

# Chapter 9

## Article 6: The Supreme Law of the Land

### Clause 1

All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the confederation.

#### Debt Perpetuity vs. Debt Cancellation

Section 1 assured public creditors that the United States' new government would honor past debts:

Hamilton put the debt of the Union at \$11,710,378 owing in foreign countries and \$42,414,085 of domestic debt. The States themselves owed \$25,000,000, making debts in the aggregate of \$79,000,000.<sup>1</sup>

It was noble that the framers chose to honor the nation's and states' past debts. However, had they intended to abide by Biblical law, this would have been the ideal place to stipulate a return to Yahweh's<sup>2</sup> sabbatical year and its provision for debt cancellation. Without this stipulation, the United States Constitution essentially provided for debt perpetuity, in contrast to Yahweh's law provision for debt cancellation. Every seventh year (known as the sabbatical year) Yahweh requires the cancellation of all debts:

At the end of every seven years thou shalt make a release. ...Every creditor that lendeth ought unto his neighbour shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbour, or of his brother; because it is called YHWH's<sup>3</sup> release. (Deuteronomy 15:1-2)<sup>4</sup>

The seventh-year release is not a moratorium, but a cancellation of all private and public debts.<sup>5</sup> If the framers (and today's politicians) were earnest about balancing the budget, they would have returned to Yahweh's law and its seventh-year cancellation of debt. Rather than choosing the only means by which America's current budget can ever be balanced, politicians opted to shackle future generations with ever-increasing debt.

Today's ungodly, usurious economic system<sup>6</sup> compounds the problem with each passing year. Under Yahweh's economic system, the budget would never be unbalanced for more than six years. Inflation and recessions would all but disappear. One can only imagine the prosperity Americans would enjoy under such a system. In fact, Yahweh promises that if we obey His law, we will never experience a deficit. Instead of being the world's greatest debtor nation, as we presently are, America would again be the greatest lending nation, as she was in the past when she adhered more closely to Yahweh's law:

...if thou carefully hearken unto the voice of YHWH thy God, to observe to do all these commandments ... YHWH [will bless] thee ... and thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow; and thou shalt reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over thee. (Deuteronomy 15:5-6)

### Clause 2

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United

States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.

### Supreme Law

The framers were fully cognizant of the word “supreme” and its meaning when they declared the supremacy of the Constitution. In so doing, they made the law of Yahweh subservient to the law of WE THE PEOPLE.

Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. (Matthew 15:6-9)

The framers, and today’s political leaders and Constitutionals pay homage to the traditions and commandments of men as the supreme law of the land. Even the Pharisees of Jesus’<sup>2</sup> day weren’t so brazen as to call their man-made traditions supreme.

Regardless what Article 6 claims, Yahweh’s law reigns above all other so-called laws, including the Constitution. This was evident when John the Baptist told Herod Antipas, “It is not lawful [according to Leviticus 18:16] for you to have her [Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip]” (Matthew 14:4). John placed the Roman Tetrarch, and the entire Roman government, under Yahweh’s law.

Constitutionalists who claim to be Christians<sup>8</sup> will predictably add “under God” or “under the Bible” to the declaration in Clause 2. But their authority to do so is not derived from the Bible or the Constitution. This is another futile attempt to make the Constitution a Christian document and a classic case of trying to serve two masters. Either the Constitution must be rejected because it never was subservient to Yahweh’s law, or Yahweh’s law must be rejected because it demands any inferior constitution be subject to and in concert with its supreme law.

If you choose to promote the Constitution on its own merit, that is your prerogative. However, if you choose to promote the Constitution as a Biblically based document, that is deception and subterfuge. Anyone who chooses the former becomes an idolater; anyone who chooses the latter attempts to provide Biblical sanction for his idolatry.

### Supreme God

Here is not a transient compact between parties: it is the institution of government by an act of the highest sovereignty; the decree of many who are yet one; their law of laws, inviolably supreme....

### History of the Formation of the Constitution, 1885<sup>9</sup>

A supreme law can only come from a supreme being. The claim that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land is another witness to the clandestine assertion in the Preamble that WE THE PEOPLE is the god of the United States government. Accordingly, it becomes the god of anyone today who looks to the Constitution as the supreme law of the land. (See [Chapter 3](#) concerning the serious implications of WE THE PEOPLE as a deity.) How can Constitutionalists claim to believe the following passage?

Thine, O YHWH, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O YHWH, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might.... (1 Chronicles 29:11-12)

This and numerous other passages declare Yahweh and His law supreme. Conversely, the Constitution as “supreme law” is a self-contained legal system:

Our Constitution is a closed legal ... system that declares itself and the laws made pursuant to it, to be the supreme law of the land, and that is the only law it allows.<sup>10</sup>

What does this say about the numerous Biblical laws in disagreement with the Constitution? Consider again the following Supreme Court decision:

"...a law repugnant to the Constitution is void."

Marbury v. Madison (1803)<sup>11</sup>

If we believe the law of WE THE PEOPLE is supreme, then all law that contravenes the Constitution, including Yahweh’s commandments, statutes, and judgments, is null and void. *Reynolds v. United States* (1879) addressed the Mormon Church’s claim that polygamy was a right afforded them under Amendment 1. Because most Americans find polygamy repugnant, the magnitude of Supreme Court Justice Morrison R. Waite’s decision is lost on them:

Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice?... So here, as a law of the organization of society under the exclusive dominion of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land.<sup>12</sup>

Contrary to Matthew 7:21-27 and James 1:22-25, the Supreme Court ruled that a man’s actions can be severed and isolated from his faith and judged illegal according to the Constitution and its supplemental edicts. This precedent paved the way for *any* Christian action based upon a Biblical conviction – such as preaching against sodomy – to be arbitrarily outlawed in the same fashion. Had the framers established Yahweh’s immutable law and its predetermined morality as the supreme law of the land, polygamy and human sacrifice (and all other issues) would have fallen under *its* jurisdiction and thereby determined to be either lawful or unlawful.

### Other Sundry Edicts and Treaties

Not only did the framers establish the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, they also declared all subsequent laws and treaties made under the authority of the United States to be supreme as well. As a result, the treaty made with the Muslims of Tripoli also became a part of the supreme law of the land:

...the government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion....

This treaty was unanimously approved by the Fifth Congress and signed by President John Adams. Shortly thereafter, it was printed in its entirety in the *Philadelphia Gazette* and in two New York papers. Samuel Adams (second cousin to John Adams) concurred with the Treaty of Tripoli:

Your Excellencies, will, I hope, excuse me when I differ from you as to our [the United States Constitutional Republic's] having a religion [Christianity] in common with you [England]; the religion of America is the religion of all mankind. Any person may worship in the manner he thinks most agreeable to the Deity; and if he behaves as a good citizen, no one concerns himself as to his faith or adorations, neither have we the least solicitude [care] to exalt any one sect or profession above another.<sup>13</sup>

Even David Barton admitted that the Treaty with Tripoli's declaration is factual:

...this is not an untrue statement since it is referring to the federal government [as opposed to 18th-century America in general]. Recall that while the Founders themselves openly described America as a Christian nation ..., they did include a constitutional prohibition against a federal establishment [of any specific religion]....<sup>14</sup>

Professor Gary T. Amos, former law professor at Regent University and the author of *Never Before in History* and *Defending the Declaration*, two books regarding the influence of Christianity on America's founding, agreed:

The treaty is nothing more than a pronouncement "that 'the Christian religion' as a formal institution was not a part of the American government...."<sup>15</sup>

For obvious reasons, many people attempt to negate this statement in the Treaty with Tripoli:

Despite the efforts of some Christian leaders to spin-doctor this document, the statement speaks for itself.... Imagine your church saying that it was "not in any sense founded on the Christian religion," or a member of your congregation telling his neighbor that his own personal faith was "not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." If such words are unfit for Christians and their churches, how are they acceptable in a Christian government? There is simply no context that justifies the statement – other than it being a deliberate denial of Christianity.<sup>16</sup>

If the federal government is not Christian, what is it? At best, it's non-Christian. At worst, it's antichristian. And regardless – thanks to [Amendment 1](#) – it's polytheistic.

America *was* founded upon Christian principles and was at one time a predominately Christian nation. But a distinction must be made between 17th-century *America* and the late 18th-century *United States of America*. Because most Constitutionals regard it as one uninterrupted, continuous history, they use the terms interchangeably. What occurred in the 18th-century United States of America was an undeniable departure from 17th-century America, which, for the most part, was governed by the supreme law of Yahweh. (See [Chapter 3](#) "The Preamble: WE THE PEOPLE vs. YAHWEH" for information regarding this extremely important distinction.)

Clause 2 dictates that “the judges in every state shall be bound” by such treaties.

Consequently, every judge – including former Alabama Judge Roy Moore – breaches his oath of office if he attempts to promote the Ten Commandments or anything else Biblical or Christian. In 2003, Constitutionals and Christians alike protested the State of Alabama’s right to impeach Judge Moore for erecting a memorial to the Ten Commandments in Alabama’s Supreme Court. In an article entitled “You Might Be a Constitutionalist If...,” 2008 Constitution Party Presidential candidate, Pastor Chuck Baldwin posited:

You might be a Constitutionalist if you believe the federal government had no authority to tell Alabama Chief Justice Roy Moore that he could not display a monument containing the Ten Commandments in the Alabama Judicial Building in Montgomery.<sup>17</sup>

You might be a *true* Constitutionalist if you believe the federal government had constitutional authority, provided by Article 6 and the Treaty with Tripoli, to do just that. On the other hand, because we have no treaties declaring the United States is not a Judaic or Islamic nation, it would not be unconstitutional if a judge were to promote portions of the Talmud or the Koran.

Not only does Clause 2 make the Treaty with Tripoli a part of the supreme law of the land, it confers the same supremacy on the Charter of the United Nations:

The Charter has become “the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”

*Sei Fujii v. the State of California* (1952)<sup>18</sup>

Anyone who promotes the Constitution is equally obligated to promote the non-Christian declaration in the Treaty with Tripoli and the United Nations Charter.

### Infanticide and Sodomy

All laws passed by Congress, including those that legalize infanticide and promote sodomy, are also the supreme law of the land. These laws could never be a part of a government predicated upon Yahweh’s law. Instead of legalizing these and other abominations, Yahweh’s law condemns infanticide and sodomy<sup>19</sup> as capital crimes. “Laws” legitimizing infanticide and sodomy are only the tip of the insidious iceberg that Christian Constitutionals are obligated to honor as part of the supreme law of the land:

The Constitution is like water poured into a cavern. It levels with current religious thought, including atheism, homosexuality and the murder of the unborn.<sup>20</sup>

### Clause 3

The senators and representatives before-mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

### The Seditious Oath of Office

Baldwin insisted that upholding a sworn oath to the Constitution is equivalent to genuine Christianity:

If America's Christian voters were really serious about selecting and preferring Christians as their rulers, they would certainly expect, yea, even require that their civil magistrates uphold their oath of office, would they not? Would they not insist that their president, their congressman, and every other elected leader live up to their word to support, uphold and defend the U.S. Constitution? How can they say they have elected a Christian to public office if they do not even know whether that person has honored his or her sworn oath to the Constitution? In the final analysis, it is far more important that an elected official be faithful to the Constitution than he or she gives lip service to an insipid Christian profession, is it not? If someone is a true Christian, would they not feel duty-bound to honor their oath to the Constitution?<sup>21</sup>

I agree with Baldwin regarding insipid Christian professions, but to make obedience to a constitutional oath a litmus test for Christianity is equivalent to requiring someone to uphold an oath to Mohammed because Islam and Christianity share some of the same laws and principles. If, after taking the constitutional oath of office, a man comes to his senses, recognizes its treasonous connotations against Yahweh, and breaks his oath in order to keep and promote Yahweh's law, what Christian would presume to identify his violation of his oath of office as unchristian? A true Christian will not insist that presidents, congressmen, and elected officials live up to their word to support, uphold, and defend the United States Constitution. Instead, a true Christian will demand that such officials renounce the Constitution as idolatry, spiritual whoredom, and sedition against Yahweh.

Timothy Baldwin claims the following regarding oaths of office:

The oath of office comes from the notion first that there is a Creator God who implements justice on earth and in life hereafter; he rewards good and punishes bad. It comes from the notion that mankind has a tendency to be evil and will use power at the expense of the people's and individuals' freedom and rights. It comes from the notion that constitutions, elections and even threats of revolts do not adequately prevent politicians from abusing power. Therefore, an oath of office is required to ensure political leaders will bind themselves to the Supreme Law of the Land...

More specifically, an oath is a solemn promise made by the politician to God Almighty, where if the politician breaks his promise, he is calling the wrath of God's punishment upon his life in whatever proportion God feels is justified.<sup>22</sup>

There are at least four problems with Baldwin's statements. First, neither in Article 6, nor in [Article 2](#), is there anything required or even mentioned regarding an oath before or to Yahweh.

Second, even if this was the general practice at the time the Constitution was framed, and even if Section 1, Clause 3 did not forbid religious oaths, [Amendment 1](#) guarantees that oaths of office cannot be administered in the name of or to any specific god.

Third, such oaths are made binding *as a result of punishment*. Nowhere does the Constitution provide such a punishment. Self-maledictory oaths of office, administered in the name of Yahweh, are effectually nullified by [Amendment 8's](#) repudiation of cruel and unusual punishments.

Fourth, even if oaths of office were administered in the name of Yahweh, doing so for the purpose of binding oneself to the humanistic, antichristian Constitution as the supreme law of the land invalidates the oath, regardless one's intentions. To swear to support the Constitution

as the supreme law of the land is tantamount to swearing *not* to support the law of Yahweh and is equivalent to denying Yahweh as God and swearing by another god:

A lawful oath consists in calling upon God [Yahweh], the occasion being of sufficient seriousness and importance, to witness the truth of what we affirm as true, or our voluntary assumption of an obligation to do something in the future – with an implied imprecation of God’s disfavor if we lie or prove unfaithful to our engagements.... Hence an oath is an act of supreme religious worship, since it recognizes the omnipresence, omniscience, absolute justice and sovereignty of the Person whose august witness is invoked, and whose judgment is appealed to as final.

It hence follows that it is a sin equivalent to that of worshipping a false god if we swear by any other than the only true and living God....<sup>23</sup>

To swear to uphold WE THE PEOPLE’s Constitution as the supreme law of the land is the same as swearing to WE THE PEOPLE as god. How could any Christian take such an oath? People argue that we need Christian men in government to keep non-Christians honest or, at least, to check moral decay. But this hasn’t worked to date. What if, instead, Christians had never compromised and had insisted on Yahweh’s government and law?

Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men. (Acts 5:29)

The Patriarch Joseph (who served in Egypt’s government) and the Prophet Daniel (who served in Babylon’s government) are raised as objections. However, Joseph and Daniel, unlike today’s so-called Christian politicians, never compromised Yahweh’s law in their official capacities. When Daniel’s contemporaries Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were commanded to commit a Second Commandment transgression by demonstrating obeisance to Nebuchadnezzar’s idol (representing his government), they chose instead to be thrown into the fiery furnace.

### Religious Tests

The test oath is abhorrent to our tradition.

Girouard v. *United States* (1946)<sup>24</sup>

The phrase “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States” can only be understood within the historical context of the States’ religious test oaths:

State constitutions enacted during the war [for independence] commonly required test oaths for holding public office. Only Protestants could hold public office in New Jersey or sit in the legislatures of Georgia, South Carolina, and New Hampshire, and only those professing “the Christian religion” could hold public office in Maryland or serve in high government positions in Massachusetts. North Carolina limited public office to those who believed in God, the truth of the Protestant religion, and divine authority of both the Old and New Testaments.... Before taking their seats, Pennsylvania legislators had to declare: “I do believe in one God, the creator and governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine

inspiration.” Delaware went further by requiring all office holders to profess belief in the Trinity and the divine inspiration of the Bible.<sup>25</sup>

The religious oaths of Vermont and Massachusetts are typical of the Christian test oaths at the time of the Constitutional Convention:

The State of Vermont’s Constitution, Section IX: A quorum of the house of representatives ... shall, each of them, before they proceed to business, take and subscribe, as well the oath of fidelity and allegiance herein after directed, as the following oath or affirmation, viz. *I \_\_\_\_\_ do solemnly swear, by the ever living God, (or, I do solemnly affirm in the presence of Almighty God) that as a member of this assembly, I will not propose or assent to any bill, vote, or resolution, which shall appear to me injurious to the people.... And each member, before he takes his seat, shall make and subscribe the following declaration, viz. I do believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the scriptures of the old and new testament to be given by divine inspiration, and own and profess the protestant religion.*

The State of Massachusetts’ Constitution: I, \_\_\_\_\_, do declare, that I believe the christian religion, and have a firm persuasion of its truth....

Because Article 6 outlaws the *Christian* test oaths required by early State constitutions, it bans all Biblical qualifications, particularly Deuteronomy 17:15:

Thou shalt in any wise set him king [leader] over thee, whom YHWH thy God shall choose.... (Deuteronomy 17:15)<sup>26</sup>

John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, said the following regarding Christian leadership:

Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty, as well as the privilege and interest, of our Christian nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers.<sup>27</sup>

This quotation is often employed in an attempt to counteract the antichristian implications of Article 6. But the personal preferences of Jay and others do not alter Article 6’s interdiction against Christian qualifications for public service. It is important to note that Jay did not identify the United States *government* as Christian, but, instead, he used the term “our Christian nation.” Eighteenth-century America was still predominately Christian (albeit significantly compromised) in its religion and demeanor, but its national government was neither Christian nor Biblical. Although it was inevitable that Christian influence affected government in 1788, that influence has diminished significantly as time has passed and our government has become more strictly constitutional. Most people believe the Constitution is Christian but that it has been exploited by secular humanists, when, in fact, the exact opposite is true:

...the Constitution removed religious test oaths as judicial requirements for judges and officers of the new national government. This, in and of itself, delivered the republic into the hands of the humanists. Nothing else was necessary after that. From that point on, the secularization of America; was a mopping-up operation. This operation is still in progress. Those being mopped up are unappreciative, but they cannot seem to identify when the turning point came. It came in 1788.<sup>28</sup>



Because Article 6 is aggressively antichristian, Christian Constitutionalists seldom discuss it. When they do, their argument goes something like this:

This [differing religious opinions among the constitutional delegates] led the representatives to guard the states from federal intrusion, preserving the authority of the states to establish their own religious parameters. Let the several states work out religious issues on their own terms. There was no need for the federal government to meddle in an area in which the national government would have no jurisdiction. The prohibition of a religious test “as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States” applied only to *national* office holders: congressmen, senators, the president, and Supreme Court Justices.<sup>29</sup>

This rationalization sidesteps the problem. Are we to believe that congressional representatives, presidents, and Supreme Court justices on the national level are exempt from the Biblical qualifications for leaders? If anything, such qualifications are more crucial on the national level.

#### State Concerns

Although the religious test clause was overwhelmingly approved with little discussion at the Constitutional Convention, it was hotly debated in several of the States’ ratifying conventions:

Amos Singletary, ... delegate to the Massachusetts ratifying convention, was upset at the Constitution’s not requiring men in power to be religious “and though he hoped to see Christians [in office], yet by the Constitution, a papist, or an infidel was as eligible as they.” ... Henry Abbot, a delegate to the North Carolina convention, warned that “the exclusion of religious tests” was “dangerous and impolitic” and that “pagans, deists, and Mahometans might obtain offices among us [and the Senators and representatives might all be pagans].” If there is no religious test, he asked, “to whom will they [officeholders] swear support – the ancient pagan gods of Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, or Pluto?”<sup>30</sup>

Gary DeMar declared, “The most base pagan practices – child killing and sodomy – are now accepted in our nation’s capital as fundamental constitutional rights. Massachusetts voters have sent two acknowledged sodomites to Congress every two years. [Henry] Abbot knew what he was talking about.”<sup>31</sup>

Virginia [attempted] ... to change the wording of Article 6 itself. “No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States” became “no *other* religious test shall ever be required *than* a belief in the one only true God, who is the rewarder of the good, and the punisher of the evil.” This change was rejected.<sup>32</sup>

If only today’s Christians were equally concerned.

In the North Carolina convention a delegate protested that “in a political view, these gentlemen who formed this Constitution should not have given this invitation to Jews and heathens.” James Iredell, later a Justice of the Supreme Court, conceded that the people might “perhaps choose representatives who have no religion at all, and that pagans and Mahometans [might] be admitted into offices.” But how, he asked, was “it possible to exclude any set of men, without taking away that principle of religious freedom which we ourselves so warmly contend for?”<sup>33</sup>

Governor Johnson agreed with Iredell, but assured the convention that while “Jews and pagans” could conceivably be elected, it was not very probable that this would happen.”<sup>34</sup>

History has proven Johnson wrong. Many Christians today laud the constitutional idea of freedom of religion, which allows gods other than Yahweh to be worshipped in our country. Thanks to Article 6 and so-called Christians then and now, the ambassadors of those other gods are now government leaders who are helping to establish their gods’ “morality” as the laws of this nation.

#### Abolition of the States’ Christian Test Oaths

The federal ban on religious test oaths almost immediately began to affect the States:

The federal test oath clause apparently had a liberalizing effect on the states. The Pennsylvania Constitution of 1790 contained a much weaker religious test than its constitution of 1776, and by 1793, Delaware, South Carolina, Georgia, and Vermont had removed religious tests from their constitutions. The revision of Pennsylvania’s test oath of 1776 resulted in part from the efforts of Philadelphia’s Jewish community. In December 1783, the city’s one synagogue submitted a memorial to the civil authorities objecting to the requirement that state legislators acknowledge the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments. Four years later, Jonas Phillips, a Philadelphia Jew, petitioned the Federal Constitutional Convention concerning the same provision. The Pennsylvania Constitution of 1790 accommodated the Jewish requests, requiring only that state officials acknowledge “the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments.”<sup>35</sup>

In addition to Pennsylvania, various other states, following New York’s example and Virginia’s Notable Act for Religious Freedom of 1785, removed political restrictions against the Jews. Georgia acted in 1789; South Carolina did so simultaneously with Pennsylvania; Delaware removed the bars in 1792; and Vermont a year later. Still other states were slower to respond to Enlightenment currents. For example, the disqualification in the Maryland Constitution of 1776 barring Jews from public office was not removed until 1825. Rhode Island did not secure equal rights for the Jews until the adoption of its constitution in 1842, and North Carolina not until 1868. ...[I]t was the federal government rather than the states which provided the most vigorous impetus to the movement.<sup>36</sup>

Compromise is a journey halfway down the road to surrender. Somewhere along that road, the remaining state constitutions’ religious test oaths were ruled violations of the federal Constitution. The last to hold out was Maryland, but, in 1961, its remaining religious test oath was quashed as well. Since the ratification of the federal Constitution and the eradication of the States’ Christian test oaths, the nation’s laws – including America’s current legislation concerning capital punishment and infanticide – have reflected Talmudic law more than Biblical law.

That the States’ Christians test oaths were eliminated should not surprise anyone. In Matthew 7:13, we are informed that “wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat.” Because constitutional power is in the hands of people, it was inevitable the majority of the people (or the courts representing them) would eventually rule against the States’ Christian oaths.

#### Polytheistic Repercussions

The ban on the religious test clause was issued, not because a federal test was deemed unnecessary in light of the States' constitutions, but, instead, to pave the way for deists, atheists, and even antichrists to hold public office. It was *not* the intent of the constitutional framers to leave the decision of religion solely to the States. While it is true that the prime motivation for the two religious clauses found in the Constitution *appears* to have been liberty of conscience in religious matters, the framers were not opposed to non-Christian or even antichrist religions. The framers had liberty for all religions in mind when they forbade Christian test oaths, as evidenced in their writings. Two years before the Constitutional Convention, James Madison wrote the following:

Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other Religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other Sects?<sup>37</sup>

This was written in opposition to a state bill introduced by Patrick Henry entitled "A Bill establishing a provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," introduced into the General Assembly of Virginia. When Madison was sent as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, he was already prejudiced against an exclusively Christian society. Following the Convention, he again bared his polytheistic leanings:

Twice in February 1788, in the *Federalist* Nos. 51 and 56, James Madison cited the "no religious test" clause as one of the glories of the new Constitution. "The door," Madison wrote, "of the Federal Government, is open to merit of every description, whether native or adoptive, whether young or old, and without regard to poverty or wealth, or to any particular profession of religious faith."<sup>38</sup>

The framers well understood the polytheistic implications of a ban on Christian test oaths. In a letter to the Honorable Thomas Cockey Deye, Speaker of Maryland's House of Delegates, Luther Martin, attorney-general of Maryland and one of Maryland's delegates to the federal Constitutional Convention, noted that the convention delegates were generally unconcerned regarding the pluralistic implications of Article 6's ban on Christian test oaths:

The part of the system which provides, that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States, was adopted by a great majority of the convention, and without much debate; however, there were some members so unfashionable as to think, that a belief of the existence of a Deity, and of a state of future rewards and punishments would be some security for the good conduct of our rulers, and that, in a Christian country, it would be at least decent to hold out some distinction between the professors of Christianity and downright infidelity or paganism.<sup>39</sup>

Article 6 not only eliminated Christian qualifications for office holders, it paved the way for Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and atheists to be presidents, congressmen, and judges. It became the initial means by which America was transformed from a monotheistic Christian nation to a polytheistic one.

On both the state and federal levels, Jews<sup>40</sup> were instrumental in the removal of the Christian test oaths and were the first to reap the rewards of these prohibitions:

By the end of the Revolution, Jews had been chosen not only to local posts in some cities, but had also been selected for more responsible positions in many parts of the country. There was no inclination to bar these people from public office and generally the question of the

offensive oaths had only to be raised to be resolved. Thus the Jews of Philadelphia [led by Jonas Phillips], in 1783-84, protested as a “stigma upon their nation and religion” the requirement that members of the General Assembly take an oath affirming belief in the New Testament. The revised constitution of Pennsylvania, a few years later, explicitly barred the disqualification on account of religious sentiments of any person “who acknowledges the being of a God and future state of rewards and punishments.”<sup>41</sup>

*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* affirms that “This petition [by the Jews of Philadelphia] later on proved to be instrumental in the revision of the Pennsylvania state constitution in such a manner as to abolish the religious test.”<sup>42</sup> On September 7, 1787, Jonas Phillips, a founder of Philadelphia’s Mikveh Israel Synagogue, also petitioned the framers at the federal Constitutional Convention:

Sires: ... It is well known among all the citizens of the 13 United States that the Jews have been true and faithful Whigs, and during the late contest with England they have been foremost in aiding and assisting the states with their lives [sic] and fortunes. They have supported the cause, have bravely fought and bled for liberty which they can not [sic] enjoy.

Therefore if the honourable convention shall in their wisdom think fit and alter the said oath [as found in the altered Pennsylvania Constitution] and leave out the words to viz.: “and I do acknowledge the Scripture of the New Testament to be given by divine inspiration,” then the Israelites [Jews] will think themselves happy to live under a government where all religious societys [sic] are on an equal footing....

Your most devoted obed. Servant, Jonas Phillips Philadelphia, 24th Ellul, 5547, or Sep’r 7th 1787.<sup>43</sup>

Phillip’s petition undoubtedly bore weight with the framers, as did the personal relationships many of the framers shared with Jews. Under the heading “Jewish Influence on the Framing of the Constitution,” *The Jewish People’s Almanac* brags about George Washington’s, Benjamin Franklin’s, and James Madison’s personal relationships with Jews:

Had the Constitutional Convention been open to the public, more than one eminent Jew would have had no difficulty in mingling on terms of equality with many of the best-known delegates. To George Washington, who presided over the sessions, Jews were of course no strangers. During the revolution he had on his personal staff Manuel Mordecai Noah of South Carolina, David Salisbury Franks of Philadelphia, and Major Benjamin Nones, a French volunteer....

Benjamin Franklin, the oldest member of the Constitutional Convention, numbered many Philadelphia Jews among his friends. ...[H]e was sufficiently friendly with them to be one of the contributors to the building fund for Philadelphia’s first synagogue, Mikveh Israel. Samuel Keimer, an English printer who was one of Franklin’s first employers, was a Jew.

Virtually all of the delegates knew Haym Salomon, who died two years before the convention met. Six of the delegates had long been dependent on his generosity for their own livelihoods or for the maintenance of the particular government function for which they were responsible. ...James Madison, a future President, sought out Salomon. Madison’s papers record his indebtedness to the Jewish financier, who refused both a note and interest.<sup>44</sup>

Michael Alexander summed up Article 6 and Amendment 1's impact upon equal rights for American Jews:

Although the Constitution of the United States does not specifically mention Jews, its religious liberty provisions in essence granted Jews the honor of citizenship. The United States was thus the first non-Jewish country, ancient or modern, that included Jews as political equals.... The Constitution of the United States prohibited a religious test for government (Article VI), and the First Amendment prohibited Congress from establishing any religion, thus permitting Jews to participate as equal citizens on the federal level.... By 1820, most state constitutions eliminated religious qualifications that had kept Jews from participating in public affairs and government office....<sup>45</sup>

Article 6 opened the door for Jews, Muslims, and other non-Christians to serve in official government capacities. It was not only an open defiance of the First Commandment, but an unequivocal contravention of the Apostle Paul's admonition to the Corinthians:

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. (2 Corinthians 6:14-18)

As important as Paul's directive is for personal relationships, how much more crucial that it be applied to those who govern others? The ramifications are much greater.

Hear this word that YHWH hath spoken against you.... Can two walk together, except they be agreed? (Amos 3:1-3)

The constitutional framers made it possible for Christians and non-Christians to be unequally yoked in official capacity. The first to take advantage of Article 6's antichristian prescription were, not surprisingly, antichristians. As it concerns antichristian and antichrist rhetoric, all other religious books of faith pale in comparison to the Babylonian Talmud.<sup>46</sup> In his book *You Gentiles*, Jewish author Maurice Samuel provides a candid confession regarding the incongruity of Jews and gentiles, which is principally attributable to their distinct and adverse religions:

I have said, "There are two life-forces in the world I know: Jewish and gentile, ours and yours."... We have lived for many centuries in close contiguity, if not intimacy.... Yet the cleavage is there, abysmal and undeniable. In the main, we are forever distinct. Ours is one life, yours is another.... [Y]our system of morality is no less a need to you than ours to us. And the incompatibility of the two systems is not passive. You might say: "Well, let us exist side by side and tolerate each other. We will not attack your morality, nor you ours." But the misfortune is that the two are not merely different. They are opposed in mortal, though tacit, enmity. No man can accept both, or, accepting either, do otherwise than despise the other. ... [t]he preferences and aversions which I here express will at least serve to make clear the irreconcilable difference between Jewish and gentile morality.<sup>47</sup>

Because of the incompatibility between Judaism and Christianity, one religion must give way to the other. An honest appraisal of what has transpired in America since the ratification of the Constitution makes it evident which religion has lost ground. There is no surer way to fulfill Jesus' statement in Matthew 12:25 ("a house divided against itself cannot stand") than to join Christians and antichristians in official government capacities.

### Separation of Church and State

Christian Constitutionalists often point out that the phrase "separation of church and state" is found in the Constitution of the USSR, not the Constitution of the United States. This is true. Nevertheless, the mandate for separation of church and state is inherent in Article 6 on two levels: 1) The Constitution is declared to be the supreme law of the land, which makes any law (secular or Biblical) contrary to this "supreme law" null and void and non-executable by the Constitutional Republic, 2) Religious qualifications for government officials are denied, which prohibits Biblical qualifications:

...the elimination of a public oath to uphold the Kingship and Law of Jesus Christ in the civil realm automatically erected an ethical "wall of separation" between the Crown Rights of Christ and the new Federal Government, thereby barring all Christians from ever holding public office from that time forward. The fact that professing, and no doubt many genuine, Christians continued in the new system to hold such offices does not negate this assertion. It only demonstrates the "intellectual schizophrenia" (the term is R.J. Rushdoony's) among Christians that has plagued the church for the last two thousand years....<sup>48</sup>

Coral Ridge Ministries attacked the American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) position on separation of church and state:

The ACLU and others insist that the nation's Founders [constitutional framers] wanted America's government free from religious influence – especially Christian influence. They have used the myth about the so-called "separation of church and state" to take prayer out of school ... the Ten Commandments out of courthouses ... and God out of public life.<sup>49</sup>

As much as I hate agreeing with the ACLU, I am compelled to do so in this instance. The ACLU is correct because of Article 6 alone. Dr. James Dobson conceded that Christians have lost the culture war:

The battles that we fought in the Eighties ... trying to defend righteousness, trying to defend the unborn child, trying to preserve the dignity of the family and the definition of marriage. We fought all those battles and really it was a holding action. ...[W]e are absolutely awash in evil. And we are right now in the most discouraging period of that long conflict. Humanly speaking, we can say that we have lost all those battles....<sup>50</sup>

Christians have spent the last two centuries lopping at the rotten fruit of the corrupt tree rather than destroying its roots. Instead of arguing with the ACLU and trying to prove something historically impossible about the framers and the Constitution, we must do everything we can to help a future generation to throw off our constitutional government and establish a government predicated solely upon Yahweh's commandments, statutes, and judgments.

The intent and effect of the religious test clause was a deliberate calculation to prevent Christianity from dictating government policy. It was Article 6's antichristian provision that was one of the major concerns of that day's anti-Constitutionalists:

God and Christianity are nowhere to be found in the American Constitution, a reality that infuriated many at the time.... Its utter neglect of religion was no oversight; it was apparent to all. Self-consciously designed to be an instrument with which to structure the secular politics of individual interest and happiness, the constitution was bitterly attacked for its failure to mention God or Christianity. Our history books ... seldom mention ... the concerted campaign to discredit the Constitution as irreligious, which for many of its opponents was its principal flaw. It is as if recognizing the dimension of this criticism would draw too much attention to what was being attacked – the secularism of the Constitution. In fact, this underdocumented and underremembered controversy of 1787-88 over the godless Constitution was one of the most important public debates ever held in America over the place of religion in politics. The advocates of a secular state won, and it is their Constitution we revere today.<sup>51</sup>

The framers intended to sever Christianity's influence from the public arena and, in effect, confine Christianity to the four walls of the church buildings.

The voters had not been willing to require of their national representatives what most states required of state representatives: an oath of allegiance to God and His Bible. The voters had been embarrassed by God. The Framers were not embarrassed by Him; they simply prohibited any public oath to Him in their new covenant document. They regarded Him as some sort of senile Uncle who could be trotted out on holidays, counted on to make a toast or two – judicially non-binding, of course – and then be sent back to His retirement home.<sup>52</sup>

We can debate the intent of the framers, but we cannot debate the effect: Christendom became merely Christianity – salt that lost its savor and good for nothing but to be trampled under the foot of non-Christians. American Christians have been under the boot of non-Christians and antichrists ever since 1788. We will continue to be the trampled until finally we throw off the current secular government and erect a government based upon Yahweh's law.

The Preamble's opening words "WE THE PEOPLE" were a *new* declaration of independence, in which the framers declared themselves free from Yahweh's sovereignty and placed their faith in themselves as sovereign. Article 6's prohibition against Christian test oaths announces, "Thou shalt have no other sovereigns before the deity WE THE PEOPLE." Not surprisingly, the United States Government is fixated on monotheistic Christianity as its religion of choice to oppress and persecute.

In 2 Samuel 23:3, Yahweh declared, "He who rules over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." The framers did *not* legislate so that men would rule in the fear of Yahweh. They left Yahweh completely out of the document, and, in Article 6, they even provided for Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and atheists to rule in the fear of their gods or the god WE THE PEOPLE. Nothing has transformed the political, legal, religious, spiritual, and moral environment of modern America more powerfully than Article 6. If you want to know why America is now non-Christian and even antichristian, look to Article 6. This is why the Constitution is the single most important issue facing Christians who hope to reclaim dominion in fulfillment of their New Covenant commission:

For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses. We are destroying speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and we are taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ, and we are ready to punish all disobedience, whenever your obedience is complete. (2 Corinthians 10:4-6, NASB)

Click to order the *Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution* CDs:

- The e-book (on CD) *A Christian Perspective on the U.S. Constitution*
- The audio CD *The Bible vs. The U.S. Constitution* (Pts. 1 & 2)

### End Notes

1. Thomas James Norton, “The Constitution For the United States: Its Sources and Its Application: Article VI” <http://www.barefootsworld.net/constit7.html>.
2. YHWH (most often pronounced Yahweh) is the English transliteration of the Tetragrammaton, the principal Hebrew name of the God of the Bible. For a more thorough explanation concerning the sacred names of God, “[The Third Commandment](#)” may be read online, or the book [Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*
3. Where the Tetragrammaton (YHWH) – the four Hebrew characters that represent the personal name of God – has been unlawfully rendered the LORD or GOD in English translations, I have taken the liberty to correct this error by inserting YHWH where appropriate. For a more thorough explanation concerning the sacred names of God, “[The Third Commandment](#)” may be read online, or the book [Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska, 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*
4. All Scripture is quoted from the King James Version, unless otherwise noted. Portions of Scripture have been omitted for brevity. If you have questions regarding any passage, please study the text to ensure it has been properly used.
5. For a more thorough explanation concerning this Fourth Commandment statute and others, “[The Fourth Commandment](#)” may be read online, or the book [Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska, 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*
6. For a more thorough explanation concerning the Bible’s condemnation of usury, “[The Eighth Commandment](#)” may be read online, or the book [Thou shalt not steal](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska, 69363, for a suggested \$6 donation.\*
7. Yeshua is the English transliteration of our Savior’s given Hebrew name, with which He introduced Himself to Paul in Acts 26:14-15. (Jesus is the English transliteration of the Greek Iesous, which is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew Yeshua.) Because many people are unfamiliar or uncomfortable with Yeshua, I have chosen to use the more familiar Jesus in this book in order to remove what might otherwise be a stumbling block. For a more thorough explanation concerning the sacred names of God, “[The Third Commandment](#)” may be read online, or [Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$4 donation.\*
8. Not everyone claiming to be a Christian has been properly instructed in the Biblical plan of salvation. Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:36-41, 22:1-16; Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:26-27; Colossians 2:11-13; and 1 Peter 3:21 should be studied to understand what is required to be covered by the blood of Jesus and forgiven of your sins. For a more thorough explanation concerning baptism and its relationship to salvation, the book [Baptism: All You Wanted to Know and](#)



More may be requested from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for free.

9. George Bancroft, *History of the Formation of the Constitution*, 5 vols. (New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company, 1885) vol. 3, p. 357.

10. Thomas James Norton, *The Constitution of the United States, Its Sources and Its Application*, published by the Committee for Constitutional Government, circa 1922, <http://www.barefootsworld.net/constit1.html>.

11. *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 US (2 Cranch) 137, 164, 176 (1803).

12. *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1879).

13. Samuel Adams, letter to the Earl of Carlisle and Others, Harry Alonzo Cushing, ed., *The Writings of Samuel Adams: 1778-1802*, 4 vols. (New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908) vol. 4, p. 34.

14. David Barton, *Original Intent: The Courts, the Constitution, & Religion* (Aledo, TX: WallBuilder Press, 4th Edition, 1st Printing, February 2005) p. 127.

15. Gary T. Amos, *Defending the Declaration* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth and Hyatt, 1989) p. 9, quoted in Gary Demar, *America's History: The Untold Story* (Powder Springs, GA: 1993 /2008) p. 135.

16. Christian J. Pinto, "The Church in Secret Societies," *Twenty Experts Advise You on How to Overcome the Most Frightening Issues You WILL Face This Century* (Crane, MO: Defender: A Division of Anomalos Publishing House, 2009) pp. 158-59.

17. Chuck Baldwin, "You Might Be A Constitutionalist If...", 28 January 2005, Chuck-Wagon Email Commentary, [www.chuckbaldwinlive.com/c2005/cbarchive\\_20050128.html](http://www.chuckbaldwinlive.com/c2005/cbarchive_20050128.html).

18. *Sei Fujii v. the State of California*, "Opinion of the District Court of Appeal, Second District, Division 2, California, April 24, 1952," in United States Congress, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *Review of the United Nations Charter: Report of the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter, pursuant to the provisions of the 83rd Congress, 2d Session Senate Document No. 87 – Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter Pursuant to S. Res. 126, 83rd Congress, 1st Session ... April 23, 1956*, p. 288.

19. For information regarding Yahweh's condemnation of infanticide and sodomy, "The Sixth Commandment" and "The Seventh Commandment" may be read [online here](#) and [here](#), or the books *Thou shalt not kill* and *Thou shalt not commit adultery* may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska, 69363, for a suggested \$4 and \$6 donation, respectively.\*

20. John Spencer, *The Constitution of the United States: A Man Inspired Document!*, p. 4.

21. Chuck Baldwin, "What Would John Jay Say Today?," 16 November 2004, Chuck-Wagon Email Commentary, [www.chuckbaldwinlive.com](http://www.chuckbaldwinlive.com).

22. Timothy N. Baldwin, JD., "Impeach the Traitors!," 6 April 2010, NewsWithViews.com, <http://www.newswithviews.com/Timothy/baldwin130.htm>.

23. A.A. Hodge, D.D., *A Commentary on the Confession of Faith: With Questions for Theological Students and Bible Classes* (London, UK: T. Nelson and Sons, 1901) p. 287.

24. *Girouard v. United States*, 328 U.S. 61, 69 (1946).

25. Arlin M. Adams and Charles J. Emmerich, *A Nation Dedicated to Religious Liberty: The Constitutional Heritage of the Religious Clauses* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. 14.
26. See [Chapter 5](#) “Article 2: Executive Usurpation” for the Biblical qualifications and the means to determine Yahweh’s choice of leaders.
27. John Jay, quoted in William Jay, *The Life of John Jay*, 2 vols. (New York, NY: J. & J. Harper, 1833) vol. 2, p. 376.
28. Gary North, *Conspiracy in Philadelphia: The Broken Covenant of the U.S. Constitution* (Draper, VA: Nicene Council.com, 2004) p. 90.
29. Gary DeMar, “God and the Constitution,” 4 November 2005, <http://www.americanvision.org/article/god-and-the-constitution/>.
30. Isaac Kramnick and R. Laurence Moore, *The Godless Constitution: A Moral Defense of the Secular State* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1966) p. 32.
31. Gary DeMar, *America’s Christian History: The Untold Story* (Powder Springs, GA: 1993 / 2008) p. 160.
32. Kramnick, Moore, p. 37.
33. Leo Pfeffer, “Shaping Our Legal History: Jews, Jewry and the American Constitution,” *Jewish Digest*, condensed from American Jewish Archives Pamphlet Series (Cincinnati, OH: American Jewish Archives, June 1983) p. 5.
34. Ibid.
35. Adams, Emmerich, p. 16.
36. Jonathan D. Sarna, Benny Kraut, Samuel K. Joseph, eds., *Jews and the Founding of the Republic* (New York, NY: Markus Weiner Publishing, 1985) p. 25.
37. James Madison, Gaillard Hunt, ed., *The Writings of James Madison*, 9 vols. (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam’s sons, 1904) vol. 2, p. 186.
38. Kramnick, Moore, p. 38.
39. Luther Martin, “The Genuine Information, Laid Before The Legislature Of Maryland...,” *Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Constitutional Convention 1787*, entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1838 (Hawthorne, CA: Omni Publications, 1986) pp. 89-90.
40. Today’s Jewish people are known as Jews not because of physical descent from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but because their Khazarian predecessors adopted the religion of Judaism (Talmudism) between the seventh and ninth centuries AD. For a more thorough explanation regarding the identity of today’s Jews, *God’s Covenant People: Yesterday, Today and Forever* (which includes over 700 documented quotations, many of them from Jewish sources) may be read online, or the [book](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$14 donation.\*
41. Sarna, Kraut, Joseph, p. 90.
42. “Salomon, Haym,” *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, 10 vols. (New York, NY: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1941) vol. 9, p. 324.

43. Jonas Phillips, quoted in Jacob Rader Marcus, ed., *The Jew in the American World: A Source Book* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1996) pp. 99-100.
44. "Jewish Influence on the Framing of the Constitution," *The Jewish People's Almanac*, David C. Gross, ed. (New York, NY: Hippocrene Books, Inc., 1988) p. 3.
45. Michael Alexander, "Jews, 1754-1820s," *Encyclopedia of American History: Revolution and New Nation, 1761 to 1812*, Paul A. Gilje and Gary B. Nash, eds. (New York, NY: Facts on File, Inc, 2003) American History Online, [www.fofweb.com](http://www.fofweb.com).
46. For documentation regarding the antichristian and antichrist nature of the Babylonian Talmud, *God's Covenant People: Yesterday, Today and Forever* may be read online, or the [book](#) may be ordered from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for a suggested \$14 donation.\*
47. Maurice Samuel, *You Gentiles* (New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1924) pp. 95-96.
48. Greg Loren Durand, "An Oath is an Act of Worship," *The U.S. Constitution – America's Covenantal Apostasy* (Dahlonga, GA: Crown Rights Book Company) p. 4.
49. Brian E. Fisher, *Coral Ridge Ministries Ministry Letter*, July 2007.
50. Ryan Powers, "Dobson concedes that the far right has 'lost' the culture," 12 April 2009, <http://thinkprogress.org/2009/04/12/dobson-defeated/>.
51. Kramnick, Moore, pp. 27-28.
52. Gary North, *Political Polytheism: The Myth of Pluralism* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989) p. 459.

\*We are admonished in Matthew 10:8 "freely ye have received, freely give." Although we have a suggested a price for our books, we do not sell them. In keeping with 2 Corinthians 9:7, this ministry is supported by freewill offerings. If you cannot afford the suggested price, inform us of your situation, and we will be pleased to provide you with whatever you need for whatever you can send.