

# The WildBranch Ministry

*...thou bearest not the root, but the root  
thee. Romans 11:18*

---

## Christianity and Liberalism

### Part 2

---

#### The Constitution Is A Living Document

One oft quoted mantra of liberal thinking is the belief, albeit a self-serving belief, that the founding document of this nation is a living, breathing, and changing record. The idea is that the founding 'fathers' never intended for their words and formulations to be etched in cement. The constitution was designed from the beginning to change with the times. This supposition fits quite well with the recent tendency, especially in our 'thinking' universities, to revise history and convert it to politically correct thinking. Both of these perceptions fit like a glove with another popular American doctrine, evolution.

Many of the main issues of the liberal platform do not conform to the 'idealism' of the founding fathers. Instead of pursuing criminals that use a gun in the act of a crime, liberals attack the 'real' meaning of the 2nd amendment. When God or 'Jesus' is mentioned in a public arena, the 'lack' of any real religious conviction of the signers of the constitution is brought up. The constitution was reviled during the election scandal in Florida last year. I know I have broached this subject many times, but why is it that grown thinking adults can look at the same words of the 1st amendment and come to two totally different conclusions. Someone asked Dr. Walter Williams, the renowned professor of economics at Georgetown University, why he could not understand that the constitution was a living document. Dr. Williams response was classic. "How would you like to play poker with me using living rules?"

The founding document of this nation has come under relentless attack in my lifetime. It seems that the best way to change the present is to repudiate the past. This is how all great revolutions succeed. It is also how great religions get their start. It is best done by criticizing your antecedent. It is only logical that the reason for starting something new is because of the failure of the old. So we first begin to justify the new by condemning the old. Anyone wishing to dramatically change our way of government will never succeed by suggesting a new constitution. First we must patiently spend a few decades tearing down public confidence in the old constitution. History, of course, is one problem to be dealt with. So, we slowly begin to revise our history, by appealing to our multicultural nature. We change our public perception of the morals and ethics of the great men of this nation, thus

villifying their motives and administrative capabilities. This eventually demonizes the whole governmental structure of the archaic commencement of our country. The step by step change of the American paradigm must always be salted with an occasional patronizing comment reflecting an appreciation for the fact that the 'old way' worked very well for those living then.

This all fits very well with the theory of evolution. Remember when our great, great ancestors had fins and gill slits? Those appendages worked fine when we were tadpoles. But we have evolved and no longer need those things. They have dropped off (about four dispensations ago) and we have left them behind. It is time to enter the dawn of a new civilization. One that is not hampered by appendages no longer needed. We must not take our archaic constitution into our culture, but, rather, our culture into the constitution.

Where did liberal thinking get this paradigm from? I would suggest that perhaps it is following the lead of it's main religious institution. The testimony of virtually every 'church father' is riddled with condemnation of Torah and the obsolescent Old Testament. In order to institute the 'new' leadership, we must render the old as impotent. Christianity's early leadership did a magnificent job of repudiating the Old Testament, and thus was born a 'new' religion, an institution free from the legalistic archaic bonds of slavery to outdated customs and traditions. It has successfully taught that the appendages associated with our evolutionary ancestors have been removed and Torah has been relegated to the primordial soup ponds of the Law and the Prophets. Even the well documented gospel accounts of the birth of the Messiah has been revised to produce a yearly tradition that would be barely recognizable to those living in the 1st century. I take that back. Most Persians, Babylonians, Romans, Assyrians, Greeks, Wiccans and Druids would feel right at home.

Just like our founding fathers, Sha'uls doctrinal stand has been flip-flopped as well. A Torah-keeping Hebrew of the Hebrews has been revised into a Torah hating anti-semite. Which is a very liberal thing to do. By showing that Paul also had no regard for the law, this makes us all feel better about our disregard for it as well. I seem to remember a recent past liberal President that rationalized his immoral behavior by bringing up Thomas Jefferson's improprieties. How many times have I heard, "Well, hey! Jesus broke the Sabbath!" It seems to me that history revisionists and Bible revisionists have a common interest, and that is to justify the new by condemning the old. Just as it is with liberalism, many of the most popular doctrines and traditions of the modern church do not square with the early writers of scripture. So instead of taking God ordained scripture into our culture, we take our culture into the scriptures. After all, the scriptures are ever changing documents. Just ask any dispensationalist.

Shalom Alechem!

---

©1993–2020 The WildBranch Ministry. | P.O. Box 97, Vernal, UT, 84078 | 1-435-789-3713 |  
WildBranch.org