

The Treaty of Tripoli, 1796 - 97

In this Law Commentary we are going to set the record straight about the paragraph quoted from Article 11 of the Treaty of Tripoli ratified by Congress on June 10, 1797 during President John Adams' administration.

If there is one thing about the Treaty of Tripoli which anti-Christians cannot escape, it is the fact that no matter how you cut it, the supposed "non Christian section" (Article 11) of that treaty is itself enveloped in a permanent controversy concerning its validity and accuracy, and has been since the time of it's origin. Simply put, whether pro or con with respect to quoting Article 11 to disprove America's Christian heritage, the Treaty of Tripoli cannot logically or historically be referenced as any "sure thing" for any certainty whatsoever. At best the issue is clouded, and anti-Christians will have to look elsewhere other than the much befuddled Article 11 of the Treaty of Tripoli's, in order to find a "lock tight" argument to stake their claim that Constitutional America was not established upon Christianity.

Nevertheless, because this topic arises so often among people who have never actually studied the subject matter in the first place, an expose' of the facts surrounding that treaty is long overdue. Let the record speak for itself.

As the circumstances were back then, in an effort to combat Muslim piracy in the Mediterranean Sea, in 1797 the U.S. ratified the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the United States of America and the Bey and Subjects of Tripoli of Barbary - otherwise know as "the Treaty of Tripoli".

The section in question, Article 11 of that treaty reads as follows:

"As the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion,-as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselmen,-and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mehomitan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries." [Note: "Musselmen" means Muslim]

(source):

Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America , Hunter Miller, Documents 1-40 : 1776-1818 Washington : Government Printing Office, 1931. – Treaty of Tripoli

Those who quote the Treaty of Tripoli to supposedly "prove" early America wasn't Christian by law, have usually read some Online blog which has clipped or cropped the eagerly touted Article 11 from a copy of the treaty, and then without any further study of the matter, point to it as their "catch all evidence" to support their claims that early America was secular in nature. While continuing in total denial of all the preceding several centuries of monumental Christian Law clearly written into the multitudinous organic documents upon which America was established, the Treaty of Tripoli is the humanist's best isolated shot at trying to present an argument that America was not built upon Christianity.

Short version of explaining the misunderstanding about the “Treaty of Tripoli”

- 1) There is no original Treaty of Tripoli in existence anywhere and there hasn't been for well over 200 years.
- 2) The U.S. ratified Treaty of Tripoli cited today as “the original” was an English version copy of an Arabic version copy of the Arabic original (now missing).
- 3) There is NO Article 11 in the Arabic version of that treaty, experts now agree that Article 11 was spuriously inserted into the English copy, and most probably by the America diplomat Joel Barlow, who helped negotiate the treaty and who was himself a skeptic of Christianity.
- 4) When the tampered English translation version was presented to Congress for ratification in 1797, in spite of Article 11 inserted and included, they had to pass the treaty anyway out of political expedience and immediate urgency to quickly stop the carnage of militant pirate attacks upon American merchant ships in the Mediterranean Sea. Because of the situation at hand, there would be no time to re-draft such a treaty and run it through the diplomatic channels again.
- 5) Eight years later when America gained a military upper hand on the situation, ***this Treaty was renegotiated*** in 1805-6, and the “non-Christian” Article 11 phrase was conspicuously removed and absent!
- 6) Those who attempt to use the Treaty of Tripoli as so called evidence proposing that this nation was not founded on the Christian religion, typically ignore the ***Treaty of Paris of 1783***, which formally ended the Revolutionary War. This Treaty, negotiated by Benjamin Franklin and John Adams among others, is truly a ***foundational document*** for America, because by this treaty Britain recognized the independence of the United States as a nation. The Treaty of Paris of 1783 begins with the words, ***"In the Name of the most holy and undivided Trinity... It having pleased the Divine Providence"*** * No qualified historian or explanatory references of any Congressional records have ever questioned, in the least, the validity of those revealing words of that treaty, as they do concerning the falsified Article 11 of the Treaty of Tripoli. *(Treaty of Paris, 1783; International Treaties and Related Records, 1778-1974; General records of the United States Government, Record group 11; National Archives)
- 7) The Treaty of Tripoli argument used against Christian America on the part of secular humanists (their “strongest” isolated claim that America was not established upon Christianity) is one based on a shallow examination of a the document. Its claimed “non-Christian part” is readily admitted by non biased experts to have either been fraudulent or some entry that is unaccounted for. By any standard, the argument lacks credibility due to its obviously spurious nature.

Long version of explaining the misunderstanding about the “Treaty of Tripoli 1797”

Anyone wanting to read the full text of the treaty can do so at this Yale Law Web. Site [Tripoli Doc]

Article 11 Treaty of Tripoli 1797:

“As the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion, -as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselmen, -and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mehomitan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.”

The entire crux of the matter surrounding the Treaty of Tripoli of 1797 rests on the events of that time and place, when the Muslim Barbary Coast Pirates from the Northern shores of Africa were raiding sailing ships in the Mediterranean Sea, stealing the cargo and capturing the crews. In order to stop the effects of the trade devastation upon American ships, America was forced into the diplomatic reality that a treaty, for the moment, was imperative to negotiate between the Barbary nations and the USA.

When the negotiations were completed at Tripoli by Capt. Richard O'Brien, the treaty was taken to Algiers for the signature and seal of the Dey of Algiers. Subsequently, the various signatures and certificates of Joel Barlow, American Consul General at Algiers, were added and became part of the official document. Joel Barlow was a known Christian critic, and it was Barlow who translated the original treaty from Arabic into English, which is the version that President John Adams and the US Congress ratified.

It is no surprise then, from the *definitive study* on the Treaty of Tripoli in the Hunter Miller Notes, Government Printing Office 1931 under “NOTE REGARDING THE BARLOW TRANSLATION”, that we read:

*“As even a casual examination of the annotated translation of 1930 shows, the Barlow translation is at best a poor attempt at a paraphrase or summary of the sense of the Arabic; and even as such its defects throughout are obvious and glaring. Most extraordinary (and wholly unexplained) is the fact that **Article 11 of the Barlow translation, with its famous phrase, "the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion," does not exist at all. There is no Article 11.** The Arabic text which is between Articles 10 and 12 is in form a letter, crude and flamboyant and withal quite unimportant, from the Dey of Algiers to the Pasha of Tripoli. How that script came to be written and to be regarded, as in the Barlow translation, as Article 11 of the treaty as there written, is a mystery and seemingly must remain so. Nothing in the diplomatic correspondence of the time throws any light whatever on the point.”*

Read actual above source in full: click here > TREATY

It's interesting to see that the controversial "Article 11" was in some form of a scribbled letter. If Barlow didn't outright insert it himself, a likely explanation is that the Dey of Algiers wrote this note on the Treaty face to alleviate any worry of the Pasha of Tripoli about entering into a Treaty with an "infidel" (non-Islamic) nation like the United States. The translator assumed this was part of the Treaty and translated it along with the rest of the document. More than likely the clauses of the original document (missing forever) were not numbered, so the translator would have numbered this as Clause 11 between Clauses 10 and 12, as he progressed in trying to organize it.

Concerning the true original text of the Treaty, it is documented that none now exists:

“--- (T)he first source of the texts of those collections was clearly a now missing copy, as is shown by the fact that they include a certification of the text as a copy --“ The 1930 Annotation in 2ND Part Treaty with Tripoli 1796 : Hunter Miller's Notes , U.S. Govt. Printing Office

So the truth is that the original treaty was written in Arabic and presented to the Barbary Muslim nations in that manner, yet the Arabic treaty has no strange Article 11 in its document. Yet by the time Barlow got the translated English version to America it contained the “non-Christian” text of Article 11. However, admittedly it was indeed this English version of the treaty, containing the phrase about America not being a Christian nation, that was fully read by Congress and signed by President John Adams. It is this ratification upon which the antichrists today hang their argument that the Treaty “de-Christianized America” by law. President Adams’ own official record of the matter reads as follows:

“Now be it known, That I John Adams, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the said Treaty do, by and with the advice consent of the Senate, accept, ratify, and confirm the same, and every clause and article thereof. And to the End that the said Treaty may be observed and performed with good Faith on the part of the United States, I have ordered the premises to be made public; And I do hereby enjoin and require all persons bearing office civil or military within the United States, and all others citizens or inhabitants thereof, faithfully to observe and fulfil the said Treaty and every clause and article thereof.” (Dept. of State File, Treaty of Tripoli 1797, instrument of ratification)

That is, the Congress ratified a treaty that contained an obscure sentence that the American government was not Christian. But what is even more bizarre about this signing of the Treaty (with the English version Art. 11 therein) by President Adams, is that Adams also said this:

“The general principles, on which the Fathers achieved independence, were the only Principles in which that beautiful Assembly of young Gentlemen could Unite....And what were these general Principles? I answer, the general Principles of Christianity, in which all these Sects were United... I will avow that I then believed, and now believe, that those general principles of Christianity are as eternal and immutable as the existence and

attributes of God; and that those principles of liberty are as unalterable as human nature.” (– John Adams, Works, Vol. X, pp. 45-46, to Thomas Jefferson on June 28, 1813.)

In addition to these statements by President Adams, which seemingly contradicts his signing of the treaty, we see that the Spanish delegation which certified the signatures of the Treaty, recognized the Treaty as an agreement between Muslim and Christian nations, for the Spanish notes concerning the Barbary Treaties with nations reads:

“We Don Gerardo Joseph de Souza Knight of the order of Christ, Consul General and Charge des Affaires of his Catholic Majesty in this City and Kingdom of Tripoli of Barbary.

*Certify That the foregoing signatures and seals are those of the persons who sign all treaties of peace which are concluded **with Christian Nations.** They are*

*Jussuf Bashaw Mahomet Bey
Mamet Treasurer
Amet Minister of Marine
Amet Chamberlain
Ally Chief of the Divan
Soliman Kaya
Galil General of the Troops
Mohamet Com'.of the City
Mamet Secy*

In faith of which I sign these presents with my own hand. Sealed with the royal seal of this Consulate of Spain, in Tripoli of Barbary on the 4th of November 1796 (L. S.) signed GERARDO JOSEPH DE SOUZA “

Thus far, what history records is that there was no “non- Christian America” Article 11 in the original Arabic Treaty document which those Barbary nations ratified. Yet the Barlow English version passed by our Congress DID have that strange Article in it. (Why Congress would pass it will be explained shortly.) In any event, what is important AT LAW when it comes to treaties, agreements, or contracts (as every first year law student knows) is that if there is not a “meeting of minds” that has taken place, then the agreement/treaty between parties is void Ab Initio. Since the Barbary nations and the USA did not ratify the exact same treaty text, or at least the Article 11 text part of it, by law it makes either the entire treaty void or else the Article 11 section void. Proponents of the Treaty of Tripoli claiming it as a basis for their reasons that America is not a Christian nation don’t want to deal with this particular law issue, nevertheless it is a maxim of Law that cannot be refuted. A treaty, agreement, or contract where no meeting of the minds takes place is no treaty at all, but is voidable upon discovery of the lack of mutual understanding. There was no Article 11 in the treaty text signed by Muslims at Tripoli, which means that even when the US Congress did ratify the treaty, it was a different text than the Muslim signers, and no true meeting of the minds took place, especially concerning the understanding of the religions of the nations involved.

Definition: “A *meeting of the minds* is a term used in contract law to refer to the mutual understanding and agreement on the same terms applicable to a contract. Mutual comprehension is essential to a valid contract.” (<http://definitions.uslegal.com>)

Can the matter get any more twisted concerning the dubious Article 11 claim? What else can we expect when somebody picks out a single isolated sentence from a manuscript translated from a foreign language under a conglomerate of international circumstances, without knowing the all inclusive details about the pertinent events, and then tries to make an opinionated doctrine out of it? --- such as “America’s not a Christian nation *because* ----- “? No friends, the Treaty of Tripoli Art 11 quote is a very weak, if not disqualified, attempt to show early America was not Christian by law.

The bottom line is that we need to answer the question, “Why would the American Congress ratify a treaty that had a sentence within it that contradicted several hundred years of Christian law background of the nation itself?” Especially since the then Congressmen individually and the President himself were Christians? For this we have to review the dire need of the time and the circumstances influencing a quick passage of this particular treaty.

Understanding the international issues about the The Barbary Coast and the USA

The historic events surrounding the Treaty of Tripoli did not happen over the span of a few years or even over several decades. The roots of this saga had been growing for centuries before America won its independence in 1776.

From a US Navy historical article we read:

“Since the sixteenth century, corsairs from the Muslim states of North Africa had controlled the Mediterranean sea lanes by force. At the time the United States won its independence, the states of the Barbary Coast--Tripoli, Algiers, Morocco, and Tunis--had been preying on the world's merchant ships for three hundred years. The Barbary pirates' methods were fairly simple: cruising the Mediterranean in small, fast ships, they boarded merchant ships, overwhelmed the crew, and took them captive. The crews were held in captivity until their home countries agreed to pay ransoms for their release. If no ransom was forthcoming, the crews were sold into slavery. Over time, most countries found it expedient simply to pay a yearly tribute to the sultans, thereby buying their ships free passage through the Mediterranean.”

“As a part of the British Empire, the ships of the American colonies were protected by the Royal Navy and by treaties between the Barbary States and England. However, once the United States became an independent nation, this protection was gone, and the new U.S. government was quickly forced to make treaties with the sultans of North Africa.”

“In 1796, the tributes to the sultans were modest; Tripoli's, for example, was \$56,000. But the pasha of Tripoli, Yusuf Karamanli, believed he could demand higher tribute and sent a message to the United States demanding a new treaty. The demands arrived in March 1801, just after President Thomas Jefferson was inaugurated. Jefferson had long disagreed with the policy of paying tribute and argued that it would be cheaper to build a navy than give in to the sultans' ever-increasing demands.” The Barbary Wars, 1801-1805; <http://www.mariner.org/usnavy/06/06a.htm>

In other words, these consortiums of Muslim pirates were so much in control of the Mediterranean and were so arrogant in their attacks and demands that the rest of the world just accepted the policy that it was easier to pay of the Sultans of these pirate nations than to engage in a long drawn out war with them. In the early 1790's period of America our nation was only in a position to follow suit in paying the ransom or suffer loss of merchant goods, ships, and their crews, along with the passengers being captured.

Ambassador Richard Parker , former US ambassador to Algeria, Lebanon, and Morocco, and noted historian on American involvements in Middle East wars, spoke at the Center for Contemporary Arab Studies at Georgetown University on March 28, 2001. Parker is a noted historian on the US and the Barbary States. The Georgetown review of Parker's statements on the subject included:

“European powers had contended with the Barbary privateers for centuries, and nearly all of them were paying tribute to North African rulers to secure the safety of their fleets. In fact, Parker stated, the British and French were actively encouraging the privateers in order to limit commercial competition by smaller states. Foreign powers also issued slips of protection for other countries' ships, as well as licenses for raiding ships.”

(Middle East Wars: US Involvements from Jefferson to Bush, summary of Parker speech by Paul Dyer, page 12, Arab web site “Friends of Morocco” <http://home.att.net/morocco>)

Plainly put, the British and French were encouraging the Barbary pirates to raid and/or sink the trade ships of smaller nations, which at that time included America. With America not yet a world power but trying to compete on the high seas it became an urgent priority for America to make some sort of ransom treaty with these bandits or else have their shipping future destroyed before it even began. **Herein lays the immediacy and absolute necessity for the reason that America ratified the Treaty of Tripoli of 1797.**

When the treaty was brought before Congress at that time in the form of the English Barlow version of it, America's hands in the Mediterranean shipping lanes were completely tied, and frustration about it was at a maximum. There was no time to squabble, nor was Congress, the President, or the navy in any position to worry about lesser phrases in the treaty that paled in significance to the pirate raids and the capture of our ships' crews. The treaty needed ratified, and any renegotiating of terms by a long drawn out repeated diplomatic effort was simply not an option. The treaty was ratified by Congress “as is”.

Next -- what happened in the ensuing years as America grew in power is something that no advocate of the supposed “non-Christian Article 11” will ever mention or pen in a debate concerning this chain of events.

The turn of international events is of paramount importance because the “final treaty” message sang a different tune when America gained the upper military hand, with the **Treaty of Tripoli being renegotiated 8 years later in 1805-6.** In that final treaty version, after several years of time now clearing the hasty channels of communication, the part about “America not being Christian” was deliberately and thoughtfully dropped from the treaty text and the treaty then better reflected the course and character of America in the eyes of the world. Here’s how the recorded series of events took place.

The Muslim piracy acts of war, then as now, always held a religious connotation and those wars to them meant a “holy religious war” in every aspect. The Barbary pirates weren’t just after ships -- for centuries they were after Christian ships of Christian nations.

From this British BBC maritime source we have:

British Slaves on the Barbary Coast

By Professor Rees Davies, published: 2003-01-07 BBC Web Site
www. bbc.co.uk/history (use “search”, enter title)

*“In the first half of the 1600s, Barbary corsairs - **pirates from the Barbary Coast of North Africa, authorized by their governments to attack the shipping of Christian countries** - ranged all around Britain's shores. In their lanteen-rigged xebecs (a type of ship) and oared galleys, they grabbed ships and sailors, and sold the sailors into slavery.*

Morgan also noted that he had a ‘...List, printed in London in 1682’ of 160 British ships captured by Algerians between 1677 and 1680. Considering what the number of sailors who were taken with each ship was likely to have been, these examples translate into a probable 7,000 to 9,000 able-bodied British men and women taken into slavery in those years.

*According to observers of the late 1500s and early 1600s, **there were around 35,000 European Christian slaves held throughout this time on the Barbary Coast** - many in Tripoli, Tunis, and various Moroccan towns, but most of all in Algiers. The greatest number were sailors, taken with their ships, but a good many were fishermen and coastal villagers.”*

*“The fishermen and coastal dwellers of 17th-century Britain lived in terror of being kidnapped by pirates and sold into slavery in North Africa. **Hundreds of thousands across Europe met wretched deaths on the Barbary Coast in this way.**”*

Things were no different when America came on the scene. The Muslim pirates were raiding Christian ships for centuries and America was no different, just another Christian nation whose ships were to be plundered and crews to be tortured and made slaves of. In 1784, Barbary pirates captured the U.S. schooner Maria and took the crew and passengers to Algeria, where they were paraded through the streets and jeered as "infidels" before being imprisoned. In 1793, Algerian pirates captured the cargo ship Polly, plundered it and imprisoned the 12-man crew. Other American ships had been captured making the number of Americans held in Muslim slavery to be over 120 then, with the numbers increasing monthly. Spain in 1492-3 had expelled the Arabs from their nation which infuriated the Muslim nations of North Africa. From then on the Muslim states held a "jihad" (holy war) against Christian Europe, thus the target of the Barbary pirates were principally Christian targets out of Muslim hatred against Christianity. From a lengthy book review for the historic work *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters, White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800* (MacMillian Pub, 2003) written by Professor Robert C. Davis of Ohio State University, we read:

(<http://www.spainvia.com/Christianslaves.htm>) *"Some Arab pirates were skilled blue-water sailors, and terrorized Christians 1,000 miles away. One spectacular raid all the way to Iceland in 1627 took nearly 400 captives. We think of Britain as a redoubtable sea power ever since the time of Drake, but throughout the 17th century, Arab pirates operated freely in British waters, even sailing up the Thames estuary to pick off prizes and raid coastal towns.*

Once in North Africa, it was tradition to parade newly-captured Christians through the streets, so people could jeer at them, and children could pelt them with refuse. At the slave market, men were made to jump about to prove they were not lame, and buyers often wanted them stripped naked again to see if they were healthy. This was also to evaluate the sexual value of both men and women; white concubines had a high value, and all the slave capitals had a flourishing homosexual underground.

The pasha or ruler of the area got a certain percentage of the slave take as a form of income tax. These were almost always men, and became government rather than private property.

Most of these public slaves spent the rest of their lives as galley slaves, and it is hard to imagine a more miserable existence. Men were chained three, four, or five to an oar, with their ankles chained together as well. Rowers never left their oars, and to the extent that they slept at all, they slept at their benches. Slaves could push past each other to relieve themselves at an opening in the hull, but they were often too exhausted or dispirited to move, and fouled themselves where they sat. They had no protection against the burning Mediterranean sun, and their masters flayed their already-raw backs with the slave driver's favorite tool of encouragement, a stretched bull's penis or "bull's pizzle." There was practically no hope of escape or rescue; a galley slave's job was to work himself to death—mainly in raids to capture more wretches like himself—and his master pitched him overboard at the first sign of serious illness."

[Note: Modern Americans tend to whine and complain a lot about personal everyday problems. Perhaps a little pondering on what our ancestors had to endure will be the ointment that soothes, and will set our righteous focus on needed work to make sure the above extreme agony doesn't happen in this country]

The Barbary pirates viewed America as merely a Christian extension of Christian Britain. A Christian crew member of the Polly, John Foss, wrote this first hand account of his captive years in Algiers, "*As we passed through the streets, our ears were stunned with the shouts, clapping hands, and other acclamations of joy from the inhabitants, thanking god for their great success, and victories over so many Christian dogs, and unbelievers, which is the appellation they generally give to all Christians*". (from the remarkable: Journal of John Foss, Several Years a Prisoner in Algiers, published in 1798, printed by Angier March, Newbury Port, Mass.)

Europe reluctantly put up with these pirates as an accepted way of life and things didn't change until America developed at a staggering rate and flex some naval muscle of its own. In the Presidency of Thomas Jefferson history witnessed a turn of events that eventually stopped the ransom treaties imposed by the Barbary nations upon Christian Europe and Christian America along with the extreme cruelty of the manner of slavery inflicted upon white Christians by African Muslims. (No form of slavery is good, but the black slaves on the American Southern Plantations endured no such severe treatment anywhere near the viciousness exacted upon whites by Muslims pirates.)

**God Almighty used America to exact His vengeance
and destroy the Barbary Pirates**

Speaking to Saxon Israel, The Living God of the Bible promised in Jeremiah 51:20
"Thou art my battle axe and weapons of war: for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms;"

--and--

Proverbs 24:3-6 "*Through wisdom is an house builded; and by understanding it is established:*

*And by knowledge shall the chambers be filled with all precious and pleasant riches.
A wise man is strong; yea, a man of knowledge increaseth strength.*

For by wise counsel thou shalt make thy war: and in multitude of counsellors there is safety.

Those who argue against having any sort of Federal Government and see only evil in the idea of a federation under our original lawful Constitution have not associated the revealed thoughts of Yahweh to what happened in our nation's history by defeating the Barbary pirates which finally relieved Christendom of those thieving scoundrels. It was under the US Constitutional form of government that Yahweh applied Jeremiah 51:20 (above) to remedy the centuries' long torment of His Christian people at the hands of the murderous Muslim pirates. Those today who wish for the several American States to remain totally separate to the unreasonable extreme of no federation between them for unity, deny the explicit will of Yahweh that war shall be conducted based upon a "multitude of counselors". (The States United) And also, "*--- if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.* (Ecc.4:12)

This means that team work is a divine institution, and the adoption of our original federal Constitution resulted in just the right mix of State sovereignty along with limited “confederated power” for all America as “one body” when the need would arise. America, at least for a short lived period, had achieved the manifestation of a true Christian nation fulfilling the now purposed Commonwealth style of government of Godly Rule first taught by Paul the Apostle in Ephesians 2:12, & 19.

On Jefferson's inauguration as president in 1801, Yussif Karamanli, the Pasha of Tripoli, demanded \$225,000 from the new administration (a lot back then), and Jefferson as quickly, refused to pay any more tribute to those Muslim pirates. Thereupon, in May of 1801 the Pasha declared war on the United States. What America was not able to do under its formation by the weaker Articles of Confederation of 1777, the Jefferson administration was now able to do as the Constitutional federation of America was surely growing in the proper direction of regulated governmental power. Prior to this, by 1785 the Continental Navy had been disbanded for lack of funds under the Articles of Confederation. With the ratification of the Constitution, America was finally able, as the “States more strongly United”, to build a formidable Navy to protect American interests abroad. Jefferson pursued an increase in military force and deployed the navy's best ships to the Barbary coastal area throughout 1802 USS *Constitution*, The USS *Argus*, USS *Chesapeake*, USS *Constellation*, USS *Enterprise*, USS *Intrepid*, USS *Philadelphia* and USS *Syren* all participated in the war under the head command of Commodore Edward Preble. During the entire year of 1803 Preble blockaded the Barbary ports and waged a heavy campaign of raids and attacks against the North African cities and their fleets. As God's “battle ax” (Jer.51:20) by May of 1805 the American Navy of the Christian Constitutional government of the United States brought the Sultans of the Christ hating Muslim pirates to their knees. As the Divine Hand of Destiny would have it, our ship the USS *Constitution* led the frightful cannon bombardment of the Muslim coastal fortresses that caused their surrender.

Not to be forgotten are the ground forces of military action in North Africa commanded by Army Captain William Eaton, a major figure in the Barbary Powers conflict. Eaton's own private writings provide even more irrefutable testimony of how the conflict was viewed at that time. Eaton was first appointed by President John Adams as "Consul to Tunis," and President Thomas Jefferson later advanced him to the position of "U. S. Naval Agent to the Barbary States," and was recognized by his forces as “General”. Jefferson authorized him to lead a military expedition against Tripoli, whereupon Eaton enlisted the aid of mercenaries to bolster his fire power. Eaton's official correspondence during his service confirms that the conflict was a Muslim war against a Christian America.

A glance at Eaton's private journals shows his disgust with the frame of mind of the militant Muslim attitude toward Christians:

“April 8th. We find it almost impossible to inspire these wild bigots with confidence in us or to persuade them that, being Christians, we can be otherwise than enemies to

Musselmen. We have a difficult undertaking!" (Prentiss, p. 325, from Eaton's journal, April 8, 1805.)

"May 23rd. Hassien Bey, the commander in chief of the enemy's forces, has offered by private insinuation for my head six thousand dollars and double the sum for me a prisoner; and \$30 per head for Christians. Why don't he come and take it?" (Prentiss, p. 334, from Eaton's journal, May 23, 1805.

The Navy barrage at sea, and Eaton's advances by ground, put an end to the centuries' long religious war on the high seas which the Muslims had waged against Christianity. A new treaty was signed, with America making sure that no verbiage such as the inconsistent Article 11 "non-Christian" sort was in its text., it having been removed. This new and conclusive treaty better reflected America's closure of the Tripoli and Barbary Coast incidents. The release and freedom of nearly 300 Americans being held by Muslim Tripoli was secured by the Jefferson administration. It wasn't until 1815, though, that all the pirate raids were completely stopped due to the fact that when America got itself tied up with the War of 1812 against the British, some North African pirates took the opportunity to raid ships again. However, upon the conclusion of the War of 1812 America took care of final matters in the Mediterranean with a second Barbary War.

Below is the related part of the renegotiated Treaty of Tripoli. It never even hints at America "not being Christian".

TREATY OF TRIPOLI, APRIL, 1806

ARTICLE XIV. *"AS the government of the United States of America has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Mussulmen, and as the said States never have entered into any voluntary war or act of hostility against any Mahometan except in defense of their just rights to freely navigate the high seas, it is declared by the contracting parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two nations. And the consuls and agents of both nations respectively shall have liberty to exercise his religion in his own house. All slaves of the same religion shall not be impeded in going to said consul's house at hours of prayer."* Source : "Treaty of Peace, Amity, and Commerce Between the President and Citizens of the United States of America, and the Basha, Bey, and Subjects of Tripoli, in Bombay, Concluded June 4, 1805; Ratified by the Senate April 12, 1806," *Treaties and Conventions Concluded between the United States of America and Other Powers, Since July 4, 1776*, published by the Department of State, 1889, page 1084

What this corrected Treaty of Tripoli of 1806 says in effect is that America doesn't care what the Arabs believe in as long as they don't attack Americans. It even goes so far as to mean that if an Arab state has an embassy in America that nobody will try to convert them to Christianity, which is Scriptural since Christ came only for the Saxon Israel race. (Mat.15:24) and the Gospel is not for them in the first place. With the culminating events

and ending treaties with the Muslim states of North Africa, there was no mention in any document whatsoever, or even close to it, that America was not a Christian nation. For a person to present a claim that America is not a Christian nation under the Constitution by basing that deduction upon Article 11 of the Treaty of Tripoli of 1797 only reveals their ignorance in extreme haste in not knowing the history of the subject matter.

At best, the “Article 11 argument” is a shaky fragile reed in trying to build a frame upon which to stand. There are so many holes in the Tripoli Treaty Article 11 theory, all centered around speculation, distortions, mistranslations, mistrust, and cleric error, that even a trained and schooled atheist should know better than to rest his anti-Christian/American claim upon such a single clouded piece of history. Evidently, to some of these blind diehards it doesn’t seem to matter. But for the seeker of truth, let the records of history speak for themselves. Christians need not apologize to anyone for America being what it is -- God’s Kingdom Nation that will prevail in the end, over all conflicts to derail it from its divine destiny.

[<BACK](#)