

Open Response to Pastor Chuck Baldwin's "[How Christians And Conservatives Are Helping To Destroy America](#)"¹

I appreciate much that Pastor Baldwin stands for. As compared with most of today's pastors, he's one in a million. Given the time to sit down and compare notes, he and I would probably find more that we agree than disagree on. Nevertheless, I couldn't differ with him more when it comes to his promotion of the U.S. Constitution as the supreme law of the land, per [Article 6](#). In fact, he undermines much of the good he could otherwise accomplish if it weren't for what seems to be an undying devotion to the biblically adverse Constitution. This is tragically true of not only Pastor Baldwin but of many of today's pastors and ministry leaders.

As well-intentioned as I'm confident Pastor Baldwin is, I cannot in good conscience let this article stand unchallenged. There's far too much at stake. Consequently, it merits a response:

Chuck Baldwin: "What makes America America? What distinguishes this country from the nations of the world—or from world history, for that matter? Even casual historians must admit that there has never been a country like the United States of America ever to exist. This nation is unique to world history. There has never been a country like this—and probably will never be one like it again."

Ted Weiland: America's greatness is equivalent to God's blessings upon her. So *why* did America become such a great nation? Deuteronomy 28:1-14 provides the answer. Yahweh¹ pours out His blessings upon nations that look to His moral law as the supreme law of the land:

Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as Yahweh my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as Yahweh our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day? (Deuteronomy 4:5-8)

Consequently, America's greatness was *not* the result of the late 18th-century humanistic government of, by, and for the people, based upon Enlightenment and Masonic concepts. Instead, Yahweh blessed America as a result of the 17th-century's Christian Colonials' governments of, by, and for God, based upon His immutable moral law.²

Because Yahweh is also true to His word in Deuteronomy 28:15-68, we know America began to be cursed the moment the Constitution was adopted. It was only by God's grace and mercy she lost her blessings incrementally. However, without repentance for our national apostasy, it was inevitable America would find herself where she is today: well on her way to being fully cursed.

CB: "As hard as it is for the anti-God types to admit, America has a deeply-rooted Christian history and culture. However, when one says, "America is a Christian country," (usually spoken by a Christian, of course), he or she may mean something that NEVER existed. So, let's set the record straight: America was never founded as a theocracy. And even though there are some well-meaning,

albeit naïve, Christian people today who pretend that America once had, and should have again, a theocratic-type government and society, the fact is, America was NEVER a theocracy.

TW: Pastor Baldwin could not be more incorrect about theocracies, and for two reasons.

First, if we're to believe men such as Alexis de Tocqueville, William McGuffey, and Pastor John Cotton, then America (or at least portions thereof) was in fact a Biblical theocracy:

Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, 1835:

They [the 1600 Colonials] exercised the rights of sovereignty; they named their magistrates, concluded peace or declared war, made police regulations, and enacted laws as if their allegiance was due only to God. Nothing can be more curious and, at the same time more instructive, than the legislation of that period; it is there that the solution of the great social problem which the United States now presents to the world is to be found [in perfect fulfillment of Deuteronomy 4:5-8].

Amongst these documents we shall notice, as especially characteristic, the code of laws promulgated by the little State of Connecticut in 1650. The legislators of Connecticut begin with the penal laws, and ... they borrow their provisions from the text of Holy Writ ... copied verbatim from the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy....

America was exalted in the eyes of the world because of her applied righteousness, embodied in Yahweh's perfect law. Since 1788, when the United States of America, as a nation, [officially and nationally] stopped following Yahweh's laws and began following the laws of WE THE PEOPLE, our legislation has ceased providing righteous instruction to others. Instead, the rest of the world now holds America in disdain. If America hopes to regain her favored status in the eyes of the world, she must return to her original Constitution.

McGuffey's Eclectic Reader, America's most popular school book in the 1800s, also testified to America's early form of theocratic government:

Their form of government was as strictly theocratical inasmuch that it would be difficult to say where there was any civil authority among them distinct from ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Whenever a few of them settled a town, they immediately gathered themselves into a church; and their elders were magistrates, and their code of laws was the Pentateuch.... God was their King; and they regarded him as truly and literally so....

William McGuffey was undoubtedly influenced by the writings of renowned early American preachers such as John Cotton:

The famous John Cotton, the first minister of Boston ... earnestly pleaded "that the government might be considered as a theocracy, wherein the Lord was judge, lawgiver and king; that the laws

which He gave Israel might be adopted....” At the desire of the court, he compiled a system of laws founded chiefly on the laws of Moses....³

Were de Tocqueville, McGuffey, Cotton, and others naive for viewing Colonial America as theocratic, as was suggested by Pastor Baldwin? I don't think so.

The second reason Pastor Baldwin errs regarding theocracies is because *all* governments are theocracies.

When one understands that the principal means by which we keep the First Commandment is by observing Yahweh's other moral laws and that idolatry is not so much about statues as it is statutes, it becomes apparent that all governments are theocratic. They serve either the true God or some false god, as demonstrated by what laws they keep and consider the supreme law of the land.

Furthermore, all nonexistent false gods always represent we the people in one form or another. In other words, today's We the Peopleism is just a contemporary form of Baalism.⁴

...There is no escaping theocracy. A government's laws reflect its morality, and the source of that morality (or, more often than not, immorality) is its god. It is never a question of theocracy or no theocracy, but whose theocracy. The American people, by way of their elected officials, are the source of the Constitutional Republic's laws. Therefore, the Constitutional Republic's god is *WE THE PEOPLE*.

People recoil at the idea of a theocracy's morality being forced upon them, but because all governments are theocracies, someone's morality is always being enforced. This is an inevitability of government. The question is which god, theocracy, laws, and morality will we choose to live under?...⁵

CB: The only theocracy in the history of the world was Old Testament Israel under Moses.

TW: Obviously untrue.

CB: After the death of Moses, God expected Israel to be governed by the principles established through Moses.... Only through Moses did God directly govern the people. And even within the government of Israel, God established the roots of what became known as republican (small "r") government....

TW:

...Constitutionalists insist the United States government is a republic, not a democracy, but they never stop to consider that the two are virtually the same regarding sovereignty.

Christian Constitutionalists further insist republics are Biblical. However, because republics (like democracies) rely upon the majority vote of the people for the selection of their leaders, rather than upon Yahweh's choice (as per Deuteronomy 17:15), republics are not anymore Biblical than are democracies. Both democracies and republics culminate in a government of, by, and for the people rather than a government of, by, and for Yahweh. The same is true with other issues voted upon by the people:

ultimately the majority's will is exalted over Yahweh's will.

As demonstrated in [Chapter 3](#), both republican and Christian governments are ultimately theocracies. As a result, they are incompatible and hostile to each other. A republic looks to the people as its sovereign; a Christian theocracy looks to Yahweh. The very definition of a sovereign, or supreme ruler, excludes simultaneous sovereigns....⁶

CB: So, if by "Christian nation" people mean that America was established as some sort of theocracy, they are gravely mistaken. It is also unfortunate that some well-meaning (at least, I think they are well-meaning) Christian people give the unchurched world the impression that they are trying to create some sort of theocracy in America today. Some even go so far as to teach that we don't need a Constitution or State and municipal laws—and any such laws are themselves evil. This is an asinine philosophy, to say the least.

TW: Such laws are evil only if they violate Yahweh's moral triune law.⁷ *This is the standard by which everything (including the U.S. Constitution) must be ethically examined.*

When the Constitution is *actually* examined by this standard, it's found to be anything but biblically compatible. In fact, there is hardly an Article or Amendment that is not antithetical, if not seditious, to Yahweh's sovereignty and morality.⁸

CB: I, for one, would never want a so-called theocracy administered by the likes of the vast majority of Christian teachers and pastors today.

TW: Nor would I. Most of today's Christians pastors and teachers would never be in the position of administering a Biblical theocracy because the majority of them do not meet the Biblical qualifications.⁹

CB: Are you kidding? Most of them can't even govern a small congregation of believers who are ostensibly assembled under the same ideology, same eschatology, same ecclesiology, etc. Have you been to a church business meeting lately? You really want those people dictating national laws? God forbid!

TW: Although Pastor Baldwin has a legitimate concern regarding today's pastors and teachers, his objection is nonetheless a straw man. His concerns about the dearth of biblically qualified men does not trump the fact that government and society should be established on Yahweh's moral law.

Follow Pastor Baldwin's reasoning to its logical conclusion and one can only conclude that he prefers a government administered by unregenerate men employing their own fickle finite "laws" (Judges 21:25, Matthew 15:6-9) over biblically qualified men employing Yahweh's perfect law and altogether righteous judgments (Psalm 19:7-11) as the standard for society.

CB: No! There is no Moses on the scene today with new revelation dictating God's will for the nation.

TW: We don't need a Moses today. God has already provided us with His triune moral law by which we're to be governed.¹⁰ What we need are biblically qualified judges who will implement and adjudicate Yahweh's law instead of their own capricious edicts:

Moreover thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be rulers.... And let them judge the people at all seasons.... (Exodus 18:21-22)

The Bible stipulates, among other things, that judicial appointees must be men of truth who fear Yahweh and hate covetousness. (See [Chapter 5](#) “Article 2: Executive Usurpation” for a list of additional Biblical qualifications.) The United States Constitution requires no Biblical qualifications whatsoever. Nowhere does the Constitution stipulate that judges must rule on behalf of Yahweh, rendering decisions based upon His commandments, statutes, and judgments as required in Exodus 18. That not even one constitutional framer contended for Yahweh, as did King Jehoshaphat, speaks volumes about the framers’ disregard for Him and His judicial system:

And he [King Jehoshaphat] set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judah, city by city, and said to the judges, Take heed what ye do: **for ye judge not for man, but for YHWH**, who is with you in the judgment.... And he charged them, saying, **Thus shall ye do in the fear of YHWH**, faithfully, and with a perfect heart. (2 Chronicles 19:5-9)¹¹

CB: That being said, there is no mistaking the fact that America has a deeply-rooted, rich Christian tradition.

TW: Indeed! A rich and deeply-rooted *17th-century* American Christian tradition when the Christian Colonials established governments of, by, and for God, based upon His moral law. That all changed when the constitutional framers rejected Yahweh’s law for their own Enlightenment and Masonic concepts.¹²

CB: America’s founders, even *those who were not professing Christians* [emphasis added], as we understand the term today, acknowledged that fact....

TW: Pastor Baldwin has inadvertently highlighted one of at least two reasons why the Constitutional Republic was doomed from its inception:

Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. (Matthew 12:25)

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)

The second reason is found in the following passage:

And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not,

shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand:
And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and
beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. (Matthew
7:26-27)

The house known as the Constitutional Republic was *not* built upon the rock of God's Word but upon the sand of non-Christian Enlightenment thinkers, such as John Locke.

CB: Noah Webster (himself an outspoken Christian, of course), said, "The religion which has introduced civil liberty is the religion of Christ and His apostles, which enjoins humility, piety, and benevolence; which acknowledges in every person a brother, or a sister, and a citizen with equal rights. This is genuine Christianity, and to this we owe our free Constitutions of Government."

TW: The standard for determining whether the Constitution is Biblical is *not* a bunch of dead men's (often cherry-picked) quotations but instead the Word of God—particularly His immutable moral law:

Recognizing the Bible and Christianity's influence upon society is not the same as legislating and adjudicating according to Yahweh's law. One only needs to look at the record to know there has been a dearth of the latter since the Constitution's ratification.¹³

Why is this? This was not the case in the 1600s Colonial governments.

In order to conclude the Constitution is a Christian document, today's Christian Constitutionalists have severed the framers' words from their actions. To date, the battle between Christians and secularists over the Constitution has been a war of quotations—and there are plenty to go around for both sides, often from the same framers....

The only means of determining whether the framers were Christians is to compare their actions to the Word of God:

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name have cast out devils? And in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity [*anomia* – lawlessness]. (Matthew 7:21-23)

This is a perfect description of the constitutional framers. Although some of them claimed to be Christians, they openly practiced lawlessness [beginning with the Constitution they framed].¹³

CB: Webster also said, "When you become entitled to exercise the right of voting for public officers, let it be impressed on your mind that God commands you to choose for rulers just men who will rule in the fear of God. The preservation of a republican government depends on the faithful discharge of this duty."....

TW: Although I appreciate Webster's sentiments, God never entitled man to vote for anyone. The framers usurped the Biblical election process by which we end up with the best of the best of two or more biblically qualified candidates, every single time. They

replaced it with constitutional elections (what amounts to not much more than a popularity contest) that, thanks to Article 6's Christian test ban (which all but eliminated Biblical qualifications) can, *at best*, only provide the best of the worst.¹⁴

CB: Daniel Webster noted the following: "Finally, let us not forget the religious character of our origin. Our fathers were brought hither by their high veneration for the Christian religion. They journeyed by its light, and labored in its hope. They sought to incorporate its principles with the elements of their society, and to diffuse its influence through all their institutions, civil, political, or literary."....

TW: Indeed! Our *1600s* Pilgrim and Puritan fathers. This is *not* true of most of the late 1700s lawyers, Freemasons, and Enlightenment boys.

For more regarding the late 1700s founders' true religious persuasions, see [Dr. Albert Mohler's interview with Dr. Gregg Frazer](#). Dr. Frazer proves from the key founders' own writings that they were neither Deists in the purest sense of the word, nor Christians in the Biblical sense. Instead, they were Theistic Rationalists.

Dr. Mohler is President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Dr. Frazer is Professor of History of the Master's College in California.

CB: America's founders never thought they were creating a theocracy, but they did have a "high veneration" for the Christian faith and "sought to incorporate its principles" into American government.

TW: Then *why* is there hardly an Article or Amendment that's not hostile to Yahweh's triune moral law?¹⁵

CB: The principles of the Christian faith include both Natural and Revealed Law. The Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights, especially, clearly illustrate the founder's understanding and appreciation for these principles.

TW: The standard is *always* God Almighty's morality as codified in His revealed law, *not* some undefined natural law. By *this* standard, the Constitution is found to be biblically seditious and is the reason America finds herself teetering on the precipice of moral depravity and destruction.

The sins of the late 1700s founders were of both commission and omission. By their sins of omission alone they doomed America to its present deplorable state of affairs:

...3. Every problem America faces today can be traced back to the fact that the framers failed to expressly establish a government upon Yahweh's immutable morality as codified in His commandments, statutes, and judgments. (Would infanticide and sodomy be tolerated, let alone financed by the government, if Yahweh's perfect law and altogether righteous judgments were the law of the land? Would Islam be a looming threat to our peace and security if the First Amendment had been replaced with the First Commandment? Would Americans be in nearly as much debt if usury had been outlawed as a form of theft? Would crime be as rampant if "cruel and unusual punishment" had not been outlawed and criminals were instead punished with Yahweh's altogether righteous judgments? Would we be on the fiscal cliff if we were taxed with a flat increase tax rather than a graduated income tax?)....¹⁶

CB: The Declaration begins, “When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which THE LAWS OF NATURE AND OF NATURE’S GOD [emphasis added] entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the cause which impel them to the separation.

“We hold these truths to be SELF-EVIDENT [emphasis added], that all men are CREATED [emphasis added] equal, that they are endowed BY THEIR CREATOR [emphasis added] with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

TW: The generic “nature’s god” and “creator” of the Masons and Enlightenment boys was *not* the God of the Bible, and to embrace that god is to reject Yahweh. Thomas Jefferson, who cut the virgin birth, miracles, resurrection, and ascension of Christ (what he described as a “dunghill”¹⁷) out of his cut-and-paste New Testament, was the chief architect of the Declaration. Be *very careful* who and what you endorse:

For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your [personal, State, White, Senate, or the] house [of Representatives], neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds. (2 John 1:7-11)

CB: As Thomas Jefferson quickly penned the Declaration (and he did write it rather quickly), he was borrowing heavily from John Locke and the commonly understood principles of Natural Law. Though the founders were dissimilar in regards to their understanding of Biblical teaching, to a man, they understood and agreed with the “self-evident” principles of Natural Law, or “the Laws of Nature.”

TW: This speaks volumes to the Enlightenment influence upon the founders:

The framers nowhere attributed the inspiration for any specific article or amendment in the Constitution to the Bible or the laws of Yahweh. After reviewing over 2,200 political writings published between 1760 and 1805, David S. Lutz and Charles S. Hyneman came to some very interesting conclusions regarding the Bible’s influence upon the constitutional framers and others of that period. Lutz admitted that while the “book ... most frequently cited by Americans during the founding era [was] ... the Book of Deuteronomy, ... the Bible’s prominence disappears [during the Federalist/Anti-Federalist debate over the Constitution],” and “the Federalists’ inclination to Enlightenment rationalism is most evident here in their failure to consider the Bible relevant.”¹⁸ Between the 1770s and ‘80s, Biblical quotations decreased among both Federalists and Anti-Federalists, while Enlightenment and Whig citations increased.¹⁹

CB: Furthermore, virtually every “right” enumerated in the Bill of Rights can be traced directly to commonly understood principles contained in Natural and Revealed Law. That fact is unassailable.

TW: America was sold down the river when the late 1700s founders replaced God-expected Biblical *responsibilities* with optional Enlightenment *rights*, which are easily controlled by whatever government happens to be in power. One need look no further than the Amendment with the wording “shall not be infringed.” The Second Amendment is the *most* infringed, licensed, and limited Amendment of the entire twenty-seven. Furthermore, a future generation of our posterity are likely to see the Second Amendment completely whittled away or repealed altogether. This is the inherent nature and danger of optional rights.

Although the Second Amendment is the closest thing to being Biblical in the Constitution, the framers robbed it of its potency when they made bearing arms in defense of ourselves, our families, and neighbors an optional right rather than a God-expected responsibility:

But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house [beginning with spiritual and physical protection], he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. (1 Timothy 5:8)²⁰

CB: In addition to our common Christian heritage, America was united with a common language, along with a common culture and history. The loss of our Christian heritage, our common language, along with our common culture and history would certainly transform America into something other than America.

TW: This is precisely what has come of the late 18th-century founders’ capricious Enlightenment ideas codified in the Constitution.

CB: Unfortunately, however, there are those who share our common faith and history who are also contributing mightily to the destruction of America. I am talking about those who would identify themselves as Christians and/or conservatives. Of course, to hear these people talk, America’s problems are all caused by “liberals,” or Democrats....

There is absolutely no question that a national breakdown of morality is seriously problematic to the survival of a free republic. No doubt about it! My only contention on this point is that the groups mentioned above are not the true problem; they are only symptomatic of the true problem. The real problem is the CHURCH. A soft, uncommitted, carnal, materialistic, lazy, self-righteous church is the root cause of ALL of America’s problems, including the ones mentioned above....

TW: I agree. This includes Christians who ironically and tragically promote the biblically seditious Constitution as any part of the supreme law of the land.²¹

CB: Phariseeism is a major problem today.... The spirit of Phariseeism is so prevalent among the Church today that is no wonder why so many unbelievers refuse to darken the doors of a church. Many of today’s Christians are as enslaved to the traditions and doctrines of men as any slave anywhere...

TW: This hits the proverbial nail on the head:

...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 Constitutionalists pay homage to the traditions and commandments of men as the supreme law of the land. Even the Pharisees of Jesus' day weren't so brazen as to call their man-made traditions supreme....²¹

CB: Some of the most enslaved people on the planet are professing Christians. Many of our churches, Christian schools, colleges, seminaries, etc. are filled with the "servants of men."

TW: Many of whom are slaves of the late 1700s Enlightenment and Masonic founders and their secular Constitution, thanks to pastors and ministry leaders who are at the forefront in beguiling their adherents into believing the Constitution is a biblically compatible document.

CB: The assault against the United States is massive. We are fast losing our Christian heritage and culture—and Christians are as much to blame as anyone....

TW: I couldn't agree more. This is predominantly being accomplished by those who are trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear—that is, the biblically seditious Constitution into a Christian document. Instead, it is the principle reason America has lost her Christian heritage on a national scale.

CB: We have lost our understanding of, and appreciation for, Natural Law. Even most pastors cannot articulate the fundamental principles of Natural Law, even though this is the Law upon which America was founded....

TW: Pastor Baldwin is correct. The Constitutional Republic was *not* founded on the *revealed* law of God's Word but on some diversely construed *undefined* natural law.²²

CB: We cheer as our country has turned into a "Warfare State." We applaud as our nation has turned into an Orwellian surveillance society. We are losing our common language, our common history and heritage, and our common faith. Christianity in 2014-15 is not even comparable to Christianity in 1775-76....

TW: And far less to our true 1600s Christian forbears' Christianity.²³

CB: Yes, the very people who claim to love America the most and who claim to be interested in her blessing and prosperity are too often the very ones who are helping to destroy her.

TW: *Indeed!*

Related Posts:

A Christian's Response to Chuck Baldwin's "You might be a Constitutionalist if..."
Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective
A Biblical Constitution
375 Years Later: Constitution vs. Constitution

1. YHWH, the English transliteration of the Tetragrammaton, is most often pronounced Yahweh. It is the principal Hebrew name of the God of the Bible and was inspired to appear nearly 7,000 times in the Old Testament. It was unlawfully deleted by the English translators. In obedience to the Third Commandment and the many Scriptures that charge us to proclaim, swear by, praise, extol, call upon, bless, glorify, and hold fast to His name, we have chosen to memorialize His name here in this document and in our lives. For a more thorough explanation concerning important reasons for using the sacred name of God, see "[The Third Commandment.](#)"

2. *375 Years Later: Constitution vs. Constitution* (Blog article)

3. [Chapter 3](#) "The Preamble: WE THE PEOPLE vs. YAHWEH" of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*.

4. [Could You be a Disciple of Baal and Not Know It?](#) (Blog article)

5. [Chapter 3](#) "The Preamble: WE THE PEOPLE vs. YAHWEH" of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*.

6. [Chapter 7](#) "Article 4: Republic vs. Theocracy" of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

7. [A Biblical Constitution](#) (See Article 2)

8. *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

9. For a list of Biblical qualifications for civil leaders, see [Chapter 5](#) "Article 2: Executive Usurpation" of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

10. *Law and Kingdom: Their Relevance Under the New Covenant*

11. [Chapter 6](#) "Article 6: Judicial Usurpation" of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*.

12. For more regarding these two antipodal governments, see blog article [375 Years Later: Constitution vs. Constitution](#)

13. [Chapter 3](#) "The Preamble: WE THE PEOPLE vs. YAHWEH" of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

14. For more regarding Constitutional elections versus Biblical elections, see blog article [Salvation by Election.](#)

15. *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

16. *5 Reasons the Constitution is Our Cutting-Edge Issue* (Blog article)

17. Thomas Jefferson, letter to John Adams, 24 January 1814, Lester J. Cappon, ed., *The*

Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams (Williamsburg, VA: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1988) p. 384.

18. Donald S. Lutz, “The Relative Influence of European Writers on Late Eighteenth-Century American Political Thought,” *The American Political Science Review* (March 1984) pp. 189-97.

19. [Chapter 3](#) “The Preamble: WE THE PEOPLE vs. YAHWEH” of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

20. [The Second Amendment: A Knife in a Gunfight](#) (Audio)

[The Second Amendment is Doomed](#) (Blog Article)

21. [Chapter 9](#) “Article 6: The Supreme Law of the Land” of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

22. For an enlightening examination of natural law from a Biblical paradigm, see Chapter 5 “Theonomy and Natural Law” of Pastor William O. Einwechter’s book [Walking in the Law of the Lord: An Introduction to the Biblical Ethics of Theonomy](#).

23. [Chapter 3](#) “The Preamble: WE THE PEOPLE vs. YAHWEH” of *Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*

[375 Years Later: Constitution vs. Constitution](#) (Blog article)