

The original USA – a continuation of the Christian Colonial Commonwealth

Examination of foundational American law of the late 1700's era:

- 1) The Christian Colonial States united under The Articles of Confederation of 1777 and named their league of friendship "The United States of America".
- 2) The Preamble to the United States Constitution of 1787 confirms that Confederation and limits it to the posterity (racial kin generations of the signers) of the white Christian family.
- 3) The Constitution for the United States of America did not do away with the fundamental law established within The Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, which is the USA government based on the prior Christian Law of the Colonial Charters.
- 4) Article VI of the Constitution brings the Colonial Christian organic engagements of law into the Constitutional government. The Article VI ban on federal religious oaths is a wise decision that protects (not destroys) the independent Christian sovereignty of the States.

American history records that The Union we know as "The United States of America" was formed by the Articles of Confederation of 1777 and not first by the Constitution of 1787, as seen in Article 1 of the Confederation document which states "*The stile of this confederation shall be "The United States of America".* Also, we must remember that the correct title of that compact is The Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union. (Ongoing)

What is presently happening in corporate Washington D.C. today has nothing to do with the original Constitution as ratified by the original 13 sovereign States, which county and State compacts themselves were "engagements entered into" by Christians to implement orderly civil government and to protect their blessings of liberty. (See [Early American Governments](#) to view the Christian based "engagements" of law of the Colonial charters and early State Constitutions)

Righteous Scriptural Civil Government is ordained by God Almighty to protect the people from evildoers. (Rom. 13:1-4) In this age of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit since the day of Pentecost (Acts chapter 2) and the New Covenant in Christ where God's Laws are now written in the hearts of His saints (Heb.10:15-25), the administration of God's laws has grown and matured into the Commonwealth manner of implementing the Laws of the Eternal King. Paul the Apostle, in the Book of Ephesians, mentions the Commonwealth administration of the mature body of Christ: "*That at that time ye were without Christ, **being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel**, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.*" --- "*Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;*" (Eph.2:12, 13, 19,20) The

true Christian States are actually Commonwealths and some of our united States still attest to that name. A Christian Commonwealth is defined as a government where the people hold private property rights, but any land that is not owned by an individual is owned by the people as a body, to be guarded, maintained, and lawfully distributed to settlers according to Godly principles. Righteous overseeing of the land was a perpetual duty of the Christian Commonwealth of people.

Not only is the law self explanatory about the perpetual nature of the Union under the Articles of Confederation, but there are other fundamental statements of law in the Constitution itself that witness to this truth. The Preamble of the Constitution reads:

“We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

In reading this Preamble, the first point that must be taken into account is that the purpose of the Founding Fathers, as clearly stated, was not to form “another Union” or a “different Union” or a “brand new Union”, but on the contrary, their purpose was recorded here in the Preamble as one set forth “to form a more perfect Union”. The question which becomes rhetorical is the obvious – namely “more perfect” than what? The answer with respect to law is -- “more perfect” from that Union already in existence under the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union.

[Side Note: Some people have e-mailed me stating that “Yahweh’s Laws are perfect” (Psalm 19:7) so why would we even want “a more perfect Union”, which they figure then must be “imperfect”? These well meaning and truly concerned folks have somehow missed the fact of the matter as declared in the Bible. Although Yahweh’s Laws are perfect, we aren’t perfect. Yes, in the sense of eternal life God sees us as “perfected” in Christ, but in our daily struggles we still have our flesh and certain weaknesses to contend with until our bodies are perfected in resurrection. (Gal.5:17; Rom.6:12; 7:22-25, etc) In this “battle” to govern our lives unto righteous works we are commanded to “***work out our own salvation (deliverance, preservation, safety) with fear and trembling***” Philip.2:12. It is in this sense that it is our Christian duty to aim for perfection, to become more perfect, even though we are not perfect in obeying God’s acknowledged perfect Laws. The Scriptures teach this reality of life in many places, and this truth is honestly and humbly reflected in the Preamble “*in order to form a more perfect union*”, as this is the dutiful and reasonable work that God has given us at the moment.]

Secondly, we also observe the clarity of the Preamble as it specifically tells us that the Founders were diligent to make sure that its assembly made “this Constitution FOR the United States of America”, and not OF the ‘United States of America’ (as if making a different NEW union). Making the Constitution “FOR the United States of America” automatically announces that it was drawn up, by the people, FOR the Union of States United (plural), which were already fully functioning under the Articles of Confederation.

In further support of proof that a fundamentally different federal union was not created by the Constitution, nor did it supplant the intent of the Articles of Confederation, we need only look at the qualification for members of the House of Representatives as listed

in the Constitution at Art. I, sec. I which states in part, “No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been **seven Years a Citizen of the United States**”. This section of the Constitution was written in 1787, meaning that seven years before this being the year 1780 refers to the period of citizenship of State residents during and under the Articles of Confederation of 1777. Yet the Constitution deems that person as being the same citizen of the same “United States”, as applying to both the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution. In other words, it is the **same** federal “United States Union” recognized for qualification as a Representative under the Constitution (with respect to the “seven year” citizenship continuance) as had qualified under the Confederation. The citizenship was within the same Union.

Even more emphatic, Article VI of the Constitution completely settles any debate as to whether the Constitution created a different and totally new secular godless government over the States, and thus supposedly discarded all of the former Christian engagements of law entered into for the previous 200 years implemented on the part of the Colonial population of America. Of course, it did no such thing, as we will see by the explicit inclusion of Art.VI into the U.S. Constitution. A historical understanding of the relevance of the lawful term “Engagements” as applied to English and American Law at the time, will serve to solidify our grasp of what the Founding Fathers established within the scope of the Constitution. Article VI of the Constitution reads in part:

*“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.**”*

Every Saxon Christian needs to memorize this section of the United States of America Constitution and know what it means!

Article VI is the most hidden, forgotten, and unknown part of the Constitution that has been swept under the rug by the enemies of Christian America who have controlled the educational and legal institutions from the early 1900’s.

“Engagements” in light of the English and American historical and law background of that era, is a word related to the contracts of religious influence upon a people binding themselves in a matter of faith. That word’s lawful significance particularly refers to what happened to Charles I King of England and the Scots in 1647. Charles I was King at a time of militant revolution in England, and who had made enemies within the English Parliament. In an attempt to raise a larger army to take complete control of England, Charles I “cut a deal” with the Scots who were vehemently anti Catholic and wanted to see Protestantism as the only religion in the British Isles. Charles entered into a compact with the Scots known as THE ENGAGEMENT of 1647 where he would make England a Protestant only nation. Here is how a British law dictionary’s historical definition of the word “Engagement” is recognized:

“Engagement”, -- “1647. Charles I (English King) gave himself up to the Scots in 1646 and began negotiations. In December 1647 he signed a secret treaty or engagement, whereby Presbyterianism should be established in Scotland, and in England for three years. In exchange, the Scots promised an army. The result was the second civil war in 1648. But the Scottish army under Hamilton which invaded England was routed by Cromwell at Preston in August 1648.” – John Cannon, “Engagement”, Dictionary of British History. 2004. *Encyclopedia.com*.

We should further note that the word “engage” came into the English language from the French where the word means “pledge” – “*engager, gage*”. (Britannica World Language Dictionary, Vol 1, p.437, 1954 ed.) Thus we see the contract and pledge obligation context of this word:

“ENGAGEMENT. *This word is frequently used in the French law to signify not only a contract, but the obligations arising from a quasi contract (also). The terms obligations (q.v.) and engagements, are said to be synonymous 17 Toull. n. 1; but the Code seems specially to apply the term engagement to those obligations which the law, imposes on a man without the intervention of any contract, either on the part of the obligor or the obligee. Art. 1370.*” -- A Law Dictionary, Adapted to the Constitution and Laws of the United States. By John Bouvier. Published 1856.

Exactly what were the *Engagements entered into* by Americans prior to the Constitution, yet still held as being valid “*under this Constitution as under The Confederation*”? It was the entire parameter of organic law, Colonial charters, first State Constitutions, and duty to each other, which were obligatory pledges among the sovereign people to establish and forever maintain Christianity and the Laws of God in the Bible. This was the standard for true government at all places within their new home of the North American Continent. Christianity, by law, was an obligation, a duty, a pledge, and an Engagement, between the Saxon people of the land.

Although supported from other points of law, Article VI of the USA Constitution even standing on its own incorporates and absorbs into the Federal Constitution *all of the prior Christian law* of the Colonial period as being valid today and forever. The Christian Founding Fathers, whose fathers and grandfathers were the Christians that themselves had made those engagements, knew exactly what they were doing. Again, Article VI states:

“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.*”

Nothing could be more plain and clear, yet we hear modern age movements saying that the United States of America Constitution left Christianity far behind and brought us into a new age of secular government. It is a sad statement of the times to hear of our own people being convinced of this mistaken notion.

But some may ask “What about the last part of Article VI which says that nobody needs to take a religious test to hold federal office under the Constitution?” That part of Article VI reads:

“but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any office under the Unites States.”

First of all, we must remember that the initial part of Article VI *deliberately includes* all of the prior Christian engagements as being valid under the Constitution. Secondly, the framers of the Constitution who wrote the “no religious test” portion of Article VI were themselves Christians! So, indeed, what was the real purpose here? Thirdly, it should be stated again that the nation of “The United States of America” was not formed by the Constitution, but rather under the Articles of Confederation, Art I., calling upon “The Great Governor of the world” (Confederation -Art.XIII), whom the people of the Christian States viewed only as the God of the Holy Bible.

The Constitution was a continuance of the nation already formed under the Confederation and it was not necessary to keep reiterating the Christian fundamental law and nature of the government, anymore than its necessary to ask a car dealer if the car you are buying comes with wheels. Likewise it is a non applicable question to ask “why doesn’t the Constitution specifically refer to Christ/God?” precisely because it was “a given” back then that the perpetual union *already was Christian*. Those who demand that the Constitution must restate that “America is a Christian nation” somewhere in its text, are not realizing “at law” the totally subservient nature of the federal Constitution to that of the then Christian States concerning “religion”.

In consideration of the Article VI ban on religious tests, it cannot be stressed enough that the federal government created by the People, as per the Constitution, exists to serve the states. Unless the People delegate *some specific* power to the federal government, those powers belong to the States. The People, of course, delegated only some of their powers to the federal government (that is, gave it some jobs to do) while retaining most of their powers for themselves. This is the exact same thing a person does when he hires another person to do some job, and tells that person what specific tools he can use and just how the job is to be done.

As we begin to see the light on this issue must realize that the People of the States are the "boss" of the federal government! The states "hired" the federal government and set forth the rules (The U.S.A. Constitution) as to how it should operate. The federal government answers to the States' People, the boss. And the “servant”, the federal government, was not given *any power* to decide *any* matters concerning religion – *period!* This was because of three reasons: 1) The nation already was Christian and it was to be left at that; 2) All matters concerning religion are reserved and deferred to the States by the “boss”. 3) The States’ meeting through representatives in “Congress assembled” were not about to take any chances that any one denomination would become a federally

mandated superior religion over the rest. This is what the Christian signers of the federal Constitution decided, demanded, and ratified.

What would happen, for instance, if a certain State had a Christian religious qualification for who was to represent them in the federal government, but then the federal government *also* had another “religious test” that was different or not quite in agreement with a particular State’s rules? Or worse, what would happen if the majority of Congress at some point in time just happened to become, let’s say, Baptist? (or another Christian sect) Lo and behold, they could monopolize and rewrite a federal religious test to force all other State’s Christians entering office conform to their own denominational preferences, and thus compel them to renounce their own congregations’ beliefs. No, no, no – this would not work, and the Christian Founding Fathers were wise enough to foresee the untold bitter problems that a federal religious test would cause to the nation. The nation was comprised of “general Christianity” and that’s what the existing common law of “friendly league of States” under the Articles of Confederation had already well agreed. That fact was not in dispute back then.

Those who complain about the “no religious test” clause of Article VI, and cite it to supposedly “prove” the Constitution must be a humanist document have not discerned the real focal point made clear by the framers --- namely, the individuals within the States were to decide religious matters, **because** the federal government is but a servant. If those who misinterpret the Article VI ban would simply read the provision in the federal Constitution itself at Article I, sec. 1, they would immediately see that the “States’ power to qualify” was the true concern, and in no way does the Article VI religious test ban have anything to do in the least with making a humanist federal government. The federal Constitution at Article I, sec. 1 reads,

*“The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the Several States, and the Electors in **each State shall have the Qualifications requisite** for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.”*

This means that the “Christian local government State Oaths” at that time were the people’s qualifying promises that were the real factor in determining who sat in the Federal House of Representatives. After they were in the House, their Constitutional “federal oath” ensured that they would protect the “Inheritance Trust nature” of the Constitution for the Preamble’s **posterity** of the white Christians who signed that document in the first place. Let it suffice to realize that the “States called the shots” pertaining to qualifying oaths, while the “federal oath” was merely a secondary oath that pertained to the Trust nature of the Preamble (and its white Christian posterity). The local people of the counties and States had the duty to preserve Christianity as the qualifying social norm, and if they were apathetic in failing to do so, then all is lost any way. The fault for non Christians invading the land cannot be laid at the feet of the federal Constitution. It is a personal problem caused by sleeping Christians.

Historical records show at that time that there were some delegates who expressed concern that a lack of a specific religious test for federal officials would open up an avenue for atheists to enter office. But they then proceeded to debate their way through the matter, with all the heated pros and cons being fully expressed and explained. As the Constitutional delegates carefully thought out precisely what they were doing, upon hearing the various scenarios of a “federal religious test”, in the end the Christian signers of the Constitution finally ratified it and agreed, for the better, that a “no religious test” policy at the federal level was, after all, the *best way* to secure the people’s individual religious freedom of the States’ general Christian population. There would be no tinkering around with giving the federal government a “loop hole” that may in some way set up one particular denomination as “head of all”. No way. The States were compelled to do their Christian duty and to promote and protect the Faith at that level.

Furthermore, let us understand that there were delegates at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia who fully endorsed the Article VI federal ban on religious tests, but had previously designed religious tests or oaths for their respective state constitutions. Article VI of the federal Constitution did not destroy Christian supremacy in America, nor could it have ever done so. The weakening of Christianity in America rests squarely with the generations sometime after that early American era, and with the individuals themselves of those later generations who squandered away our Christian heritage for that of a pleasure oriented society which lightly esteems any true Scriptural guidance.

It is well documented that even after the ratification of the federal Constitution the people of the nation considered ours to be a Christian nation. The Constitution itself was never the problem of the condition of our society. The people themselves, especially after the turn of the century at 1900, eventually became their own ever increasing problem.

Early Federalism under the Constitution was Christian Federalism.

The laws of the States as well as the American Federalism viewpoint *after* the Constitution was ratified showed the governing principles of civil liberty to be decidedly Christian as the following views of the leaders speak for themselves:

Ben Franklin, who signed the Constitution, was of the conviction that civil liberty did not originate with any humanist document, but with the Bible and an aware people.

"A Bible and a newspaper in every house, a good school in every district; all studied and appreciated as they merit; are the principal support of virtue, morality, and civil liberty."
- Ben Franklin, signer of the Constitution, in a letter dated March 1778 to the Ministry of France

"To the kindly influence of Christianity, we owe that degree of civil freedom, and political and social happiness which mankind now enjoy. In proportion, as the genuine effects of Christianity are diminished in any nation, either through unbelief, or the

corruption of its doctrines, or the neglect of its institutions; in the same proportion will the people of the nation recede from the blessings of genuine freedom and approximate the miseries of complete despotism." (1799) -- Dr. Jedidiah Morse, U.S. Clergyman, geographer, and father of Samuel F.B. Morse. (*The Life of Jedidiah Morse* (New York, 1874), William Buell Sprague)

"The patriot who feels himself in the service of God, who acknowledges Him in all his ways, has the promise of Almighty direction, and will find His Word in his greatest darkness, a lantern to his feet and a lamp unto his paths.' He will therefore seek to establish for his country in the eyes of the world, such a character as shall make her not unworthy of the name of a Christian nation...." **Francis Scott Key** -- the man who penned the words of the national song "Star Spangled Banner", February 22, 1812. In an oration delivered before the Washington Society of Alexandria

In 1832, Noah Webster, author of America's first dictionary, published his *History of the United States*, in which he wrote:

"The brief exposition of the constitution of the United States, will unfold to young persons the principles of republican government; and it is the sincere desire of the writer that our citizens should early understand that the genuine source of correct republican principles is the Bible, particularly the New Testament or the Christian religion.

"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.

"The moral principles and precepts contained in the Scriptures ought to form the basis of all of our civil constitutions and laws....All the miseries and evils which men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery and war, proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible.

"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;

"If the citizens neglect their duty and place unprincipled men in office, the government will soon be corrupted; laws will be made not for the public good so much as for the selfish or local purposes;

"Corrupt or incompetent men will be appointed to execute the laws; the public revenues will be squandered on unworthy men; and the rights of the citizens will be violated or disregarded.

"If a republican government fails to secure public prosperity and happiness, it must be because the citizens neglect the divine commands, and elect bad men to make and administer the laws.

"Corruption of morals is rapid enough in any country without a bounty from government. And...the Chief Magistrate of the United States should be the last man to accelerate its progress." (Noah Webster, 1832)

Also in the post-Constitution ratification period, the United States Supreme Court (February 29, 1892), in the case of *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 US 457-458, 465-471, 36 L ed 226, declared the following, as Justice Josiah Brewer rendered the Supreme Court's decision:

"Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is impossible that it should be otherwise; and in this sense and to this extent our civilization and our institutions are emphatically Christian.

No purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state or national, because this is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation.

The commission to Christopher Columbus... [recited] that "it is hoped that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered..."

The first colonial grant made to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584... and the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony provided that they "be not against the true Christian faith..."

The first charter of Virginia, granted by King James I in 1606... commenced the grant in these words: "... in propagating of Christian Religion to such People as yet live in Darkness..."

Language of similar import may be found in the subsequent charters of that colony... in 1609 and 1611; and the same is true of the various charters granted to the other colonies. In language more or less emphatic is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant. The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the Mayflower, 1620, recites: "Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith... a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia..."

"The fundamental orders of Connecticut, under which a provisional government was instituted in 1638-1639, commence with this declaration: "... And well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union... there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God... to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess... of the said gospel [which] is now practiced amongst us."

“ In the charter of privileges granted by William Penn to the province of Pennsylvania, in 1701, it is recited: “... no people can be truly happy, though under the greatest enjoyment of civil liberties, if abridged of... their religious profession and worship...”

Coming nearer to the present time, the Declaration of Independence recognizes the presence of the Divine in human affairs in these words:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights... appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions... And for the support of this Declaration, with firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.”

“ ... We find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth... because of a general recognition of this truth (that is America being a Christian nation, added note), the question has seldom been presented to the courts...”

“There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons: they are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people.”

“While because of a general recognition of this truth the question has seldom been presented to the courts, yet we find that in *Updegraph v. The Commonwealth*, it was decided that, Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law of Pennsylvania ... not Christianity with an established church... but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men.

And in *The People v. Ruggles*, Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said:

“The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice... We are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those imposters.”

“ And in the famous case of *Vidal v. Girard’s Executors*, this Court... observed:

“It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law...”

“ If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the customs of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies and most conventions with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, “In the name of God, amen”; the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath, with the general cessation of all secular business, and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day; the churches and church organizations which abound in every city, town and hamlet; the multitude of charitable organizations existing everywhere under Christian auspices; the gigantic missionary associations, with general support, and aiming to establish Christian missions in every quarter of the globe.”

“... we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth...These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation...

“The happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality. Religion, morality, and knowledge [are] necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty, and the happiness of mankind.”

[end Sup. Ct. decision Feb.29,1892]

A Proclamation

Proclamation 5018 -- Year of the Bible, 1983

February 3, 1983

By the President of the United States of America

“Of the many influences that have shaped the United States of America into a distinctive Nation and people, none may be said to be more fundamental and enduring than the Bible.

Deep religious beliefs stemming from the Old and New Testaments of the Bible inspired many of the early settlers of our country, providing them with the strength, character, convictions, and faith necessary to withstand great hardship and danger in this new and rugged land. These shared beliefs helped forge a sense of common purpose among the widely dispersed colonies -- a sense of community which laid the foundation for the spirit of nationhood that was to develop in later decades.

The Bible and its teachings helped form the basis for the Founding Fathers' abiding belief in the inalienable rights of the individual, rights which they found implicit in the Bible's teachings of the inherent worth and dignity of each individual. This same sense of man patterned the convictions of those who framed the English system of law inherited by our own Nation, as well as the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

For centuries the Bible's emphasis on compassion and love for our neighbor has inspired institutional and governmental expressions of benevolent outreach such as private charity, the establishment of schools and hospitals, and the abolition of slavery.

Many of our greatest national leaders -- among them Presidents Washington, Jackson, Lincoln, and Wilson -- have recognized the influence of the Bible on our country's development. The plainspoken Andrew Jackson referred to the Bible as no less than “the rock on which our Republic rests.” Today our beloved America and, indeed, the world, is facing a decade of enormous challenge. As a people we may well be tested as we have seldom, if ever, been tested before. We will need resources of spirit even more than resources of technology, education, and armaments. There could be no more fitting moment than now to reflect with gratitude, humility, and urgency upon the wisdom

revealed to us in the writing that Abraham Lincoln called ``the best gift God has ever given to man . . . But for it we could not know right from wrong."

“The Congress of the United States, in recognition of the unique contribution of the Bible in shaping the history and character of this Nation, and so many of its citizens, has by Senate Joint Resolution 165 authorized and requested the President to designate the year 1983 as the ``Year of the Bible."

Now, Therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, in recognition of the contributions and influence of the Bible on our Republic and our people, do hereby proclaim 1983 the Year of the Bible in the United States. I encourage all citizens, each in his or her own way, to reexamine and rediscover its priceless and timeless message.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventh. “ Ronald Reagan

Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:10 a.m., February 3, 1983

[We're not going to debate the pluses and minuses of Ronald Regan, but in this proclamation he correctly pointed out the fact of our nation's Constitutional foundation as being influenced by the Christian Bible]

The great weight of evidential material of law witnesses to the truth that early Constitutional Federalism was Christian, as were the Constitutions and other organic document engagements of the original States of that period. May God Almighty grant that our Commonwealth Union of all the United States, under constant attack since its inception, continues unto the coming of our Eternal King Jesus Christ.

The provision within Article VI of the Constitution mentioning “treaties” and how they affect the Union will be left for another essay.