dominate them until they do what the Congress wants them to do—to approve the Fourteenth Amendment.

2. What general statement could you make that explains why Johnson says that a military rule would be terrible for protecting the rights of southerners?

There are no checks and balances, like in a government with three branches; the commanding officer can do whatever he wants and call it legal; the officers that the commander allows to do the same will be tyrants.

3. Name a few ways that Johnson says military rule violates the Constitution.

There's no power in the Constitution to put the South under military rule granted to Congress. Also, the Constitution grants only a judiciary, not a military ruler and his underlings, the power to determine defendants “guilty” or “not guilty,” and only by a jury trial. The Constitution also prohibits a person's being arrested without a warrant given where there is “probable cause” that he has committed a crime, and indictment by a grand jury. The Fifth Amendment prohibits taking away a man's life, liberty, or property without “due process of law,” which is what happens in a military dictatorship like what the Republicans put upon the South. And this rule suspends the right of habeas corpus, which is guaranteed by the Constitution.

4. Given that Johnson points out again and again that the Reconstruction Act is unconstitutional, and given the fact that Johnson was later nearly removed by Congress on trumped-up charges, what does the fact that the Republican Congress was furious with Johnson's veto message tell you about their reasons for passing the bill?

Obviously their reasons were not legal or just, but based on revenge and hatred toward the people of the South—to punish all of them for daring to commit the “crime” of...wanting to be left alone and not pay taxes that benefited the North.

21.4

Review for Quiz 6! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

22.1

1. What did Jesus say and do about paying taxes in Matthew 17:24-27?
He told Peter that they were to be paid, so that His followers wouldn't offend others.
2. What Special Knowledge do government officials claim to have when they set up numerous levels of "progressive" income tax rates and dollars earned amounts?
They apparently believe they know how much income earners should be punished for the "crime" of making more money than those on the level below them.
3. Have you ever seen an article or TV show about a family that won millions of dollars in a lottery, then was broke a few years later? How does that relate to the passing of the Sixteenth Amendment in America?
A family that spends like made everything it gets is like a government that, when it's given even more taxes to spend, goes through it just as quickly and "needs" more.
4. What do you think are some other things that "the rich" in America do to avoid paying outrageous income taxes, besides not working as much as they could?
Hiding and/or investing their money legally in corporations, trusts, and other setups. It's similar to the protective tariff racket: Even though tariffs are constitutionally supposed to be for raising revenue to pay the bills of the U. S. government, the whole system makes it so those who might have to pay the extra cost avoid paying tariffs by purchasing items from other companies, defeating the whole purpose! (Various studies have been done, by the way, that show that the higher the income tax rate goes, the lower the amount of taxes are collected.)

22.2

1. Can you see the "method of electing senators" choice as a battle between the idea of "democracy" and "republican" forms of government? How so?
AWV, but you could argue that majorities are always more dangerous to liberties than representative government, because it's easier to fool just a little more than half the people into believing something. And now senators are sent to the Senate by simply appealing to more than half of a state's voters.
2. Can you think of one way a company could reward a senator who votes for a bill that enriches that company that isn't an obvious bribe? What do Proverbs 29:4, and Amos 5:12 say about this?
AWV, but it could be via donating toward his campaign or getting his family a contract to make money that the government spends on something. Proverbs 29:4 says, "The king by judgment establisheth the land: but he that receiveth gifts [bribes] overthroweth it." Amos 5:12 says, "For I know your manifold transgressions and your mighty sins: they afflict the just, they take a bribe, and they turn aside the poor in the gate from their right." These are warnings to rulers not to take bribes.

22.3 (Wilson's Speech)

1. If you were President of a nation *not* involved in a current war, what would you do about the people of "your" nation who traveled on ships in war zones? (Be sure your actions are constitutional!)
AWV, but I'd warn them: "You want to travel on a ship through a war zone? Good luck! We're not going to get our nation in a war because you want to take a trip. And wear a life preserver."
2. What do you think about Wilson's saying in this speech that the U. S. should fight "selfish and autocratic power" in other nations...right after he tells Congress they need to draft into the military at least 500,000 men?

It's laughably ironic. "Selfish and autocratic power"? What does he think ordering half a million young men to be drafted (enslaved) into the army shows about "selfish and autocratic power"? The idea that Wilson owns the lives and futures of those young men is a perfect example of what he's criticizing.

3. What do you think about Wilson's using such phrases as "the peace of the world is involved" and "the future peace of the world" and "the ultimate peace of the world and...the liberation of its peoples"? How does this attitude compare to what you remember about George Washington's Farewell Address?

It seems bombastic and exaggerated, almost as if he were doing it as an excuse to do something "big" like get America involved in the war. If you can convince others (and maybe yourself) that "the peace of the world" is at stake, maybe you don't feel so bad in sending hundreds of thousands of Americans off to possibly die halfway across the world.

4. If you worked for the German state *during a war you were not winning*, would you advise your military to bomb harmless ships with a large, powerful nation's citizens on them—just to be murderous and evil? Why or why not?

Of course not. Why would you want another powerful enemy to line up against you? This completely undercuts Wilson's claims that the Germans were all evil murderers who wanted nothing more than to randomly kill others.

22.3 (Norris's Speech)

1. What does Norris say about the U. S. government's policy on English and German war zones?

The U. S. government should have respected both and remained neutral. If it had done so, the nation wouldn't be hurtling toward war as it was then.

2. What groups does Norris say have a "financial interest" in leading the U. S. toward war?

Weapons makers (who can sell them to various nations at war), bankers, and anyone who has lent money to nations at war who wants security that those loans will be paid back.

3. What miserable consequences does war bring to a nation?

Death, starvation, mangled bodies, children growing up without fathers, debt, guilt, etc.

22.4

1. What key principle can we deduce from how the Wilson administration portrayed the *Lusitania* incident and handled the issue of American ships that sailed in war zones (not what he *did*, but what we can *learn* from it)?

AWV, but one obvious, clear one is this: Government leaders often will not hesitate to flat-out lie right to the faces of the people, if it will produce the results they want. It's extremely important to realize that it was the case then, now, and in the future.

2. A nation's government sees that war is raging among other nations, but also realizes it is not in danger of being attacked. What does it say about that government's opinion of the people it rules if it decides to enter that war anyway?

AWV, but it shows that the government thinks little of their lives and the damage it will cause their families if they're captured or killed in battle. Very few sane persons want to go to war; although no doubt some leaders feel it's necessary for good reasons, most reasons governments go to war is to empower themselves and/or to ensure that certain favored persons make money off of the racket that war is.

3. In general, what do you think about organizations or individuals who communicate a position on an issue, but try to stop anyone else from criticizing or disagreeing with their position? What does it say *about* their position?

AWV, but it's pretty pathetic and horrible. It shows that their position is basically worthless, since they can't defend it in a discussion or debate. This is what the government looked like during World War I, when it jailed and fined Americans who spoke out against the war and against the draft. Unbelievable that this could happen in a supposedly free society.

23.1

1. If you were the judge in the scenario in this section's opening, and you were assigned to hear the *Schenck v. United States* case, what principles would you follow to rule on it? Did the court's decision meet Biblical standards?
AWV, but you should follow the principles that all speech should be allowed unless it causes clear damage/harm against someone. The court's decision did not meet the Bible's standards, obviously, because no one was being harmed by Schenck's speech—in fact, had he been successful, he would have kept others from being drafted and put into harm's way.
2. When you see two persons disagreeing over an issue, and the first person tries to shout down or otherwise prevent the second person from speaking his mind, what does that tell you about the first person's view of the issue?
The first person's view is, to use a technically scientific term, "lame-o."
3. Explain the meaning of the decree in bold at this section's end.
*Holmes ruled in *Schenck v. United States* that the government should be able to violate one part of the Constitution, which prohibits it from infringing upon the right to free speech, so that the government can violate another part of the Constitution, that prohibits "involuntary servitude" (the draft).*

23.2

1. How is a national bank an example of (a) violating the Bible's standards on the true purpose of government and (b) violating the Constitution?
(a) It doesn't meet the Bible's standards of what the government's purpose is—to punish violent evildoers, to execute judgement and justice, and so on. (b) There's no power whatsoever to operate a national bank granted to the U. S. government in the Constitution.
2. Explain briefly how inflation benefits the rich at the expense of the poor.
It gets the new "money" to the rich and powerful first, so it has more value. When the "money" trickles down throughout the economy, the value of it decreases because prices have been increased to account for its lesser value. (Since the pieces of paper are worth less, stores must charge more pieces of paper for their goods.) The poor have the hardest time buying things like food and housing, and when the cost goes up for them, it's even harder.

23.3

1. Briefly, how could you respond to someone who says, "You're against the Environmental Protection Agency? I can't believe it! Do you want to live in a world with polluted air and streams filled with toxic chemicals?"
AWV, but you might say, "Of course I don't! But the EPA isn't constitutional. Just because I oppose the government's doing something doesn't mean I oppose doing it at all."
2. Practice using the above conversation model with someone who says, "We have to have a Department of Agriculture. Hey, like the saying goes: 'No Farmers, No Food!' Anybody who doesn't think agriculture is important is crazy." *AWV!*

23.4

1. Remember that your state has two senators and a number of representatives (roughly) based on your state's population. Now, find (a) the name of your local member of the House of Representatives, and (b) the names of your two senators, and pray for their salvation and wisdom in carrying out their governmental responsibilities. *AWV!*
2. Find out how many persons live in your congressional district. (That is, how many residents is your representative... representing?) *AWV!*

24.1

How does the textbook controversy described above relate to the central point of this book—that there is a true, moral, Biblical reason for government to exist? How are the parents who are angry about the textbooks' content missing the entire point? How could they better spend their energy and time?

If the government kept itself to its proper, moral functions, these ridiculous textbook arguments wouldn't exist. Parents would educate their own children and not fight over who gets to spend other residents' tax money to teach the government schools in the way they want it taught. It's understandable that parents whose children are in the government system are frustrated by what they see as bad teaching and bad textbooks, but they're missing the point: They should be teaching their own children, not trying to swing the plunder to the way they want it swung.

24.2

1. What do 1 Thessalonians 4:11-12 and 2 Thessalonians 3:10 tell Christians?

That Christians should “do [their] own business” and “work with [their] own hands,” and that if a Christian wants to eat, he should work.

2. Sum up Bastiat's explanation of how to recognize *legal plunder*. What makes a program like Medicaid less efficient than a doctor's simply deciding to treat a patient for free? (That is, what other costs come with government programs?)

It's anything the government does that if you did it, you'd be arrested for theft. Government programs like Medicaid and welfare are less efficient because much of the money paid into those programs doesn't go to the patient or the “poor” person—most of it goes to pay the employees who work for those programs and dole out the money to those who receive the plunder. Welfare is notorious, especially—I've read reports that only about 25-30 percent of money collected by the government for welfare goes to the “poor”—70-75 percent goes to the government agency itself.

24.3

1. What's the best way for government to handle a poor economy? Why?

To cut taxes and spending and get out of the way. No government action can do anything except for meddle in the decisions of millions of people, who know much better how to spend their money than the government does.

2. How did Hoover and FDR both handle the Great Depression?

The both instituted huge, expensive government taxing, regulating, and spending that hindered the economy from correcting itself, and lengthened the Great Depression.

3. Explain how new and constantly changing laws on regulation, production, hiring, and taxes would affect you as a business owner.

AWV, but they would frustrate business owners greatly, making them wonder what hare-brained scheme they'd be saddled with next, and making them less likely to invest and hire.

24.4

Review for Quiz 7! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

25.1

1. Why shouldn't a President have the power to create laws?
It's too much power for one person; it would result in a dictatorship.
2. What is your take on the NRA rules for chicken companies—the ones that limited how much employees can work, specified how much they must be paid, and prevented customers from picking out what chicken they wanted to buy?
AWV, but they're completely insane. As if government agencies have any idea about the varying needs and desires that thousands of chicken companies all over the nation have. And by the way, where in the Constitution is that power granted? The founders would turn over in their graves if they knew it was happening.
3. When a President or other government official initiates an absurd scheme like FDR's "court packing" scam, even though it's completely obvious to everyone what he's doing, what does it say about that official's view of the public?
It shows that he thinks the public is made up of a bunch of idiots who are too stupid to know what he's doing, like telling a toddler whose cat got run over that "He took a great big fun trip to Cat Fun World for forever." It's insulting for an adult to be treated that way by a politician.

25.2

The RSA isn't Biblically just, since it doesn't have anything to do with punishing violence and/or executing judgement and justice. It isn't constitutional either. There's no constitutional power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8 to operate an old-age retirement fund. Taxes are to be raised to "pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." In the Philadelphia Convention debates, the Nationalists insisted that only the specific powers granted to the U. S. government could be exercised. The RSA doesn't meet the requirements for the "General Welfare" clause, either: It's specific welfare—given back to those who reach the age of 65 and want to supplement their income with a "forced savings plan." (The RSA, by the way, is based on the same arguments used to justify another totally unconstitutional big-government plan FDR hatched: Social Security (in 1935).

25.3

1. Define exactions and what the Bible teaches what (a) rulers and (b) Jesus followers should do about them.
Unfair, unjust taxes taken for reasons other than to raise revenue. (a) Rulers shouldn't impose them upon those whom they rule, and (b) Jesus followers should pay them anyway.
2. Name several things should Christians "render to God." AWW!

25.4

1. Explain what the Bible says about why governments exist.
To "remove violence and spoil" (Ezekiel 45:9), to be a "terror" to "evil" (Romans 13:3), to "execute judgement and justice" (Jeremiah 22:3), and to punish "evildoers" (1 Peter 2:14).
2. Why is the U. S. government's involvement in education unconstitutional?
There's no power granted whatsoever to the U. S. government in Article I, Section 8 to have anything to do with education. And using the "General Welfare" clause is lame, since, again, paying for something like education is specific welfare—only going to those who have children and want them to attend government schools.
3. What is your thought on the question at the end of the second paragraph of this section, especially after having read the various quotes in the black boxes?

The question is “What is their real reason for offering to do this?” AWW, but I hope students see that the real reason governments offer something as a favor or for free is that there are strings attached. The quotes in the black boxes offer conclusive proof that many of those in government schools are there to train children to become statisticians, humanists, and socialists.

26.1

AWV!

26.2

AWV!

26.3

1. What would happen, in your opinion, if governments *only* waged wars that were defensive *and* legally declared by the appropriate government branch?

They would almost never wage war.

2. A U. S. soldier must swear an oath to uphold the United States Constitution. How does he violate this oath if he agrees to follow orders to fight in a “military action” that the President orders?

He violates it because the Constitution he swears to uphold forbids a President from sending troops anywhere unless Congress legally declares war.

3. Knowing what happens to the people’s freedoms when a nation is at “war” with *anything*—a nation, an idea like “terrorism,” or a virus—why should people, especially Christians, be skeptical when a government claims it *has* to go to war?

Governments often claim “emergency” situations when they want to exercise more powers.

26.4

Write one-sentence summaries for the above quotes from (a) Thomas Jefferson, (b) John Quincy Adams, (c) James Madison (pick one), and (d) Douglas MacArthur.

(a) Those who want to go to war invent fanciful and phony “proof” using numbers that a nation “has” to go to war. Spending tons of money to grab a little piece of land from another country is much less productive than spending way less money simply improving the land we already have, and it would be much better for everyone. (b) Americans love freedom, and wish others around the world the best, but we shouldn’t ever use our government’s power and money obtained from taxpayers to fight other nations’ battles. (c) Madison’s quotes, in order: Governments, when they steal liberty from the people, blame phony “dangers” from outside; war is the worst enemy to freedom there is; tyrants love to exercise great powers over the people, and when they do they love to scare the people into thinking it’s necessary because of a “foreign enemy” who’s about to kill us all. (d) Governments love to claim there’s a “national emergency” or dangerous foreign nation who’s going to invade and kill us unless we blindly rally behind the government and obey whatever it tells us to do.

27.1

1. Name, from memory, everything you can about that group of Bible verses that details the proper, moral function of government. How do they apply to the office of the President?

AWV. Those apply to a ruler like a President, certainly.

2. How is a U. S. President's powers limited by Congress?

Congress can override his veto, the Senate can refuse to approve his appointments for U. S. court positions, he's the commander in chief only if Congress declares war, and he can't make a treaty with another nation unless two-thirds of the Senate approves.

3. How do you answer someone who says something like, "We need a President who takes charge—somebody who just goes in there and gets things done!"?

AWV, but that sounds like a king or a dictator, not a president. Presidents, like all rulers, should follow the laws that they are bound by. And the typical person who says something like this gets spitting mad when a President from the other political party gets into office and just starts "getting things done"; it's hypocritical.

27.2

1. Well, why do you suppose some politicians and news media members applaud a "Powerful President," but blow a gasket when a President vetoes a bill?

Because they like giant, centralized, powerful government. A President who is "powerful" is one who ignores the law; a President who vetoes contributes toward decreasing the size of the U. S. government.

2. Explain in one sentence the overall point that James Buchanan makes in the second paragraph of his veto message excerpt on the previous page.

Congress shouldn't spend money on pet projects to benefit certain areas or industries. If they do, it opens up a whole can of worms of Congressmen trying to grab U. S. tax money for their own districts—necessarily stealing it, via the law, from other districts around the nation.

27.3

1. How could the threat of immediate presidential pardons also rein in unconstitutional rulings by the Supreme Court?

If the Supreme Court makes a bad/unconstitutional ruling, a President can just announce, "It doesn't matter what the Supreme Court ruled; I'll still pardon anyone convicted of breaking that unconstitutional law."

2. Ask your parents for an immoral or unjust federal law that they would like anyone convicted of breaking to be pardoned by the President. *AWV!*

27.4

Review for Quiz 8! (Take the quiz if you're *not* in my physical homeschool co-op class.)

28.1

1. Briefly answer a person who says, “I think public schools are great! There are some bad ones, but ours is okay—we have a Christian principal.”

AWV, but students might point out that they violate the Bible’s standards on what government should do. And saying, “There are some bad ones, but ours is okay—we have a Christian principal!” is lame. That’s an excuse we hear all the time, but schools all over the entire country fail the Christian and Biblical standard of what education is supposed to be.

2. How could taking prayer out of government schools hurt them? How is putting prayer or religion back in those schools not a long-term solution for fixing the way they work?

God might have honored many of those prayers in schools—who knows? But putting prayer back in schools isn’t a long-term solution, because the whole system is rotten—based on a belief that government should educate children, which violates the Bible’s teachings.

28.2

1. A lobbyist for the nation of Kliftonistan persuades Representative Ann Williams to include \$150 million of “foreign aid” to Kliftonistan in the next yearly U. S. budget. Give a brief outline of how this interaction between Kliftonistan’s lobbyist and Representative Williams could result in corruption.

AWV, but might include Kliftonistan’s government leaders’ stealing the money for themselves that the U. S. government sends it, then bribing Williams secretly by giving her part of the money the officials kept for themselves.

2. A lobbyist for the multi-billion grocery store chain GrubMart persuades a senator to add a section to a bill that forces all grocery stores across the nation to pay their employees at least \$12 per hour. Why do you think GrubMart might want this part added to the bill? What could be in it later for the senator?

GrubMart might be trying to squeeze out competitors that can’t afford to pay their employees \$12 per hour yet. Again, the senator might get some sort of financial donation to his campaign in exchange, or a bribe in some other way.

3. List as many of the Bible’s purposes for a just government from memory as you can. (See the previous page for any you forgot.) How could you answer someone who says, “The government needs to make sure children get three meals a day. That’s the Christian thing to do—to make sure the poor are taken care of”? *AWV!*

28.3

Pretend you’re a lobbyist. Choose one of the products or services you thought of at the beginning of this section. Now, brainstorm: Using that product or service, (a) think up a way you could use the power of the government to increase your sales, and (b) come up with a short response to those who criticize your company/industry after you get the government to help you gain “forced customers.” *AWV!*

28.4

1. Keeping in mind the Bible’s standards for government, is providing medical care for the aged or the poor a proper function of government?

No, it has nothing to do with executing judgement or justice, punishing violent evildoers, or being a terror to evil.

2. Why, specifically, are both Medicare and Medicaid unconstitutional?

There’s no power at all granted to Congress to take money from some citizens and give it to other groups of citizens to pay for their medical care.

3. How can you respond to someone who says, “The Constitution says Congress has the power to ‘provide for the general welfare.’ Paying for medical care for the old and poor certainly is in their welfare, and hey—you might be poor or old one day, so don’t knock it!”
“General welfare” differs from “specific welfare,” which is what Medicaid and Medicare are.
4. The Food and Drug Administration, as noted on the previous page, has to approve a drug before those suffering from diseases and other health conditions are *allowed* to take it. Often this drug approval process takes many years. What is morally wrong with this power given to the FDA?
Aside from being unconstitutional, it’s morally wrong to tell people, “You’re not allowed to take this drug, even though you’re suffering and it might help you.” People should be allowed to make that decision for themselves.
5. Often today you hear Americans say, “Health care is a *right*.” Break down this claim as far as you can to *what it actually means when you get right down to it*. What’s wrong with that claim?
It’s not a right, because that means one person has a “right” to the labor and knowledge of another person. You don’t own somebody else; you can’t force someone to work for you! Besides being morally wrong, it violates the Thirteenth Amendment.
6. Again keeping in mind the Bible’s guidelines for the proper role of government, give an example of how the state *should* intervene in a situation that involves medical care—one that deals with someone’s harming or stealing from another person. *AWV!*

29.1

Christians would oppose using marijuana to get high or indulge their fleshly desires. Marijuana use, however, does not qualify as the kind of “evil” the Bible says that the government is put into place to punish. The word “evil” in the Bible means “harm”—hurting, kidnapping, killing, or ruining the reputation of someone. It’s not a Biblical function of government to stop people from using drugs that might harm themselves, any more than it is a function of government to stop people from smoking, drinking alcohol, or overeating. If a person uses drugs and causes property damage, however, the government can step in—not to punish someone for using the drugs, but to make the person make restitution for his damaging someone else’s property.

29.2

1. How did the *Roe v. Wade* ruling violate the Tenth Amendment?

The Constitution doesn’t give the U. S. government the power to stop states from passing anti-abortion law. The Tenth Amendment says that if a power is not specifically granted to the U. S. government, then it doesn’t have that power.

2. Why did Justice Blackmun decide that the Constitution did not protect the unborn as “persons”?

He said that when the Constitution talked about “persons,” they were already born, so he claimed that the unborn weren’t “persons,” according to the Constitution.

3. What was the purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment? Why do you think the Supreme Court pulled out of thin air the phrase “right to privacy” and claim the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed it?

To protect the rights of freed slaves as citizens. They pulled the “right to privacy” out of thin air and desperately cited the Fourteenth Amendment because they had no other way to constitutionally justify banning states’ restrictions upon abortion.

4. Should a person have a “right to privacy”? How should this right be balanced against the rights of others?

Yes, but it should not be allowed to violate the rights of others—their life, their liberty, and their property.

5. Reread the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment under the “Five *Roe v. Wade* Questions” subheading. How could a person argue that that amendment—just like the ending of the Fifth Amendment—*prohibits* the practice of abortion (look at the very end of the section quoted)?

That amendment says that “nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” That’s exactly what abortion does—take an unborn baby’s life without due process of law.

29.3

1. Imagine you’re a high-level U. S. government official itching to exercise more power over Americans. Because of irresponsible and corrupt government decisions, the U. S. economy is declining, with many Americans losing jobs and many companies going out of business. Explain several steps you could take—not to *fix* this situation, but to create an “emergency,” so that the people would give you more power over their lives.

AWV, but any supposed “emergency” will do to distract the American people and take their minds off the bad economy (and your part in causing it).

2. Ditto the above scenario, except this time you’re made aware of a virus that is a little less dangerous than the seasonal flu (i.e., it’s only of concern to the elderly, those suffering from life-threatening illnesses, the very overweight, or a combination of those conditions).

AWV, although you could lie about the death rate, fake the number of deaths, keep changing the way you count cases, count deaths not from the virus as happening from the virus to keep the numbers up and scare the people, and so on. (Not that that would ever happen.)

29.4 List a few of Congressman Paul's beliefs on what government should do. How do your choices compare to the overall theme of what we've discussed this year regarding the Bible's teaching on government's true purpose?
AWV!

30.1

1. “Thus saith the Lord GOD; Let it suffice you, O princes of Israel: remove ___ and ___, and execute ___ and ___” (Ezekiel 45:9).
Violence, spoil; judgement, justice
2. “Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the ___ out of the hand of the ___: and do no wrong, do no ___ to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow, neither shed ___ blood in this place” (Jeremiah 22:3).
Spoiled, oppressor, violence, innocent
3. “For rulers are not a ___ to good works, but to the ____...for he [the ruler] is the minister of God, a revenger to execute ___ upon him that doeth ___” (Romans 13:3-4).
Terror, evil, wrath, evil
4. “Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the ___ of ___” (1 Peter 2:13-14).
Punishment, evildoers

“We need a *Christian* government. There are too many *evil* things going on in our country.”

“A Christian government isn’t possible; the church’s job is to forgive and return good for evil; these are the opposite jobs of the state. It’s not the state’s job to punish anyone but an “evildoer” who physically harms or steals from or kidnaps or kills someone.”

30.2

1. Why did the Federalists—wrongly called “Anti-Federalists,” remember? —oppose the United States Constitution? (Section 7.4)
They believed it gave too much power to the national government, and was written in many places where it could be “interpreted” to mean the national government would take many powers not listed.
2. What did the Nationalists—wrongly called “Federalists”—promise repeatedly about the Federalists’ claims about the Constitution? (Section 7.4)
Nationalists repeatedly promised that there was no way the Constitution could be interpreted to mean anything other than exactly what it said.
3. How did the Federalists and Nationalists interpret the Constitution differently after it was ratified? What is a little nutso about the whole interpretation debate? (Section 8.3)
Nationalists took a “broad” interpretation, Federalists a “strict” one; the whole idea of interpreting the Constitution is crazy, since we’re looking at the exact same words here!
4. Why is it a little strange to include in the Constitution a list of powers granted to Congress, and a list of powers they may not exercise? (Section 9.1)
If there’s a list of things the U. S. government is allowed to do, why do we need a list of the things it can’t do? Shouldn’t listing the only powers given to it be enough to explain it?

“The government should offer college free for anybody who wants it. And it’s constitutional, because the Constitution says that Congress can ‘provide for the general welfare.’”

It’s unconstitutional, because “free” college is not general welfare; it’s specific welfare. Besides, giving away other people’s money who didn’t earn it to pay for college is not even close to being one of the specific powers listed in Article I, Section 8.

30.3

1. How could you respond to your big-government history professor at college when she says the following?: “The state of West Dakota has no right to ignore the new law Congress passed yesterday outlawing homeschooling. The ‘supremacy clause’ in the Constitution means that the new law is “the supreme law of the land.” (Section 10.1)

The “Supremacy Clause” doesn’t mean the national government can pass any law it wants and the states have to agree to follow it. Only laws that are made “in pursuance thereof” (in agreement with the Constitution) are legal, so states should ignore illegal laws.

2. Pretend the Constitution never added a Bill of Rights. Does the U. S. government then have the right to prevent Americans from owning a gun? (Section 10.4)

No. The power to infringe upon the people’s right to bear arms isn’t one of the powers granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, so even without a Second Amendment, Congress wouldn’t have that power.

3. What did America’s founders generally think about standing armies? And in the Second Amendment, to what group does the word “militia” refer to? (Section 12.1)

They hated them, seeing them as dangerous to the people’s liberties and tools of tyrants. The word “militia” in the Second Amendment means the people.

4. Name several reasons why the U. S. government should stay out of the affairs of foreign nations. What label is often unjustly stuck to those who support a nation’s government that does this? (Section 15.3)

AWV, but it’s expensive, gets Americans killed, abridges freedoms, violates the warnings of early American statesmen, and so on. Those who oppose sending American soldiers and weapons into other nations, but approve of trading with them, are often called isolationists.

“The Supreme Court ruled in *Yecch v. Clonker* that stores can’t keep shoppers out of their buildings for not wearing shoes. How can you possibly disagree with that? It’s the Supreme Court! They have the final say on interpreting the Constitution.”

No, they don’t. All branches may interpret the Constitution.

30.4

1. If Congress passes a law which violates the Constitution, why is nullification by a state government a sensible, just reaction? (Section 16.4)

It’s only right—an illegal law should be ignored or resisted by state governments.

2. What evidence is there that the North/South War did not occur because the North wanted to end slavery? (Section 20.3)

Northern politicians, including Lincoln, openly admitted they didn’t care whether the South had slaves or not (even offering to protect slavery there forever)—they just wanted the South to pay protective tariffs or buy Northern goods.

3. How does war lead to bigger, worse, and oppressive government? (Sections 26.3, 26.4)

It violates freedoms of speech, kidnaps young men into “service,” increases taxes, etc.

4. Explain the basic lesson behind the “Pickled Beets Affair” in Section 28.3.

Lobbyists can influence (bribe) lawmakers into writing favorable law for their particular industry in exchange for favors.

“I don’t mind giving up a few minor rights during the next few months. We all should be willing to help—the President says we’re in a national emergency! Stop being so selfish.”

AWV, but giving up rights in a supposed “emergency” makes it attractive for power-seeking governments to declare lots of phony “emergencies” so they can strip citizens of their rights.