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Preface

“Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone. But if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.”1 “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”2

The journey that has brought me to the point of writing this book began in 1982. I was saved and baptized and became a member of Community Baptist Church in Fort Worth, Texas in July 1982. Being a new Christian was exhilarating. Within a year of my salvation the Lord had laid it on the hearts of Pastor W. N. Otwell and the members of the church to start a boy’s home. As a result of that calling the church stepped forward in faith and opened a home for wayward boys shortly after that.

Being a part of the Community Baptist Church boy’s home ministry (“the Otwell Home”) was one of the most joyful and blessed experiences of my life. I began to know some of the boys personally. One of the boys would assist me part time in my photography business, and several were always in line wanting to take over if and when the boy who was helping me left. They seemed to enjoy working in photography, and, of course, it gave them some spending money. After the home was attacked and closed down by the state, Randy, the boy who was assisting me at that time, had to be put into a mental ward. Before the battle began, he seemed very happy and the mental problems he had before coming to the home were in remission. He had a home where people loved him. After the battle started, I began to see evidence of recurrence of his mental problems when he was assisting me photographing weddings. The loss of his home was devastating to him, probably even more than it was to me.

March 31, 1986 was one of the saddest days of my life, and one of the most tragic days in the history of the state of Texas. On that date, State District Judge Paul R. Davis ruled that Community Baptist Church had to accept a state license or close its children’s home ministry. The ruling ultimately not only took dozens of boys from the home they loved and from the people that loved them, but also indicated to me that religious freedom as supposedly guaranteed by the federal and state constitutions was dead in Texas.

In addition to being heartbroken, I was quite angry about what the state had done. Boys were being helped at no cost to the state. I had the privilege of being a part of a church that was actually practicing the second great commandment—“love thy neighbor as thyself.” How could officials of the civil government believe that state employees, the vast majority of whom were unregenerate, cared for children more than Christians whose motivation was love, not money, benefits, and retirement?

Lost people and Christians (saved people who follow the principles of God as laid down in the New Testament) have different natures. I understand lost people. I was one for thirty-five years. In the eyes of the world, I was a good person. I had been trained by America through my secular public school and college education as well as by other secular sources to seek the American

---

1 John 12.24-25.
2 John 15.13.
dream which the Declaration of Independence (“life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”) and the United States Constitution allowed me the freedom to seek (again, as taught me by America’s civil government, schools, and institutions of higher learning and media)—to be selfish, to seek to make a good life for myself by becoming successful at my chosen vocation, obtaining a certain type of house, car and other material possessions, and to ease my conscience by trying not to hurt anyone, helping someone financially here and there, contributing to charities and the like.

I believe that state agencies that help young people are mostly staffed by lost people who have never experienced the love of God, the love He is willing to so freely give. These people are paid good salaries and get substantial material benefits, at least in comparison to the pittance, if anything, the workers in the church ministry received in gifts. The main motivations of state employees are worldly success and money. They let that be known by their constant complaints about their salaries and benefits and their attempts to persuade the government to give them more so that they can do a better job in serving students or others that their state agency or profession serves. Do you believe that they would continue to do their work without being paid as many Christians do? Do you believe that their motivation is love or love alone?

After the Lord saved me, I slowly began to grow in the Lord, as a born again Christian with a new nature. As a Christian, I no longer enjoy the same environment, appetite, or associations that I enjoyed as a lost man. Now the center of my universe is the Lord. My goal is to glorify Him by loving him and loving my fellow man, lost or saved. My motivation and the motivation of any Christian is love for God and man, not selfishness. Many of the Christians I have been associated with have always given much of their time in service to God and their fellow man for little or no financial reward. I and the members of Community Baptist Church wanted to help those boys because of the love of God and love for the boys. After salvation, much of my time was spent not in trying to become successful in a worldly sense, but in service to God through my church, which included first spreading the message of salvation, then serving the boys in the home as well as serving others, motivated not by selfishness, but by God’s love as demonstrated by the sacrifice of his son, the Lord Jesus Christ.

During those early years as a Christian, I knew little about church-state separation, but because of the devastating effects of the illegitimate actions of the state of Texas against God’s church, the Lord has guided me since then to become more biblically educated about separation of church and state and to make myself available wherever He opens the door concerning this preeminent issue.

The battle that ended in the closing of the Otwell Home started when the state found out about the home. State agents came in and secluded all the boys in the sanctuary. They interrogated all the boys. Not one boy had anything bad to say about the home. They loved it there—it was their home. Nonetheless, the state told us that the home had to get a license because of the 1975 Texas Child Care Licensing Act (“the Act”). The Act required any institution or person that cared for more than six children to apply for a state license. Our pastor, with the church body behind him, refused. We considered this to be God’s ministry.

---

3 Vernon’s Ann.Civ.St. art. 695a—3, §§ 1 to 27; TEX. HUM. RES. CODE. ANN. § 42.001; (1975).
The state filed suit to force compliance. We stood our ground and a long battle resulted. Many pastors and other Christians came to be with us during that battle. Among those was Pastor Hank Thompson, my pastor today, and other members of the body of Capitol City Baptist Church who came from Austin, Texas and stood with us for several months. Dr. Greg Dixon was also with us. He was a great inspiration to us all. Other inspirational leaders who came to help included Pastor Aubrey Vaughan, Pastor Bob McCurry, and Pastor W. A. Parks. I have forgotten the names of many of the others, but the Lord remembers their names and their contributions.

During the confrontation between the state of Texas and the Otwell Home, I saw Community Baptist Church come under siege by the state of Texas. During the siege, a spiritual battle was fought. For example, on October 17, 1986 over 100 armed law enforcement personnel surrounded the church and invaded the property of the church in an unsuccessful attempt to remove boys from the Otwell Home. On October 22, 1986, Judge Davis ordered the home padlocked.

As a young Christian, I was shocked at this display of power by the state which defied logic and violated not only biblical principles but also the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The Texas Court of Appeals at Waco upheld the trial court and decided in favor of Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, which was led by Pastor Lester Roloff, in 1984.\(^4\) Corpus Christi Baptist Church had also refused to take a license to run their home for children (“the Roloff Home”). The court held that the Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protected the Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church from interference by the state; that application of the Act to church violated [Article I] Section 6, Article I Section 19, Article II Section 1, Article III Section 1, and Article I Section 3(a) of the Texas Constitution; and that application of the Act to the pastor, staff, children and parents of children in the homes would violate 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by depriving them of the civil rights secured to them by the U.S. Constitution.\(^5\)

The Department of Human Services (“DHS”) requires 100% compliance with over 240 minimum standards contained in the Act.\(^6\) Many of those standards are in direct conflict with the biblical guidelines for the care of children.\(^7\) The Act gives DHS ultimate control of the plan of care at a child care facility, whether that facility is religious or secular.\(^8\) For example, the Act requires that children be given professional consultation and treatment, which at the discretion of the DHS must include psychiatric treatment.\(^9\) Under the Act, the DHS views as its responsibility to supervise the moral and emotional development of all children residing in child care facilities.\(^10\) The DHS reserves the right to determine who is or is not qualified to work in a child care facility, and will also determine, in its own judgment, whether the mode of dress at a
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\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) Ibid. and TEX. HUM. RES. CODE. ANN. § 42.001.

\(^8\) State v. Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, Inc. No. 10-83-128-CV.

\(^9\) Ibid.

\(^10\) Ibid.
licensed institution is acceptable. In short, the Act gives the DHS almost total control of the facility.

The Texas Supreme Court reversed the Waco Court of Appeals. The Court noted that “People’s Baptist does not, however, resist all licensing to do business in Texas. In fact, it does its business and service as a corporation under the corporate name of Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, Inc., and it complies with all business licensing requirements.” The Court stated that “The record reveals that People’s Baptist has provided excellent physical facilities, a dedicated staff and a list of many children who have been successfully treated by its programs.” The opinion analyzed the case based upon the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment:

“First, the party complaining of a Free Exercise Clause violation must show that the regulations under review impose a substantial burden on the exercise of his religion. Second, if the complaining party demonstrates that it is burdened by the regulations, then the State must have a compelling state purpose for the laws. Relevant to this prong of the test is an inquiry into whether there exists a less restrictive alternative to the regulation.

“We hold that, as a matter of law, the State has a compelling interest of the highest order in protecting the children in child-care facilities....

“The state has a right and a duty to protect and nurture its minor children....

“Licensing and regulation of child-care facilities are the least restrictive of the alternatives that the State could provide for the protection of children.... No entity other than the State can carry out these responsibilities for the public.”

Although the Court did not consider biblical principles, of course, and even though the Court’s reasoning was wrong and illogical, the Court was right in its decision, according to Scripture. When a church incorporates, as did Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, that church commits a wicked act which grieves the Lord, places herself under the control of the state, and, as will be shown in Section VI, submits herself to the private-public division of responsibilities declared by the United States Supreme Court in the early nineteenth century—charity being declared a public responsibility of civil government. Pastors such as Lester Roloff, a great man of God, had an excuse for their lack of knowledge concerning biblical principles concerning church and state and church entanglement with civil government. Alliance with the state had not caused the churches in America many problems before, and education for the ministry had not included a study of the issue. Today, however, even though almost all Bible colleges, institutes, and seminaries encourage incorporation and Internal Revenue Code § 501(c)(3) (“501(c)(3)”) status, and provide no biblical instruction on those issues, many Bible believing pastors have no excuse because there are those who have tried to warn them that incorporation and 501(c)(3) status violate biblical principles concerning the relationships between the state and the Lord’s church, between God and state, and God and church.

Compared with the spotless record of the Roloff Homes and the Otwell Home, the record of licensed facilities is and was no less than horrendous. All one has to do to see the severe problems with state run help organizations is to follow the news for a while.

11 Ibid.
12 State v. Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, Inc. et. al, 683 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1984).
13 Ibid., p. 694.
14 Ibid., p. 696.
15 Ibid.
“The State as an Abuser of Children

Regardless of the facts, people in the juvenile justice system cannot overcome the myth that state intervention is good for children. This is true despite the fact that the reality of the system has been graphically exposed time and again. Consider what the state of Texas had done to its children in the 1970’s.

“When new children (known as ‘fresh fish’) were admitted to the Mountain View State School for Boys, they were regularly beaten by other boys at the facility as the initiation rite, under the supervision of the guards. Guards also employed a system of ‘racking’: Boys were lined up against a wall with their hands in their pockets while a correctional officer punched each one in the stomach. Documented reports from Mountain View include the case of one boy who was hit and kicked by a guard until knocked unconscious and another boy who was knocked down and had tear gas sprayed in his face for not answering questions about why he had attempted suicide. Another boy struck by a guard ended up ‘with a hole going straight through’ his eardrum.

“Some of the less shocking situations included work details established by the institution. In one work detail, known as ‘picking,’ boys were forced to line up foot to foot with their heads down and were required to strike the ground with heavy picks swung overhead as the line moved forward. They did this for five hours at a time with three fifteen-minute breaks. During the breaks, all were required to sit with their heads between their legs looking down without talking. In a second detail, aptly called ‘grass pulling,’ boys were required to bend from the waist with their knees straight and pull grass out of the ground without talking or looking at one another for six hours a day. If they bent their knees they were ‘racked’ or otherwise beaten. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that nothing was ever planted in these fields. The work was ordered solely for discipline…. The Texas abuses can in no way be considered isolated, and they do condemn the entire system….

“Far from being isolated, state abuse of children is the most rampant problem we face. The state is, by far, the greater abuser of children in this country. And the abuse is imposed, it is to be remembered, not as punishment, but for the children’s ‘own good.’”

Abuse in state run youth facilities has continued and will continue. Without regeneration and sanctification, fleshly desires and lusts control people to one degree or another. Of the two criminal justice issues which dominated the 80th legislative session in 2007 and media news coverage, one was “the sexual abuse scandal at the Texas Youth Commission.”

Despite intensive investigations by the civil government, no abuse occurred; and, therefore, no abuse was discovered at the Roloff Home. As a matter of court record, the “Surveillance by the Department of Human Resources (“DHR”) of the ‘Roloff homes’ was continuous and extensive.” The court stated that the investigative personnel working for DHR used surveillance methods which stressed surreptitious techniques, used binoculars, cameras, tape recorders, and the soliciting of information from persons connected with the homes. DHR personnel even posed as church members to gain access to worship services and their reports “detailed contents of sermons and the hymns sung at the worship services” according to the court records. Furthermore, a child, a parent, an outside observer, or a conscientious worker in the home is free to report abuse. But in over 30 years of operation, no one in the Roloff
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18 State v. Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, Inc. No. 10-83-128-CV.
19 Ibid.
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Home was ever convicted of child abuse or neglect, and the Otwell Home had the same spotless record for over 2 years of operation.

When the records of licensed facilities is compared with the records of the Roloff and Otwell Homes, only a totally biased dogmatist could believe that the state’s concern is for the health, safety, and welfare of the children. This and other state arguments to justify licensing were given to create a smoke screen to hide the real motive behind the state’s desire to license. The real issue is control, as made clear in the court case dealing with the Roloff Homes.

And besides all that, the civil government, through its criminal law and also its civil law, through the Texas DHR, already provides the means to protect children. Child abuse (according to biblical guidelines of abuse), no matter where it occurs in Texas, is and should be against the law. An unlicensed institution has no more right to abuse children than does a licensed facility. Anytime a child is abused in a church ministry, those guilty may be charged, convicted, and jailed just as easily, if not more so in this anti-Christian society, as those guilty of such an act in a licensed home. Unfortunately, many in civil government and especially in the social service agencies, having received a very narrow and biased education, and having been indoctrinated in a world-view which is anti-biblical and anti-Christian, classify as abuse some actions which the Bible requires of, for example, a loving Christian parent. Too bad the state does not apply those same guidelines to its own child-care operations. And too bad the state does not utilize the principles of the Bible, including the love of God and the love of man, in structuring itself and its agencies. If it did, it would not have most or any of those agencies. It cannot because the vast majority of state leaders, officials, and employees are either unregenerate or baby Christians who are more American than Christian.

Early in my Christian life, I came to believe, based upon both the teaching and preaching of my pastor and other pastors and independent study, that the Bible teaches that God desires both the church and state to be under God only and that neither the church nor state is to be under the other. As I have become more knowledgeable, my belief has been strengthened, not changed. Although our federal and state constitutions guarantee separation of church and state (according to biblical principle), the humanistic decisions of United States Supreme Court Judges have added to the meaning of the First Amendment religion clause so as to remove God from public life while at the same time upholding the wall between a New Testament church and the state.

The ignorance of Christians and state personnel concerning biblical principles of separation of church and state was responsible for the closing of the Roloff Home. The perverted interpretations of the principle of separation of church and state as set out in our Federal Constitution and many of our state constitutions were responsible for the closing of the Otwell Home. Neither the Roloff Home nor the Otwell Home received one dime from the state. The Roloff Home was partially under the state and not entirely under God since the ministry was an incorporated creature of the state which received benefits from the state and submitted to other state licenses. The Otwell Home was not under the state in that Community Baptist Church was neither incorporated nor had it taken a 501(c)(3) tax exemption—this issue was never litigated.

Although a worldly observer might conclude that Community Baptist Church lost and the state of Texas won, I believe that God would say that Texas lost and Community Baptist Church won. Anytime a church does things God’s
way, that church is a winner and the government that asserts false authority over that church is the loser. Anytime a “church” does things man’s way, that church, the individual, the family, and the government are the losers.

During and after the battle with the state, the Lord dealt with me about the need for more Christian lawyers. At the same time, I realized the dangers to a Christian in becoming a lawyer. Isaac Backus wrote, concerning lawyers and while discussing the role of lawyers in forming the Constitution of Massachusetts which at the time required supporting religious teachers by taxation:

“This article [in the Constitution of Massachusetts] was drawn by [a] great lawyer; and men of that profession are interested in supporting religious teachers by force as really as any men in the world; for a great part of their gains come by controversies about religion; and when teachers and lawyers are in confederacy together, they will make words to mean any thing which they please.”

Although I knew that in becoming a lawyer, I faced the danger of being indoctrinated by the secular state and/or of using the power of the attorney for purposes and in ways displeasing to God, I was assured by God’s Word: “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world.”

There was obviously a need and a cause. As a result, the Lord opened the door and I entered the University of Texas School of Law in August 1990. The Lord made it possible for me to get my license to practice law in November of 1993.

All along I was seeking the Lord’s direction. He initially led me to practice criminal law. I knew that not many, if any, of the Christian law firms dealt with or specialized in criminal law, and that some Christians were being charged with crimes for their Christian behavior and for taking a stand for God’s principles.

The Lord confirmed my choice. Very soon after I started practicing, I helped an Eastern Orthodox priest with a criminal charge. He was charged under a criminal statute for trying to expose the promotion of sodomy and other sins within a Catholic Church. God gave the victory in that case. Then Steve, a Christian who counseled outside abortion clinics, called me. He was charged with a crime under the Austin, Texas Sign Ordinance for his activities outside an abortion clinic. Being a new lawyer, I called the Rutherford Institute. They asked me to send them a summary of the facts and a copy of the Sign Ordinance. Then they told me that we could not win the case and that they would not help. We lost at trial, but God gave us the victory on appeal. The Austin Police Department immediately cited Steve for violation of the state sign ordinance. The Lord gave the victory at trial.

My first felony trial came about a year and six months after I started practicing law. A single Christian mother was charged with third degree felony injury to a child for spanking her six year old son. She left some prominent stripes across his rear end and also a stripe across his face when he turned suddenly during the spanking. The Lord gave us the victory at trial. At the same

22 1 John 4.4.
time, I was also representing another Christian married lady who was charged with
the same crime for spanking her little girl with a switch. On the date the
trial in that case was to begin, the prosecutor, with prompting by the judge,
lowered the offer to deferred adjudication probation of short duration on a
misdemeanor charge with very few conditions on the probation. In a deferred
adjudication in Texas, there is never a judgment of guilt if the probationer
successfully completes the term of the probation, (and, with successful
completion of the probation, the probationer can now file a Motion for
Nondisclosure which, if granted, requires the file to be sealed so that the general
public has no access to it). The mother decided to take the offer.

The Lord has also allowed me to help Christian parents in numerous
situations involving Child Protective Services (“CPS”) infringement into
parental rights. God has given the victory in all those situations.

The Lord has also used me to intervene in numerous situations where
government officials or private companies tried to deny certain Christians their
rights to do door-to-door evangelization, preach on the street, hand out gospel
literature in the public forum, and pass out gospel tracts and communicate the
gospel at their place of employment.

The Lord has brought numerous other legal spiritual battles my way. The
most recent of those battles which went all the way to trial was a 2003 case in
San Antonio. A peaceful pro-life advocate was arrested and charged with
criminal trespass for handing pro-life literature giving information about the
development of the unborn baby, places to go for help, and other information to
women entering an abortion clinic. All the above-mentioned cases as well as
others not mentioned were handled free of charge (except the last spanking case
mentioned above for which I received $750 for my services). Since that time,
and even before, I have felt that the Lord was telling me that it is time to move
on. I have been seeking His will. My prayer was that He would show me His
direction.

Again, He answered my prayers. While at a Camp Meeting at Heritage
Baptist Church outside Mount Enterprise, Texas, at the first meal, I sat down to
eat at the only open chair I spotted on the side of the room I was on. As it turned
out Dr. Greg Dixon was sitting diagonally across the table from me. We began
to talk. As a result of that encounter, Dr. Dixon ultimately asked me to consider
becoming legal counsel for the Biblical Law Center (“BLC”).

It did not take me long to decide that, if the Lord opened that door, I would
step in. I discussed the opening with my pastor who gave his approval. Since my
early Christian life, I have considered the issue of separation of church and state
as taught in the Bible to be one of the primary issues facing New Testament
churches today. I believe, based upon what the Bible teaches, that incorporating
or intentionally operating as an unincorporated association and/or getting a tax
exempt status from the government at the very least puts the church under the
headship of both the Lord and the state, and may even take the church from
under the headship of Christ and put the church under the headship of the state. I
believe that taking scriptures out of context and applying human reasoning
contrary to biblical teaching (such as “Obey every ordinance of man,” or “We
should be good stewards and incorporation is good stewardship”) in order to
justify unbiblical marriage with the state causes our Lord much grief.

Once I took on the position as counsel for the BLC, it was necessary to do
an in-depth study of the issue of separation of church and state. I began with the
Bible. I initially read through the Bible at least five times (and several more times since then) primarily seeking the answer to the question, “Does the Bible have anything to say about this issue?” I was amazed at what I learned. The Bible gives us God’s principles concerning separation of church and state, the purpose of a church, the purpose of the civil government, the headship of church, the headship of civil government, the principles by which each is to be guided, and much more concerning these two God ordained institutions. I continue to read the Bible daily seeking insights into these and other issues.

I also began to read other books. I had already read starting shortly after being saved, books and other information by Christian authors. For example, I had read, among other works, A Christian Manifesto, The Light and the Glory, From Sea to Shining Sea, The Myth of Separation and some other works by David Barton. These resources inspired, influenced and guided me and millions of other Christians, gave us philosophical and historical underpinning, and led us into battlefields such as politics, law, and education armed with what we learned from them.

Sometime in 2006 I began to realize that some of the books by Christian authors which I had come to depend upon were misleading, at the very least. Other books revealed to me that some of the above mentioned books had misinformed and misled sincere Christians by revising and/or misrepresenting the true history of separation of church and state in America. In 2006, I read One Nation Under Law which cites a wealth of resources for one seeking to understand the history of separation of church and state in the United States and of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Reading One Nation Under Law, some of the books it cited, and some other books was a launching pad into the universe of historical information which I never dreamed existed. I had expected to be misled in the secular law school I attended. I was amazed that I had been misled by Christian brothers. I asked myself, “How could Peter Marshall and others have missed this vital information?” At an Unregistered Baptist Fellowship conference in Indianapolis, Indiana, James R. Beller, a Baptist historian, gave a PowerPoint presentation which gave me the answer to this question. I bought two of his books and read them. Those books filled in the details not mentioned in Pastor Beller’s concise PowerPoint presentation.

30 The First Amendment to the United States Constitution states: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.” The religion clause, properly interpreted, as will be shown in this book, is a correct application of the biblical principle of separation of church and state.
Misleading information put out by some of the above authors has been parroted by many others. So, I was dismayed after recently reading one of another in a long line of similar books, because I realized that the deception continues. Nowhere in books of this type can we learn the real history behind the First Amendment.

Actually, the First Amendment came primarily as a result of a conflict between persecutors (the established state-churches and church-states) and persecuted (dissenters from the official state-church or church-state position, that is dissenters from the established church position.). For example, America would never have had a First Amendment had the Puritans, the Anglicans, or other Protestant denominations had their way. Church-states believed that the church should use the state to enforce all ten of the Ten Commandments. Under state-churches, the King or the state was head of the church and enforced the official version of theology.

This controversy has been a dividing point among Christians since early in church history, and Christians on the Judaizing side of that issue, at first the Catholics after their unholy marriage with the state in the fourth century and then the Protestants which came out of Catholicism, according to all the ramifications of their church-state theology, have tortured, imprisoned, and killed millions of Christians, including my Baptist spiritual forefathers who were on the other side of the issue.

Thus, many false teachers have led sincere Christians to believe either the falsehood that all the Christian sects in America lived harmoniously, shared the same basic fundamental beliefs, and that we owe to all these Christian forefathers our freedoms of speech and religion, among other freedoms that are guaranteed by our Constitution, or that we owe our religious freedom to the Puritans and other Protestants. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, a great spiritual warfare, a continuation of that in Europe, took place. Established churches, Catholic and Protestant—the persecutors—in general, did not share fundamental beliefs with dissenters—the persecuted—the most predominant of which in America became the Baptists.

“This conflict between the demands of authority and the permissiveness of freedom, between the established church and the dissenters unwilling to be bound by their restraints, lasted more than three centuries.” Out of this conflict between the persecutors and the persecuted came the greatest law providing for freedom of conscience and action that has ever been written. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution gave everyone in America the freedom not only to choose and practice his religious beliefs, but also to proclaim those beliefs in the public square. The law in America did not require Christians to choose between confining their beliefs to their minds and outwardly accepting the doctrines of the official state-church or suffering persecution by the civil government. Sadly, as this book will show, most churches have willingly put themselves under the authority of the state thereby giving up their First Amendment freedoms.

32 It should be noted that the Catholic Church in America has never yet had the power it had in other nations to persecute those with dissenting views.
Introduction

““My husband has been a Methodist all his life, but if it comes to choosing between being a Methodist and an American, he’ll be an American every time.””

“‘Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.’ That command implies that God wants to be worshipped and glorified. … When the God of the universe uttered those words, He was giving an absolute command that applied to all things in all places for all time, until the end of time and beyond.”

The book is being written for the glory of God and not for the happiness of man. This book is about the Lord’s love for His churches, and the love of the believer for the Lord. One who honestly reads and studies it will want to examine his love for the Lord as reflected in his faithfulness to the Lord. Paul was jealous over God’s churches “with a godly jealousy.” Paul wanted to present God’s churches “as a chaste virgin to Christ.” Yet Paul feared that Satan would beguile sincere believers through subtlety, “so [their] minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.” Just as a husband is jealous of his wife, Christians, as “members of [the Lord’s] body, of his flesh, and of his bones,” should share this jealousy for God’s churches, the bride of Christ, the wife of Christ, the body which Christ loved and gave Himself for. To understand God’s relation to His churches, one must understand how God deals with nations, both Jew and Gentile, the relationship of God with His churches, and the relationship God wants His churches to have with the state.

Of primary importance is the recognition that for spiritual success one must set his goal as the glory of God. Disobedience to God’s order to “have no other God’s before me” results in the “loss of everything—sanity, security, rationality, health, happiness, civility, civilization—for the rule God uttered has to do with the ultimate good and the final basis of all things, with the foundation for all foundations, the measure of all measures…” There must be “no other goal, no other pursuit or prize, no multiple destinations.” Tragically, America is now influenced and ruled by the philosophies of others, philosophies which find their roots in the deception in the Garden of Eden. The ideas that rule the world today have saturated the public schools, almost all universities of higher learning, the media (and to a large degree the “Christian” media), and to a lesser degree, Bible schools, Christian schools, Bible institutes and seminaries, and the pulpits of churches including those of many or most “fundamental Bible believing churches.” Those ideas “are now unquestioned and unrefuted, having become the conventional wisdom.”

---

1 Robert Paul Sessions, “Are Southern Ministers Failing the South?”, 234 The Saturday Evening Post (1961), 19:82, cited in Franklin Hamlin Littell, From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962), p. 134 (Statement of the wife of a state Supreme Court justice in Arkansas in 1961. This statement is probably true of the vast majority of Christians in America today, regardless of their denomination, whether they realize it or not.).


3 The most important principle in regards to the issues in this book is presented in Section II, Chapter 3: Christ, the Bridegroom/Husband/Head of the church.

4 II Corinthians 11.2.

5 Ibid.

6 II Corinthians 11.3.

7 Ephesians 5.30.

8 See Breese, pp. 10, 12, 13.
The main issue addressed by this work is the biblical principle of separation of church and state and the American application thereof. The primary concern is with the church, not the state. One would expect the state to get the principles wrong since most leaders of civil governments are unregenerate and cannot understand spiritual matters. One would not expect to see, as in America, that the vast majority of churches and church members, including pastors, have never studied the subject and are offended when a Christian tries to approach them about the truth concerning separation of church and state. Believers are the only ones who can get the issue right. As will be pointed out, at least two civil governments since Christ have come out correctly on the issue, but have since departed from that truth. Therefore, this work is offered for Christians, in the American context, who would truly like to know what the Word of God teaches on this issue.

The author, in an attempt to provide information for the reader who truly loves God and is seeking, like Paul, to become knowledgeable enough to implement God’s principle of separation of church and state, will lay out the biblical principles concerning government, church, and separation of church and state. Then he will look at the true history of separation of church and state in America, including the persecution of believers and others by the civil governments in colonial America operating alongside and with the established churches. After that, he will summarize the Supreme Court treatment of the doctrine of separation of church and state as implemented in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Finally, he hopes to show how the civil government has successfully seduced most churches, including most “fundamental Bible believing churches,” into an unholy alliance with the state and federal governments.

The reader should keep in mind that God desires the goal of every individual, family, church, and civil government to be under God and to glorify Him. This does not mean that either the church should be under the state or that the state should be under the church. Quite the contrary. The author will show that both church and state were ordained by God for specific purposes which He lays out in His Word and that He desires each to be under Him and neither to be under the other.

Sometimes the proclamation of truth in love, and nothing more, brings one into conflict with his Christian brethren. For that reason, sometimes one finds it hard and distasteful to proclaim truth. Roger Williams understood the importance of truth. He wrote a dialogue between truth and peace in which we find these words:

"Peace. Dear truth, I know thy birth, thy nature, thy delight. They that know thee will prize thee far above themselves and lives, and sell themselves to buy thee. Well spake that famous Elizabeth to her famous attorney, Sir Edward Coke; 'Mr. Attorney, go on as thou hast begun, and still plead, not pro Domina Regina, but pro Domina Veritate.'

"Truth. It is true, my crown is high; my scepter is strong to break down strongest holds, to throw down highest crowns of all that plead, though but in thought, against me. Some few there are, but oh! how few are valiant for the truth, and dare to plead my cause, as my witnesses in sackcloth, Rev. xi. [3]; while all men’s tongues are bent like bows to shoot out lying words against me?"

Roger Williams was the founder of Rhode Island, the first government in history with complete freedom of conscience. Due to the efforts of Mr. Williams, Dr. John Clarke, and others who followed America has the First Amendment to the United States Constitution which gives freedom of conscience. A brief history of the efforts of Roger Williams and others is recounted in Section IV.
“Peace. Oh! how could I spend eternal days and endless dates at thy holy feet, in listening to the precious oracles of thy mouth! All the words of thy mouth art truth, and there is no iniquity in them. thy lips drop as the honey-comb. But oh! since we must part anon, let us, as thou saidst, improve our minutes, and according as thou promisedest, revive me with thy words, which are sweeter than the honey and the honey-comb.”

Warren Smith points out in his book which addresses the New Age teachings of the Purpose Driven Church Movement:

“When it comes to teaching about the things of God, nobody gets a free pass…. We are all accountable to truth. We must preach the whole truth and nothing but the truth. We cannot overlook any false teaching or dismiss godly criticism by pointing out all the perceived good that seems to be coming from our ‘good works’ or whatever else we are doing. Jesus never operated this way and He doesn’t want us to either.”

Unity, in avoidance of conflict—even conflict arising because of proclamation of truth—is the easy way, and sometimes it is probably the right way. To cause unrest for light and transient causes is usually foolish. But certainly a time comes when a child of God may be led to speak truth about vital biblical issues. Thomas Armitage realized this when he delivered his message Christian Union: Real and Unreal on March 25, 1866 at a meeting of the Christian Union Association.

“He said with charity, clarity, calmness and incisive reasoning: ‘As far as I can discover, my Pedobaptist brethren seem to think that [Christian Union] consists very largely in a warm-hearted, loving feeling toward each other as regenerated men.’ He said the effort at Christian union meant a setting aside of disagreement for the sake of worship and concluded that the association believed ‘disagreement, if you can agree with it, is unity!’ To the Dutch Reformed, Congregational, Presbyterian and Methodist congregation he said, ‘That is, kneeling on the same floor, sitting on the same seat, singing the same hymn, uniting in the same prayer (when you have never been divided at all as to the floor, the bench, the hymn, or the prayer); and being as different as possible, in all other respects, constitute Christian union!’

“This ‘good feeling’ Armitage said, ‘is looked upon, very generally, as good, fair, Bible Christian union. Well, it may be; but if it is, things have changed vastly since apostolic times. The truth is that kindly feeling is not Christian union, and may exist where ‘the unity of the faith,’ is rent into a thousand shreds.’”

Did not our Lord speak the truth, including truth about the issue of separation of church and state, even though His actions and statements offended the highest religious leaders of God’s chosen nation and prevented unity with the Jewish religious leaders? Did not the apostles and the early Christians continue to love their neighbors by doing good for them as well as speaking out about the Gospel of salvation, the errors of the Pharisees and heresies that were already creeping into the church, and also about the issue of separation of church and state? Was not this tradition of standing on truth, including the biblical truth about separation of church and state, continued by Christians since the time of Christ to this day? Were and are saints not hated, imprisoned, tortured, and killed because of their proclamations of the truth?

---

This book is a proclamation of biblical truth and a revelation of certain untruths concerning the issue of separation of church and state and the history of that separation in America that have been circulated among our “fundamental” churches since the early days of our history as a nation and especially since the 1970s. Although the truths contained herein should not separate those who agree on the other major principles of the Word of God, but rather should spark a search for the truth and an implementation of that truth, the result may instead be an ignoring of that truth by many, and a distancing from that truth and the proclaimers thereof by many others who have become more American than Christian. To distance oneself from truth usually means conformity with lies with expected undesirable consequences somewhere down the road of time.

Lies, especially about important and historically verifiable matters, in conjunction with spiritual ignorance and falsehood never help anyone, at least in the long run. The historic and spiritual revisionism of some “Christians” is catching up with them. Secularists are exposing their misrepresentations about history. God’s just hand is taking care of their spiritual misrepresentations and actions. Historical and spiritual lies weaken the Christian position. How can lying about historical fact which anyone, even secularists, can research help the cause of Christ? Furthermore, as a result of the misinformation concerning the issue of separation of church and state, “fundamental Bible believing churches” have been led, contrary to biblical principles, to enter into an illicit relationship with the state, an act which causes great grief to our Lord and which ultimately brings dire consequences to efforts to win the lost. Does one not need the power of God for his efforts to be effective? Does one really believe that the Lord Jesus will endue His church and His people with His power when His people have at the very least entered into a relationship with the state or at worst prostituted His church?

The Word of God did not stop the apostasies of Israel or of the church. So, of course, this book will not accomplish what the Bible cannot accomplish. Israel, called by God the wife of Jehovah, despite many warnings from God Himself and His prophets, suffered consequences for her fornication. The New Testament tells us that the church, called the wife of our Lord Jesus, will likewise sink into apostasy, become a whore, and will suffer the consequences.

The author knows that his feeble efforts are not going to stop this. He knows that many are going to disregard this book without a second thought. Since he realizes that he does not know and understand everything, and since the Bible can be interpreted differently with regards to some issues, he challenges those pastors and Christians who are seeking truth concerning the biblical issue of separation of church and state to read this book and tell him where they believe he is wrong. One thing is certain—the truths in the Word of God are absolute and many of those truths can be discovered. One will find those truths only if he is a born again Christian who works to uncover those truths through a diligent study of God’s Word. When that is done, the Christian must be willing to set aside his human reasoning which appeals to his lust, fear, and greed if it contradicts the Word of God, and follow the Lord in faith.

This is not the first time in America that the truth concerning the issue of separation of church and state and the history thereof was presented in contrast to the more accepted but inaccurate views. Isaac Backus\(^\text{14}\) wrote:

---

\(^{14}\) Isaac Backus was born in Connecticut in 1723/24, a time when those dissenting from the views of the established church were persecuted. He withdrew from the established Congregational church,
“And if it should be found, that nearly all the histories of this country which are much known, have been written by persons who thought themselves invested with power to act as lawgivers and judges for their neighbors, under the name of orthodoxy, or of immediate power from heaven, the inference will be strong, that our affairs have never been set in so clear light as they ought to be; and if this is not indeed the case I am greatly mistaken; of which the following account will enable the reader to judge for himself.

“The greatest objection that I have heard against this design is, that we ought not to rake up the ashes of our good fathers, nor to rehearse those old controversies, which will tend to increase your present difficulties. But what is meant by this objection? To reveal secret, or to repeat matters that have been well settled between persons or parties, is forbidden, and its effects are very pernicious; but what is that to a history of public facts, and an examination of the principles and conduct, both of oppressors, and of the oppressed?

“Men who are still fond of arbitrary power may make the above objection; but a learned and ingenious paedobaptist that felt the effects of such power, lately said, ‘The Presbyterians, I confess, formerly copied too nearly the Episcopalians. The genuine principles of universal and impartial liberty were very little understood by any; and all parties were too much involved in the guilt of intolerance and persecution. The dissenters in our times freely acknowledge this, and condemn the narrow principles of many of their oppressors; having no objection to transmitting down to posterity, in their true colors, the acts of oppression and intolerance of which all sects have been guilty. Not indeed, as is sometimes done, with view of encouraging such conduct in one party by the example of others; but of exposing it alike in all, and preventing it wholly, if possible, in time to come.’ This is the great design of the ensuing work; and such a work seems essentially necessary to that end.”

The truth has always been opposed by the establishment. For example, Roger Williams, the man most responsible for the first government in history which guaranteed freedom of conscience, as is revealed in Section IV, was vehemently opposed by members of the established church in Massachusetts. Another example occurred during first Great Awakening in America when false teachers and false teachings were exposed by George Whitefield and the army of itinerant preachers which arose out of his preaching. “THE GREAT AWAKENING, an unprecedented movement of religious revival, appeared early in the eighteenth century in Great Britain, in Protestant Europe, and in America.”

George Whitefield’s first visit to New England during the Great Awakening around 1740 brought revival. Whitefield preached in buildings owned by churches, out of doors (many times church buildings could not contain the crowds seeking to hear him), and at colleges such as Yale. As a result of Whitefield’s preaching, in a brief six weeks period, the religious became a Separate, and later a Baptist. As a Separate and later a Baptist, he was persecuted and witnessed, researched, and wrote about the persecutions going on in New England. He was a leader in the fight for religious liberty in America. For more information on Isaac Backus see, e.g., William G. McLoughlin, Isaac Backus and the American Piestic Tradition (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967); Isaac Backus on Church, State, and Calvinism, Pamphlets, 1754-1789, Edited by William G. McLoughlin (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968); Isaac Backus, A History of New England With Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians Called Baptists, Volumes 1 and 2 (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, Previously Published by Backus Historical Society, 1871).

Isaac Backus and others such as Roger Williams, and John Clarke led the fight against the establishment of the church in the early history of America, and to their efforts we owe the First Amendment to the United States Constitution which guarantees religious liberty.

climate of New England was changed. The churches experienced unprecedented growth. Entire communities flocked to hear the gospel, and hundreds were converted in single localities.\textsuperscript{18}

Some aspects of the Great Awakening, such as the emphasis on individual conversion and the new birth, the dramatic expressions of their feelings by the excited converts, the many itinerant preachers which came out of the revival, and the sharp criticism hurled by revivalists at the established ministry were offensive to the established churches.\textsuperscript{19} Conservative groups became alarmed.\textsuperscript{20} Whitefield hurled epithets such as “hypocrites” and “wolves in sheep’s clothing” at the unconverted or antirevivalistic clergy, and he did not hesitate to go uninvited into their parishes.\textsuperscript{21}

As a result of the offenses of the Great Awakening, Whitefield was not warmly received by many of the establishment when he returned to New England in 1744. In fact, he faced a confused situation. Although multitudes supported him and continued to attend his revival meetings, a formidable body of opposition to him and his methods had developed in his absence of four years.\textsuperscript{22} The faculty of Harvard College condemned Whitefield, the Connecticut legislature declared that no minister should preach in the parish of another without the incumbent’s consent, and later the General Court forbade all itinerant preaching with penalty of loss of right to collect one’s legal salary and imprisonment. He found few pulpits open to him, and a barrage of declarations and testimonies was aimed at him.\textsuperscript{23} Most of the ministers of the established churches, as well as the faculties of Yale and Harvard Colleges were opposed to him. Nonetheless, he continued to preach, the revival continued, and many, including Shubal Stearns and Daniel Marshall, two men who were to become Baptists and chief instruments for carrying the Great Awakening to the South, were converted as a result of being strongly moved by Whitefield.\textsuperscript{24}

America still has an establishment which includes many of the pastors and other members of our “independent fundamental Bible believing” churches and which opposes those who, endued with the power of God, proclaim truth concerning the issue of separation of church and state. Within the last thirty years certain fundamental leaders have stepped to the front in alerting their brethren of the unholy alliances that have been and are being formed by churches with the government. Some have sounded the alarm through preaching. Their names are too numerous to mention, but the Lord will reward them appropriately. Some have written books, in addition to preaching and speaking on the issue.\textsuperscript{25} Those brethren are, for the most part, marginalized by most other

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., pp. 5-7 citing Mitchell, pp. 11, 15; Joseph Tracy, \textit{The Great Awakening} (Boston: Tappan & Dennet, 1842); Williston Walker, \textit{A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States} (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1894).
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., pp. 6-7.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., pp. 7-8.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., pp. 9-10.
“fundamental Christians.” This book is being written in support of their just cause by an independent, fundamental Baptist whom the Lord specifically called into the legal profession. As such, it may offer additional insights from a somewhat different perspective that may be helpful to the Christian who truly wants information and truth.

As far as I know, most Bible colleges and seminaries provide no biblical or historical studies on the issue of separation of church and state. Many rely on information and teaching given by some “Christian” law associations and other legal firms. The humanistic teaching and information they receive from such sources is biblically unsound and generally based upon man’s laws, court cases, books and writings of Protestant and Catholic scholars, lawyers, law professors, historians and so forth. The result has been an inaccurate picture of the biblical principles involved, a revised history of how America has arrived where she is, bad advice—from God’s point of view—to churches about what to do concerning the issue of separation of church and state, and a general downward spiral for individuals, families, churches, and civil governments in America.

The Apostle Paul warned believers to beware of false teaching:

“For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father and of Christ: In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. And this I say, lest any man entice you with enticing words... As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”

Obviously, Paul was aware that Christians were susceptible to being misled. Many Christians today have been deceived concerning the issue of separation of church and state, and many—including pastors and members of fundamental churches, professors or teachers in almost all our fundamental Bible colleges, seminaries, and schools, and in almost all of America’s Christian schools, including fundamental Baptist schools—are teaching other Christians those deceptions to one degree or another. Many of those Bible preaching pastors and Christians who are correct on many biblical principles have let their American education override biblical teachings about some issues, including the issue of separation of church and state. Not only are Christians being deceived by other Christians, Christians are also being deceived by false prophets which come or have come to us in sheep’s clothing as well as by the unregenerate agents of governmental entities.

Sadly, most American Christians and most pastors—including most “fundamental Bible believing” pastors—are more American than they are Christian. They kneel to humanistic American principles, satanic principles, on some if not most issues. They have been Americanized in contradistinction to Christianized, at least with regard to some doctrines. They have other gods before the true God. Their goal is not the “glory of God,” but “the happiness of man.” Rather than having been rooted and built up in Christ and “stablished in
the faith”, they have been “spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit, after the
tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”

Dave Breese describes the philosophies of seven men who rule the world
from the grave—Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, Julius Wellhausen, Sigmund
Freud, John Dewey, John Maynard Keynes, and Soren Kierkegaard. Of course,
there are others. In Christendom, many of those are Catholics, Protestants, and
even Baptists. Today, most “fundamental Bible believing” preachers and church
members (some of which are lawyers with an inordinate degree of influence)
are—perhaps either unknowingly or willfully ignorant—in violation of the
command, “Thou shalt have no other Gods before me,” when they structure their
churches in a way that is contrary to the biblical principle of separation of
church and state but consistent with the American idea of the relationship
between church and state.

Pragmatism is the order of the day. The standard of most is humanism or
man’s reason, not biblical principle. “Does it work? If it works, it must be good.
If it works, it must be of God.” Many look at the “fruit” that is supposedly
coming in the midst of the heresies of misled Christians and false teachers as
evidence that their teaching must be of God. Aren’t people being saved? Yes,
some are being saved, but not as a result of the false gospels of many American
churches. Aren’t churches prospering? Some are, but only materially for a
season and not spiritually, and, since such prosperity is based upon lies, it will
ultimately lead to total apostasy and will usher in the great deceiver, anti-Christ
himself. How can an incorrect version of the biblical principle of separation of
church and state, the re-creation of church history, and the “practical”
application of man’s reasoning rather than the truths of the Word of God ever
result in the glorification of God and the advancement of His kingdom?

The Lord was concerned that His churches could be deceived and therefore
He warned us through the Apostle Paul:

“For I [Paul] am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one
husband, that I may present you [the wife and bride of Christ, the church] to one husband,
that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the
serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the
simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have
not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another
gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.”

The reference to Eve, in the above passage, is not accidental, for Eve was a type
of the church. As God wanted Eve to remain pure, so He wants His churches to
remain chaste virgins. Eve was deceived by lies from Satan—lies which were
directly contrary to God’s Word. She was deceived about a simple truth. At the
time, she needed no salvation. She was destined for a life in paradise on earth
and for eternity. She gave up that earthly paradise and polluted herself because
she followed the deception. Just as her deviation from God’s Word had far
reaching consequences for her, for Adam, and for every person who has ever
lived, the deception of God’s churches has and will lead to dire consequences
not only for those churches, but also for millions of people who do hear God’s
truth but are like “stony ground,” where the Word of God will not take root and
grow.

Breese.

II Corinthians 11.2-4.
The tempter would always have us claim God’s promises without regarding His precepts, “which is the practice the tempter would have drawn our Saviour into.”

The first Adam failed when Satan approached and deceived Eve by misquoting the Word of God. The second Adam, our Lord Jesus Christ, showed us how to face the deceptions of the devil. Satan approached Him in the wilderness where Christ had gone “to be tempted of the devil.” After Christ had fasted forty days and nights, Satan came to him with a threefold temptation. First Satan said to Christ, “If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.” This was a physical temptation. The Bible calls this type temptation the “lust of the flesh.”

“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.”

Jesus answered by quoting Deuteronomy 8.3: “It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

Then, Satan tested the Lord by taking him into the holy city, setting him on the pinnacle of the temple and inaccurately quoting Psalm 91.11 and 12: “If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.” This was the “spiritual temptation.” For Eve it was that she saw the fruit was “to be desired to make one wise.” For the Christian, it is the “pride of life.” Jesus answered by quoting Deuteronomy 6.16: “It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.”

Finally Satan tested the Lord by taking Him “up into an exceeding high mountain, and [showing] him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, [and saying] unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.” This, you see, was the psychological temptation. Man lusts for power. Eve was subjected to the same temptation: ‘ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.’ (Genesis 3.5). Many of us succumb to this test.

Jesus answered by quoting Deuteronomy 6.13 and 10.20: “... Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”

Thus, Jesus demonstrated to Christians how to confront the devil: quote the Word of God accurately. The author in this book, contrary to the route taken by most “Christian” lawyers, will attempt to point out the scriptural, not the legal, principles governing the issues and doctrines discussed. He will discuss laws

---

32 Ibid.
33 Matthew 4.3.
35 Matthew 4.4.
38 Matthew 4.7.
39 Matthew 4.8, 9.
41 Matthew 4.10.
and/or caselaw insofar as they are applicable to and/or comply with or deviate from those principles. The Bible, not the laws, statutes, regulations, executive orders, and cases handed down by the civil government, is the supreme authority which sets the standard for everything.

The Christian must work to attain those tools that will allow him to be effective:

“According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; And to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall:”

As is evident from the above, many ingredients are necessary for Christian success in spiritual warfare. Among those ingredients are truth and knowledge, first concerning the Word of God and then the facts facing one in this world. Truth and knowledge, especially truth and knowledge from the Word of God, are deficient in the lives of most Christians and particularly truth and knowledge regarding the battleground of separation of church and state. Why is this? It is partly or wholly because “Christians” are led by the ideas and philosophies of others and by the tradition of men, and not by the Word of God.

Probably due to a lack of biblical knowledge about the issue, the issue of separation of church and state is not a “hot button” for some Christians. The issue is, “Is it a ‘hot-button’ for the Lord?” Is it important to the Lord? How important is the issue to the Lord? In pages that follow, the author will give God’s answer to the question, from His Holy Word. The conclusion of it all will be that the issue is very important to the Lord and that when a church is not under Christ in all things, that church is disobedient to the commandment, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.”

The church, not the state, is to be the leader in this issue because civil governments are almost always led by the lost and possibly some carnal Christians, and, therefore will always choose Satan’s cosmic principles of force, greed, selfishness, ambition, and pleasure over God’s principles. The only motivations of the unregenerate and the carnal Christian are the principles of the god of this world. The individual believer and the church are still to follow God’s rules, no matter what the civil government does. That is the reason tens or hundreds of millions of believers have chosen to die for living in accordance with God’s rules rather that submit to Satan’s principles. The fact that churches will be deceived and fall away into apostasy and the consequences of that deception are revealed in God’s Word.

Doctrines concerning the church and the civil government, both Jewish and Gentile, and the accepted theological doctrine concerning the relationship between church and state have shaped the doctrines and laws of many nations since Christ. Ultimately, the church, the nation Israel, and Gentile nations will

42 II Peter 1.3-10.
face different fates. The return of the Lord presents different consequences for the church, the nation Israel, and the Gentile nations:

“... Taken together, the N.T. teachings concerning the return of Jesus Christ may be summarized as follows: (1) That the return is an event, not a process, and is personal and corporeal (Mt. 23.39; 24.30; 25.31; Mk. 14.62; Lk. 17.24; John 14.3; Acts 1.11; Phil. 3.20, 21; 1 Thes. 4.14-17). (2) His coming has a threefold relation: to the church, to Israel, to the nations.

“(a) To the church the descent of the Lord into the air to raise the sleeping and change the living saints is set forth as a constant expectation and hope (Mt. 24.36, 44, 48-51; 25.13; 1 Cor. 15.51, 52; Phil. 3.20; 1 Thes. 1.10; 4.14-17; 1 Tim. 6.14; Tit. 2.13; Rev. 22.20).

“(b) To Israel, the return of the Lord is predicted to accomplish the yet unfulfilled prophecies of her national regathering, conversion, and establishment in peace and power under the Davidic Covenant (Acts 15.14-17 with Zech. 14.1-9). See “Kingdom (O.T.),” 2 Sam. 7.8-17; Zech. 13.8, note; Lk. 1.31-33; 1 Cor. 15.24, note.

“(c) To the Gentile nations the return of Christ is predicted to bring the destruction of the present political world-system (Dan. 2.34, 35; Rev. 19.11, note); the judgment of Mt. 25.31-46, followed by world-wide Gentile conversion and participation in the blessings of the kingdom (Isa. 2.2-4; 11.10; 60.3; Zech. 8.3, 20, 23; 14.16-21).”

Sections I, II, and III examine the biblical doctrines of government, church, and separation of church and state because this is necessary for one to understand “separation of church and state.” Sections IV, V, and VI build upon that foundation by looking at the history of separation of church and state—mainly in America but with some historical background prior to the colonization of America—the Supreme Court treatment of the issue of separation of church and state which has resulted in the removal of God from almost all civil government affairs, and the manners in which civil governments have enticed churches to violate the biblical principle of separation of church and state even though they were not and are not required by the state in America to do so.

The author proceeds from the belief that Scripture is true and has been accurately translated. Res judicata pro veritate accipiture.44 The truth of Scripture has been proven beyond any doubt in many ways. For example, most of the approximately two thousand prophesies of Scripture, many given hundreds or thousands of years prior to fulfillment, prove the supernatural origin of the Bible. Also, since the Bible and secular history record consequences of many choices experienced by individuals, families, churches, and nations for acting or failing to act according to God’s principles contained within His Word, and since one can also compare consequences he has personal knowledge of with admonitions in Scripture, one can safely conclude that Scripture is a reliable source for direction and guidance in all matters. That is, one can a priori45 accurately predict the consequences of certain actions, choices, and behaviors of individuals, families, churches, and nations by a study of Scripture;

44 “A matter adjudged is taken for truth....” BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 1310 (6th ed. 1990), definition of “Res judicata pro veritate accipiture.”
45 “From the cause to the effect; from what goes before. A term used in logic to denote an argument founded on analogy, or abstract considerations, or one which, positing a general principle or admitted truth as a cause, proceeds to deduce from it the effects which must necessarily follow.” BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 103 (6th ed. 1990), definition of “a priori.”
and, if one correctly divides the Word of Truth, he can also *a posteriori*\(^{46}\) many times determine the cause of current events as they unfold before one’s eyes.

If the church member, including the pastor, does not value biblical principle, he will not read this book since it deals with theology. Many Christians today are untheological or anti-theological. They have a theological bias. Many leaders in the Faith Movement, Church Growth Movement, Emerging Church Movement, and many fundamental Bible believing pastors find it more practical to avoid conflicts involving theological principles. Many fundamentalist pastors and professors who have no such bias when it comes to many biblical issues have such a bias when it comes to the relationship between church and state. If theology does not matter, then it does not matter what you believe or what you do.

“[Many] evangelicals have exchanged the theological enterprise for success measured in church attendance, income, and prestige. Seminary professor, David Wells, laments the loss. ‘The new quest for contemporary practicality has transformed the nature of the Christian ministry, the work of the seminaries, and the inner workings in denominational headquarters, and in each the transformation has sounded the death knell of theology… Seminary students are not blind to the fact that the big churches and the big salaries go to those who are untheological or even anti-theological.’\(^{47}\)

In today’s humanistic atmosphere, most pastors and other church members wish to pass the subject of the biblical principle of separation of church and state off immediately without discussion or biblical consideration. Such persons will not want to read this book.

Although many pastors will summarily dismiss this book without reading it, the author still loves them. He has no choice—God told Christians to “love one another.” The pastor of each church is primarily responsible for properly leading the local body of believers to which he is called; and he will answer to God for His failure to rightly divide the Word of Truth. God has warned him against willful ignorance. Just as God has called the author to proclaim truth in the matter of separation of church and state, He has also called other Bible believing Christians, including pastors, to inform the author, in love, if and how they believe he is in error. Seeking truth in important spiritual matters is preeminent.

The author references many verses from Scripture. Many times, he quotes verses in order to save the reader the time and effort of looking them up. He also quotes many of his sources because he believes this will be helpful to the reader. The author agrees with those he quotes unless otherwise indicated, but this does not indicate that he agrees with everything a cited authority writes or advocates, with one exception—he believes the Bible to be inerrant. He gives the sources of all quotes because he has discovered in his research that many authors have stolen information from others without giving credit and he believes that this is a completely dishonest practice.

---

\(^{46}\) “From effect to cause; from what comes after. A term used in logic to denote an argument founded on experiment or observation, or one which, taking ascertained facts as an effect, proceeds by synthesis and induction to demonstrate their cause.” BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 95 (6th ed. 1990), definition of “*a posteriori*.”

Section I
Government

“For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.”¹

“Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.”²

¹ Romans 13.1b,c.
² I Timothy 6.15.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Nothing is more crucial to our concept of faith than a proper understanding of the nature of God. God is the Sovereign of the universe. Unlike His characterization in the cultic theology of the Faith Movement where “God is nothing but a ‘faith being,’ a pathetic puppet at the beck and call of His creation,” and “man is deemed to be sovereign,”¹ and/or in churches which submit themselves to civil government through incorporation, 26 United States Code § 501(c)(3), or in any other manner, God is Supreme Ruler, the Highest Power. His is the supreme government. He ordained and rules over all other governments.² “Ordain” means “to establish or order by appointment, decree, or law.”³

God teaches in many ways, throughout the Bible, that He is the Supreme Ruler and His is the Higher and Highest Power. “The earth is the LORD’s, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein....”⁴ John the Baptist understood the supreme rulership of God; speaking of Jesus Christ he said, “He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all.”⁵

“As ‘possessor of heaven and earth,’ the most high God has and exercises [supreme] authority in both spheres: (a) The heavenly authority of El Elyon (e.g., Daniel 4.35: ['And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?']; Isa. 14.13-17 [Satan tried to usurp God’s throne, but God threw him out of heaven and he will be thrown into hell.]; Mt. 28.18 ['And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.']); (b) the earthly authority of El Elyon (e.g. Deut. 32.8 [‘When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.’]; Psa. 9.2-5 ['I will be glad and rejoice in thee: I will sing praise to thy name, O thou most High....']; 21.7 ['For the king stablisheth in the LORD, and through the mercy of the most High he shall not be moved.']; 47.2-4 ['For the LORD most high is terrible; he is a great King over all the earth....']; 56.2, 3 ['Mine enemies would daily swallow me up: for they be many that fight against me, O thou most High.']; 82.6, 8 ['I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the most High. Arise, O God, judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations.']); 83.6, 7, 16-18 ['... That men may know that thou, whose name is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth.']; 91.9-12 ['Because thou hast made the LORD, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation....']; 2 Sam. 22.14, 15 ['The LORD thundered from heaven, and the most High uttered his voice....']; Dan. 5.18 ['O thou king, the most high God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honour[.']."]⁶ [Bold emphasis mine.]

“That God is supreme, the Highest Power, is revealed in the Old Testament through[, among other things.] His names, as follows:

---
² See Romans 13.1b,c, see footnote 1 on p. 1.
³ WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 818 (10th ed. 1995).
⁴ Psalm 24.1.
⁵ John 3.31.
Class | English form | Hebrew equivalent
-----|-------------|------------------
Primary | God | El, Elah, or Elohim (Gen. 1.1, note)
 | LORD | Jehovah (Gen. 2.4, note)
 | Lord | Adon or Adonai (Gen. 15.2, note)
Compound (with El = God) | Almighty God | El Shaddai (Gen. 17.1 note)
 | Most High, or most high god | El Elyon (Gen. 14.18, note)
 | Everlasting God | El Olam (Gen. 21.33, note)
Compound (with Jehovah = LORD) | LORD God | Jehovah Elohim (Gen. 2.7, note)
 | Lord God | Adonai Jehovah (Gen. 15.2, note)
 | LORD of hosts | Jehovah Sabaoth (1 Sam. 1.3, note)

“This revelation of God by His names is invariably made in connection with some particular need of His people, and there can be no need of man to which these names do not answer as showing that man’s true resource is in God. Even human failure and sin but evoke new and fuller revelations of the divine fullness.

“The [Old Testament] reveal[s] the existence of a Supreme Being, the Creator of the universe and of man, the Source of all life and intelligence who is to be worshipped and served by men and angels….”

As the Supreme Ruler, He has decreed that men may choose to be guided by His principles or not. Just as man’s ordinances which, for example, place a speed limit on the highway or forbid people from driving while intoxicated do not and cannot keep people from violating those ordinances because people decide whether to obey those ordinances or not, God cannot force men to comply with His ordinances since He has given every government—self-government, family government, civil government, and church government—freedom of choice or free will. However, choices are met by either blessings or...

---


8 In the colonial period, Isaac Backus recorded that “How to reconcile divine sovereignty with human liberty, and efficacious grace with the use of means for conversion were also questions that they had long and tedious debates upon.” See Backus, A History of New England..., Volume 2, p. 239.

Dr. J. Vernon McGee has stated on his “Thru the Bible” radio program that no matter what one argues, it cannot be denied that both the sovereignty of God and the free will of man are in Scripture. God in His sovereignty has allowed man choices because without choices love is impossible. That is, love requires choices. God wants our love. One can force a man to marry a woman with a shotgun, but that man does not love the woman if he has to be forced to marry her.

God foreknows everything that will happen, but foreknowledge does not mean control.

Pastor Joey Faust commented upon the paradox of the sovereignty of God and the free will of man: “God is able to ‘control men’ (Prov. 21.1); yet He is so powerful and sovereign that He alone can control men without infringing on man's free will! We do not understand with our limited minds (Rom. 11.33-36) how God can control, and yet do so without interrupting man's responsibility. Therefore, I believe in absolute free will that will be punished or rewarded. But I also believe that God is somehow able to work through man's free will in His perfect plan. We see this in the Jews who crucified the Lord. Peter says they were wicked to do so (wickedness requires free will); yet it was also ordained by God. We see this also in Samson who rebelled against his parents, but it was said to be of the Lord. There are many other examples.

“The Calvinist Postmillennialists will seize on [the] statement that ‘God cannot force men to comply with His ordinances since He has given every government—self-government, family government, civil government, and church government—freedom of choice,’ and imply that God has left all nations, and thus the whole world, under the whims of their free will. They will point out that God sets limits and boundaries. I am no Calvinist; but I do believe in a paradox beyond our comprehension. Most Calvinists advocate sovereignty and make free-will a dirty word. Some who deny Calvinism go to another extreme. For example, the Jewish radio host, Dennis Prager, argues that if some tragedy takes place, it is because God was too weak to stop it. He says this is the only...
judgment. In the final analysis He will either reward or judge all governments according to the degree they abide by His will.

The first government established by God was self-government. Every person exercises self-government, and decides whether he or she will receive the only true and eternal hope which is provided by God, that is the Lord Jesus Christ, as Savior. Since only some will do so, only those institutions which are composed of Christians—born again believers who also follow the principles of Christ—or which are dominated by Christians, have any hope of receiving the blessings of God.

After the fall of man in the Garden of Eden, and man knew “good and evil,” God established family government. Every person within a family, in exercising self-government, chooses whether to submit to God’s guidelines concerning family government.

The next type of government ordained by God was human government or civil government. God ordained civil government at the time of the great flood. For the first time, He gave man the responsibility of ruling the world for God. Relatively quickly after Cain killed Abel, all mankind except Noah and his family, guided only by conscience (knowledge of good and evil or an awareness of right and wrong) had become totally corrupted. Civil government provided further control over the evil nature of man.

Some time after ordaining civil government, He called out Abraham to be the father of Israel. Israel was established as a theocracy. All other nations were non-theocratic and were and are called “Gentile.” God established Israel to be directly under Him for specific purposes. Israel was to be the only theocracy that God has ever ordained. The Gentile nations can only look to Israel to see that God is who He claims to be, but God still desires every nation to choose to honor Him and His principles.

The Word of God teaches us that no civil government, Jew or Gentile, since it is made up of sinful men, will, before the return of Christ, ever follow the principles of God for any significant period of time. “That both Israel and the Gentiles have governed for self, not God, is sadly apparent.” Therefore, every civil government that has ever existed or which will ever come about prior to the return of the Lord will be judged by God. God used a Gentile nation to take Israel into captivity, and He has already judged and is judging many Gentile nations. The Lord will return and crush the Gentile world-powers existing at the time of His return which, led by the beast and false prophet, will come and besiege Israel. The nation Israel will then be restored to the land which God gave them according to his covenant with them. God will do this for His “holy name’s sake, which [Israel had] profaned among the heathen...” Then Satan will be cast “into the bottomless pit, that he might deceive the nations no more, way to make God good. Calvinists decry this view of Divine weakness (and rightly so). The biblical balance is beyond our comprehension.”

9 Jesus said, “And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.” John 6.40.

10 Revelation 19.19.

11 Many verses in the Bible verify this. Here are a few: Isaiah 11.11-16; 14.1-8; 27.12-13; 43; 45.17; 48; 49.8-21; 51; 52; 54; 61.3-62; 65.17-66.24; Jeremiah 16.14-16; 23.3-8; 24.6; 30.8-11, 16-24; 31; 32.37-44; 46.27; 50.19-20; Ezekiel 11.17-21; 16.60-63; 28.25-26; 34.11-31; 36; 37.21-25; 37; 39.25-29; Hosea 2.14-23; Joel 3; Amos 9.13-15; Micah 4.6-8; Zephaniah 3.4-20; Zechariah 10; Acts 1.6-7; Romans 11.25-27.

12 Ezekiel 36.22-23, 32.
till the thousand years should be fulfilled,14 the nations shall be judged,15 and God’s kingdom will be set up.16

Thus, a believer can understand that the word “government” does not apply only to “civil government.” It is tragic that America has been so successful in indoctrinating its citizens to believe that the only government is civil government. This is against the desires of God who wishes all people to know that He is the Supreme Ruler, that His is the supreme government and that He has ordained various types of government each with its own God-given purposes and limitations.

Today’s America has redefined “government.” Most Americans now believe that all direction and control should come from civil government. For example, many now blame civil government when their child rebels, fails to get an education, becomes an alcoholic or drug addict, etc. The modern Webster’s Dictionary defines “government” entirely differently than did the 1828 Webster’s Dictionary which to a large degree still honored biblical teaching:

“The modern definition quoted above suggests civil government in every definition and the one definition which does not, “moral conduct or behavior,” is noted as being “obsolete.”

In the 1828 Webster’s dictionary, definitions of “government” went beyond civil government:

14 Revelation 20.1-3.
15 Matthew 25.32-46.
16 Daniel 2. 34-36, 44.
17 MERRIAM WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 504 (10th ed. 1995).
the rights and duties of citizens and public officers are prescribed and defined; as a monarchial government, or a republican government....

“6. An empire, kingdom or state; any territory over which the right of sovereignty is extended.

“7. The right of governing or administering the laws....

“8. The person or persons which administer the laws of a kingdom or state; executive power.

“9. Manageableness; compliance; obsequiousness.... Shak.”18

The older definition recognized the biblical teaching that God did not intend civil government to be an all-seeing, all-defining, all-controlling, all-directing eye; and that God Himself, as the Supreme Authority, has given churches, individuals, parents, and authorities, in addition to civil government, rules and boundaries by which to govern themselves and others without the control of the civil government, except for violations of certain moral laws. God was able to do this because His is the Supreme Government, over all other governments. He is “KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS.”19

Those who believe in the supremacy of civil government have not thought out the consequences of their belief. For example, as John Eidsmoe points out:

“[the humanist] would deny that government derives its authority from God. But in doing this, he also denies the source of government’s limitations and the source of human rights. If government does not depend upon God and his law for its authority, it is not bound to respect the limits God has placed on its authority, and it becomes a monster unleashed to do whatever it pleases. Under this concept there can be no such thing as an unjust law, for there is no higher standard by which man’s law can be judged. If government has said they are just; government becomes the arbiter of right and wrong as well as of legality.

“That is why humanists, when they try to destroy the biblical foundations of government (in the name of liberty yet!), end up creating a tyranny far worse than even they ever imagined. The very word tyranny, in its early Greek root tyrannos, means ‘one who rules without the sanction of religious law.’

“[A statement of William Penn] summarized it well…, ‘Men must choose to be governed by God or condemn themselves to be governed by tyrants.’20

The reader should keep in mind all governments: first, God’s Supreme Government, then the other governments which God has ordained—self-government, family government, civil government, and church government. Biblical principles of governments other than church government are dealt with in this section, Section I; and biblical principles of church government are dealt with in Section II. God laid down the boundaries of the authority of each type of government and the principles by which every government should conduct its affairs. He will hold every government responsible for the choices it makes. The reader should also keep in mind that the God-given goal for all governments is the glory of God, not the happiness of man. Joy is a side effect of “loving the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.”

---

18 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828).
19 Revelation 19.16.
Chapter 2
The motivation and the goal

A government—individual, family, church, or civil—will stay on track only should it have the proper motivation and set the proper God-given goal. The proper motivation for the saved is love for God first, and love for man second. Love is the key. Notice the use of the word “love” throughout this book. The improper motivation is love for oneself. If one’s motivation is love for God and man, he will set the proper goal—the glory of God—and he will have happiness as a side-effect, at least in eternity. If one’s motivation is self-love, he will set the wrong goal—his own happiness—and sooner or later he will be unhappy.

“Goal” means “the end or final purpose; the end to which a design tends, or which a person aims to reach or accomplish.”¹ The two ultimate and mutually exclusive goals are “the glory of God,” and the “happiness of man.” Should a person aim for the goal of “the happiness of man,” his path must differ from one whose goal is “the glory of God.” The conflict between these two goals is seen throughout Scripture and history in the life of every individual, family, church, and nation. Every entity, spiritual or earthly, sets one of these two goals.

Adam and Eve, Abel and Cain set one of the above-mentioned goals. All the heroes of the faith in the Bible understood or came to understand the importance of setting the proper goal. For example, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, King David, the prophets, the apostles, and the Christian martyrs throughout the ages understood the importance of setting the right goal. Joshua understood the importance of setting the right goal. He said, “[C]hoose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD.”²

Paul understood this. Amidst persecution and on his way to martyrdom, he joyfully said, “I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.”³ In the midst of bonds and afflictions, he said, “But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.”⁴ Certainly his lifestyle would have taken a different course if his goal had been his happiness. If all he had counted his salvation for was “fire insurance,” and his own eternal happiness in heaven, he could have avoided the physical torture, pain, and martyrdom which he experienced on earth. Perhaps one who professes to know Christ as Savior only in order to obtain eternal happiness in heaven without real repentance should examine his eternal salvation. Most “Christians” today have as their goal not only eternal but also temporal happiness.

God desires the goal of every government to be “the glory of God” and not “the happiness of man.” One will set this goal only if he loves God. Should the author of this book, or anyone else, serve God his entire life and die and go to hell, he would only be getting what he deserves.Every person should realize

¹ AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828), definition of “GOAL.”
³ Philippians 3.14.
that. But hell does not have to be the destination of sinful man: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”⁵ “We love him, because he first loved us.”⁶ Eternal happiness in heaven is promised to the believer, but that is never the goal of the believer; it is only a side effect.

The Bible glorifies God and reveals that the glory of God is the God-given goal for every person and that everything was created for His pleasure. The first of the Ten Commandments, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me,”⁷ is a concise statement of this principle. Besides that verse, the Bible makes abundantly clear that the God-given goal of man, which man can embrace or reject, is the “glory of God,” and that glory is due to God for many reasons.

“Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The LORD strong and mighty, the LORD mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The LORD of hosts, he is the King of glory. Selah.”⁸

“And he said, Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken; The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran,”⁹

“That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him:”¹⁰

“And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory; Amen, and Amen.”¹¹ “For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever: Amen.”¹²

“And blessed be thou, LORD God of Israel our father, for ever and ever. Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all. Now therefore, our God, we thank thee, and praise thy glorious name.”¹³

“Give unto the LORD, O ye mighty, give unto the LORD glory and strength. Give unto the LORD the glory due unto his name; worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness. The voice of the LORD maketh the hinds to calve, and discovereth the forests: and in his temple doth every one speak of his glory. The LORD sitteth upon the flood; yea, the LORD sitteth King for ever.”¹⁴

“Give unto the LORD, O ye kindreds of the people, give unto the LORD glory and strength. Give unto the LORD the glory due unto his name: bring an offering, and come into his courts. O worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness: fear before him, all the earth. Say among the heathen that the LORD reigneth: the world also shall be established that it shall not be moved: he shall judge the people righteously.”¹⁵
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“The LORD reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne. A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about. His lightnings enlighten the world: the earth saw, and trembled. The hills melted like wax at the presence of the LORD, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth. The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory.”

“...The LORD is high above all nations, and his glory above the heavens. Who is like unto the LORD our God, who dwelleth on high,”

“All thy works shall praise thee, O LORD; and thy saints shall bless thee. They shall speak of the glory of thy kingdom, and talk of thy power; To make known to the sons of men his mighty acts, and the glorious majesty of his kingdom. Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.

“In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple…. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory…. Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts.”

“Do not abhor us, for thy name's sake, do not disgrace the throne of thy glory: remember, break not thy covenant with us.”

“And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

“And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”

“And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

“Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.”

“And cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God,
“The Bible indicates that God is glorified through His sovereign dealings with nations (Ezek. 39:17-21), rulers (Rom. 9:17; Dan. 4:17, 34-37), Israel (Isa. 43:1, 7; 46:13; 60:1-3; Jer. 13.11), the Church (Eph. 3:20-21), and the nonelect (Rom. 9:17-18, 21). God is glorified by His sovereign act of creation (Ps. 19:1; Rev. 4:11), His sovereign acts in storm (Ps. 29.1-3, 9-10), His sovereign judgments (Isa. 2.19, 21; 59:18-19; Ezek. 39.17-21; Rev. 11:13; 19:1-2), and His sovereign act of hiding knowledge from human beings (Prov. 25:2). God glorifies Himself by sovereignly redeeming lost human beings and sovereignly keeping those whom He has redeemed (Rom. 9:23; 15:7-9; Eph. 1:5-6, 12, 14, 18; Phil. 4:19-20; 2 Tim. 4:18). God is to be glorified through the righteous deeds of believers performed through the equipment which God sovereignly gives (1 Cor. 10:31; Phil. 1:11; Heb. 13:21).”

“Christians” who do not love God and whose goal is “the happiness of man,” as opposed to “the glory of God,” probably will not respond to God’s call for active service. They will be like Micah who combined a little of the world with a little religion and employed a Levite for ten shekels, a suit, and his victuals and then said, “Now know I that the LORD will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest.” They have their goal—they will be eternally happy in heaven so why not use God to also bring temporal happiness on earth?

This principle applies to individuals, families, churches, and nations. The goal of lost people and most “Christians” is happiness, not the glory of God. Many families whose goal is “the happiness of man” will seek the American way of life into which they have been indoctrinated. Mom will work, the children will be left at day-care, will attend public schools, and will be brainwashed in Satan’s principles. Many “Christians” set out to make themselves and others happy, not to glorify God. Many nations likewise have the goal of “the happiness of man,” although that goal is only for an elite in many nations.

Individuals and families who love God and whose goal is to glorify God will get to work for the Lord. They will be seeking what they can do for God, not what God can do for them. They will be faithful to church even if someone else in the church makes them unhappy. They will seek to serve God, to carry out the Great Commission, and to love everyone, including their enemies. Churches and civil governments who love God will remain totally under Him and neither will seek to be over or under the other.

Saved people will one day be in heaven where they will be happy, but their eternal goal and purpose—glorifying God—will be natural.

“...heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.”

God’s children, unlike when they get to heaven where loving and glorifying God will be natural, may now choose to love and to glorify Him.

28 Revelation 7.10-12.
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31 Revelation 5.13.
Chapter 3

Self-government

Self-government was the first government ordained by God and is simply control or direction over oneself according to the principles of God’s Word.

On the sixth day, God created man in His own image, “male and female created he them.” 1 After creating the man, God created woman out of one of Adam’s ribs to be an “help meet” for him. 2 God brought the woman to Adam and marriage was instituted: “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.” 3

After creating them,

“[G]od blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.... And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” 4

Thus, God, as recorded in the above verses, made a covenant with man and woman. Some call that covenant the Edenic Covenant.

“The Edenic Covenant, the first of the eight great covenants of Scripture which condition life and salvation, and about which all scripture crystallizes, has seven elements. The man and woman in Eden were responsible:

“(1) To replenish the earth with a new order—man; (2) to subdue the earth to human uses; (3) to have dominion over the animal creation; (4) to eat herbs and fruits; (5) to till and keep the garden; (6) to abstain from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; (7) the penalty—death.” 5

God, in the Garden of Eden, gave man an opportunity to operate under self-government, under the constraint of only one simple rule. Man failed. Man was tempted by Satan to disobey the one small rule God had laid down, and mankind failed. 6 Satan came to woman and misquoted the Word of God: “Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?” 7 Eve quoted the Word of God back to Satan, but added to it: “We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” 8 Satan then directly challenged the Word of God: “Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” 9

---
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“And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.”

At that point, God judged the serpent (the devil), the woman, and the man:

“And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: [a]nd I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; [t]horns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; [i]n the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

Thus, God gave what is called by many the Adamic Covenant.

“The Adamic Covenant conditions the life of fallen man—conditions which must remain till … ‘the creation also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God’ (Rom. 8.21). The elements of the Adamic Covenant are:

“(1) The serpent, Satan’s tool, is cursed (v.14), and becomes God’s illustration in nature of the effects of sin—from the most beautiful and subtle of creatures to a loathsome reptile. The deepest mystery of the atonement is intimated here. Christ, ‘made sin for us,’ in bearing our judgment, is typified by the brazen serpent (Nu. 21.5-9; John 3.14, 15; 2 Cor. 5.21). Brass speaks of judgment—in the brazen altar, of God’s judgment, and in the laver, of self-judgment.

“(2) The first promise of a Redeemer (v.15). Here begins the ‘highway of the Seed,’ Abel, Seth, Noah (Gen. 6.8-10), Shem (Gen. 9.26, 27), Abraham (Gen. 12.1-4), Isaac (Gen. 17.19-21), Jacob (Gen. 28.10-14), Judah (Gen. 49.10), David (2 Sam. 7.5-17), Immanuel-Christ (Isa. 7.9-14; Mt. 1.1, 20-23; 1 John 3.8; John 12.31).

“(3) The changed state of the woman (v16). In three particulars: (a) Multiplied conception; (b) motherhood linked with sorrow; (c) the headship of the man (cf. Gen. 1.26, 27). The entrance of sin, which is disorder, makes necessary a headship, and it is vested in man (1 Tim. 2.11-14; Eph. 5.22-25; 1 Cor. 11.7-9).

“(4) The earth cursed (v17) for man’s sake. It is better for fallen man to battle with a reluctant earth than to live without toil.

“(5) The inevitable sorrow of life (v17).

“(6) The light occupation of Eden (Gen. 2.15) changed to burdensome labor (vs. 18, 19).

“(7) Physical death (v19; Rom. 5.12-21). See ‘Death (spiritual)” (Gen. 2.17; Eph. 2.5, note).”

Isaac Backus, a great Baptist pastor, author, and leader in New England, appropriately described man’s state before and after the fall in the Garden of Eden. “Before man imagined that submission to [God’s] government and acting strictly by rule was confinement and that breaking over those bounds would
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enlarge his knowledge and happiness, how clear were his ideas!”

After his fall, because he felt evil, guilt, and misery instead of good and happiness, he tried to hide from the Omniscient One. “[I]t appears that the notion of man’s gaining any dignity or liberty by refusing an entire submission to government was so delusive that instead of its advancing him to be as Gods, it sunk him down into a way of acting like the beasts and like the Devil.”

He had no sooner revolted from the authority of Heaven than the beauty and order of his family was broken.

God continued to hold man individually responsible for his spiritual decisions. In Genesis 4, the Bible tells the story of Cain and Abel. Cain, the son of Adam and Eve, brought an offering of the fruit of the ground to God which God did not respect because the offering represented Cain’s own works. God did respect the offering brought by Cain’s brother Abel, “the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof,” because it spoke of the coming Savior who would give His life, shed His blood, for all who would trust Him as Savior. “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts.”

Cain, as do all individuals, had the choice of coming to God by faith or doing things his way. God said to Cain, “Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.”

Old Testament saints placed their faith in a future Messiah. New Testament saints place their faith in the risen Messiah. Since the fall all individuals choose either to come to Christ, and only Christ, in faith or to depend upon their own philosophies or the philosophies and/or religions of others. Hebrews 11 gives the names and faithful acts of many Old Testament saints who came to God in faith: Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and Sarah (Abraham being the father of Israel), Isaac and Jacob, Joseph, Moses and his parents, Joshua and Israel, Rahab, etc. Speaking of the faith covenant, Paul wrote that all “which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

These verses all apply to individuals who are self-governing, not to nations—that is, not to civil governments. God has always dealt with individuals on the same basis. Alongside His dealings with individuals, as the Old Testament records, God also deals with nations or civil governments. Isaac Backus wrote: “By divine institution a whole family and a whole nation were taken into covenant; now none are added to the church by the Lord but believers who are saved.”

Satan is still successfully deceiving man as to God’s authority and God’s government by manifold attacks on the inerrancy of the Word of God, by the same “Yea, hath God said” strategy he used in the Garden of Eden. This book will show how he has deceived untold millions of Christians with regard to the
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issue of separation of church and state by misquoting and misinterpreting the Bible.

No individual has an excuse for rejecting God and his authority. God first speaks to every individual through His creation:

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.”

If an individual believes the creation, God next speaks to him through his conscience:

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.”

If an individual believes the creation and his conscience, God then speaks to him through Scripture:

“[L.]et God be true, but every man a liar: as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou are judged... As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.... For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God: Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”

A good study Bible will reveal that Romans 3 quotes extensively from Old Testament Scripture. For example, the immediately preceding verses quote Psalm 14.1, 2, 3; 53.1-4 and Ecclesiastes 7.20.

If an individual believes the creation, his conscience, and Scripture, God reveals the way to Himself through Christ Jesus:

“And therefore [Abraham’s faith] was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.”

“No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.”

Thus man makes a choice of his own free will as to how he will respond to God. The principle of freedom of conscience or free will is found throughout the
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Bible. In addition to examples already mentioned of men exercising their faith, a couple of powerful verses showing free will follow:

“For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.... He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.”

“And the spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.”

Love requires a choice. Without free will, man has no choice and God would be, by force, taking some people to heaven and some to the lake of fire at His discretion. Admittedly, one can do no work to earn his way to heaven, but faith is not a work. “But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.”

All other governments, except God’s supreme government, are made up of individuals. God desires the individual(s) who lead(s) a church government, a family government, or a civil government to confine that government to the principles laid down by God for the administration of itself. If a civil government will point individuals, families, businesses, and other institutions to God’s principles without infringing the God-ordained limitations to its authority and the freedom of conscience of individuals to choose God, god, gods, or no god at all, that civil government will guarantee liberty and will be operating in God’s will, as will be shown.
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Chapter 4
Family government and conscience

Prior to the fall of man in the Garden of Eden, man and woman were co-regents. Neither ruled over the other.1 After the fall, God established family government. He said to the woman: “I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.”2 The Bible teaches that the husband is to be the head of the wife,3 and children are to be instructed and led by the parents.4 Parents, not the state, are to care for their children: “But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.”5 Even an infidel has a love for his children placed there by God.6 God desires that man satisfy his sexual desire only in marriage. “Thou shalt not commit adultery.”7 “Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.”8

God desires parents, not civil government, to provide a God-centered education for their children:

“Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD: And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.”9

After the fall, God gave mankind a chance to be directed by his conscience (an awareness of doing wrong), still to be individually controlled only by self-government. God had told man, prior to the fall, “For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof [of the forbidden fruit], then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.”10 After man ate the forbidden fruit, God told them, “And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.”11 Dispensationalists12 usually refer to this economy as Conscience, the title being taken from these verses: “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another[.]”13 The Holy Spirit also strove with man during the days before the upcoming flood: “And the LORD
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said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years."\textsuperscript{14}

God gave mankind certain responsibilities:

"During this stewardship man was responsible to respond to God through the promptings of his conscience, and part of a proper response was to bring an acceptable blood sacrifice as God had taught him to do (Gen. 3.21; 4.4). We have a record of only a few responding, and Abel, Enoch, and Noah are especially cited as heroes of faith. We also have the record of those who did not respond and who by their evil deeds brought judgment on the world. Cain refused to acknowledge himself a sinner even when God continued to admonish him (Gen. 4.3, 7). So murder came on the scene of human history."\textsuperscript{15}

In the story of Cain and Abel, we see that God still did not allow civil government. After Cain killed Abel, the Lord told Cain, "And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand; When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."\textsuperscript{16} Since Cain feared that "every one that findeth me shall slay me,"\textsuperscript{17} God said, "... Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him."\textsuperscript{18} The Supreme Ruler of the universe was telling man that he had no authority to rule over man.

\textsuperscript{14} Genesis 6.3.
\textsuperscript{16} Genesis 4.11-12.
\textsuperscript{17} Genesis 4.14.
\textsuperscript{18} Genesis 4.15.
Chapter 5
Civil government

In spite of conscience and the restraint of the Holy Spirit, what happened without civil government? Very soon after the fall,

“GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.... And God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.” After the flood, “[T]he LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.”

The only remedy was God’s judgment.

At that point, for the first time, in the Noahic Covenant, God gave man the responsibility for ruling over man for Him—God ordained human or civil government. God initiated the Dispensation of Human Government. “For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.” He did so at the flood: He declared,

“And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of every man’s brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.”

“God gave man the right to take the life of a man, which in the very nature of the case gave man the authority to govern others. Unless [civil] government has the right to the highest form of punishment, its basic authority is questionable and insufficient to protect properly those it governs.”

Although the Bible did not call the institution which He ordained at that point civil government, that is what it was. It was the first time God ordained that man was to exercise authority, direction, or control over man. In addition to conscience and the restraint of the Holy Spirit, God instituted civil government. He ordained civil government to secure for man a temporal good—the protection of mankind from violence while on the earth. Only God had the power to prevent civil government, and only God had the power to institute civil government. It was apparent, in context, that He desired man to operate civil government under Him, according to His rules.

He ordained civil government for the earthly benefit of man—to control evil—as is contextually apparent: Before the flood,

“... God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.... And God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt: for all flesh corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, I will destroy them with the earth.”
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“[A]nd the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.”

Mankind was so utterly corrupt that the only solution was for God to destroy every man, woman, and child, except the one righteous family. This total corruption of mankind, except for Noah and his family, had occurred in a relatively short period of time after Adam and Eve had been expelled from the Garden of Eden. At the same time that God judged man by the flood, He ordained civil government, in order to control the violence that resulted from the wickedness of man, to secure for mankind as a whole a temporal good. Some leaders have realized this.

Alexander Hamilton asked and answered his own question: “Why has government been instituted at all? Because the passions of men will not conform to the dictates of reason and justice without constraint.”

Civil government was established within the covenant God made with Noah.

“The elements of the Noahic Covenant are:

“(1) The relation of man to the earth under the Adamic Covenant is confirmed (Gen. 8.21).
“(2) The order of nature is confirmed (Gen. 8.22).
“(3) Human government is established (Gen. 9.1-6).
“(4) Earth is secured against another universal judgment by water (Gen. 8.21; 9.11).
“(5) A prophetic declaration is made that from Ham will descend an inferior and servile posterity (Gen. 9.24, 25).
“(6) A prophetic declaration is made that Shem will have a peculiar relation to Jehovah (Gen. 9.26, 27). All divine revelation is through Semitic men, and Christ, after the flesh, descends from Shem.
“(7) A prophetic declaration is made that from Japheth will descend the ‘enlarged’ races (Gen. 9.27). Government, science, and art, speaking broadly, are and have been Japhetic, so that history is the indisputable record of the exact fulfillment of these declarations.”

God ordered man to multiply and populate the earth: “And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.”

Would man obey God on the basis of conscience, the restraint of the Holy Spirit, and human government? Man almost immediately failed to govern under God—Noah became drunk and incapable of ruling. Furthermore, Noah’s descendants rebelled against God’s command to populate the whole earth. The
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pattern has continued with every nation that has ever or will ever exist until Christ returns.

The covenant God made with Noah was to continue: It was to be an “everlasting covenant” \(^ {11}\) for “perpetual generations.”\(^ {12}\) Thus, the covenant is in effect today.

Shortly after the flood, God divided the world into nations: “By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.”\(^ {13}\) God probably did this because if all worldly government were concentrated in one world government, the potential for evil would be unlimited.

“Rulers are sinful and given too much authority can become oppressive tyrants. Nations check each other’s power. A one-world government would have no check on its power. No one could check violations on legal limitations and guarantees. World government has the potential for world tyranny.”\(^ {14}\)

“The people, instead of obeying God’s command to scatter and fill the earth, conceived the idea of staying together and building the tower of Babel to achieve their aim. Fellowship with man replaced fellowship with God.”\(^ {15}\) Soon after this division into nations, mankind attempted to build the world’s first “United Nations” building. “And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.”\(^ {16}\) What was wrong with their attempt?

“It was a picture of salvation by works, reaching heaven by one’s own efforts; one of its probable purposes was astrology or Satan worship, as with the ziggurat towers in ancient Babylonia; it was based on pride and self-exaltation. In addition, its purpose was to keep the people together in a one-world government instead of spreading them out into national entities as God had intended. The Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, writing shortly after the time of Christ, says:

‘Now it was Nimrod who excited them to such an affront and contempt of God…. He also gradually changed the government into tyranny—seeing no other way of turning them from the fear of God, but to bring them into a constant dependence upon his power. He also said … that he would build the tower too high for the waters to be able to reach and that he would avenge himself on God for destroying their forefathers….’

“As we can read in Genesis 11.5-9, God frustrated the building of the tower by causing the people to speak different languages. God then reaffirmed nationalism: ‘And from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth’ (Genesis 11.9). God further re-affirms nationalism in Deuteronomy 32.9 and Acts 17.26. National entities will continue even during Christ’s millennial rule on earth (Isaiah 2.4; 66.18; Revelation 12.5; 20.3, 8), and perhaps even in heaven (Revelation 21.24, 26).”\(^ {17}\)

Thus, God again judged man for his failure to keep His command to populate the whole earth. God confused their language. Since they could no longer speak the same language, the builders could no longer understand one
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another. They separated and relocated to different parts of the earth. They began to populate the entire earth.

The New Testament teaches that one God-given purpose of Gentile civil government is to control evil:

“For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.”18

“Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers or fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.”19

A second purpose can be inferred from an admonition of Paul to Timothy—to organize society under God, that is according to God’s principles:

“I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.”20

For example, an application of God’s principles in civil law would be laws regulating hunting. In the Noahic covenant, mankind is told: “Every living thing that liveth shall be food for you.”21 Thus, God gave man the authority to hunt animals, but not the “right to engage in mass and wanton slaughter of the animal kingdom.” On the other hand, God placed man in the Garden of Eden to “dress it and keep it,”22 not to destroy it. “So God requires man to exercise wise stewardship in his use of the animal kingdom and of natural resources in general.”23 God wants every Gentile nation to choose to operate under Him—that is, under His principles as given in His Word. If a nation will do that, Christians will live a quite and peaceable life and non-Christians will be free to choose God, no god, or false gods or gods since, as will be seen, separation of church and state is a biblical principle for Gentile nations.

A third, and the most important purpose of civil government is to teach. Just as “[t]he law is a “schoolmaster” to bring us unto Christ,”24 a nation, by its laws, teaches. The laws of a nation, as do God’s laws, have a didactic effect; that is, they teach. Lawrence McGarvie observed:

“American law tended to operate as if it had a life of its own, shaping society to conform to legal values by directing the actions of individuals. Recognizing law’s relative autonomy, scholars such as Michael Grossberg, Christopher Tomlins, and Mark Tushnet contend that law acted to infuse the new society—including the judges—with a system of rules and principles derived from liberal ideology. Many authors have noted the
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incremental pace of legal change. Law’s structural dependence on the Constitution, common-law precedent, and the procedural dictates of pleading recognizable legal arguments mitigated any societal tendencies toward rapid transformation. Instrumentalism, as a theory of understanding law, fails to fully appreciate its institutional inertia, the multiplicity of forces involved in its creation, and its hegemonic role as a relatively autonomous body of values, beliefs, and doctrine that provides the means of ‘discourse’ in a nation of law.”

A nation under God will base its law upon biblical principles and such a civil government teaches its citizens the biblical principle that they have freedom of conscience, but that individuals should choose to conform their wills to the will of God. Everyone in such a nation may choose the one true God, god, gods, or no gods at all. If under God, a nation teaches and points to truth, including the ultimate truth that Jesus stated: “I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” This is why it is important, for example, that government leaders, officials, and others pray in no other name than the name of Jesus. On the other hand, a nation which is not under God teaches the principles of Satan, the god of this world. A civil government not under God will allow or require official government prayers in the name of any god, no god at all, and perhaps also in the name of Jesus.

The Noahic Covenant was written to Gentile nations. Gentile nations were to always proceed under God’s original plan for civil government. Later, as will be shown, God called out a nation, Israel, for specific purposes applicable only to that one nation. Israel was to operate as a theocracy directly under God. Israel was to be the center of God’s dealings with nations. God’s treatment of every Gentile nation depended and depends upon that nation’s treatment of Israel.

Thus, the Bible teaches that God can prevent man from setting up civil government, and He can ordain civil government. He is the Highest Power. At the same time, because God has given man free will, God does not force civil government to operate within the sphere of its God-given authority. Again, all other powers, including all other governments and civil government officials and leaders are under Him, subject to His rules. “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.”

All that God showed man as recorded in the Old Testament failed to convince mankind, excluding a remnant, that God was who He claimed to be, that His rules and principles could not be changed, that judgment falls upon individuals and institutions which do not operate according to His principles. As Isaac Backus observed: “Yet all this [all that God had done in the Garden of Eden, the flood, the ordaining of civil government] did not remove the dreadful distemper from man’s nature, for the great Ruler of the universe directly after the flood gave this as one reason why he would not bring such another while the earth remains, namely, For the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.” “So that if he was to drown them as often as they deserved it, one deluge must follow another continually.”
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Chapter 6
God desires nations to choose to glorify Him

The Bible, especially in the Old Testament, deals extensively with nations and shows that God ordained nations, that He is over every nation, but that He gives every nation a temporary choice of whether to submit itself to the sovereign God. The following verses, among many others, prove that God is over all nations and wishes each nation to choose to glorify Him:

“When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.”  

“Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are they which put their trust in him.”  

“The wicked shall be turned into hell and all nations that forget God.”  

“If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?”  

“Make a joyful noise unto the LORD, all ye lands. Serve the LORD with gladness: come before his presence with singing. Know ye that the LORD he is God: it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.”  

“The LORD is high above all nations, and his glory above the heavens.”  

“Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.”  

“A wise king scattereth the wicked, and bringeth the wheel over them.”  

“Mercy and truth preserve the king: and his throne is upholden by mercy.”  

“Take away the wicked from before the king, and his throne shall be established in righteousness.”  

“When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.”  

“Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and art counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing.... All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.... It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in: That bringeth the princes to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity. Yea, they
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shall not be planted; yea, they shall not be sown: yea, their stock shall not take root in the earth: and he shall also blow upon them, and they shall wither, and the whirlwind shall take them away as stubble. Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth.”

“But thou [Jeremiah] shalt say unto them, This is a nation that obeyeth not the voice of the LORD their God, nor receiveth correction: truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth.”

“At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them.”

Paul speaking to those at Lystra who would have worshiped Paul and Barnabas because Paul healed the impotent man on his 1st missionary journey said: “And saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein: Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.”

Paul said in his sermon on Mars’ hill: “God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; ... And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring.”

“Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords[.]”

Obviously, civil governments still exist and still have responsibility under God to rule for Him, but He still gives every civil government a choice of whether to go by His or Satan’s principles. “[The civil magistrate] ought to cherish, as a foster-father, the Lord Jesus, in his truth, in his saints, to cleave unto them himself, and to countenance them even to the death, yea, also, to break the teeth of the lions, who offer civil violence and injury unto them.”

Sadly, civil governments do not choose, at least for any significant period of time, to be “under God,” to guide their actions by His principles. Patrick Henry [who led the fight in Virginia against ratifying the Constitution, and was a great defender of the Baptists who were persecuted in Virginia even though he was in favor of a state-church] understood this:

“Where are your checks in this government. Your strongholds will be in the hands of your enemies. It is on the supposition that your American governors shall be honest, that all the good qualities of this government are founded; but its defective and imperfect
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construction puts it in their power to perpetrate the worst of mischiefs, should they be bad men. And sir, would not all the world, from the eastern to the western hemispheres, blame our distracted folly in resting our rights upon the contingency of our rulers being good or bad? Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty.”

---

Chapter 7

Israel—the only theocracy ordained by God

Originally, all civil governments were under the same guidelines. Although Gentile nations proceeded under the original plan as ordained by God in the Noahic Covenant, God called out Israel, a nation for Himself. First, Abraham was called out and obtained a promise of God.

“And so, after he [Abraham] had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.”

“Since man had failed to obey God on the basis of human conscience, the restraint by the Holy Spirit, and human government, God instituted what is called by some the Dispensation of Promise.”

“Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”

God promised Abraham that He would bless him, make his name great, give him many physical descendants, make him the father of many nations, give him the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and bless those who blessed him and curse those who cursed him.

“And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

“And the LORD said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.”

“And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee, and
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in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. 

The Jewish patriarchs failed in the responsibilities God gave them, and judgment followed. Their responsibility was only to believe and serve God who provided all material and spiritual resources requisite to inspire them to do this. God gave them the Promised Land, and blessings were guaranteed while they remained in the land. In spite of this, their future was predominated by failure. Jacob eventually led his children to Egypt where they were enslaved. God delivered them and crushed their taskmasters.

After God delivered Israel from their Egyptian oppressors, He gave them the Mosaic law. This was, of course, before they entered the Promised Land. He dealt with them now on the basis of that law in addition to conscience, the restraint of the Holy Spirit, civil government, and promise. This new way of dealing with man is called by some the Dispensation of Law. Promise and law are sharply distinguished in Galatians 3 even though the law did not annul the promise. 

“For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.”

The Mosaic Law covered the period from Moses until the death and resurrection of Christ, or from Exodus 19.1 to Acts 1.26. Under the Mosaic Covenant, the Jews were to be responsible for keeping the whole law. “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.” They did not succeed in their responsibility. “Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.”

The result was the captivity of Judah by Babylon and the captivity of Israel by Assyria. After the Jews later rejected the Lord, they were scattered over the entire world. Jesus lamented, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say
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unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.”

“All during their many periods of declension and backsliding, God dealt with them graciously from the very first apostasy with the golden calf, when the law was being delivered to Moses, to the gracious promises of final regathering and restoration in the millennial age to come. These promises of a glorious future are guaranteed secure by the Abrahamic promises, which the law in no way abrogated (Gal. 3.3-25). We are also told clearly in the New Testament (Rom. 3.20 [“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.”]) that the law was not a means of justification but of condemnation.”

The law was written in stone and “was a totally external way of God’s administering His rule over Israel.” It was an external moral restrainer.

“But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.”

When Israel went into the Promised Land, she operated under a covenant directed solely to the nation Israel. All other nations, the Gentile nations, continued under the Noahic Covenant. Israel entered the land given it by God under the Palestinian Covenant which was declared in Deuteronomy 30.1-10:

“The Palestinian Covenant gives the conditions under which Israel entered the land of promise. It is important to see that the nation has never as yet taken the land under the unconditional Abrahamic Covenant, nor has it ever possessed the whole land (cf. Gen. 15.18, with Num. 34.1-12). Deuteronomy 30 gives seven parts to the Palestinian Covenant:

“(1) Dispersion for disobedience, v. 1 (Deut. 28.63-68. See Gen. 15.18, note).
“(2) The future repentance of Israel while in the dispersion, v.2.
“(4) Restoration to the land, v. 5 (Isa. 11.11, 12; Jer. 23.3-8; Ezk. 37.21-25).
“(5) National conversion, v.6 (Rom. 11.26, 27; Hos. 2.14-16).
“(6) The judgment of Israel’s oppressors, v. 7 (Isa. 14.1,2; Joel 3.1-8; Mt. 25.31-46).
“(7) National prosperity, v. 9 (Amos 9.11-14).”

Israel was set up originally as a theocracy directly under God for God’s purposes. God spoke directly to Moses, Joshua, and then chosen judges in Israel. Israel is the only theocracy that has ever existed. Gentile nations make a choice of whether to operate under God’s principles as laid down in the Bible, but God does not speak directly to them. He speaks to them only through their conscience and through His Word. The church, which God instructed to be directly under God and His principles only, is not a state, and therefore not a theocracy. The word “theocracy” comes from two Greek words, theos meaning God and kratos meaning ruler. “Theocracy” means
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“Government of a state by the immediate direction of God; or the state thus governed. Of this species the Israelites furnish an illustrious example. The theocracy lasted till the time of Saul.”

God promised Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their seed everlasting possession of a physical land on the earth with prescribed boundaries. The Gentile nations could only look to Israel as God’s chosen nation. Although Gentile nations were not directly under the leadership of God, they still had a responsibility to glorify God and rule under God or suffer the consequences. Israel’s government, working in conjunction with the Jewish religious leaders, was given the responsibility to enforce all ten of the Ten Commandments, as well as all of God’s moral law. The Gentile nations proceeded under the original plan laid down by God and their highest function was the judicial taking of life, from which all other governmental powers may be implied.

Israel was called by God for specific purposes:

“This is the rod for his inheritance,” and God will use Israel to “break into pieces the nations.”

Thus, Israel is the key to everything regarding the nations of this world. Israel was ordained to be a theocracy under the direct rule of God, through His judges. God was directly over the state. This type civil government was unique to Israel. We see how this type of civil government was applied by Israel in the book of Judges. Over and over again, especially in Deuteronomy, the Jews were told to follow God’s law, to keep his commandments and statutes. “These are the statutes and judgments, which ye shall observe to do in the land, which the LORD God of thy fathers giveth thee to possess it, all the days that ye live
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upon the earth....”

God’s laws covered everything, including idolatry. As mentioned above, the Ten Commandments exemplified the law, and the whole of the Ten Commandments, including the first four, were to be enforced in the nation Israel.

God gave Israel free will. Ultimately Israel rejected God’s plan under which God himself ruled over the nation of Israel and demanded a king like the Gentile nations: “Now make us a king to judge us like all nations.” God told Samuel to hearken unto their demand: “And the LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.”

God also told Samuel to tell the people the ill consequences of being ruled by a king:

“And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the LORD will not hear you in that day.”

But they still demanded a king. They were looking at man, not God, when they made this demand: “And they said unto Samuel, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways[.]” They still did not realize that God fulfills His purposes. Had Israel walked in faith and kept His statutes and commandments, God had promised to bless them.

Before the Israelites rejected God, God’s law as transmitted through Moses, then through his successors, was the whole of civil and religious government. God’s chosen people, even in the theocracy, rebelled against God and His ways and again, were judged by God for so doing, and returned to God.

When kings started to rule, kings dominated prophet and priest. Saul, the first king, disobeyed the command of God through Samuel and even sought to slay Samuel, the prophet of God. David followed Saul as king of Israel. After the death of Solomon, David’s son who became king after the death of King David, the nation of Israel split in two. The northern Kingdom was called Israel, and the southern Judah. Before those two nations were eventually taken into captivity for their failure to proceed under God, all nineteen kings of Israel were evil and only eight of twenty kings of Judah were good (did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord).

During that time, God sent prophets to warn the kings of both Israel and Judah to cast down their idols and return to the ways of the Lord and to proclaim

---
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the consequences that would surely come if they did not do so. Rarely did the kings heed the warnings of those prophets. The Jews broke the Mosaic Law repeatedly.

“Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD.”

“Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the LORD of hosts hath sent in his spirit by the former prophets: therefore came a great wrath from the LORD of hosts.”

The nation was judged many times during this dispensation. Israel and Judah were both ultimately conquered and the people taken into captivity because of their rebellion against God. Worldwide dispersion resulted from their rejection of Christ.

Israel miserably failed to obey God on the basis of conscience, the restraint of the Holy Spirit, human government, promise, and law. As a result, God instituted what some call the Dispensation of Grace which will be discussed elsewhere in this book. Under this dispensation, conscience, the restraint of the Holy Spirit, human government, promise, and grace are being used by God to govern people. The law is not a ruling factor for the believer during the dispensation of grace.

“Therefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator…. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.”

“For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.”

“And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law;”

Grace as a ruling factor for the believer consists of two things. First, a confirmed favorable disposition toward God, the law of God in the heart.

“For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:”

“Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart. And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the
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ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.”

“For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.”

The second thing is the indwelling Holy Spirit.

“What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.”

Sadly, the majority of Jews and Gentiles do not accept the gift of righteousness offered by God in the Dispensation of Grace. Organized Christendom does not fulfill its mission given it by God in the New Testament—it does not “fulfill the Great Commission, maintain a pure membership, discipline unruly members, prevent false teaching from existing within it, and contend earnestly for the true faith.” Man again will fail, and judgment will follow.
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Chapter 8
God is the God of Israel

God promised the nation Israel He would bless those that bless her and curse those who curse her. This promise was for all time. No such promise was ever given to any other nation. David understood this. He said to the Lord after the Lord proclaimed to him what is called the Davidic Covenant:

“And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people, which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, from the nations and their gods? For thou hast confirmed to thyself thy people Israel to be a people unto thee for ever: and thou, LORD, art become their God. And now, O LORD God, the word that thou hast spoken concerning thy servant, and concerning his house, establish it for ever, and do as thou hast said…. And let thy name be magnified for ever, saying, The LORD of hosts is the God over Israel: and let the house of thy servant David be established before thee.”

To suggest that Israel has only the rights God has given to all nations is a shocking rejection of clear biblical teaching! God distinctly tells Israel that He has “separated [and] severed [her] from other people” and that she will not be “reckoned among the nations” because He loved Israel and chose her to be a “special people ... above all people:”

“For thou [Israel] art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharoah king of Egypt.”

God promises repeatedly, “O Israel ... I am with thee ... to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee.”

“The Bible identifies the true god as ‘the God of Israel’ 203 times, ‘the God of Jacob’ 28 times, ‘the God of Abraham’ 17 times, and ‘the God of Isaac’ 13 times. Never is He called the God of any other ethnic group. These designations are foundational to every one of the Bible teaches, including the character of God. To profess to believe in God and at the same time to hold a prejudice against God’s chosen people, the Jews, or against Israel, which turns these clear biblical identifications into meaningless titles, casts doubt upon whether one really knows the true God.”

The land of Israel was unconditionally given to Abraham and to his seed in the Abrahamic Covenant:
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"Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. So Abram departed, as the LORD had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran."

God said to Abraham, “For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever;” 8 “And he said unto him, I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.” 9

“The Abrahamic Covenant as formed (Gen. 12.1-4) and confirmed (Gen. 13.14-17; 15.1-7; 17.1-8) is in seven distinct parts:

“(1) ‘I will make of thee a great nation.’ Fulfilled in a threefold way: (a) In a natural posterity—‘as the dust of the earth’ (Gen. 13.16; John 8.37), viz. the Hebrew people. (b) ‘In a spiritual posterity—look now toward heaven ... so shall thy seed be’ (John 8.39; Rom. 4.16, 17; 9.7, 8; Gal. 3.6, 7, 29, viz. all men of faith, whether Jew or Gentile.) Fulfilled also through Ishmael (Gen. 17.18-20).

“(2) I will bless thee.’ Fulfilled in two ways: (a) temporally (Gen. 13.14, 15, 17; 15.18; 24.34, 35); (b) spiritually (Gen. 15.6; John 8.56).

“(3) ‘And make thy name great.’ Abraham’s is one of the universal names.

“(4) ‘And thou shalt be a blessing.’ (Gal. 3.13, 14).

“(5) ‘I will bless them that bless thee.’ In fulfillment closely related to the next clause.

“(6) ‘And curse him that curseth thee.’ Wonderfully fulfilled in the history of the dispersion. It has invariably fared ill with the people who have persecuted the Jew—well with those who have protected him. The future will still more remarkably prove this principle (Deut. 30.7; Isa. 14.1, 2; Joel 3.1-8; Mic. 5.7-9; Hag. 2.22; Zech. 14.1-3; Mt. 25.40, 45).

“(7) ‘In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.’ This is the great evangelic promise fulfilled in Abraham’s Seed, Christ (Gal. 3.16; John 8.56-58). It brings into greater definiteness the promise of the Adamic Covenant concerning the Seed of the woman (Gen. 3.15).

“NOTE.—The gift of the land is modified by prophecies of three dispossessions and restorations (Gen. 15.13, 14, 16; Jer. 25.11, 12; Deut. 28.62-65; 30.1-3). Two dispossessions and restorations have been accomplished. Israel is now in the third dispersion, from which she will be restored at the return of the Lord as King under the Davidic Covenant (Deut. 30.3; Jer. 23.5-8; Ezk. 37.21-25; Lk. 1.30-33; Acts 15.14-17).” 10

Thus God made three kinds of promises in the Abrahamic Covenant: (1) personal promises to Abraham, (2) national promises concerning Israel, and (3) universal promises that would affect all the people of the world. 11 Some of those promises have been fulfilled, but His promises “to give the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession to Abraham’s physical descendants (Genesis 17.8) and to give the Abrahamic Covenant for an everlasting covenant to those same descendants (Genesis 17.7, 19)” have not yet been fulfilled. 12

---
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The Abrahamic Covenant was an everlasting covenant dependent upon God and not upon what Abraham did. A theological controversy surrounds this issue, but the author is convinced beyond all doubt that the covenant is everlasting.  

As pointed out above, Israel entered the land under Joshua after Israel wandered forty years in the wilderness under the conditional Palestinian Covenant. The Palestinian Covenant, which was established by God with Israel after He gave the Mosaic Covenant, was separate from the Mosaic Covenant. “These are the words of the covenant, which the LORD commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb.”  

In conjunction with the covenant, God made very significant promises to Israel.

“And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath driven thee, And shalt return unto the LORD thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thine soul; That then the LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the LORD thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the LORD thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the LORD thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies, and on them that hate thee, which persecuted thee. And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the LORD, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day. And the LORD thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy land, for good: for the LORD will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy fathers: If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes wherewith I command thee this day. And the LORD thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy land, for good: for the LORD will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy fathers: If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this book of the law, and if thou turn unto the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul.”

These promises are to be fulfilled with literal, not spiritual, Israel, and reveal that God always leaves the way open for unfaithful Israel to be reconciled to Him. The final fulfillment of these promises to Israel is in the future. Since God intends to fulfill these promises to Israel when all the curse of Deuteronomy 28 concerning the nation Israel has been completed, this shows that literal Israel, as distinguished from the church (identified by some theologians as spiritual Israel), will survive the curse of God. God’s promise to restore Israel to the land which he gave to Abraham and his descendents when all the curse of Deuteronomy 28 has been fulfilled is another guarantee of Israel’s permanent ownership of that land. The Word of God in the promises of the Palestinian Covenant guarantees that literal Israel will repent and become saved in the future.

The future blessing of Israel as a nation rests upon the Palestinian Covenant of restoration and conversion and the Davidic Covenant of the Kingship of the Messiah, David’s Son, and this gives to predictive prophecy its Messianic character. The exaltation of Israel is secured in the kingdom, and the kingdom
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takes its power to bless from the Person of the King, David’s Son, but also “Emmanuel.” The interpretation of “Emmanuel” is “God with us.”

Later, after Israel rejected the theocracy and demanded a king, and after God anointed David as King, God made a covenant with David:

“Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcoat, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel: and I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth. Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime. And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all thine enemies. Also the LORD telleth thee that he will make thee an house. And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever. According to all these words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak unto David.”

The Davidic Covenant, “upon which the glorious kingdom of Christ ‘of the seed of David according to the flesh’ is to be founded, secures:

“(1) A Davidic ‘house’; i.e. posterity, family.
“(2) A ‘throne’; i.e. royal authority.
“(3) A kingdom; i.e. sphere of rule.
“(4) In perpetuity; ‘for ever.’
“(5) And this fourfold covenant has but one condition: disobedience in the Davidic family is to be visited with chastisement, but not to the abrogation of the covenant (2 Sam. 7.15; Psa. 89.20-37; Isa. 24.5; 54.3). The chastisement fell; first in the division of the kingdom under Rehoboam, and finally, in the captivities (2 Ki. 25.1-7). Since that time but one King of the Davidic family has been crowned at Jerusalem and He was crowned with thorns. But the Davidic Covenant confirmed to David by the oath of Jehovah, and renewed to Mary by the angel Gabriel, is immutable (Psa. 89.30-37), and the Lord God will yet give to that thorn-crowned One ‘the throne of his father David’ (Lk. 1.31-33; Acts 2.29-32; 15.14-17).”

Utterly violating the conditions of the Palestinian Covenant, the nation was first disrupted and then cast out of the land. The dispersion was for disobedience, as foretold by God:

“And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath driven thee, And shalt return unto the LORD thy God, and shall obey his voice according to all thine heart, and with all thy soul; That then the LORD thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee from all the nations, whither the LORD thy God hath scattered thee.”
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“The LORD shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them: and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth.... And it shall come to pass, that as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the LORD shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone.”

A temporary dispersion within was prophesied, to come before the extended dispersion. “The LORD shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known; and there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone.” This refers to Babylonian captivity of 70 years prophesied by Jeremiah.

“And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the LORD, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations.”

God, through Moses, told Israel that her continued disobedience would be punished by a worldwide dispersion.

“And it shall come to pass, that as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the LORD shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone.”

The Lord Jesus confirmed Moses’ words: “And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.” After the siege and total destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. almost all Judea became a desert and remained that way for nineteen-hundred and fifty years until 1948.

But the same covenant unconditionally promises a national restoration of Israel which is yet to be fulfilled. We see this in many prophecies, such as:

“... The Lord shall “recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, From Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. 12 And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth....”

Isaiah 12 describes the worship of the kingdom.

Isaiah 14: The kingdom set up and Israel restored and exalted. “For the LORD will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob....”
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whole earth is at rest, and is quiet: they break forth into singing... For the LORD of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back? ...29

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall beat off from the channel of the river unto the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the LORD in the holy mount at Jerusalem.”30

“Fear not: for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth.”31

“But Israel shall be saved in the LORD with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end.”32

Isaiah 48 explains that Israel will be restored & why. “Because I knew that thou art obstinate, and thy neck is an iron sinew, and thy brow brass.... Yea, thou hearest not; yea, thou knewest not; yea, from that time that thine ear was not opened: for I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and wast called a transgressor from the womb. For my name’s sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off.... For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it: for how should my name be polluted? And I will not give my glory unto another.”33 [Bold emphasis mine.]

Isaiah 49.8-21: Israel to be preserved & restored.

Isaiah 49.22-26: judgment on Israel’s oppressors. “And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the LORD: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me.... And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine: and all flesh shall know that I the LORD am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob.”34

“... For the LORD shall comfort Zion: he will comfort all her waste places; and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the LORD; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving, and the voice of melody....”35

“... when the LORD shall bring again Zion.... For the LORD hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem.”36

Isaiah 54 describes Israel the restored wife of Jehovah & security and blessing of restored Israel.


Isaiah 65.1-16 tells of all the bad things Israel, the rebellious people had done. Isaiah 65.17-25 tells of the eternal blessing of Israel in the new earth. Verse 17 looks beyond the kingdom-age to the new heavens and the new earth, but verses 18-25 describe the kingdom-age itself. Longevity is restored, but death, the “last enemy” (1 Corinthians
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15.26), is not destroyed till after Satan’s rebellion at the end of the thousand years (Revelation 20.7-14).

“[A]nd I will bring them again into their land that I gave unto their fathers.”

Jeremiah 23.1-40: the future restoration and conversion of Israel. This chapter tells the bad things the nation, the prophets, the priests, the people had done, and also states, “And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase.... Behold, the days come saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.”

Jeremiah 24 speaks of both the good and the evil and the good people who will be deported & the evil who remain in Judah and those who dwell in Egypt. God says he will remove the evil “into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whither I shall drive them ... and will send the sword, the famine, and the pestilence, among them, till they be consumed from off the land that I gave unto them and their fathers” But He will “set [his] eyes upon them for good, and ... will bring them again to this land: and ... will build them, and not pull them down; and ... will plant them, and not pluck them up.”

Jeremiah 30.8-11, 16-24; 31; 32.37-44: Israel will be restored. “Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child and her that travaileth with child together: a great company shall return thither.... Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people....”

“Because of all the evil of the children of Israel and of the children of Judah, which they have done to provoke me to anger, they their kings, their princes, their priests, and their prophets, and the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. [in verses 33-35 their abominations given].... Behold, I will gather them out of all countries, whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: And they shall be my people, and I will be their God: and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them: And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, and they shall not depart from me. Yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land assuredly with my whole heart and with my whole soul....”

Jeremiah 33: God will restore Israel and Judah. “And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me.... Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall

---

37 Jeremiah 16.15c; see Jeremiah 16.14-16.
38 Jeremiah 23.3, 5-6.
39 Jeremiah 24.9-10.
40 Jeremiah 24.6.
41 Jeremiah 31.8, 31-33.
42 Jeremiah 32.32, 37-41.
dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our righteousness....”43

“But fear thou, O my servant Jacob, and be not dismayed, O Israel: for, behold, I will save thee from afar off, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and be in rest and at ease, and none shall make him afraid. Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant, saith the LORD: for I am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee: but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure; yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished.”44

“And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, ... for I will pardon them whom I reserve.”

“For Israel hath not been forsaken, nor Judah of his God, of the LORD of hosts; though their land was filled with sin against the Holy One of Israel.”45

Ezekiel 11.17-21: Israel to be restored to the land and converted.

Ezekiel 16.60-63: The promise of future blessing under the Palestinian Covenant and the New Covenant. “Nevertheless I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant. Then thou shalt remember thy ways, and be ashamed, when thou shalt receive thy sisters, thine elder and thy younger: and I will give them unto thee for daughters, but not by thy covenant. And I will establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt know that I am the LORD: Thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done.”46

“When I shall have gathered the house of Israel from the people among whom they are scattered, and shall be sanctified in them in the sight of the heathen, then shall they dwell in their land that I have given to my servant Jacob. And they shall dwell safely therein, and shall build houses, and plant vineyards; yea, they shall lie in a good fold, and in a fat pasture shall they feed up on the mountain of Israel.... And I will set up on e shepherd over them, and he shall feed them even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the LORD will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the LORD have spoken it....”47

Ezekiel 34.11-31. Israel to be restored and the Davidic kingdom to be set up. “... [I] will deliver [my sheep] out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be: there shall they lie in a good fold, and in a fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountain of Israel.... And I will set up a shepherd over them, and he shall feed them even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the LORD will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the LORD have spoken it....”48

Notice the reason God restores Israel: “Therefore say unto the house of Israel, thus saith the Lord GOD: I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for mine holy name’s sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went. And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the LORD, saith the Lord GOD, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. Not for your sakes I do this saith the Lord GOD, be it known unto you: be ashamed and confounded for your own ways, O house of Israel.”49 [Bold emphasis mine.]

43 Jeremiah 33.8, 14-16.
44 Jeremiah 46.27-28.
45 Jeremiah 50.19-20, 51.5.
46 Ezekiel 16.60-63.
48 Ezekiel 34.12-14, 23-24.
49 Ezekiel 36.22-23, 32. One purpose for God setting aside the nation of Israel was to point other nations to God. Israel failed miserably. See Ezekiel 36 and many other passages in the OT. Man always fails. Only God succeeds. As was mentioned in Chapter 2 above, the God­given purpose of man is to glorify God, but man seeks his happiness, and seeks not the glory of God.
“Jehovah gives [in Ezekiel 37] the method of the restoration of the nation. The “bones” are the whole house of Israel who shall then be living. The “graves” are the nations where they dwell. The order of the procedure is: (1) the bringing of the people out (v12); (2) the bringing of them in (v12); (3) their conversion (v13); (4) the filling with the Spirit (v14). The symbol of the 2 sticks follows. The 2 sticks are Judah and the ten tribes; united, they are one nation (vs. 19-21). Then follows (vs 21-27) the plain declaration as to Jehovah’s purpose, and verse 28 implies that then Jehovah will become known to the Gentiles in a marked way. This is also the order of Acts 15.16, 17, and the two passages strongly indicate the time of full Gentile conversion. See also Isa. 11.10.”

“Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.”

Ezekiel 39.25-29: Vision of restored and converted Israel. “Then they shall know that I am the LORD their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there.”


Ezekiel 43.7-12: The place of the throne of the future kingdom. “And he said unto me, son of man, the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst to the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name, shall the house of Israel no more defile, neither they, nor their kings, by their whoredom, nor by the carcases of their kings in their high places....”

“That Israel is the wife of Jehovah (see vs. 16-23), now disowned but yet to be restored, is the clear teaching of the passages [in the book of Hosea]. ... Israel is, then, to be the restored and forgiven wife of Jehovah, ... Jehovah’s earthly wife (Hos. 2.23). ...” [Bold emphasis mine.]

Hosea 2.14-23: Israel, the adulterous wife, to be restored.

Hosea 13.9-16: The ultimate blessing of Israel in the kingdom.

“For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem.” Joel 3.17-21: The kingdom blessing. “For Judah shall dwell forever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation.”

Amos 9.13-15: Full kingdom blessing of restored Israel. “... And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their lane, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the LORD thy God.”

Micah 4.6-8: Israel to be regathered. “... and the LORD shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever.”

---
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Zephaniah 3.14-20: The kingdom blessing of Israel. “Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem.... Behold, at that time I will undo all that afflict thee: and I will save her that halteth, and gather her that was driven out; and I will get them praise and fame in every land where they have been put to shame. At that time will I bring you again, even in the time that I gather you: for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the LORD.”

Zechariah 2.4-13: Jerusalem in the kingdom age.

Zechariah 8.1-8: Jehovah’s unchanged purpose to bless Israel in the kingdom. “And I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God, in truth and righteousness.”

Zechariah 8.20-23: Jerusalem to be the religious center of the earth. “Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of host in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD.”

Zechariah 9.10-17: The future deliverance of Judah and Ephr iam, and the world-wide kingdom. “And the LORD their God shall save them in that day as the flock of his people: for they shall be as the stones of a crown, lifted up as an ensign upon his land.”

Zechariah 10: The future strengthening of Judah and Ephraim and the dispersion and regathering of Israel in one view. “And I will sow them among the people: and they shall remember me in far countries; and they shall live with their children, and turn again. I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and gather them out of Assyria; and I will bring them into the land of Gilead and Lebanon; and place shall not be found for them.”

Luke 1.26-38 (Here the angel Gabriel says to Mary): “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.”

Zacharias, filled with the Holy Ghost, prophesies... “And he raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; The oath he swore to our father Abraham, That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.”

When Jesus taught the apostles after he was risen, they “asked of him saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.” Notice, Jesus indicated that this would happen, but would not tell them when.

“... Taken together, the N.T. teachings concerning the return of Jesus Christ may be summarized as follows: (1) That the return is an event, not a process, and is personal and corporeal (Mt. 23.39; 24.30; 25.31; Mk. 14.62; Lk. 17.24; John 14.3; Acts 1.11; Phil. 3.20, 21; 1 Thes. 4.14-17). (2) His coming has a threefold relation: to the church, to Israel, to the nations.
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“(a) To the church the descent of the Lord into the air to raise the sleeping and change the living saints is set forth as a constant expectation and hope (Mt. 24.36, 44, 48-51; 25.13; 1 Cor. 15.51, 52; Phil. 3.20; 1 Thess. 1.10; 4.14-17; 1 Tim. 6.14; Tit. 2.13; Rev. 22.20).

“(b) To Israel, the return of the Lord is predicted to accomplish the yet unfulfilled prophecies of her national regathering, conversion, and establishment in peace and power under the Davidic Covenant (Acts 15.14-17 with Zech. 14.1-9). See “Kingdom (O.T.),” 2 Sam. 7.8-17; Zech. 13.8, note; Lk. 1.31-33; 1 Cor. 15.24, note.

“(c) To the Gentile nations the return of Christ is predicted to bring the destruction of the present political world-system (Dan. 2.34, 35; Rev. 19.11, note); the judgment of Mt. 25.31-46, followed by world-wide Gentile conversion and participation in the blessings of the kingdom (Isa. 2.2-4; 11.10; 60.3; Zech. 8.3, 20, 23; 14.16-21).”

“... Peter, in his 1st sermon [recorded in Acts 2.14-36], preaches that Christ is the Messiah, an unwelcome message to the Jews because they were expecting as promised, a regathered Israel established in their own land under their covenanted King (e.g. Isa. 11.10-12; Jer. 23.5-8; Ezk. 37.21-28.) Instead of explaining, as Rome 1st taught, followed by some Protestant commentators, that the covenant and promises were to be fulfilled in the church in a so-called ‘spiritual’ sense, Peter shows (vs. 25-32) from Psa. 16 that David himself understood that the dead and risen Christ would fulfill the covenant and sit on his throne (Lk. 1.32, 33). In precisely the same way James (Acts 15.14-17) met the same difficulty. See ‘Kingdom (O.T.),’ Zech. 12.8; (N.T.). Lk. 1.33; 1 Cor. 15.24.”

“A distinction must be observed between the ‘last days’ when the prediction relates to Israel and the ‘last days’ when the prediction relates to the church (1 Tim. 4.1-3; 2 Tim. 3.1-8, Heb. 1.1, 2; 1 Pet. 1.4, 5; 2 Pet. 3.1-9; 1 John 2.18, 19; Jude 17-19). Also distinguish the ‘last days’ (plural) from the ‘last day’ (singular); the latter expression referring to the resurrections and last judgment (John 6.39, 40, 44, 54; 11.24; 12.48). The ‘last days’ as related to the church began with the advent of Christ (Heb. 1.2), but have especial reference to the time of declension and apostasy at the end of this age (2 Tim. 3.1; 4.4). The ‘last days’ as related to Israel are the days of Israel’s exaltation and blessing, and are synonymous with the kingdom-age (Isa. 2.2-4; Mic. 4.1-7). They are ‘last’ not with reference to this dispensation, but with reference to the whole of Israel’s history.”

“Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.... Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.”

Acts 15.13-17: James declares the result of the council at Jerusalem which considered the issues of whether it was “needful to circumcise [the Gentile believers], and to command them to keep the law of Moses,” the outcalling of the Gentiles agrees with the promises to Israel. Peter had argued, “And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they.”

Romans 9-11: The Gospel does not set aside the covenants with Israel. 9.4-5 gives the sevenfold privilege of Israel. “I SAY then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew.... And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is

68 Ibid., n. 1, p. 1150 to Acts. 2.14.
69 Ibid., n. 1, p. 1151 to Acts 2.17.
70 Acts 2.21, 25, taken from Peter’s second recorded sermon (Acts 2.12-26).
71 Acts 15.5.
72 Acts 15.8-11.
written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant unto them, and I shall take away their sins.”

“That Israel has not been forever set aside is the theme of [Romans 11]. (1) The salvation of Paul proves that there is still a remnant (v. 1). (2) The doctrine of the remnant proves it (vs. 2-6). (3) The present national unbelief was foreseen (vs. 7-10). (4) Israel’s unbelief is the Gentile opportunity (vs. 11-25). (5) Israel is judicially broken off from the good olive tree, Christ (vs. 17-22). (6) They are to be grafted in again (vs. 23, 24). (7) The promised Deliverer will come out of Zion and the nation will be saved (vs. 25-29). That the Christian now inherits the distinctive Jewish promises is not taught in Scripture. The Christian is of the heavenly seed of Abraham (Gen. 15.5, 6; Gal. 3.29), and partakes of the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 15.18, note); but Israel as a nation always has its own place, and is yet to have its greatest exaltation as the earthly people of God. See ‘Israel’ (Gen. 12.2; Rom. 11.26); ‘Kingdom’ (Gen. 1.26-28; Zech. 12.8).”

This is where we are in prophecy at the present time: “And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.”

God told Israel, “If my people [Israel], which are called by my name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.” Israel will repent in the future while still in the dispersion: “And shalt return unto the LORD thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul[.]” God will then forgive them, restore them to their land which He gave them, and heal them.

---
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Chapter 9
God desires Gentile nations to glorify Him

God has also given to the Gentile civil governments freedom of choice. Many scriptures illustrate that God wanted Gentile civil governments to recognize Him as who He is: for example, Exodus 7.5, 17; 14.4, 18 (Egypt); Ezekiel 25.11 (Ammonites); 25.14 (Edom); 25.17 (Philistia); 26.6, (Tyre); 28.22, 23, 24 (Zidon); 29.6, 9, 16, 21; 30.8, 19, 25; 32.16 (Egypt); 35.4 (Mt. Seir); 38.23 (the nations); 39.6, 7 (Magog & the heathen). Solomon, in his blessing after dedicating the temple said, “That all the people of the earth may know that the LORD is God, and that there is none else.”¹ David, within his last words, said: “He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.”² [To Nebuchadnezzar it was said] “they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and seven times shall pass over thee, until thou know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will.”³ So it happened and so Nebuchadnezzar then, after being restored to his kingship, “[extolled and honoured] the King of heaven, all of whose works are truth, and his ways judgment,“ recognizing that “those that walk in pride [God] is able to abase.”⁴ So Nebuchadnezzar came to be called the “servant” of Jehovah.⁵ God judged King Belshazzar, Nebuchadnezzar’s son, because he did not humble his heart and “lifted up [himself] against the Lord of heaven” and had not glorified God “in whose hand [Belshazzar’s] breath was and whose were all his ways,” knowing what God had done to his father.⁶ Darius, after seeing that God miraculously delivered Daniel when he was thrown into the den of lions, decreed:

“That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel: for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions.”⁷

Cyrus chose to serve God:

“That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid. Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut.”⁸

God sent Jonah to “cry against” the Gentile city of Nineveh “for their wickedness [had] come up before [Him].”⁹ After Jonah went through the city of

¹ I Kings 8.60.
² II Samuel 23.3-4.
³ Daniel 4.32b.
⁴ Daniel 4.37.
⁵ Jeremiah 25.9; 27.6; 43.10.
⁶ See Daniel 5.17-31.
⁸ Isaiah 44.28-45.1.
⁹ Jonah 1.2.
Nineveh crying, “Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown,”\textsuperscript{10} “[t]he people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them.”\textsuperscript{11} “And God saw their good works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not.”\textsuperscript{12} Unfortunately, more than a century later Nahum delivered an unrelieved warning of judgment because Nineveh had fallen back into moral awfulness:\textsuperscript{13} “[H]e will make an utter end; affliction shall not rise up the second time.”\textsuperscript{14} “According to Diodorus Siculus, the city was destroyed nearly a century later, precisely as [predicted by Nahum].”\textsuperscript{15}

Thus God wishes each civil government to choose to rule for His glory under His precepts; that is, to establish free will for every individual while ruling under biblical principles, but not to enforce God’s rules concerning man’s relationship with God. Just as Belshazzar was without excuse in that he saw what God had done to his father, likewise rulers and civil governments today are without excuse in that the Word of God is available today for all to read and to know God’s principles and His ways.

\textsuperscript{10} Jonah 3.4.
\textsuperscript{11} Jonah 3.5.
\textsuperscript{12} Jonah 3.10.
\textsuperscript{13} Nahum 3.1-19.
\textsuperscript{14} Nahum 1.9.
\textsuperscript{15} 1917 Scofield Reference Edition, headnote to Nahum, p. 952.
Chapter 10
God judges nations

God judges nations. He judged Israel by sending Israel and Judah into captivity because of their repeated failure, despite many warnings from God, to keep His commandments and His statutes. He warned them in advance of what he was going to do. He judged nations by sending Israel and Judah into captivity because of their repeated failure, despite many warnings from God, to keep His commandments and His statutes. He warned them in advance of what he was going to do.1 His prophets repeatedly warned the Jews, not only of the consequences of their sins, but also pointed out their specific sins. Here are a few of the many relevant prophecies of warning to Israel:

“... [F]or the LORD hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood. Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth therein shall languish, with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven; the fishes of the sea also shall be taken away....”2 Israel was willfully ignorant: “... because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no more priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children....”3

God reminds Israel through his prophet Amos of all His judgments against Israel and in spite of those judgments, “yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.” God says, “Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.”4

God wanted Amos to preach 3 things to Israel: (1) the people did not respect the preaching of the word of God;5 (2) Israel did not honor the Sabbath;6 (3) they did not detest sin any more.7 God also wanted Amos to tell Israel exactly what he was about to do. They rejected his message. In fact, they didn’t even want to hear him preach. They rebelled at the message and the messenger.

God also judges Gentile nations. He has given them their authority,8 and will hold them to account:

“The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God. Put them in fear, O LORD: that the nations may know themselves to be but men. Selah.”9

“For the LORD most high is terrible; he is a great King over all the earth. He shall subdue the people under us, and the nations under our feet.”10

Psalm 135.6-12. “Whatsoever the LORD pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places.... Who smote great nations, and slew mighty kings; Sihon king of the Amorites, and Og king of Bashan, and all the kingdoms of Canaan....”11

“To him which smote great kings: for his mercy endureth forever; And slew famous kings, for his mercy endureth forever; [kings named].”12

---

1 See, e.g., Jeremiah 25.11.
2 Hosea 4.1-3.
3 See Hosea 4.6-11.
4 Amos 4.6-13 (part of verses 10 and 12 quoted).
5 Amos 7.10-13, 16.
6 Amos 8.5.
7 Amos 8.14.
8 Daniel 2.37-40.
10 Psalm 47.2-3.
11 Psalm 135.6, 10-11.
12 Psalm 136.17-21.
God used Assyria to judge Israel and then judged Assyria for its pride in boasting that Assyria did this.13

God, through his prophets, told of the coming judgments on all nations, and the reasons for those judgments: destruction of Moab;14 destruction of Damascus;15 burden of Egypt;16 prophecy that Assyria will waste Egypt and Ethiopia;17 burden of Tyre;18 woe of Ephriam;19 Armageddon: “the indignation of the LORD is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them...”;20 judgment of Babylon;21 judgment on Israel’s oppressors;22 all nations to be judged—many nations listed to be judged;23 destruction of Egypt, Philistia, Tyre, Moab, Ammonites, Edom, Damascus, Elam, Babylon, Chaldea, etc.—read through Jeremiah 46-51 and notice the reasons given for destroying these nations; Babylon destroyed because Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, scattered Israel;24 because they [strove] against the LORD;25 the judgment against Babylon and all the inhabitants of Chaldea because of the violence and evil done to Israel;26 judgments against various nations in Ezekiel 25-32—the reason for each judgment given and the judgment; judgment of the Gentile nations in Joel 3.2-8 after Armageddon; judgments on people surrounding Israel prophesied in Amos 1.1-2.3; judgments on certain nations prophesied in Zephaniah 2.4-15; Zechariah, more than Haggai or Malachi, gives God’s thoughts about the treatment of Israel by nations surrounding Israel—He has given them their authority and will hold them to account, the test being their treatment of Israel. “For thus saith the LORD of hosts: After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you: for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye.”27

The test for a Gentile nation, as always, is the way a nation treats Israel. “And I will make of thee [Israel] a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; And I will bless them that bless thee, and cursed be he that curseth thee: and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”28 “Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee.”29 “He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion: who shall stir him up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee.”30 Nations that blessed Israel have invariably been blessed, those that have persecuted Israel have suffered ill.31 A careful study of ancient history and of current events reveals that disaster follows when a nation “curses” the nation Israel.32

---
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The “times of the Gentiles,” a period during which Jerusalem is under Gentile rule, began when Nebuchadnezzar carried Zedekiah into Babylon, since which time Jerusalem has been under Gentile rule. Only a remnant returned to Israel after seventy years in captivity. That remnant remained until Jerusalem was destroyed and the Jews were dispersed throughout all nations. Christ foretold: “And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.”

The whole world system, made up of the Gentile nations after the dispersion of the Jews, fell into and will remain in confusion until the Lord returns, conquers the nations with a crushing blow, and sets up His kingdom. Ultimately, Christ will return and gather the nation Israel, the “the apple of the eye of the Lord of hosts,” from all nations where He has scattered them, and bring them into the land He has given them: “Thus saith the LORD of hosts: Behold, I will save my people from the east country, and from the west country; And I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God, in truth and in righteousness.” He will establish His kingdom by power, not persuasion. This will be after the divine judgment upon the Gentile world powers:

“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.” “And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.”

In addition to His treatment of Israel at His return, Christ will destroy the present political world-system and judge the nations. Then there will follow world-wide Gentile conversion and participation in the blessings of the kingdom:

“Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.”

---
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“And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD’S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”

“And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.”

“And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.”

“Thus saith the LORD; I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth; and the mountain of the LORD of hosts the holy mountain.... Thus saith the LORD of hosts; It shall come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: ... Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you.”

“And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the king, the LORD of hosts, upon them shall be no rain. And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, that have no rain; there shall be the plague, wherewith the LORD will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles. This shall be the punishment of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of the tabernacles. In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD; and the posts in the LORD’S house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the LORD of hosts: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein: and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the LORD of hosts.”

“For then [in context, after the Lord crushes the nations] will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the LORD, to serve him with one consent.”

“And to this agree the words of the prophets: as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.”

“And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.
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And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years. And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had perceived his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that that part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

God will use Israel to “break in pieces the nations.” The order of events [of the last days] is:

“(1) We are now at the end of the times of the Gentiles. The end began in 1948 when Israel became a nation. A nation was born in one day. The return was a miraculously event fulfilling the scripture that a nation would be ‘Born in a day.’ ‘Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children.” They returned in unbelief; the Prophet Ezekiel foretold this return of the Jews without God, trusting in their own strength. Without the Holy Spirit the Jews are nothing but ‘dry bones.’ The yearning in the heart of the Jews for their land—“Next Year in Jerusalem”—has been the watch cry of Jews for 2000 years. They started going back at the beginning of the 13th Century because of persecution. A trickle in the beginning has reached around 5 million today. Israel is returning to the land in unbelief. ‘Now learn a parable of the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.’

The fig tree is Israel. (2) Invasion of Israel by Russia and Moslem allies — Magog (Rosh), Meshech (Moscow-Eastern Capitol), Tubal—(Western Capitol), Persia—(Iran), Ethiopia, Libya, Gomer—(Southern Russia), Togarmah. This alliance includes Russia, Iran (Persia) and their Moslem allies. These nations will be miraculously defeated by Israel. “(3) The invasion of Palestine by Gentile world powers headed up under the Beast and false prophet. (4) The destruction of the invaders by the Lord’s army, and the repentance of Judah in the land. (5) The answer of Jehovah. (6) The pouring out of the Spirit. (7) The return of the Lord in glory and the setting up of the kingdom by the regathering of the nation and the judgment of the nations. (8) Full and permanent kingdom blessing.”

---
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Chapter 1
Satan orchestrates the world-system

Sometime long ago, Satan rebelled against God, thereby introducing sin to the world:

“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; That made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners?” [Notice Satan’s five “I wills.”]

“His ‘I will’ (Isa. 14:13) marks the introduction of sin into the universe. Cast out of heaven (Lk. 10:18) he makes earth and air the scene of his tireless activity (Eph. 2:2; 1 Pet. 5:8). After the creation of man he entered into the serpent. (Gen. 3:1, note) and, beguiling Eve by his subtlety, secured the downfall of Adam and through him of the race, and the entrance of sin into the world of men (Rom. 5:12-14).”

Satan seduced Eve with the same temptation whereby he was tempted: “I will be like the most High.” He said to Eve: “For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” Since that day, Satan has been the god of this world, but,

“[t]he Adamic Covenant (Gen 3:14, note) promised the ultimate destruction of Satan through the ‘Seed of the woman.’ Then began his long warfare against the work of God in behalf of humanity, which still continues. The present world-system (Rev. 13:8) organized upon the principle of force, greed, selfishness, ambition, and sinful pleasure, is his work and was the bribe which he offered to Christ (Mt. 4:8-9). Of that world-system he is prince (John 14:30; 16:11) and god (2 Cor. 4:4). As ‘prince of the power of the air’ (Eph. 2:2) he is at the head of vast host of demons. (Mt. 7:22, note). To him, under God, was committed upon earth the power of death (Heb. 2:14). Cast out of heaven as his proper sphere and ‘first estate,’ he still has access to God as the ‘accuser of the brethren’ (Rev. 12:10) and is permitted a certain power of sifting or testing the self-confident and carnal among believers (Job 1:6-11; Lk. 22:31-32; 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20) but this is strictly permissive and limited power, and believers so sifted are kept in faith through the advocacy of Christ (Lk. 22:31-32; 1 John 2:1, note). At the beginning of the great tribulation Satan's privilege of access to God as accuser will be withdrawn (Rev. 12:7-12). At the return of Christ in glory Satan will be bound for one thousand years (Rev. 20:2) after which he will be ‘loosed for a little season’ (Rev. 20:3, 7-8) and will become the head of final effort to overthrow the kingdom. Defeated in this, he will be finally cast into the lake of fire, his final doom. The notion that he reigns in hell is Miltonic, not biblical. He is prince of this present world-system, but will be tormented in the lake of fire.”

Men, except for the remnant, and nations always choose the principles of Satan over the principles of God, and men and nations will always suffer the consequences.

1 Isaiah 14.12-17.
3 Genesis 3.5.
“Kosmos [translated ‘world’ in Revelation 13.8] in the sense of the present world-system, the ethically bad sense of the word, refers to the ‘order,’ ‘arrangement,’ under which Satan has organized the world of unbelieving mankind upon his cosmic principles of force, greed, selfishness, ambition, and pleasure:

“Mt. 4.8, 9 ['Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'];

“John 12.31 [[Jesus said] ‘Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.’]; 14.30 [[Jesus said] ‘Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.’];

“John 14.30 ['Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me. ‘]

“John 18.36 ['Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. ‘]

“Eph. 2.2 ['Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.' Ephesians 4.3 goes on to say, 'Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. ‘];

“Eph. 6.12 ['For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. ‘];

“I John 2.15-17 ['Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. ‘]

“This world-system is imposing and powerful with armies and fleets; is often outwardly religious, scientific, cultured, and elegant; but, seething with national and commercial rivalries and ambitions, is upheld in any real crisis only by armed force, and is dominated by satanic principles.”

The god of this world blinds people to the truth.

“But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”

At the same time Satan is blinding people to truth, he indoctrinates people into his world principles.

A specific instance of God directly addressing Satan is recounted in Ezekiel 28. Although speaking to the king of Tyre,

“as in Isaiah 14.12, the language goes beyond the King of Tyre to Satan, inspirer and unseen ruler of such pomp and pride as that of Tyre…. The unfallen state of Satan is here described; his fall in Isa. 14.12-14 [supra]. (See Rev. 20.10, note). But there is more. The vision is not of Satan in his own person, but of Satan fulfilling himself in and through an

6 II Corinthians 4.3-4.
earthly king who arrogates to himself divine honours, so that the prince of Tyre foreshadows the beast (Dan. 7.8; Rev. 19.20).” [Notice God’s five “I wills in Ezekiel 28.16-18.]

Does God desire that a government be under Satan? No! Pursuant to the Word of God, God desires every government—self-government, family government, civil government, and church government—to be under Him. But He gives every government a choice. To verify this, look at the verses cited above and then read through the Bible looking at how God deals with governments. Even a nation (civil government) can repent and turn to God at any time. God through Jeremiah said:

“At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them.”

Just as the doom of self, family, and churches is directed by Satan, so will the downfall of all nations be orchestrated by Satan. It is important to remember, however, that God gives every individual, every family, every church, and every nation a choice between going by His or Satan’s principles. All individuals and institutions are doomed if they let Satan’s principles of force, greed, selfishness, ambition, and/or pleasure influence them to give in to their lusts and follow Satan. Ultimately, as the Bible reveals, one’s only hope is to come to God with a humble and contrite spirit, repent of sins, and trust the Lord Jesus Christ as his/her personal savior. This will be the beginning of a new life in which one who continues in His Word will become His disciple and will know the truth which will set him free.

---
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Chapter 12
Conclusion

Salvation is the beginning of a new life. After salvation, one’s purpose is to glorify God. Jesus said to Peter who rebuked Him for speaking of His coming sufferings and death at the hands of the elders and chief priests and scribes:

“Get thee behind me Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men. If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.”

Hope begins with the individual, with self-governments. A saved individual has hope. He has rejected sin and Satan and his rule and turned to Christ and His principles.

One who is saved, continues in God’s Word, and seeks to live according to biblical principles has the promise of persecution while on this earth: “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” Some Christians forget that although every saved person will go to heaven, there they will still be rewarded according to their works:

“For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay stubble; Every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved: yet so as by fire.”

A church, a family, or a nation made up of Christians (those who are saved and follow the principles of God) has hope. Peter makes clear he will keep his brethren in remembrance that a Christian needs certain things to prevent himself from being barren and unfruitful and to keep himself from falling—faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. God would have us exercise these qualities in all things.

“All things would include all principles of the Word of God: the doctrines of church, state, and separation of church and state are therefore to be studied diligently and applied by the Christian. Unfortunately, most Christians are deficient, especially in knowledge. The principle of Hosea 4.6-19 concerning rejection of knowledge and the inevitable consequences thereof, although
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directed immediately to the children of Israel, is also a general principle which applies to believers today. Sadly, in any nation, the lost and the saved who are not seeking to follow after God’s principles always outnumber Christians, at least in the long run. As a result, no civil government has ever been under God for any length of time, and every civil government has been or will be judged by God before He sets up His kingdom.

Did God give us all the principles people need for success as individuals, as families, and as nations knowing that we would always ultimately fail? Yes. He knew it from the beginning. He knew we would totally destroy ourselves even with all His wisdom at our disposal. He knew that we would ultimately totally reject all His wisdom, statutes, and commandments. And along the way, He knew that no one, at any time, would ever fully comprehend God and God’s ways. He knew man would blow it. Yet, because of His love, He sent His own Son to pay the price for our monstrous sins. He gave each and every person a way out. That way was not oneself, one’s conscience, one’s family, one’s virtue, one’s good deeds, one’s church membership, one’s baptism, or one’s civil government. That way was His Son. Period.
“And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

“How that by revelation he made known unto me [Paul] a mystery; And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord:”

1 Matthew 16.18.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

As foretold by Isaiah, John the Baptist announced:

“Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.”

The phrase “kingdom of heaven”

“is peculiar to Matthew and signifies the Messianic earth rule of Jesus Christ, the Son of David. It is called the kingdom of the heavens because it is the rule of the heavens over the earth (Mt. 6.10). The phrase is derived from Daniel, where it is defined (Dan. 2.34-36, 44; 7.23-27) as the kingdom which ‘the God of heaven’ will set up after the destruction by ‘the stone cut without hands’ of the Gentile world-system. It is the kingdom covenanted to David’s seed (2 Sam. 7.7-10, refs.); described in the prophets (Zech. 12.8, note); and confirmed to be Jesus the Christ, the Son of Mary, through the angel Gabriel (Lk. 1.32, 33).

After Israel morally rejected the kingdom of heaven, Jesus predicted judgment on the places chosen for the testing of the nation, Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, “wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not.”

Jesus, at that point, turned from the rejecting nation, offered rest and service to individuals in the nation, and turned to the Gentiles. “In fulfillment this awaited the official rejection, crucifixion, and resurrection of Christ, and the final rejection of the risen Christ (Lk. 24.46, 47; Acts 9.15; 13.46; 28.25-28; Rom. 11.11).”

Just as God ordained civil government, He also ordained the church after the nation Israel rejected Him and the kingdom of heaven. The power given by God to the church was to secure a spiritual good for its members. When Christ asked His disciples whom they thought Him to be, Peter answered “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” At that point, our Lord announced the out calling of the church when He said: “And I say also unto thee, [t]hat thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

The building of the church is on the rock of Peter’s confession, the Christ he confessed. Peter makes clear that the rock upon which the Lord will build His church, which is a spiritual house made up of spiritual beings offering up spiritual sacrifices, and not a physical house made by man, is Christ Himself:

---
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“To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner. And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.”

“This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.” From the context, it is obvious that Peter is speaking of the Lord as being the chief corner stone.

Nowhere in the Bible is there any indication that Peter was the cornerstone of the church. The words used also make clear that Christ was referring to Himself as the rock on which the church would be built.

“There is in the Greek [in Matthew 16.18] a play upon the words, “thou art Peter [petros—literally, ‘a little rock’], and upon this rock [Petra] I will build my church.” He does not promise to build His church upon Peter, but upon Himself, as Peter himself is careful to tell us (1 Pet. 2.4-9).”

Jesus Christ, Head of the church, “loved the church and gave Himself for it.” Jesus did not give Peter the keys—a key being a badge of power or authority (see, e.g., Isaiah 22.22 and Revelation 3.7)—to the church, but to “the kingdom of heaven” the keys in the sense of Matthew 13, that is of the sphere of Christian profession. Peter assumed no other authority. In the council at Jerusalem as recorded in Acts 15, James seems to have presided. Peter claimed nothing more than to be an apostle by gift and an elder by office. The power of binding and loosing was shared by the other apostles. Since only Christ held the keys of death and the place of departed spirits, “this did not involve the determination of the eternal destiny of souls.” “I [Jesus Christ] am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.”

Isaac Backus, the great Baptist leader in New England, elaborated upon the faith confessed by Peter:

“This faith is the foundation of the church; against this faith the gates of hell shall not prevail; this faith hath the keys of the kingdom of heaven; what this faith shall loose or bind on earth, is bound and loosed in heaven.... Now it followeth, that whatsoever person hath received the same precious faith with Peter, as all the faithful have, 2 Pet. i. 1, that person hath a part in this gift of Christ. Whosoever doth confess, publish, manifest or make known Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, and Saviour of the world, that person opens heavens gates, looeth sin, and partakes with Peter in the use of the keys; and hereupon it followeth necessarily, that one faithful man, yea, or woman either, may loose and bind, both in heaven and earth, as all the ministers in the world.”

10 I Peter 2.4-9.
11 Acts 4.11, part of Peter’s address to the Sanhedrin.
13 Ephesians 5.25.
14 See I Peter 1.1 and 5.1.
15 See Matthew 18.18 and John 20.23.
17 Revelation 1.18.
Paul’s epistles develop the doctrine of the church. The Lord did not explain how, when, or of what materials the church should be built, or of what should be its position, relationships, privileges or duties.\textsuperscript{19} God revealed to Paul the mystery of the church which was to be made up of both Jewish and Gentile believers. He, through the Apostle Paul, explained the purpose, membership, make-up, and operation of the church and relationship of His church to the Lord Jesus. “Through Paul alone we know that the church is not an organization, but an organism, the body of Christ.”\textsuperscript{20}

God’s Word describes the church as being the bride of Christ and the wife of Christ. Those designations carry connotations about how He feels about His relationship with His church, and the Word of God gives ample instruction to alert the church member to what this relationship entails.

Although the Lord made clear that He wants every church to be under Him in all things, God allows men in a church free-will to decide whether to do things His way.

Our Lord warned against false teachers to come and some writers of the New Testament warned of already existing apostasy in the church and revealed that before the return of Christ true believers would all be raptured and those left behind in the visible “church” would go into total apostasy, be called a whore and not a church, and be destroyed by the nations. Religious apostasy of some churches in America began with the importation from Europe of modernism and has recently accelerated as seen in the recent Church Growth Movement and, after that, the Emerging Church Movement.

Because of the signs of the times, as related to biblical prophecy, true believers should be vigilant in seeking the salvation of the lost since it appears that the Lord will return soon. Only true believers have the ultimate hope: the true church will reign with the Lord. The Holy Spirit is now calling out, not the subjects, but the co-heirs and co-rulers of the kingdom. Since the Lord told believers to love others, they should have a great burden for the salvation of the lost.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
Chapter 2
Definition, organization, and purposes of a church

The author does not agree with covenant theologians in their interpretation of Scripture. The author does not accept the definition of “church” given by Covenant theologians: “The community of all true believers for all time.” Instead, for many reasons, some of which are discussed in Part One (Sections I, II, and III), this author believes that the dispensational view of the church is correct. All true believers in Christ, whether before or after His death and resurrection, are saved. However, the church, as such, is never mentioned in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, as in the New, God dealt with individuals, on the basis of their faith or absence of faith in Christ. In the Old Testament, God also dealt with nations, and most of the Old Testament tells of God’s dealings with nations, especially the nation Israel and Gentile nations as they related to Israel. However, no organism which resembled the New Testament church was described in the Old Testament. Old Testament believers were told at times to assemble to worship God, but nowhere were they described as the church is described in the New Testament.

Furthermore, the author does not believe that the church has replaced Israel. Covenant theologians believe that the church has replaced Israel and that God’s principles regarding the nation Israel should be applied to the church. The author addresses this in Section III. Section IV shows the anti-biblical consequences of the brand of Covenant Theology practiced in Europe and brought to America by established Protestant churches.

A church is made up of visible people who have made a profession of faith in Jesus Christ. On the other hand, the author believes that since one cannot see the spiritual condition of people’s hearts, in one sense a church, which is the fellowship of believers, is invisible. “We can see those who outwardly attend the church, and we can see outward evidences of inward spiritual change, but we cannot actually see into people’s hearts and view their spiritual state. Only God can do that…. The invisible church is the church as God sees it.” Therefore, one can be in the visible church, yet unregenerate, lost, and destined for hell.

“The predicted future of the visible Church is apostasy (Lk. 18.8; 2 Tim. 3.1-8); of the true Church, glory (Mt. 13.36-43; Rom. 8.18-23; 1 Thes. 4.14-17).” When Lord returns with “his mighty angels,” He will “In flaming fire tak[e] vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ[].”

This does not mean that Christians are to be “fruit inspectors.” A church is authorized to remove a professed believer from fellowship only, and that for gross immorality in order to “deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction

---

2 Ibid., p. 853.
3 See, e.g., Deuteronomy 4.10.
4 See Grudem, pp. 859-863.
7 II Thessalonians 1.7-8.
of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

Obviously, the author rejects the Roman Catholic position that the Roman Catholic “church” is the only true church. The Roman Catholic “church” has been responsible for the persecution of untold millions of believers when that “church” had earthly authority. The persecution was based upon a false theology. Study of God’s Word, without brainwashing, a practice which the vast majority of Roman Catholic churches have traditionally condemned, reveals the fallacies of Roman Catholic theology. The author believes that many Catholics today are probably saved, but ignorant. Otherwise, they would leave the harlot church and join a Bible believing New Testament church.

In the New Testament, the church is spoken of in two senses. In one sense, the church is the community of all true believers. Jesus Christ promised, in speaking to Peter, “Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church.”

“And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”

“Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.”

All true believers are members of the church which is the wife of Christ, and the bride of Christ. All true believers are members of the body of Christ. All true believers who are added to the church and know the Lord will be part of the marriage of the Lamb.

In a second sense, the church is a local body of believers. In this sense, a church has a visible aspect—it is a church as Christians see it. All references to a church here on the earth refer to an autonomous local body of Jewish and/or Gentile believers and not to a universal or catholic church. Nowhere in the New Testament is a church here on the earth ever referred to as anything other than a local spiritual body and nowhere does Scripture teach that a church is to have any type authority above it other than the Lord Jesus Christ. Some examples of references to churches as they existed in the New Testament follow:

“Then had the churches rest throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.”

Paul said, “Likewise greet the church that is in their house.” Notice that the church refers to the local body of baptized believers. The house was just the place where they met; it was not a church.

Paul wrote to the church in Corinth, “Paul ... Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both their’s and our’s.”

“If therefore the whole church be come together into one place....”

“The churches [Not “the church of Asia”] of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house.”

---
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“Paul … unto Philemon … and to the church in thy house.”

“... [T]hat thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.”

The Bible defines “house of God”: “For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house; as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken of after; But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.”

In Revelation, the Lord speaks to “the church of Ephesus,” “the church in Smyrna,” “the church in Pergamos,” “the church in Thyatira,” “the church in Sardis,” “the church in Philadelphia,” and “the church of the Laodiceans.”

Baptists have always recognized the biblical teaching as to this aspect of a church—that is, that a church on earth is only a local spiritual body of believers whose head is Jesus Christ. As Isaac Backus wisely noted:

“[A] power in councils above particular churches has no foundation in Scripture, and is an endless source of confusion among Christians.... In all earthly governments, the laws are executed in the name of the supreme authority of it, which can see but a little of what is done in its name. But the Son of God is present in every church, as well as through the world, by his universal knowledge and power; and if any of his churches leave their first love, and will not repent, he removes the candlestick out of his place. Rev. ii. 1-5.”

J. M. Carroll said this:

“[N]either Christ nor His apostles, ever gave to His followers, what is known today as a denominational name, such as ‘Catholic,’ ‘Lutheran,’ ‘Presbyterian,’ ‘Episcopal,’ and so forth—unless the name given by Christ to John was intended for such, ‘The Baptist,’ ‘John the Baptist.’ (Matt.11:11 and 10 or 12 other times.) Christ called the individual follower ‘disciple.’ Two or more were called ‘disciples.’ The organization of disciples, whether at Jerusalem or Antioch or elsewhere, was called Church. If more than one of these separate organizations were referred to, they were called Churches. The word church in the singular was never used when referring to more than one of these organizations. Nor even when referring to them all.”

To help us understand the nature of the church, Scripture describes a church in many ways. A church is a family. “Rebuke not an elder, but intreat him as a father; and the younger men as brethren; The elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity.” “And [I] will be a Father unto you, and ye
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shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.”32 “And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.”33

A church is called the body of Christ, and therefore a living organism, not a congregation. The Holy Spirit forms the church.

“(2)(g) When Peter opened the door of the kingdom to the Gentiles (Acts 10), the Holy Spirit, without delay, or other condition than faith, was given to those who believed (Acts 10.44; 11.15-18). This is the permanent fact for the entire church-age. Every believer is born of the Spirit (John 3.3, 6; 1 John 5.1), indwelt by the Spirit, whose presence makes the believer’s body a temple (1 Cor. 6.19; Rom. 8.9-15; 1 John 2.27; Gal. 4.6), and baptized by the Spirit (1 Cor. 12.12, 13; 1 John 2.20, 27), thus sealing him for God (Eph. 1.13; 4.30)…. (5) The Holy Spirit forms the church (Mt. 16.18; Heb. 12.23, note) by baptizing all believers into the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12.12, 13), imparts gifts for service to every member of that body (1 Cor. 12.7-11, 27, 30), guides the members in their service (Lk. 2.27; 4.1; Acts 16.6, 7), and is Himself the power of that service (Acts 1.8; 2.4; 1 Cor. 2.4).”34

Although the word “congregation” is used several hundred times in the Old Testament, it appears only once in the New Testament, in Acts 13.43, referring to a meeting of the Jews in the synagogue at Antioch where Paul had preached to them on the Sabbath day. A “congregation” is “an assembly of persons, or a gathering; especially, an assembly of persons met for worship and religious instruction.”35 On the other hand, a New Testament church is described as a spiritual body wherein each member has a specific purpose. For the church body to function correctly, all the members must perform their functions. The difference between the church, a spiritual body, and a congregation is significant: a church body is a spiritual organism whereas a congregation is an earthly gathering of people.

Paul gives two metaphors of the body. In the first, Christ is outside the body, that is outside the church. He is not described as the head of the body:

“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole body were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary: And those members of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon 32 II Corinthians 6.18.
33 Matthew 12.49-50.
35 See AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828) definition of “CONGREGATION” and MERRIAM WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 243 (10th ed. 1995), definition of “congregation.”

According to one Rabbi Hisda, the Hebrew word sbr meaning “assembly” or “congregation” is a contraction of three words: s from saddiqim (meaning “righteous”) plus b from benonim ("middle of the road persons") and r from reshan ("wicked ones"). Leonard Verduin, The Anatomy of a Hybrid (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Derdmans Publishing Co., 1976), fn W, p. 216.
these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need: but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked: That there should be no schism in the body: but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.  

In other passages, Christ is depicted as the head of the church and the earthly members as the body.

“And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”  

“But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.”  

“And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.”  

The church is also compared to a pearl of great price which “a merchant man sold all that he had, and bought it;” the Father’s love gift to Jesus Christ, the bride and wife of Christ, who is the Head of the church as the husband is the head of the wife; a virgin espoused to one husband; “the household of God” and “an holy temple in the Lord;” branches on a vine, an olive tree; a field of crops; “God’s husbandry and God’s building”; a harvest; “lively stones, built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ;” Christ’s house built by Christ Himself, and “the pillar and ground of the truth.” God gave each metaphor for a reason. Wayne Grudem explains:

“Each of the metaphors used for the church can help us to appreciate more of the richness of privilege that God has given us by incorporating us into the church. The fact that the
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church is like a family should increase our love and fellowship with one another. The thought that the church is like the bride of Christ should stimulate us to strive for greater purity and holiness, and also greater love for Christ and submission to him. The image of the church as branches in a vine should cause us to rest in him more fully. The idea of an agricultural crop should encourage us to continue growing in the Christian life and obtaining for ourselves and others the proper spiritual nutrients to grow. The picture of the church as God’s new temple should increase our awareness of God’s very presence dwelling in our midst as we meet. The concept of the church as a priesthood should help us to see more clearly the delight God has in the sacrifices of praise and good deeds that we offer to him (See Heb. 13.15-16). The metaphor of the church as the body of Christ should increase our interdependence on one another and our appreciation of the diversity of gifts within the body. Many other applications could be drawn from these and other metaphors for the church listed in Scripture.”

How can one recognize a true church? J. M. Carroll, in describing the overall organization of the church, listed eleven “Marks of a New Testament Church:

1. Its Head and Founder—CHRIST. He is the lawgiver; the Church is only the executive. (Matt. 16:18; Col. 1:18.)
2. Its only rule of faith and practice—THE BIBLE. (II Tim. 3:15-17.)
3. Its name—‘CHURCH,’ ‘CHURCHES.’ (Matt. 16:18; Rev. 22:16.)
4. Its polity—CONGREGATIONAL—all members equal. (Matt. 20:24-28; Matt. 23:5-12.)
5. Its members—only saved people. (Eph 2:21-22; I Peter 2:5.)
6. Its ordinances—BELIEVER’S BAPTISM, FOLLOWED BY THE LORD’S SUPPER. (Matt. 28:19-20.)
7. Its officers—PASTORS AND DEACONS. (I Tim. 3:1-16.)
8. Its work—getting folks saved, baptizing them (with a baptism that meets all the requirements of God’s Word), teaching them (‘to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you’). (Matt. 28:16-20.)
9. Its financial plan—‘Even so (TITHES and OFFERINGS) hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.’ (I Cor. 9.14.)
10. Its weapons of warfare—spiritual, not carnal. (II Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:10-20.)
11. Its independence—separation of Church and State. (Matt. 22:21.)

Certainly, a preacher on the street corner with a crowd around him as he preaches is not a church. Nor is a group of people meeting in a house and preaching the Word. However, if that house group initiates a proper baptism for new believers and begins to partake of the Lord’s Supper, a church comes into existence. The Lord adds those who are saved to the church, although it is the obligation of saved people to assume their role in a church body. A church body must practice baptism of those who get saved and partake of the Lord’s Supper. Where only false doctrines are preached, no church can exist. For example, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Islam, and the Jehovah’s Witnesses are not churches. “When the preaching of a church conceals the gospel message of salvation by faith alone from its members, so that the gospel message is not clearly proclaimed, and has not been proclaimed for some time, the group meeting there is not a church.”

A church can exist only where the Bible is believed to be the inerrant Word of God, where the Bible is the sole basis for faith and practice, and where that Bible is preached.

A church has responsibilities. Strong, knowledgeable believers who are walking in the spirit will practice all their God-given responsibilities. Included
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in those responsibilities, but not developed in this chapter or section, is the responsibility to “present [the church] as a chaste virgin to Christ.”

Worship is preeminent for the believer and for a church. “Worship” means “[t]o adore; to pay divine honor to; to reverence with supreme respect and veneration.”

“We should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.”

“Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ[.]”

The principles of worship set out in Exodus 30, the great worship chapter, still apply. Exodus 30.38 condemns “making worship a mere pleasure to the natural man, whether sensuous, as in … music …, or eloquence, merely to give delight to the natural mind.”

Christians are to worship God in spirit and in truth. The Word of God contains principles regarding appropriate music, dress, conduct, and attitude for worship. The Lord commanded, “Ye shall offer no strange incense [on the altar of incense], nor burnt sacrifice, nor meat offering; neither shall ye pour drink offering thereon.”

No ‘strange’ incense was to be offered (that is simulated or purely formal worship forbidden) and no “strange” fire was permitted (referring “to the excitation of ‘religious’ feelings by merely sensuous means, and to the substitution for devotion to Christ of any other devotion, as to religious causes, as sects.”)

A church is to nurture her members and to aid in the maturing of their faith. God gifted members of a church “For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:”

The church is to preach Christ, “warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus[.]”

The church has the responsibility to evangelize. “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Along with the obligation to evangelize goes helping and doing good to fellow believers as well as to unbelievers.
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“But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful.”

“But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?”

“Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judaea:”

“Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men.”

“See that none render evil for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men.”

“Praying us with much intreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints.”

“What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.”

A church is united together and to Christ by the baptism with the Holy Spirit. As such, it is a holy temple for the habitation of God through the Spirit; and espoused to Him as a chaste virgin to one husband. Other metaphors, as pointed out above, have also been used to describe a church. Local churches assemble in His name for the breaking of bread, worship, praise, prayer, testimony, the ministry of the word, discipline, and the furtherance of the Gospel. Every such local church has Christ in the midst, is a temple of God, indwelt by the Holy Spirit, and is “the pillar and ground of the truth.” Only the assembly where the true doctrine is preached is a church: “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” A church is the body of Christ of which He is the Head. Christ desires that a church remain solely under Him: “And [God] hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church.” “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church.”
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Chapter 3
Christ, the Bridegroom/Husband/Head of the church

Christ is the Bridegroom/Husband/Head of the church. As to the issue of separation of church and state, this is particularly important as will be shown in Sections III, IV, and VI.

The Church is called the bride of the Lamb: “Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled.”

“Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.”

The New Testament speaks of the church as the virgin espoused to one Husband; Eve is a type of the church as bride and wife of Christ: “Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly: and indeed bear with me. For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.”

Paul likens the marriage relationship of husband and wife to the relationship of Christ and His church: “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. For no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.”

“And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.”

Various people in the Old Testament are types of Christ, the Bridegroom, and the church, the bride. For example, Rebecca was a type of the church, the “called out” virgin bride of Christ. Isaac was a type of the Bridegroom, who loves through the testimony of the unnamed Servant:
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4 Ephesians 5.23, 25-27, 29-33.
5 Revelation 19.6-8.
Isaac was a type of the Bridegroom who goes out to meet and receive his bride.

“For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first.”

“Typically, the book of Ruth may be taken as a foreview of the church—Ruth, as the Gentile bride of Christ, the Bethlehemite who is able to redeem.”

The coming of the Bridegroom is cause for great rejoicing by the believer, the friend of the Bridegroom. The marriage of the Lamb to His bride the church will be a glorious event which will occur in heaven, unlike the restoration of Israel which will take place on the earth:

“Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints. And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God.”

The husband is to be the only head of the wife, and Christ is to be the only Head of His churches:

See Ephesians 5.23, 25-27, 29-33 quoted above.

“And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church.”

After Jesus was born, “there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, Saying, where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.” “The King’ is one of the divine titles (Psa. 10.6), and so used in the worship of the Church (I Tim. 1.17), but Christ is never called ‘King of the Church.’ He is ‘King of the Jews’ (Mt. 2.2) and Lord and ‘Head of the Church’ (Eph. 1.22, 23).”

“Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.”

Christ, likened unto a husband, because of His love for the church, gave Himself to redeem the church. He is, in love, sanctifying the church, and will present the church to Himself as a reward for His sacrifice and labor of love, a

---
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Chapter 3: Christ, the Bridegroom/Husband/Head of the church

glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, a perfect church without spot or blemish, “one pearl of great price.”  

Jesus is the Father’s love-gift to the world:

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

The believer, the church member, is His reward, given Him as a love-gift by the Father:

“As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.”

“I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.”

“I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.”

“And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled.”

“Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.”

Just as a bridegroom gives gifts to his earthly bride, so Christ gives gifts to His bride, to those whom the Father gave Him:

Eternal life: “As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.”

The Father’s name: “I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word: And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.”

Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.”

The Father’s words: “For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me:... I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.”

---
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His own joy: “And now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves.”

His own glory: “And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one.”

Loving God is preeminent for a believer and for a church. One does not love God by just asserting that he loves God. Jesus said, “If ye love me, keep my commandments.” The greatest commandment is to love the Lord with all one’s heart, soul, mind, and strength.

Love is action. This love between Christ and His church is seen in the Song of Solomon:

The Song of Solomon, “[p]rimarily, is the expression of pure marital love as ordained of God in creation, and the vindication of that love as against both asceticism and lust—the two profanations of the holiness of marriage. The secondary and larger interpretation is of Christ, the Son and His heavenly bride, the Church (2 Cor. 11.1-4, refs.).”

“Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it: if a man would give all the substance of his house for love, it would be utterly contemned.” “Contemned” means “despised, scorned, slighted, neglected, or rejected with disdain.” God despises, scorn, slight, neglect, or reject with disdain all that a church does, whatever professions of love she makes, if those acts and/or professions are without love. A church that does not honor Christ as a wife is to honor her husband, her bridegroom, by remaining pure and chaste, does not display love for the Lord. Thus, loving ones neighbor by witnessing to him, sending missionaries to him, helping him materially or any other way in obedience to the second commandment—“Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself”—is vanity in God’s eyes if one ignores the greatest commandment.

This fact is also articulated in the New Testament. The Lord Jesus is jealous over His church. If we do not love the Lord Jesus, He despises all the “Christian” work we do and the money we put in the offering plate:

“Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.”

“In a theological sense, [‘charity’] “includes supreme love to God and a universal good will to men. 1 Cor. xiii. Col. iii. 1 Tim. i.” Love is an act of the will. A church refutes its proclamations of love for the Lord when it wholly or partially takes the church from under the headship of her Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ.
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Love “[r]ejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.”

Iniquity means “Injustice, unrighteousness, … [w]ant of rectitude [rightness in principle or practice], … a sin or crime; wickedness….” Bible truth makes clear that the love of Christ for His church is immense, that He wants to be the only Head and companion of the church which is likened to His wife and bride, and that for a church to even partially put herself under or associate with another entity is a great wickedness and repudiates all professions of love for the Lord. As will be shown in Section VI, the church that incorporates and secures a 501(c)(3) tax exemption puts herself partially under another head, commits a wicked sinful act in violation of biblical principle, and rejoices in iniquity.

The Lord Jesus gave a warning to the church at Ephesus:

“I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name’s sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted. Nevertheless, I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.”

As Dr. J. Vernon McGee teaches us, this warning was for every church that has lost her love for the Lord Jesus:

“It was a warning of danger of getting away from a personal and loving relationship with Jesus Christ. The real test of any believer, especially those who are attempting to serve Him, is not your little method or mode or system, or your dedication, or any of the things that are so often emphasized today. The one question is: Do you love Him? Do you love the Lord Jesus? When you love Him, you will be in a right relationship with Him, but when you begin to depart from the person of Christ, it will finally lead to lukewarmness. The apostate church was guilty of lukewarmness. It may not seem to be too bad, but it is the worst condition that anyone can be in. A great preacher in upper New York state said: ‘Twenty lukewarm Christians hurt the cause of Christ more than one blatant atheist.’ A lukewarm church is a disgrace to Christ.”

As the Lord Jesus Christ is jealous over His churches, so should pastors and church members be jealous, with a godly jealousy, over the church they belong to, just as Paul was:

“For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtility, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.”

The church that really loves her Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ, will seek to maintain her purity, to be subject to her Husband in all things. All the professions of love, all the good deeds, the hymns sung, and the messages preached by a church which does not totally submit herself in all things to her Husband, are contemned by the Lord. As will be shown in Section VI, a church

36 I Corinthians 13.6.
37 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828), definitions of “ INIQUITY” and “RECTITUDE.”
38 Revelation 2.2-5.
40 II Corinthians 11.2-4; Luke 18.8; II Timothy 3.1-8.
that takes a 501(c)(3) tax exemption, an incorporation, a license, or any type
permit from the state, or puts herself under the state in any way, becomes an
earthly legal entity subject to the jurisdiction of an earthly power, the civil
government. Such a “church” is in fact a two headed monster. Such a “church,”
in spite of any professions of love for the Lord, according to her acts shows that
she does not love the Lord Jesus Christ.
Chapter 4
Heresy and apostasy

Prior to the return of the Lord, the visible churches will go into apostasy. “Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition: who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.”

“Apostasy, ‘falling away,’ is the act of professed Christians who deliberately reject revealed truth (1) as to the deity of Jesus Christ, and (2) redemption through His atoning and redeeming sacrifice (1 John 4.1-3 [‘Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: And even now already is it in the world.’]; Phil. 3.18 [‘For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ:’]; 2 Pet. 2.1 [‘But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.’]). Apostle differs therefore from error concerning truth, which may be the result of ignorance (Acts 19.1-6 [‘And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.’]), or heresy, which may be due to the snare of Satan (2 Tim. 2.25, 26 [‘In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.’]), both of which may consist with true faith. The apostate is perfectly described in 2 Tim. 4.3, 4 [‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables.’]. Apostates depart from the faith, but not from the outward profession of Christianity (2 Tim. 3.5 [‘Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away.’]), or heresy, which may be due to the snare of Satan (2 Tim. 3.5 [‘Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away.’]), or heresy, which may be due to the snare of Satan (2 Tim. 3.5 [‘Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away.’]).

Apostate teachers are described in 2 Tim. 4.3 [‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables.’]. Apostate teachers are described in 2 Tim. 4.3 [‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables.’]. Apostate teachers are described in 2 Tim. 4.3 [‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables.’]. Apostate teachers are described in 2 Tim. 4.3 [‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables.’]. Apostate teachers are described in 2 Tim. 4.3 [‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables.’].

---
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whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.’

[**Jude 4, 8, 11-13, 16**]

[‘For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ…. Likewise also these *filthy* dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities…. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds *they are* without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling *words*, having men’s persons in admiration because of advantage.’].

**Apostasy in the church, as in Israel (Isa. 1.5, 6; 5:5-7), is irremediable, and awaits judgment (2 Thes. 2.10-12) [‘And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness’]; 2 Pet. 2.17, 21 [‘These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever…. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.’]; Jude 11-15; Rev. 3.14-16].”

Inevitably, there is no remedy for apostasy but judgment.

“Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?”

The reference is not to personal faith, but to belief in the whole body of revealed truth. “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.”

In the New Testament, the apostasy was treated as having already set in. In fact, the Asian churches had not disbanded, nor ceased to call themselves Christian; but they had turned away from the doctrines of grace distinctively revealed through the Apostle Paul. Thus, even in the beginning of the church, the apostle Paul and Jude were concerned with the tendency to depart from the faith due to the influence of false teachers:

“I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you; and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.”

“For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Many of our churches today, even many of our independent Bible believing churches, have perverted the gospel of Christ and turned the grace of our God into lasciviousness (“Looseness; irregular indulgence of animal desires; wantonness; lustfulness; Tendency to excite lust, and promote irregular
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indulgences.”⁹ even though perhaps they have not verbally denied our Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Gentile world apostasy comes in seven stages:

“Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.”¹⁰

As a result of this worldwide Gentile apostasy, mankind sinks to the depths of depravity:

“Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents. Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.”¹¹

The apostasy is usually introduced by ungodly men who will “wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.”¹² Our Lord warned against false teachers:

“Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.”¹³

“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.”¹⁴

“And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.”¹⁵

“And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many.”¹⁶

“For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.”¹⁷
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"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven."\(^{18}\)

"But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."\(^{19}\)

The Lord is obviously warning that many of His children will be deceived by the many false prophets which shall arise. With heresy and apostasy, the God-given doctrines and goal for churches and for Christians are left in the dust. The goal or purpose of most churches and “Christians” is the happiness of man and not the glory of God. They ask “What can God do for me,” not “What can I do for God?” Their purpose for giving, for doing, and for going to church is to get something back from God. Many believers today, many in independent Bible believing churches, are being deceived about many biblical doctrines, including the doctrine of separation of church and state. As a result, they are, among other things, incorporating, operating as unincorporated associations, and becoming 501(c)(3) tax exempt organizations. Section VI will discuss incorporation and tax exempt status of churches in some detail, and will explain ways that a church can hold property and also please God.

As a result, God is not glorified at all. Everything in the ultimate modern American church is for self—the headship, the “Bibles,” the doctrines taught, the preaching, the music, the dress, the goal, everything.

Peter, Paul, and Jude traced the origin of apostasy to false teachers, explained their methods of operation, and warned the church to beware of the apostasy:

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock: Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears."\(^{20}\)

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."\(^{21}\)

"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?"\(^{22}\)

"For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."\(^{23}\)

"For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him."\(^{24}\)

"For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision; Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake."\(^{25}\)

\(^{18}\) Matthew 5.19.
\(^{19}\) Matthew 15.9.
\(^{21}\) Galatians 1.8-9.
\(^{22}\) Galatians 3.1.
\(^{23}\) 1 Corinthians 11.19.
\(^{24}\) II Corinthians 11.4.
“Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.”

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned to fables. Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.... Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved wages of unrighteousness; But was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb ass speaking with man’s voice forbad the madness of the prophet. These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage.”

“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 house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.”

“Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”

“For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Only a little leaven can completely change and pervert the truth of the Gospel:

“Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.”

False teachers deny redemption truth: “[False teachers] shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction.” Others deny the truth concerning Christ’s person as Son of God, God himself.

“BELOVED, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God:
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25 Titus 1.10-11.
26 1 Timothy 4.1-2.
27 II Timothy 4.3-5.
28 II Peter 2.1-3, 15-19. All of II Peter 2 deals with false teachers.
29 II John 9-11.
30 II Peter 3.3-4.
31 Jude 4. Jude predicts the apostasy of the professing church as describes the cause and course of the apostasy. As in II Timothy and II Peter, the apostasy is treated as having already set in.
32 Galatians 5.7-9.
33 II Peter 2.1.
Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world. Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world. They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them.”

In Jude all phases of apostasy are seen. Jude mentions those who “ran after the error of Balaam for reward.” Many pastors and other Christians today, like Balaam, revert to human reasoning and, among other unbiblical practices, put God’s church under the state for reward—that is, for money, for popularity, or power. They may not have gone completely into apostasy, but heresy is the first step toward apostasy.

The tone of the New Testament writers when dealing with heresy and apostasy is never one of dejection or pessimism. God & His promises are still the resource of the believer. Although Paul as recorded in II Timothy and Peter as recorded in II Peter are aware that martyrdom is near, both are apparently sustained and joyful:

“For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.”

The whole book of II Timothy reflects Paul’s joyful attitude as II Peter shows Peter to be likewise joyful and sustained.

II Timothy, II Peter, Jude, and II & III John deal the personal walk and testimony of a true servant of Christ in a day of apostasy and declension. For example, Paul instructs the “good soldier” in the face of apostasy:

“[Y]ou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life: that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.... Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel: ... It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: If we deny him, he also will deny us: If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.... Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: ... Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.”

Paul instructed Timothy, a preacher whom Paul called his “dearly beloved son” and his “own son in the faith:”

34 I John 4.1-5; See also, I John 2.18-28.
35 See II Timothy 4.6-8, II Peter 1.14, and John 21.18-19.
36 II Timothy 4.7-8.
37 II Timothy 2.1-4, 8, 11-13, 15-17a, 22-25.
38 II Timothy 1.2.
39 I Timothy 1.2.
“Preach the word: be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned into fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of the evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.”

The believer’s resources in a day of general declension and apostasy are faith, the spirit, the Word of God, the grace of Christ, separation from vessels unto dishonor, the Lord’s sure reward, and the Lord’s faithfulness and power.
Chapter 5
Recent accelerated apostasy in the United States

“As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”1

The application by Christ’s churches in America of the principle of the headship of Christ over His church will be discussed and developed in Sections III, IV, and VI. This chapter will deal with the accelerated apostasy in America’s churches aside from but arising after and then existing alongside the rejection by churches of the biblical principle of separation of church and state.

When a church does not love the Lord enough to make sure that she does everything to keep wicked doctrine out of the church and to keep herself totally under her Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ, a little leaven has entered that church and successive steps away from true biblical doctrine inevitably follow. This principle was seen in the Old Testament when the people of Israel chose to take themselves from under God and demanded a king. The direction from that point for Israel was only downward.

Churches in America began to dishonor the Lord in the United States shortly after the ratification of the Constitution (and even before the ratification of the Constitution). As will be shown in Section VI, many Bible believing churches, in not studying, understanding, and/or applying biblical principles concerning Christ and His church and biblical principles concerning the relationship of church and state, started the downward slide of God’s churches. They took the first step into pragmatic religion. In one way they said, “Our goal will not be only the glory of God; an additional goal will be the happiness of man.” Churches decided to be practical, to do that which was right in their own eyes. They incorporated, thereby introducing a little leaven into the relationship between church and state.

Leaven is defined by our Lord as evil doctrine:

“How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.”2

“And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod.”3

“Leaven Summary: (1) Leaven, as a symbolic or typical substance, is always mentioned in the O.T. in an evil sense (Gen. 19.3, refs.). (2) The use of the word in the N.T. explains its symbolic meaning. It is ‘malice and wickedness,’ as contrasted with ‘sincerity and truth’ (1 Cor. 5.6-8). It is evil doctrine (Mt. 16.12) in its three-fold form of Phariseesism, Sadduceesism, Herodianism (Mt. 16.6; Mk. 8.15). The leaven of the Pharisees was externalism in religion. (Mt. 23.14, 16, 23-28); of the Sadducees, skepticism as to the supernatural and as to the Scriptures (Mt. 22.23, 29); of the Herodians, worldliness—a Herod party amongst the Jews (Mt. 22.16-21; Mk. 3.6).”4

1 Colossians 2.6-8.
2 Matthew 16.11-12.
3 Mark 8.15.
“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.”

With the advent of religious liberalism in the nineteenth century, liberal churches rejected the truth and inerrancy of Scripture, the divinity of Christ, biblical salvation, and other biblical principles. The philosophy of those churches was humanism and the goal of humanism is the happiness of man. Although liberal theologians did not believe in the inerrancy of Scripture, the deity of Christ, heaven and hell, or any of the other cardinal principles of the Bible, they employed a lot of people and needed a way to justify their continued existence. So they said, “We don’t believe in an eternal happiness, but we do know that you have to live 70 years on earth. So come and let us help you enjoy the ride. Let us show you how to be happy while you are alive.” They set out to teach man how to be happy here on earth and to help others who were less fortunate so they also could be happy—the social gospel. Instead of preaching from the authority of the Bible, they read poems, “preached” smooth things and appealed to the self. Liberal “Christianity,” then as now, was a feel-good religion. God became, for the liberal, a means to an end, a way to achieve happiness while on earth. Liberal “Christianity” is man-centered.

Humanism, or liberalism, affected even many fundamental churches. While many churches at first departed from the biblical doctrine of separation of church and state, most adhered to other major biblical doctrines. They preached inerrancy of Scripture, the depravity of man, the holiness of God, repentance from sin, and salvation by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. But with time, since the atmosphere was humanism, the goal of many fundamental churches became the happiness of man, not the glory of God. They said, “We believe in the inerrancy of Scripture, the deity of Christ, and heaven and hell.” But the goal became humanistic—the eternal happiness of man in heaven. Again, the God-given goal for man is the glory of God, not the happiness of man, which is just a by-product of salvation and not a goal. Some fundamentalists began to preach God as a means, not an end, forgetting that it’s not what God can do for the believer but what the believer can do for God. The God-given goal is to preach the gospel so that the Lamb of God may receive the reward of His suffering.

God sends his children to the heathen to preach the gospel because He loved them in spite of their monstrous sins.

“As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known: There is no fear of God before their eyes….

Every person deserves hell. The attitude of the believer should be: “I will serve Him my whole life, even should I go to the hell which I deserve (which is not possible) because He is worthy. He did it all for me because of my monstrous sins.” Believers are a reward for the Savior who died a horrible death on the cross in order to pay the penalty God requires for the sins of every person.

5 See I Corinthians 5.6 and Galatians 5.9.

6 Romans 3.10-18, 23; see also, e.g., Deuteronomy 31.27; Job 20.11; Psalms 26.10, 53.1-6; Ecclesiastes 7.20; Isaiah 1.5, 64.6; Jeremiah 17.9 and 23, 22.17; Romans 7.18; II Corinthians 3.14; James 3; II Peter 2.14; etc. The principle of man’s total sinfulness runs throughout the Bible and explains why every man, to be saved, must trust Christ to save him.
So eventually many fundamental churches, in the humanistic earthly and spiritual atmospheres in America, began to preach, “Come, add Jesus to your life, and you will have eternal happiness in heaven.” The goal became humanistic. When someone made a verbal profession of adding Jesus to his life, someone would slap him on the back, congratulate him, and welcome him into a church. Yes, a saved person goes to heaven, but that is not his goal. The goal is the glory of God. Many churches no longer preach that man is sinful, that men are monsters of iniquity, that man deserves hell, that God saves men because He loves them and endured the agonies of torture and crucifixion for them, that He deserves the reward for His suffering, and that He deserves those for whom He died. Christianity says, “The end of all being is the glory of God.” Humanism says, “The end of all being is the happiness of man.” “One was born in hell, the deification of man; and the other in heaven, the glory of God.” Humanism may or may not bring temporary happiness. Some professing Christians do not respond to God’s calls for service in their lives because to do so would not make them happy. When one’s goal is the glory of God, he responds to God’s calls whether he believes it will make him happy or not. True Christianity brings eternal happiness, but only as a side effect, and not as a goal.

The advance of apostasy accelerated in Europe and America starting in the mid-eighteen hundreds. As a result, only a small remnant remains in Europe, and the deception engulfs the church in America more and more each day. Since the birth of religious liberalism, which developed the idea that rationalism is superior to revelation, in the mid-nineteenth century, “the contest between those polarities grows hotter, suggesting that this contest may be the final battle of human history.” Until perhaps the mid-eighteen-hundreds, “the Bible was the authoritative book, the government was to be respected, order in society was to be kept—that’s the way it was.” But things were changing quickly, and one of the most fundamental changes was within the Christian religion:

“That change was so dramatic, so fundamental, so far-reaching that it can be said that because of it the Christian religion, though retaining its external form, became a fundamentally different thing on the inside. At the close of the century, the churches were still there, the choirs still sang, the babies were still baptized, and the candles continued to burn, but the substance, the core—yes, the life—of Christianity was gone. The idea that God was in the midst of it all and that He had revealed Himself in His inspired, infallible Word—that idea, that life, slipped through the fingers of an unsuspecting church in those days.”

In the nineteenth century a German rationalist scholar named Julius Wellhausen stepped to the fore and religious liberalism came into being. “Before Wellhausen came on the scene, the Bible was generally accepted as the revealed, true, and inerrant Word of God; and Christians everywhere believed that all of Scripture was given by inspiration of God.” The German rationalists, with Wellhausen at the forefront, changed all that. Wellhausen taught that human reason was totally dependable and insisted that the Bible could not be trusted. A cold wind of doubt, distrust of God, and spiritual disquiet, influenced by the coming of Darwinism and Marxism, began to blow through the churches, the
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7 From excellent sermon delivered by Paris Reidhead, “Ten Shekels and a Shirt” available online at sermonaudio.com.
8 Breese, pp. 89-104.
9 Ibid., p. 90.
10 Ibid., p. 91.
11 Ibid.
schools, and the homes of Germany and Europe. “From that point, the advent of anti-revelational liberalism, Christianity ceased to be a religion based on divine revelation but rather became a set of composite religious views anchored in human reason.”

“From that point, the advent of anti-revelational liberalism, Christianity ceased to be a religion based on divine revelation but rather became a set of composite religious views anchored in human reason.”

“The Christian religion became a complex set of human rationalizations, rather than the revealed truth of God.”

Initially, the effect of his new theology upon a Christian culture was on the schools, churches, and scholarship of Europe. Quickly, the state-churches embraced the rationalistic point of view, lost the concept of divine revelation and faith in the Bible; and Europe lost its soul. The result in Europe—as of 1990, less than one percent of Europe was evangelical Christian.

“Soon after it came into being, liberalism leaped the ocean and began to be preached in the old-line denominational churches, colleges, and seminaries of the eastern seaboard of the United States.”

J. Greshcham Machen, a great scholar, discussed those days and the coming of liberalism to the Methodists, Anglicans, and especially the Presbyterians, reminding us of what liberalism truly is. “Machen wrote Christianity and Liberalism in 1924, but for many institutions, the old-line denominations, it was too late because the arguments of liberalism had already subverted many educational establishments.” Happily, one can now look at the record and rejoice in the fact that liberalism, although it became firmly rooted in America, did not win the day in the United States, carrying everything before it as it had done in Europe and to the significant extent in England.

Another aspect of liberalism deserves note:

“[I]ts insistence in calling itself Christian. While denying the inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, the true nature of faith, and most of the other cardinal Christian doctrines, the liberals still want conservative Christians to think of them as ‘one of us.’ As a consequence it is almost a rule of life that the liberals do not leave the visible church. [Even though] they tell of plans to open new churches, start new seminaries and the like, alas, that does not happen. There is a severe strain of dishonesty about this reluctance to leave, this maintaining a pretense of Christianity by those who deny the faith. Great clarity could be wrought by liberals if they called their religion by another name than Christianity and set up shop on their own.”

Frank Hamlin Littell observed in 1962 that American churches, once faithful and disciplined, had in their prosperity settled back into the world, and that America would seem well on the way to secularization and faithlessness. Most American church members in 1962 were first-generation, or at best second-generation Christians who but vaguely grasped the implications of Christianity. At that time the problems of the church were promiscuity and depreciation of the integrity and authority of the family, materialistic standards of success, racialism (the practice of religion as a tribal cult), and widespread theological illiteracy. Always the “new Christians” have brought over into the
church some of the habits of their unbaptized condition.\textsuperscript{22} In America the “new Christians,” whose conversions were not followed by class meetings and careful instruction, either fell back in a short time into the old way of life or were gathered up in new prophetic cults started by, among others, Joseph Smith, Mary Baker Eddy, Norman Vincent Peale, Marcus Garvey, and Father Devine which blended tribal wisdom with selected or corrupted Christian teachings.\textsuperscript{23} Joseph Smith’s message, for example, offered a solution to those who had looked in vain to the revivalists for food to sustain their awakened spirits, for a new pattern of community to express their new faith.\textsuperscript{24} Camp meetings and revivalists worked through the area year after year, converting & reconverted, without giving clear and careful guidance to newborn men & women as to how to continue their pilgrimage in responsible churchmanship.\textsuperscript{25}

It was perhaps inevitable that, as “converts” remained unchanged in life, eventually even the verbal phase should be softened & accommodated to popular opinions.\textsuperscript{26} In the latter half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, various professional evangelists turned from dealing with major issues in society, proclaiming the Lordship of Jesus Christ over all of life, calling upon men to repent, convert, and be healed and introduced a new style of message; avoiding any offense to the ruling elements in the cities, their patrons, they concentrated on the “sins” of the workingmen: drinking, swearing, gambling, and joining unions.\textsuperscript{27} The decline in great preaching—i.e. proclamation of the Word that convicts & converts, that moves to repentance and to turning again to the Lord of nations & generations—is one of the most striking measures of the deterioration of the Free Churches into culture-religion.\textsuperscript{28}

The ordinary members who never have had the discontinuity between life in Christ and life in the world brought home to them are less at fault for the inadequate training than the leadership of the churches, who—though sworn to uphold the form of sound words and doctrine—neglect catechetical instruction and concentrate solely on the acquisition of more and new members at any price.\textsuperscript{29} These problems are greatest in the churches which have grown most—Baptist, Methodist, and Churches of Christ.\textsuperscript{30} In the most live theological circles in America, however, even as early as 1962, there was growing up the realization that the 19\textsuperscript{th} century had ended with the rise of the most terrible apostasy & mass defections experienced by Christendom since Islam swept through & captured the ancient strongholds of Christianity in North Africa.\textsuperscript{31} Theologically and ecclesiologically those who are determined that the American churches shall bless “our way of life” stand exactly where the collaborators with the Nazis, the “German Christians,” stood in the 1930s and 1940s. Theirs is the same curious mixture of creedless “spirituality,” of treason toward the ... church.\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 125.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid., pp. 125-26.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p. 126.
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Thus, by 1962, apostasy had taken its toll on American churches. The nineteenth century ended with “mass defections from the churches of Europe. In her decline, Christianity “spawned the most monstrous ideologies and political religions.”

“The warning that comes to America, that is declared to her by her ablest theologians, is that ‘Christendom’ is no longer a viable concept, that the nineteenth-century continuum is split apart. Nevertheless, it is serious error—though a common one—to bracket the churches in America & the churches of Europe in a common destiny. True, the most serious challenge confronting the faith in America is also tribal religion, Protestant nativism, apostasy of the sort that many of the churches in Europe also have had to struggle with. The words of Professor Edmund Schlink on the condition of religion in pre-Hitler Germany might be transferred without amendment or alteration to popular religion of the present in America:

“... people had grown accustomed to regard God primarily as the protector of ordered family life, a help in the education of children and a friend in the events of life such as leaving school, marriage and death. He had become the guarantor of national and civic security, in the midst of the insecurities of this world.”

In today’s American churches, as always, Satan is using the same technique he used to attack and draw people away from the Word of God in the Garden of Eden where he started the deception by saying, “Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?” Eve then answered, “We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.” She erroneously added to God’s Word “... neither shall ye touch it.”

The “‘Yea, hath God said…?’ strategy may be the Serpent of Old’s most deadly. The process involves weaning evangelical Christians away from the knowledge of, and understanding of; and a dependence upon the Word of God. The objective is to produce biblically shallow Christians who are functionally illiterate regarding what the Bible teaches, and who therefore have no accurate basis for, or interest in, discerning biblical truth from error....

“Conditioned by a subversive weaning process, these biblically shallow Christians have little or no concern about doctrine. They major in the experiential, with their feelings almost exclusively determining what they believe. [As the apostle Paul said,] ‘For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables’ (2 Timothy 4:3, 4).

“Today, experiential Christianity has extended far beyond the bounds of what was considered a fringe evangelical element[, the extreme Charismatics and Pentecostals]. It now pervades the entire church, including those denominations and movements once known for their conservative doctrinal views and biblical adherence. They have vigorously blocked the lying signs and wonders seduction at their front doors while opening wide their side entrances and youth rooms to the purveyors of the experiential in less obvious yet equally disastrous forms.

“... [T]rue Christianity is both doctrinal and experiential....

“The chief error today in the evangelical church is that experiences (feelings, emotions, passions, intuitions, etc.) have become the guide for entering into and attempting to establish true spirituality. Rather than subjective feelings and emotions being present as a result of one’s adherence to sound doctrine, they have become the judge of whether or not something is truly Christian. Instead of testing a teaching or

34 Genesis 3.1.
35 Genesis 3.2-3.
36 Genesis 3.3.
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Satan is using this “Yea, hath God said” strategy in today’s churches in a variety of ways. This chapter will look at a few. Today, “[t]he true Christ and the true faith of the Bible are being replaced rapidly with diseased substitutes offered by a group of teachers who belong to what has been labeled the “Faith Movement.” Multitudes who name the name of Christ have adopted a wildly distorted perception of what it means to be a Christian.

“Under the banner, ‘Jesus is Lord,’ multitudes are being duped by a gospel of greed and are embracing doctrines straight from metaphysical cults.” Eternal truths from the Word of God are being perverted into bad mythology—and all the while Christianity is hurling at breakneck speed into a crisis of unparalleled proportions.

Spiritual leaders are teaching that Satan conquered Jesus on the Cross, that they are God and Jesus, that we should not pray such “faith-destroying words” as “If it be thy will,” that we are in control and God has to be given permission to work in the earth realm, and that man was created equal with God and can stand in God’s presence without any consciousness of inferiority.

In Christianity in Crisis Hank Hanegraaff chronicles a composite of erroneous teachings of individuals such as Benny Hinn, Kenneth Copeland, Kenneth Hagin, Frederick Price, and many others. Many of the followers of these false teachers are sincere, born again believers who love the Lord.
Hanegraaff points out the chief teachers of this movement, noting that “the bulk of their theology can be traced to the cultic teachings of the Faith Movement and that much of the theology of the Faith Movement can be traced to such cults as Religious Science, Christian Science, and the Unity School of Christianity.”

These men “point to Scripture,” produce ‘miracles,’ and operate under the banner of ‘Jesus is Lord.'

“This 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 they name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.”

Jesus said “And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.”

Many of the churches in the Faith Movement are cults or cultic.

One definition of a cult is: “[A]ny religious movement which claims the backing of Christ or the Bible, but distorts the central message of Christianity by 1) an additional revelation, and 2) by displacing a fundamental tenet of the faith with a secondary matter. A primary characteristic of cults in general is the practice of taking biblical texts out of context in order to develop pretexts for their theological perversions.”

Although cults use biblical terms, the meanings they attach to those terms are erroneous. Most or all cults, for example, do not believe that Jesus was the only Son of God or that the Son of God was also God. Islam, for example, believes that Jesus was a great prophet, but that he was not God; Jehovah’s Witnesses believe Jesus was the Archangel Michael.

Satan, through his false teachers, says to Christians seeking to solve their mental, emotional, and behavioral problems, “Yea, hath God said?” and then points out that the “science of psychology” will show them how to love themselves and overcome those problems. Many churches have “turned from God’s Word to psychology, that is, to man’s bankrupt theories in attempting to resolve mental, emotional, and behavioral problems;” in other words, to doctrines of devils which are designed to undermine what is taught in Scripture. Since many Christians are biblically illiterate but well-informed in the teachings of Satan through the public schools, the secular and “Christian” institutes of higher learning including most Bible colleges and Christian seminaries, the secular media including secular books and magazines, worldly friends and relatives, and perhaps their own pastors, psychology has had little

---

46 Ibid., p. 39.
47 Matthew 7.21-3.
48 John 6.40.
49 Hanegraaff, pp. 42-45.
50 Ibid., p. 43.
resistance in most “Christian” circles to prevent it from becoming a very effective “Yea, hath God said” technique used to infiltrate the church today.

Scripture warns: “This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves...”52 Although men have, since the Garden of Eden, been self-seeking and self-serving, “it has only been since the rise of modern psychology that self has been proclaimed as the solution to all of our mental, emotional and behavioral ills.”53 With the theory of evolution which, if believed, eliminated the need for God, mankind is left only with “self” and must solve all his problems.54 This requires man, of course to be innately good, since it would be impossible for man to help an innately sinful person,55 for a man to love an innately sinful person. The Bible teaches that man already loves himself to the point where he is selfish.

The great commandments are, according to Jesus, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all they heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment.”56 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself57,58

Thus, Jesus indicates that we already love ourselves, something that is consistent with the view of man as seen in all Scripture, and the view of man presented by reality. Would one really get down on himself if he did not love himself?

The key for the disciple of Christ is to learn to love God so much that he gives up all that he has and, by comparison, he hates himself and others.

“If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.”59

In context of Scripture, Jesus was saying that although one is to love others, and although one loves himself, that love, compared to the love one is to have for God, is equal to hate. In other words, a disciple is to put God far above anyone, including himself. Jesus also said, “So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.”60

Whereas the Bible teaches that man is sinful by nature,

“All the psychotherapeutic selfisms, from self-love to self-esteem to self-image to self-actualization to self-realization—and ultimately to self-deification—are predicated upon the innate goodness of one’s nature.

“Humanistic psychology—to which all psychotherapies are related—is the pseudoscientific belief system of the Antichrist, who is the personification of human evil. The bases of his religion were introduced to mankind by Satan in his seduction of Eve (turning her away from obedience to God and toward her own self-interests, even godhood—Genesis 3) and culminate in a man, the Antichrist, setting himself up in the temple of God to be worshiped as God (2 Thessalonians 2:4). It’s all about the worship of self ...

“Only biblical Christianity stands against the exaltation of self that ties all other religions together. The Bible declares self to be evil and hopeless and says that man’s salvation can come only from God as it is received by faith in Jesus alone, who satisfied
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divine justice by His full payment for the sins of mankind, according to the Scriptures. All other religions look to self to obtain salvation, ultimately through one’s own efforts, whether by rituals, sacraments, meditation, liturgies, good works, and so forth."\(^{61}\)

Even though, from a biblical perspective, psychotherapy is an antichristian, religious counterfeit, the evangelical church is a primary referral service for counseling psychologists and psychiatrists, and many large churches have licensed psychotherapists on staff.\(^{62}\) And in spite of the fact that psychotherapy, according to numerous scientific studies, rarely works (and then only superficially) and is known to be harmful, “[m]ost evangelicals are convinced that psychotherapy is scientific and is necessary to supply what is lacking in the Bible regarding man’s mental, emotional, and behavioral needs.”\(^{63}\) By mixing psychology and Christianity in the hope of merging “science” and faith, Christians have ignored biblical principles and common sense.\(^{64}\) Psychology is not a science nor can it be Christianized.\(^{65}\) Although the situation in the church is serious, Scripture tells us it will far exceed what we can imagine.\(^{66}\) “The apostle Paul is emphatic in his warning that ‘in the last days’ man’s condition will be ‘perilous.’”\(^{67}\)

Norman Vincent Peale pioneered the merger of theology and psychology.\(^{68}\) His blasphemous humanistic views were then spread throughout the “Christian” community by Robert Schuller, and even by many conservative evangelical preachers and teachers of note such as Chuck Swindoll, Charles Stanley, Josh McDowell, Anthony Hoekema, and Norm Geisler who “bought into, taught, Christianized, and further popularized the concepts of self-love, self-esteem, self-worth, and self-image.”\(^{69}\) “… [S]wellingly regarded, degreed professionals teach the church what they have gleaned from ‘the counsel of the ungodly.’”\(^{70}\) Rick Warren, a pastor with great influence in churches and in America today lists in an article in Ladies Home Journal five humanistic unbiblical truths: accept yourself, love yourself, be true to yourself, forgive yourself, believe in yourself.\(^{71}\)

“Rick Warren’s 30 million copies of The Purpose-Driven Life include Jungian concepts, such as Psychological ‘types.’ Saddleback Church’s ‘Celebrate Recovery’ program (See TBC Oct ’05), which has been exported to 4,500 churches and Prison Fellowship Ministries, is based on A.A.’s 12-Step principles. A.A. co-founder Bill Wilson received the 12 steps during the time he was in contact with spirit entities. He later wrote a personal letter to Carl Jung\(^{72}\) thanking him for his influence…. Warren is not the only
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\(^{72}\) Psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung, the son of a Protestant pastor who seriously doubted his professed faith, was more popular among professing Christians than was Sigmund Freud (an atheist) because of his perceived affinity for religion and things spiritual. However, Jung was anti-biblical and resentful of organized Christianity from his youth. His early symbolic visions revealed Jesus as a Dark Lord and God defecating on a cathedral. His mother’s side of the family was heavily involved in spiritualism…. Jung’s teachings are doctrines of demons, gleaned directly from seducing spirits…. Jung promoted all things occult, including astrology, alchemy, the I-Ching, mysticism, necromancy,
witting or unwitting promoter among evangelicals of what Jung learned from demons. He is just the most successful and the best known.”

The results of the natural progression of humanistic pragmatism are seen today in the Church Growth Movement and the Emerging Church Movement in America.

Noah Hutchings states that “Perhaps the greatest paradigm shift that has visited the church since the Protestant Reformation … may be occurring at the present time in the Purpose-Driven Church Movement birthed by Rick Warren.” Rick Warren was influenced by the Church Growth Movement of Donald McGavran. Marshall Davis explains that the Church Growth Movement applies scientific principles to the church, principles which “can be successfully applied to any organization—secular or religious, Christian or non-Christian…. Mormons and New Age religions are welcomed into the seminars, and they successfully employ the principles of church growth taught there.”

As a seminary student, Warren studied the one hundred largest American churches in order to discover why they grew so large. He became the champion of the movement. He, like church growth leaders before him, embraces pragmatism, but without restraint of right and wrong—the end justifies the means. In a Christian worldview, God justifies the means. Pragmatism says that any strategy that works is good no matter where it comes from; if it doesn’t work, it is bad. Rick Warren has gone “further and said that if something is working, then it is of God.” If a “church” is growing, then it must be of God. For example, the new idea of tolerance attracts people to the “church” whereas the biblical concept of tolerance repels people in this postmodern age. The biblical concept of tolerance says, “Let’s discuss our disagreements amiably in an effort to discover truth. God gives everyone freewill and no one will be forced to accept the truth; every belief, even false beliefs, will be tolerated.” The postmodern concept of tolerance says, “All lifestyles, beliefs, philosophies, and truth claims are equal; and, since one has no right to say that his are superior to any other, intolerance is the only thing that will not be tolerated.”

“The average American believes that all religions basically teach the same thing. They are not really interested in religious doctrine anyway. They are interested in application, something that will work in their personal lives…. Americans have embraced the idea of religious tolerance and acceptance. They do not want an exclusivist religion that says, ‘My way or the highway.’ They want a form of Christianity that is fun on Sundays and useful on Mondays, and preferably not too time consuming…. The Purpose-Driven Life’s ‘40 days to spiritual maturity’ is just about right.”

Since the teaching of the anti-biblical concept of tolerance “works,” it must be of God. Nor can a “church” teach theological doctrine with any precision. That would result in offending some who would refrain from coming to “church.” Pragmatism opens the door to all kinds of satanic infiltration including the New
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Age. Satan is a deceiver. “And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.”

In using anything and everything that will work, Warren appeals to the average American who will always be more influenced by the information corresponding with what they have received as Americans than they will be by something new to them like true biblical doctrine. This is true even should they really get saved, as can be seen by looking at the membership of the average “Bible believing church.”

“American seekers do not care if there is a little New Age mixed in with their gospel. They are used to it. They hear it on Oprah. They watch Wayne Dyer and Deepak Chopra on PBS. They may have read Bernie Siegel. The Saddleback Sams and Sallys targeted by Rick Warren are baby-boomers who went through the 1960s and 70s. They feel comfortable with the ideas of Eastern religions. They take yoga classes and send their children to karate classes.

“[T]he spiritual foundation of this whole Purpose-Driven Movement [can] be found in the writings and teachings of Robert Schuller’s 50-year ministry.” In turn Schuller’s ministry was greatly influenced by How to Win Friends and Influence People by Dale Carnegie and The Power of Positive Thinking by Norman Vincent Peale as well as by other teachings of Norman Vincent Peale. Robert Schuller is the real architect of this movement. The following words express the author’s sentiment regarding this movement exactly: “I believe this movement to be one of the worst distortions of the church that American ingenuity, born of an outworn capitalist mentality, could possibly devise.”

The theology of the megachurches and ultra-churches of the Church Growth Movement purports to be biblical. However, for the most part, at least as pushed by the leaders of the movement, a spattering of biblical quotes from mainly perverted interpretations of the Bible are interspersed in a sea of business, humanistic, and New Age principles, some or all of which are being copied by untold numbers of churches throughout the nation and world. For example, the “Purpose-Driven Life does not use the Bible as an authority. It quotes it [actually, for the most part, interpretations of the Bible] as a supporting witness when it is useful to do so.”

Pastors and Christian leaders, many of whom are apparently solid Bible-believers, flock to Robert Schuller’s Crystal Cathedral to learn principles of “successful church leadership” as did Rick Warren. Schuller reveals an obvious hypocrisy in what he says to Christians and has undeniable ties to the New Age Movement. He promotes Jerry Jampolsky whose life is founded upon the principles of A Course in Miracles and whom Schuller falsely portrays as a traditional Christian when in fact the god of Jampolsky is not the God of the Word of God. Here are some examples of the New Age teaching in which Jampolsky believes:

“Do not make the pathetic error of ‘clinging to the old rugged cross;’ the journey to the cross should be the last ‘useless journey;’ the recognition of God is the recognition of
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You: yourself; when God created you He made you part of Him; there is no sin; it has no consequence; The Atonement is the final lesson he [man] need learn, for it teaches him that, never having sinned, he has no need of salvation; and for Christ takes many forms with different names until their oneness can be recognized."^84

“Schuller is revealing himself to be the kind of leader who is willing to compromise and sacrifice God’s truth for the purposes of the New Age and the New Spirituality.”^85 Yet untold thousands of pastors and “Christian leaders” flock to his seminars and subscribe to some or all of his teachings. Those who think that they can attend Rick Warren’s or Robert Schuller’s seminars or read and study their teachings in any way and not be negatively influenced thereby forget the ample warnings in Scripture such as:

“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”^86

“Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us…. And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.”^87

“Separation in Scripture includes separation ‘from’ whatever is contrary to the mind of God: and ‘unto’ God Himself. The underlying principle is that in a moral universe it is impossible for God to fully bless and use His children who are in compromise or complicity with evil.”^88

“Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness.”^89

Rick Warren violated this principle of separation. In 1979, Rick Warren as a last year seminary student drove from Texas to California with his wife to attend a Robert Schuller church growth seminar. Warren’s wife is quoted as saying,

“‘We had a very stony ride out to the conference,’ she says, because such nontraditional ministry scared her to death. Schuller, though, won them over. ‘He had a profound influence on Rick,’ Kay says. ‘We were captivated by his positive appeal to nonbelievers. I never looked back.’”^90

Rick Warren was so transformed that he became a leading deceiver in the “Christian” world. He went back to Schuller’s institute for pastors many times. Warren and Schuller parted ways after Schuller invited Stephen Covey, “a devout Mormon who has publicly ridiculed evangelicals and the Christian gospel,” to speak at the Crystal Cathedral. Although Warren and Schuller have parted ways “Schuller’s legacy remains in the teachings and methodology of The Purpose-Driven Life,”^91 and in all Warren’s teachings.
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Satan, through his false teachers, says to Christians seeking to solve their mental, emotional, and behavioral problems, “Yea, hath God said?” and then points out that the “science of psychology” will show him how to love himself and overcome those problems. Charles Spurgeon of England, correctly “warned about changing the Gospel to accommodate changing society:

“The idea of a progressive gospel seems to have fascinated many. To us that notion is a sort of cross-breed between nonsense and blasphemy. After the gospel has been found effectual in the eternal salvation of untold multitudes, it seems rather late in the day to alter it; and, since it is the revelation of the all-wise and unchanging God, it appears somewhat audacious to attempt its improvement…”

The standard megachurch gospel is not the gospel of the Bible. “It is a reincarnation of the old-time liberalism that infiltrated evangelical ranks a hundred years ago.” The emergence of the Church Growth Movement and megachurches is carrying the techniques and principles of religious liberalism plus more to the extreme. Due to the anemic and compromised state of Christianity and Christian pastors, leaders, and other church members in America now, the chances that American Christendom will suffer the same fate as that of Europe after the onslaught of religious modernism beginning in the nineteenth century is great.

Warren begins his book *The Purpose-Driven Life* with the statement, “It is not about you,” then proceeds to write a whole book about how “you” can be happy. The preface of the book states that, “By the end of this journey, you will know God’s purposes for your life and will understand the big picture.... Having this perspective will to reduce your stress, simplify your decisions, increase your satisfaction, and most important, prepare you for eternity....” The book lists “five great benefits of living a purpose-driven life:” [k]nowing your purpose gives meaning to your life,” “simplifies your life,” “focuses your life,” “motivates your life,” and “prepares you for eternity.”

Noah W. Hutchings points out that Rick Warren

“belittles pop-psychology then repeatedly promotes it by simply calling it something else. He publicly cuts ties with Robert Schuller, then regurgitates some of the most odious things that Schuller has been teaching for thirty years. He claims commitment to the Scriptures then underlines them at almost every turn. He will tell his followers that he is not tampering with the message but only reengineering the methods, when in fact he has so altered the message as to make it all but unrecognizable.”

Warren camouflages the “Yea hath God said” strategy; and only the true biblical believer, student, or scholar can discern the lies of the movement. Warren uses a seeker sensitive approach contrary to biblical principle. Warren also utilizes the idea “of being driven by the purposes of God,” an idea that is foreign to the Scriptures. Such a concept is similar to the Islamic concept—the Muslim is Allah’s servant and the only way he relates to Allah is by submitting

---

92 Hutchings, p. 29, quoting Charles Spurgeon.
93 Davis, p. 110.
95 Ibid., p. 9.
96 Ibid., pp. 30-34.
98 Davis, p. 41.
himself to Allah’s five-fold purpose for human life: faith, prayer, almsgiving, fasting, and worship.”

Warren is wrong on his doctrines concerning Jesus and salvation. As to Jesus Christ, the doctrinal statement of Warren’s church, Saddleback, neither mentions the virgin birth and that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit, nor is there any mention of the substitutionary atonement. Warren never explains the nature and purpose of Jesus nor does he explain how one is saved through Jesus Christ. Although the “Purpose-Driven Christ is a shadowy figure, undefined and unexplained,” “that does not stop Warren from leading readers to commit their lives to Jesus and then assure them that they are eternally saved.”

As to salvation, Warren’s teaching is totally unbiblical. For example, there is no confession of sin or repentance—just say a little prayer, “Jesus, I believe in you and I receive you,” and “[y]ou’re in the club.” “Just believe a few platitudes, receive an unexplained Jesus, and you are assured of eternal life. What a deal?”

There is no recognition of who a lost person is—a lost sinner—or who the biblical Jesus is, since one’s concept of who God or Jesus is is of little importance. The Purpose-Driven gospel is nothing more than a postmodern version of the old time liberalism, described by Richard Niebuhr as ‘a God without wrath [bringing] men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross.’

Along with seeker-sensitive techniques which aimed at meeting people’s needs as they saw it, Warren Smith, a Christian who was saved out of the New Age Movement, points out that Rick Warren immediately began to utilize age-old metaphysical techniques which are taught in the New Age movement. Those techniques have been so successful that they are practiced, taught, and emulated by millions in growing churches and in personal lives, to the glory of Satan. Smith’s book, cited herein, should be read for its extensive insights into the New Age teachings within Rick Warren’s writings.

Smith points out that one of Rick Warren’s unstated purposes as a self-proclaimed “change agent,” seems to be to

“mainstream Robert Schuller’s teachings into the more traditional ‘Bible-based’ wing of the Church. Many believers who seem to trust Rick Warren, ironically, do not trust Robert Schuller. Rick Warren’s ‘magic’ seems to be able to make the teachings of Robert Schuller palatable to believers who would have otherwise never accepted these same teachings had they come directly from Schuller himself. And … one of Rick Warren’s colleagues[,] Bruce Wilkinson, (whose book The Dream Giver and whose teachings on dreams are based upon the teachings of Robert Schuller and are contrary to biblical principles) [is] also in the process of doing much the same thing.”

Smith points out that Rick Warren wrote on the dedication page of The Purpose-Driven Life: “This book is dedicated to you. Before you were born, God planned this moment in your life. It is no accident that you are holding this
This assertion, actually an assertion that it was “meant to be,” has lead many to immersion in the New Age movement.

Only true Bible believing, knowledgeable Christians—thus effectively disqualifying most megachurch pastors, leaders, and members as well as many other pastors and “Christians”—can know what is happening in the Church Growth Movement:

“Imbedded in the ideological framework [of members of the church who are dispensational in their theology and hold to a literal interpretation of Scripture] is also the realization that the church of Jesus Christ is facing a major shift away from the ‘Old Time Religion’ of its fathers and grandfathers. This shift is not a minor adjustment, but rather, a major change that threatens to alter the face of Christianity forever. Tragically, if this shift continues unchecked, the subsequent change will create a new ‘hybrid Christianity’ that will bear little resemblance to the ‘faith of our fathers’ or the church as described in the New Testament. This new hybrid is instead birthing a ‘false Christianity’ that will lead its adherents to a pseudo-faith that will result in their missing the Rapture, believing ‘a lie’ and falling into the arms of Antichrist as gently as the falling petals of an autumn rose.”

The churches of the Church Growth Movement must be filled with lost people, some members who linger on whether deceived or not, and/or deceived saved people who migrated in or were saved somehow by hearing and responding to the true gospel of salvation from other sources.

These churches propose to bring all denominations together and bring about church growth, not by sound biblical techniques but by using New Age and other satanic and/or business techniques such as: changing perception by viewing people as “churched or unchurched rather than “saved” or “lost;” “finding out what impresses the unchurched in your community’ and doing it;” attracting the multitudes by bringing in popular heroes (like, e.g., almost nude wrestlers); using “successful principles and good cash flow;” modeling pastors after businessmen and planning strategically; winning people by building relationships rather than by preaching expository sermons; moving “from a theocentric approach to ministry to a ‘human needs approach;’” deciding not to “convert any other religious people to my viewpoint;” refusing to point out that one “recognize his own personal sin, … need for repentance, … need for crucifixion of self;” teaching that “[t]he Christ Spirit dwell in every human being,” that “nothing exists but God,” that “Christ was self-esteem incarnate;” recognizing that “[t]he most destructive thing that can be done to a person is to call him a sinner,” that sin is any act or thought that robs myself or another human being of his or her self-esteem.”

These churches generally, among other errors, change to unbiblical dress, music, “Bibles,” and false interpretations of Scripture, and eliminate and belittle doctrine in their teaching. “Rick Warren has transformed the worship of God into an informal get together,” as is exemplified by the clothing and other aspects of worship. Members of a Purpose Driven Church are expected to dress
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like Rick Warren dresses. Anyone who wears a tie or coat may be “considered mainstream and against the pastor.”

The Word of God teaches that all a believer does should be holy and for the glory of God. “And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin.” One can discern that biblically one should dress neatly and cleanly in a way that glorifies God and that no member should be coerced into dressing like everyone else as long as he dresses according to the directives of the Word of God. Even public schools at one time recognized this principle: in order to maintain stability, and promote respect for teachers and staff, dress codes and respectful titles were required. Informality in a school or church setting corresponds with contempt, disrespect, rebelliousness, and selfishness.

No comprehensive treatment of music is attempted here, but just a few comments are appropriate. Rick Warren copies the type of music that draws the biggest crowds in the secular world and “proudly reports that Saddleback is known as ‘the flock that likes to rock’.”

“According to a professor of preaching at Emory University, the typical megachurch praise song is ‘simplistic, repetitive, and finally, boring…In the short run, it gets you on your feet clapping your hands, but in the long run it cultivates a monotonic, downsized faith, a faith too naive and simple to handle complexity, too repetitive to deal with real change.’ Yet in the short run the strategy works. Warren reports that within a year of adopting this popular style of music that his church ‘exploded with growth.’”

Warren believes the only difference between Christian and non-Christian music is the lyrics. The truth is that “[t]he language is still there, but the substance has been thrown away. Without any real truth, reality is turned into theater, and life into a show.”

Rock music, regardless of the words, dishonors God, appeals to the flesh, and adversely affects man. According to music evangelist David Armistead, whereas traditional hymns have simple rhythms which place greater emphasis on the words and appeal to spiritual principles and the spiritual nature, Christian rock emphasizes complex rhythms which are usually loud and excite the flesh, and, generally speaking, simple, repetitive words with shallow meaning. Rock music, whether “Christian” or secular, is “a war upon certainty and stability;” is “sex” with which “you have to hit them in the face” (according to Mick Jagger of the Rolling Stones); “is supposed to be outrageous;” “can be addictive (physically addictive because it rediscovered the power of pagan music in its volume, repetitiveness, and highly syncopated rhythm patterns);” has “very little melody, only rhythm” (which seemingly reverts the listeners to savagery thrusting constant listeners into turmoil); has a beat which “is contrary to our natural body beats and rhythms” and “can actually weaken you” since it
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“interferes with brain wave patterns, causing mental stress;” and can “alter the brain permanently.”

Rick Warren sang, as he said he has always wanted to do, “Purple Haze”—written and made popular by Jimmy Hendrix, a heroin and sex addict who died of a drug overdose in 1970—before thirty thousand in the Anaheim Angels baseball stadium. He said, “We are loud. We are really, really loud…. We’re not going to turn it down…. Baby boomers want to feel the music, not just hear it.” But music need not go as far as did “Purple Haze” in order to be classified as “rock music” with all or many of the attributes listed above. Much “Christian” rock has all the attributes of “Purple Haze” except for the lyrics. Noah W. Hutchings appropriately comments:

“I doubt that the Purpose Driven Church movement would have ever gotten off the ground without the heavy-metal rock, drug-inspired, hippie music of the 60’s that has been revived by a new champion in so-called church praise groups. This music came out of one of the darkest periods of national morality, the 1960s hippie generation, so need we say more.”

As far as church services, the Bible is not to be seen and never read from as authority, but “is used more like a sourcebook of illustrations that has some helpful tips to guide us through the journey of life.” Warren gives people relief, not truth, since that is what they are seeking. “Scripture verses are used as supporting evidence for the points instead of the foundational authority for the sermon.” The praise band and worship team are center stage. In The Purpose-Driven Life, Mr. Warren references fifteen versions of the Bible. In his 1995 book, The Purpose-Driven Church, Warren states:

“Read Scripture from a newer translation. With all the wonderful translations and paraphrases available today, there is no legitimate reason for complicating the Good News with four-hundred-year-old English. Using the King James Version creates an unnecessary cultural barrier…. Clarity is more important than poetry.”

That the King James Version complicates the “Good News” is a brazenly false assertion. If the King James Version can provide the clarity for a New Age man and wife to discern the deceptions of the New Age teachings, it can provide the clarity for anyone who reads and understands the English language to discover God’s truth. Warren Smith wrote:

“It was the clarity and precision of our King James Bible that had exposed the deception behind our New Age teachings. And it is the clarity and precision of our King James Bible that continues to expose these same New Age teachings that are creeping into the Church today. I just thank God no one put something like The Message in my hands when I was in the New Age. And I thank God for kindly Christian widows [like the one who gave me the King James Bible that was responsible for exposing the New Age to me].”
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The Message, a false interpretation of Scripture, is one of Warren’s favorites and is referenced more than any other. The Message obscures and alters verses from Scripture, omits important details, and adds misleading words and phrases, all this in such a way as to allow a New Ager to read The Message without being challenged as to his satanic beliefs.  

Rick Warren constantly quotes from this corrupt paraphrase as though it were God’s Holy Word. Rick Warren used many words and phrases with deep New Age meanings from The Message. By so doing, ministers in “the Purpose Driven Movement can make the Bible say things that are not true but fit doctrine [such as New Age] that these men are devising.” For example, Warren quotes The Message version of Colossians 1.16 right under the title to the first chapter, “It All Starts with God:” “For everything, absolutely everything, above and below, visible and invisible, … everything got started in him and finds its purpose in him.” The Message uses this phrase, “as above, so below,” an occultic New Age term, in the Lord’s Prayer. What does this signify?

“Thousands of years ago in ancient Egypt, the great master alchemist Hermes Trismegistus, believed to be a contemporary of the Hebrew prophet Abraham, proclaimed this fundamental truth about the universe: ‘As above, so below; as below, so above.’ This maxim implies that the transcendent God beyond the physical universe and the immanent God within ourselves are one. Heaven and Earth, spirit and matter, the invisible and the visible worlds form a unity to which we are intimately linked…. ‘“As above, so below’ means that the two worlds are instantaneously seen to be one when we realize our essential unity with God…. The one and the many, time and eternity, are all One’ (Ellipsis dots in original).”

The term “as above, so below,” according to the New Age Journal Editor who stated that “old forms of religion no longer serve people, and that the term ‘as above, so below’ describes the ‘emerging spirituality’ that is quickly moving onto the world’s scene. [The meaning of the term can be verified by a Google search.]” Rick Warren, Robert Schuller, and Eugene Peterson are not only exposing one of the central concepts of the “New Spirituality” and probable New World Religion—the idea that the “transcendent God beyond the physical universe and the immanent God within [us all] are one”—“they seem to be agreeing with it!”

Warren also suggests other New Age and anti-biblical concepts in his teachings which are described by Warren Smith such as the concept that “at least metaphorically, everyone’s life is ‘driven’ by some force,” the “Rick Warren’s implication and Robert Schuller’s contention that God is ‘in every person.’”
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In *The Purpose-Driven Life* Warren takes verses and portions of verses out of context to support his conclusions. For example, Warren Smith points out that Warren quotes a portion out of Isaiah 49.4 to incorrectly conclude that Isaiah had no hope. At the same time, he prefaced his whole discussion about the importance of having “hope’ and a deep sense of life purpose’’ by referring to [Bernie Siegel] a man whose own hope and purpose are so totally invested in the false teachings of the New Age.

In *The Purpose-Driven Life* Warren includes many quotes from not only Christians such as C. S. Lewis, Martin Luther, and A. W. Tozer but also from many people who publicly oppose the gospel such as Bertrand Russell, an atheist “known for his refutation of Christianity;” Anais Nin, a French feminist “who was notorious for her sexual promiscuity, including bigamy;” Thomas Carlyle, “the nineteenth century essayist who rejected Christianity and embraced Transcendentalism;” George Bernard Shaw who was a playwright and “a leader in the precursor to the theosophy movement, which sees God as an impersonal pantheistic force in nature; and Aldous Huxley who wrote one of the classic books “of the drug culture of the 1960s.”

All the interpretations of the Bible promoted by the Purpose Driven Church, unlike the *King James Version* of the Bible, view doctrine as less and less important, and Purpose Driven Churches view doctrine as divisive, bad, or evil. They specialize in uniting people in “love” since doctrine divides. Warren constantly discards the role of doctrine. He designs his preaching to appeal to the happiness of man—that is, what appeals to the earthly desires of his listeners—not God’s Word. He gives people what they want—relief, not truth. “Recent polls reveal that 75 percent of people do not go to church to discover truth but to improve their lives.” As one person said, “[Rick Warren takes] all the new so-called versions of the Bible and quote[s] from the one or ones when put together makes the scriptures say what he wants them to say.”

Apparently Rick Warren, as do Robert Schuller and Bruce Wilkinson, adheres to replacement theology, and the preterist, amillennial position. He, as did the religion of many of America’s colonists as will be documented and explained in Section IV (although their methods were different from Warren’s), believes that the church will eliminate war, hunger, disease, crime, and ignorance in preparation for the return of the Lord. He stated, “Our goal will be to enlist one billion foot soldiers for the Kingdom of God, who will permanently change the face of international missions to take on these five ‘global giants for which the church can become the ultimate distribution and change agent to overcome Spiritual Emptiness, Self-serving Leadership, Poverty, Disease, and Ignorance.”

To achieve this goal, on April 17, 2005, the same day he sang “Purple Haze” to 30,000 in Angel Stadium, Warren launched a 5-step PEACE Plan which has a format similar to the 5-Step P.E.A.C.E. plan of Neale Donald Walsch, a New
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Age leader, that is totally antagonistic to the Bible’s true Gospel of Jesus Christ. Rick Warren, Robert Schuller, and Bruce Wilkinson “seem[] to minimize that Satan is described in the Bible as the extremely deceptive ‘god of this world’ (2 Corinthians 4:4), and that he comes as an ‘angel of light’ and his ministers as ‘ministers of righteousness’ (2 Corinthians 11:14-15).”

Warren needs to read and believe a properly translated Bible. Jesus, in Matthew 24, in answer to the disciples’ question to Him—“Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and the end of the world?”—gave them much prophetic detail concerning the great spiritual deception that would engulf the world and the signs that would prevail before His coming. He stated that there would be “wars and rumors of wars,” “that nation would rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom,” that there would be “famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places,” that His followers would be persecuted and martyred, that “many false prophets” who will “deceive many” would arise, and that love would wax cold because of the prevalence of iniquity. “For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape.” Rick Warren and many other “Christian” leaders just do not understand these biblical principles. A false Christ is deceiving Warren and his followers who are being used to mislead the world for satanic purposes.

*The Purpose-Driven Life* is full of ridiculous misinterpretations of Scripture in addition to those already mentioned. One example is the assertion in the introduction to *The Purpose-Driven Life* that “The Bible is clear that God considers 40 days a spiritually significant time period. Whenever God wanted to prepare someone for his purpose he took 40 days.” This is totally inaccurate, and the examples that he cites do not support his assertion. Therefore, “Warren’s whole premise of purpose is fatally flawed.” Noah was not transformed by being on the ark for forty days, Moses was not transformed by being on Mount Sinai forty days, and the twelve spies were not transformed by the forty days spent in the Promised Land. Actually, one is transformed at the moment of salvation and his purpose becomes, at that moment, the glory of God. A believer grows in the Lord by Bible study and as a member of a local body of believers.

To achieve their version of success, pastors of Purpose Driven Churches become clones of Rick Warren who “has gutted the Christian faith of all its content, thus maximizing his capacity to appeal to ALL religious backgrounds, as well as the ‘unchurched’ who possess sizable incomes, but sadly, with no place to direct it…. Anyone who wants to gut the Christian faith of her
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vocabulary for the sake of Church growth, is not a shepherd but a cheap hireling...."146

The process of preparing an existing conservative church for the goals of the Purpose Driven Church movement is in several steps and takes three to five years. Churches which decide to go the way of the Purpose Driven Church will see changes. Many of the leaders of the movement, like Rick Warren, are replacement theologians, and—like the covenant theologians of the colonial era147—viciously and without restraint lie about, libel, and slander those who disagree with their theology.148 Leaders of these churches are vicious to those who cross them. In line with the New Age secular philosophy and techniques these churches adopt, they discard those who disagree with them, especially those who were pillars of the church. The “old pillars” usually leave when the membership of the church, in step four, is told what is happening. If there is opposition, “those who are against the change in music, worship, and leadership are marginalized and asked to leave.”149

Furthermore, in such a church “a very deliberate change of attitude and presentation of God occurs.” Services, for both adults and children, become more entertainment based—for example, from Bible based emphasis, such churches emphasize things such as “Black Light Friday Night;” a disco ball for their Friday night dances; “‘Christian’ concerts where there are mosh-pits, ear-shattering music, and a total lack of dress codes;” and bringing in “skateboarders, pro wrestlers (some brandishing tattoos and/or piercings), who claim to be Christians but whose extreme lifestyles are fuel for rebellion;” and the incorporation of pagan practices such as “contemplative prayer” which is nothing more than camouflaged Eastern meditation.150 In the Purpose Driven Church, fun with lots of parties, music, and games for the youth has replaced holiness and the glory of God as the church’s goal. “Many Christians have the misconception that to win the world to Christ we must first win the world’s favor. If we can get the world to like us, they will embrace our Savior. That is the philosophy behind the user-friendly church movement.”151

The shift to more of an entertainment base is accompanied by the loss of authentic worship. The Christian who loves the Lord needs to worship God, not be entertained. After a few days in the world, a child of God who is part of the wife of Christ needs the refreshment that accompanies the assembly of the saints of God. He wants something different from what the secular world has thrust in his face. Marshall Davis describes the effects on himself of services in a Purpose Driven Church:

“I want to worship God: I do not want to applaud men. The congregational applause that now punctuates evangelical worship feels like a secular intrusion into sacred space. I feel like overturning some tables—or at least some padded chairs. [Applause is appropriate at
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a concert or a theatre to show appreciation for the performers.] It feels sacrilegious to applaud worship leaders for worshipping God.

“[After attending services in some churches when out of town] I always leave the worship service feeling like I need to take a shower… I feel like I have been to a high school pep rally, and I need to find a place to worship as an adult. I get this feeling in a lot of evangelical churches.”

Rick Warren considers this change in the concept of worship a good thing. He spells out his new type of worship in his books. To Warren, worship can include anything. This is the flaw of pantheism coming through to this concept of worship. Everything is sacred. But to be sacred, something must be set apart. “If the sacred is no longer distinguished from the world, it has lost its sacredness.” When everything can be worship nothing is definitely worship. Worship in the Purpose Driven Church imitates the world and is not set apart. How can it please God?

One more aspect of the Purpose Driven Church needs to be at least mentioned: it is a merchandizing phenomenon. The Purpose Driven Church has become big business:

“Rich Karlgaard, the publisher of Forbes magazine, calls The Purpose-Driven Church, ‘the best book on entrepreneurship, business, investment that I’ve read in some time.” Megachurch pastors often act as chief executives and use business tactics. “Both the philosophy and vocabulary of the marketplace have been imported into the church…. Christianity has become big business in America, and the megachurches are leading the way…. Half of all churchgoing Americans are attending only 12 percent of the nation’s four hundred thousand churches …. The average American church, which has a congregation of less than 100 in worship, is going out of business at the rate of fifty a week, while the Christian supercenters are thriving…. The American Christian has gone from being a disciple to being a customer, from being a follower of the Lord Jesus to being a consumer of a spiritual commodity…. As Gebhards observes, “Today, however, the church is a place of self-indulgence and self-satisfaction. Self-interest has become pandemic, even in worship, making it difficult for some churchgoers to imagine that Christianity is not intended to revolve around them…. The philosophy of the megachurch is to compete with the world on its own terms and using the same strategies that businesses have found to work successfully.”

The megachurches in general are “light on doctrine, ignorant of religious history, and tolerant of theological error, as long as the person has ‘accepted Jesus Christ.’” Thus, “[t]he next crop of leaders will not have the foundation of a solid theological and religious upbringing.” Consequently, they will be in position to slide further down the slope to apostasy. In fact, that slide is already occurring.
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There is an emerging trend beyond the Church Growth Movement that embraces all the marks of apostasy. This is a movement called the Emerging Church Movement. In this movement “sound doctrine” gives way to what “seemeth right unto a man;” apostate teachers advance an experiential mode that appeals to fleshly lusts and promotes self-serving fables and myths; “these ‘deceitful workers’ and lying ‘ministers of righteousness’ draw upon teachings of ‘seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;’ ‘grievous wolves’ have entered among the flock teaching ‘perverse things, to draw away disciples among them.’

“For many of those helping to promote the movement, their motivation to ‘try something different’ grew out of the frustration of their own very limited success in evangelizing and discipling young people. Some of the leaders were in seeker-sensitive and purpose-driven churches, and they saw firsthand that their church-growth marketing schemes were not effective for drawing those in their late teens, 20s, and early 30s. The main fare of most consumer-driven churches features contemporary music with shallow, repetitive choruses, topical 30-minutes-or-less sermons (mostly psychology-based), a host of social programs to attract the lost (and the fleshly nature of Christians), and ‘Bible studies’ that address everything but the Bible….

“[The roots of motivating youth through the use of a youth room with subdued, ‘catacombish,’ candlelit environment with the worship band using acoustic guitars was a youth-oriented MTV concert. This new ‘vintage form of Christianity,’ featuring rituals, ceremony, candles, incense, prayer stations, and images to create a spiritually experiential atmosphere for evangelicals, which is an imitation of unbiblical Eastern Orthodox and medieval Roman Catholic liturgies, is directly at odds with the method of Peter in Acts chapter 2.] In the power of the Holy Spirit, Peter’s preaching brought conviction of sin, repentance, and belief; 3,000 came to Christ that day….

“[ECM leaders] go far beyond subtly ‘weaning evangelicals off the Word’ to rendering the Bible and its doctrines as the enemy when it comes to drawing the world in general and, specifically, our postmodern culture, to the love of Jesus….

“[The ECM] approach attempts to accommodate Jesus and the Scriptures (actually ‘another Jesus’ and a corrupted and emasculated Word) to our postmodern culture.

“Rick Bell writes in Velvet Elvis, following 22 pages of weakening the authority of the Bible (making statements such as ‘It is possible to make the Bible say whatever we want it to, isn’t it?’ and ‘With God being so massive and awe-inspiring and full of truth, why is his book capable of so much confusion?: ‘[L]et’s make a group decision to drop once and for all the Bible-as-owner’s manual metaphor [i.e., God’s specific instructions for mankind]. It’s terrible. It really is…. We have to embrace the Bible as the wild, uncensored, passionate account it is of experiencing the living God.’ …

“His view, common to most emergent writers, is that the key to the authority of Scripture is one’s interpretation, and that is most authoritative when the interpretation takes place in a community and validated by a ‘group decision’: ‘Community, community, community. Together with others, wrestling and searching and engaging the Bible as a group of people hungry to know God in order to follow God.’

“We are now told [contrary to clear biblical teaching] that understanding and obedience to what God said are subject to a community’s interpretation. Consequently, ECM churches disdain preaching and authoritative teaching, yet they delight in discussion, causing some to dump the pulpit in favor of a dialogue-led Starbucks environment. As the goals of the community change, we’re told the interpretation may also change….

“Kristen Bell acknowledges …, ‘I grew up thinking that we figured out the Bible … that we knew what it means. Now I have no idea what most of it means, and yet I feel like life is big again—like life used to be black and white, and now it’s in color.’ Brian
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McLaren, the most prominent of the emergent leaders, echoes Bell’s ‘doctrine’ of avoidance regarding what the Bible says about homosexuality:

‘Perhaps we need a five-year moratorium on making [doctrinal] pronouncements. In the meantime, we’ll practice playful Christian dialogue, listening respectfully, disagreeing agreeably. When decisions need to be made, they’ll be admittedly provisional. We’ll keep our ears attuned to scholars in biblical studies, theology, ethics, psychology, genetics, sociology, and related fields. Then in five years, if we have clarity, we’ll speak; if not, we’ll set another five years, for ongoing reflection.’

‘[ECM leaders use the same approach Satan used to seduce Eve. For example, Brian McLaren says,]’

‘The church latched on to that old doctrine of original sin like a dog to a stick, and before you knew it, the whole gospel got twisted around it. Instead of being God’s big message of saving love for the whole world, the gospel became a little bit of secret information on how to solve the pesky legal problem of original sin.’

“He says elsewhere, ‘I don’t think we’ve got the gospel right yet. What does it mean to be saved? … None of us have arrived at orthodoxy.’"163’

Many modern American churches have replaced their God-given goal, the glory of God, with the humanistic goal, the happiness of man. Instead of exalting Christ and abasing man, they have abased Christ and exalted man. Seeing what has happened in Christendom generally, in America, and in “fundamental Bible believing” circles, it is not surprising to see that the great majority of churches have, along with their other unbiblical practices and teachings, taken themselves from under the headship of Christ in at least some, if not most or all matters. American fundamentalism started to slide toward apostasy before the ratification of the Constitution and soon thereafter when many Bible believing churches ran to incorporate and place themselves under the state. This slide downward has now accelerated with implementation of “pragmatic” but unbiblical practices introduced by modern religious liberalism.

Chapter 6
Apostasy at the end of the church age

The Lord says to the church of the Laodiceans, at the end of the church age and at the final stage of the apostasy:

“I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent.”

Many pastors believe that the saved will go to heaven but be without rewards should they not follow after Christ after salvation. Pastor Joey Faust states the following concerning the church at Laodicea:

“To fall from, one has to be in something first. I believe Laodicea is a church made up of TRUE (thus real) Christians, who nevertheless have fallen away from truth and fellowship with Jesus in their materialism, pride, etc. This church and its pastor (and all true churches in the last days who are Laodicean) will lose the right to reign and fellowship with Jesus when He appears—thus the Lord's command to be zealous and repent!”

Whether one agrees with Pastor Faust or not concerning this issue, the Bible shows that at the end of the church age, the Lord will be outside the Laodicean church. Nonetheless, He will still be there for the individual, just as He, while on earth as the second Adam, still appealed to the individual after the nation Israel rejected His rule over the nation: “If any man will hear my voice, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.”

The final result of the apostasy will be the great ecclesiastical harlot spoken of in Revelation 17 and 18. In Revelation 17 is mystery Babylon, the apostate church. The church of Thyatira, described in Revelation 2.18-29, which permitted Jezebel to teach, will become the apostate church of the great tribulation. It will attain the goal of the present-day apostates of all the great systems of the world: Romanism, Protestantism, pagan religions, cults and isms. Even in our so-called independent Bible churches there will be those who are not believers, and during the tribulation they will join this great organization that may call itself a church but is not. The Bible calls it a harlot.... This is ecumenical ecclesiasticism of the one-world church....

“... The church of Thyatira, described in Revelation 2.18-29, which permitted Jezebel to teach, will become the apostate church of the great tribulation. It will attain the goal of the present-day apostates of all the great systems of the world: Romanism, Protestantism, pagan religions, cults and isms. Even in our so-called independent Bible churches there will be those who are not believers, and during the tribulation they will join this great organization that may call itself a church but is not. The Bible calls it a harlot.... This is ecumenical ecclesiasticism of the one-world church....

“The true church will not go through the great tribulation; it will be raptured out before the tribulation begins.... [The church which will be raptured] is a collective term meaning all true believers, those who are in Christ.... The rest of the church members will be left here on this earth to go through the great tribulation. As Dr. George Gill used to say, some churches will meet the Sunday after the rapture and will not miss a member.... They are not part of the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. He never calls them His church; He calls it a harlot! It is a pseudo-religious system, which controls the wild Beast during the
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first half of the great tribulation, yet it is hated by him. During the last half of the tribulation, the Beast destroys the harlot in order to set up his own religion.”

True believers, the true church, will be glorified. The Lord will rapture the dead in Christ and the true church:

“For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.”

Ecclesiastical Babylon (apostate Christendom, the harlot whom many biblical scholars logically conclude will be headed up under the Papacy and which will at that time condone every iniquity of the rich and will be corrupted to the core by commercialism, wealth, and luxury) will be destroyed by political Babylon, that is by the nations; and political Babylon, the nations, will be crushed by Christ when they come against Israel at the end of the tribulation. All this will happen because men choose to succumb to Satan’s principles in order to satisfy their lusts.
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Chapter 7
The church will reign with the Lord

True Christians have the ultimate hope: they will reign with the Lord. This should be a cause for great rejoicing as well as incentive to be responsible members of the body of Christ and to make sure that every effort is made to glorify God and assure that a church remains totally under Christ in every way.

“The Holy Spirit is now calling out, not the subjects, but the co-heirs and co-rulers of the kingdom[:]

“(II Timothy 2.11-12 [‘It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us[,]’"

“Revelation 1.6 [‘And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.’];

“Revelation 3.21 [‘To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne.’];

“Revelation 5.10 [‘And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.’];

“Romans 8.15-18 [‘For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.’ The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.’];

“I Corinthians 6.2-3 [‘Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?’]).”

The Supreme Ruler ordained the church, as He ordained civil government. He gave churches—as He has given individual, family and civil governments—His Word wherein they can learn God’s guidelines which He wishes His body, the church, as well as all other governments to follow. Satan has successfully misled most churches and other governments, and most have followed his principles. He has used false teachers from the beginning. As a result, apostasy crept into the church shortly after its inception. That apostasy has accelerated in America as the rapture and the tribulation approaches.

Many or most people in American churches today are rich, but spiritually blind. “Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked[.]” As He was not deceived, but His bride was, “… Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.” As the first Adam had to give up a perfect existence in order to be with his wife, so the last Adam, Christ, stepped down from heaven to save his bride.

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because their deeds were evil.”

“[Jesus], being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”

“While the first Adam “blew it,” the last Adam would make everything right! (Romans 5:12-21) Charles Wesley set this doctrine to music with the words, ‘Second Adam from above, reinsta...’

Regardless of this inevitable apostasy and the events that are to follow, things are looking good for you and me— that is, if you are a Christian!
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“The religion of Jesus has suffered more from the exercise of this pretended right [to make religious establishments] than from all other causes put together; and it is with me past all doubt, that it will never be restored to its primitive purity, simplicity and glory, until religious establishments are so brought down as to be no more.”

“True believers have ever been the best subjects of civil government; but men have discovered enmity against them in every age, because of the light of holiness which God hath caused to shine in their lives, to expose the hypocrisy and wickedness of others. But every man is guilty of adultery, who hath not been made dead to the works of the law, in order to be married to Jesus Christ. Rom. vii. 1—6. For every true Christian hath been presented as a chaste virgin to him. II Cor. xi. 2.”

2 Ibid., p. 559.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Historically, Christians, as warned by Jesus and the apostles, have been persecuted. Christians were persecuted from the beginning of the church. After union of church and state in the fourth century, the established “church,” in conjunction with the state, persecuted Christians.

Jesus preached to the multitudes concerning persecution of His followers:

“Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.”

Jesus warned the disciples that His followers would be persecuted.

“If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me.” [Emphasis mine.]

At first the persecution of Christians was by the Jewish religious leaders. Paul (then called Saul) was present at the stoning of Stephen, the first Christian martyr. Paul, before salvation, was actively involved in persecution: “As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison.” After Paul’s salvation, he was persecuted and finally beheaded. He was seized by the Jews during his last visit to Jerusalem. They would have killed him, but as they were beating him, the chief captain of the Romans took soldiers and centurions, intervened, and held him. At that time Paul was allowed to speak to the people. He said,

“I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day. And I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women.”

Following the crucifixion of the Savior

“in rapid succession fell many other martyred heroes [in addition to Stephen and Paul, already mentioned]: … Matthew was slain in Ethiopia, Mark dragged through the streets until dead, Luke hanged, Peter and Simeon were crucified, Andrew tied to a cross, James beheaded, Philip crucified and stoned, Bartholomew flayed alive, Thomas pierced with lances, James, the less, thrown from the temple and beaten to death, Jude shot to death with arrows, Matthias stoned to death….”

1 Matthew 5.10-12.
2 John 15.18-21.
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4 Acts 8.3.
5 Acts 22.3-4.
6 Carroll, p. 11.
Rome persecuted Christians off and on until the early fourth century. The persecution varied in extent and duration with various emperors. Then, some “churches” were recognized by the state and formed a union with the state and became the official state “church.”

“[U]nder the leadership of Emperor Constantine there [came] a truce, a courtship and proposal of marriage. The Roman Empire through its emperor [sought] a marriage with Christianity: Give us your spiritual power and we will give you of our temporal power…. In A.D. 313, a call was made for a coming together of the Christian churches or their representatives. Many but not all came. The alliance was consummated. A Hierarchy was formed. In the organization of the Hierarchy, Christ was dethroned as head of the churches and Emperor Constantine enthroned (only temporarily, however) as head of the church.

"[This was the beginning of what became the Catholic church."

“Let it be definitely remembered that when Constantine made his call for the council, there were very many of the Christians … and of the churches, which declined to respond. They wanted no marriage with the state, and no centralized religious government, and no higher ecclesiastical government of any kind, than the individual church.”

Before the union of church and state, both Judaism and Paganism had persecuted Christians. After the union, “Christians” began to persecute Christians. “Thus [began] the days and years and even centuries of a hard and bitter persecution against all those Christians who were loyal to the original Christ and Apostolic teachings.” Some leaders of that new state “church” who had supported liberty, “forgot what they had preached in their youth” and supported persecution of dissenters. The most significant of these was St. Augustine.

“Augustine made much use of the passage in Luke 14.23: ‘Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.’ His position on religious liberty has been summarized in the maxim commonly (though erroneously) ascribed to him: ‘When error prevails, it is right to invoke liberty of conscience; but when, on the contrary, the truth predominates, it is just to use coercion.’

“Augustine’s influence on the course of religious liberty and the relationship of church and state can hardly be measured. Fifteen hundred years have passed since his death, yet his teachings are still a potent factor in the position of the Catholic Church on the subject of religion and government. As a result of his teaching,

“The principle that religious unity ought to be imposed in one way or another dominates the whole of the Christian Middle Ages and finds a concise and rigorous sanction in civil as well as in ecclesiastical legislation.

Because of Augustine, more than any other person,

“the Medieval church was intolerant, was the source and author of persecution, justified and defended the most violent measures which could be taken against those who differed from it.”

The Middle Ages reflected the thinking of “Augustine and Aquinas, who taught that salvation could be achieved through compulsion, and that oppression

---
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and persecution of heretics was not merely the right but the holy duty of the Church.”  

“Over 50,000,000 Christians died martyr deaths … during the period of the ‘dark ages’ alone—about twelve or thirteen centuries.”

The Inquisition was instituted in 1215 A.D. at a Council called by Pope Innocent III.

“[P]robably the most cruel and bloody thing ever brought upon any people in all the world’s history was what is known as the ‘Inquisition,’ and other similar courts, designed for trying what was called ‘heresy.’ The whole world is seemingly filled with books written in condemnation of that extreme cruelty, and yet it was originated and perpetuated by a people claiming to be led and directed by the Lord. For real barbarity there seems to be nothing, absolutely nothing in all history that will surpass it.”

The atrocities and heresies of the Catholic “church” eventually led to an effort to reform that “church” from within. Among the greatest of the reformers were Martin Luther, who started the Lutheran church (which became the state-church of Germany), and John Calvin, founder of the Presbyterian church (which became the state-church of Scotland). During this period of reformation, there always existed those who dissented from Catholic and Reformation theology. In early sixteenth century Germany, two currents flowed in opposite directions. One, fostered by the established church, was toward a state-church. The other, promoted by dissenters, was toward separation of church and state. When a Protestant church became an established church it continued the persecution practiced by the harlot church.

“Both the Lutheran and Presbyterian Churches brought out of their Catholic Mother many of her evils, among them her idea of a State Church. They both soon became Established Churches. Both were soon in the persecuting business, falling little if any, short of their Catholic Mother.”

Martin Luther wrote:

“It is out of the question that there should be a common Christian government over the whole world. Nay, over even one land or company of people since the wicked always outnumber the good. A man who would venture to govern an entire country or the world with the Gospel would be like a shepherd who would place in one fold wolves, lions, eagles, and sheep together and let them freely mingle with one another and say, ‘Help yourselves, and be good and peaceful among yourselves. The fold is open, there is plenty of food, have no fear of dogs and clubs.’ The sheep forsooth would keep the peace and would allow themselves to be fed and governed in peace; but they would not live long nor would any beast keep from molesting another. For this reason, these two kingdoms must be sharply distinguished and both be permitted to remain. The one to produce piety, the other to bring about external peace and prevent evil deeds. Neither is sufficient to the world without the other.”

“When Luther was expecting excommunication and assassination, he pleaded that:

“Princes are not to be obeyed when they command submission to superstitious error, but their aid is not to be invoked in support of the Word of God.
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“Heretics, he said, must be converted by the Scriptures, and not by fire. With passion he asserted:

“I say, then neither pope, nor bishop, nor any man whatever has the right of making one syllable binding on a Christian man, unless it be done with his own consent. Whatever is done otherwise is done in the spirit of tyranny…. I cry aloud on behalf of liberty and conscience, and I proclaim with confidence that no kind of law can with any justice be imposed on Christians, except so far as they themselves will; for we are free from all.”

Nonetheless, Luther later, when he had made an effective alliance with the secular power, advocated that the magistrate, who does not make the law of God, enforce the law of God. According to Luther,

“The law is of God and from God. The State is the law-enforcing agency, administering a law of God that exists unchangeably from all eternity…. The need for a state arises from the fact that all men do not hear the word of God in a spirit of obedience. The magistrate does not make the law, which is of God, but enforces it. His realm is temporal, and the proper ordering of it is his responsibility. Included in the proper ordering the maintenance of churches where the word of God is truly preached and the truly Christian life is taught by precept and example. In his realm, subject to the law of God, the Prince is supreme, nor has man the right to rebel against him. But if the Prince contravenes the law of God, man may be passively disobedient, in obedience to a higher and the only finally valid law.”

“Heretics are not to be disputed with, but to be condemned unheard, and whilst they perish by fire, the faithful ought to pursue the evil to its source, and bathe their hands in the blood of the Catholic bishops, and of the Pope, who is the devil in disguise.”

Luther espoused that coercion by the state to achieve religious unity was justifiable. This was an expansion of Erastian philosophy—“the assumption of state superiority in ecclesiastical affairs and the use of religion to further state policy.” Erastianism … pervaded all Europe, with the exception of Calvin’s ecclesiocratic Geneva, after the Reformation. Erastianism achieved its greatest triumph in England.

Luther’s position resulted in persecution of dissenters such as Anabaptists who believed in believer’s baptism. Although there is no reason to believe that the Anabaptists were explicit believers in a separation of church and state and in religious tolerance, opposition to a state-church follows logically from the thinking behind adult baptism.

“Believer’s baptism [was] the key to religious thought of the Anabaptists. Infant baptism implies that a child may be admitted into the Church without his understanding or personal consent. Such a church must be a formal organization, with sponsored membership possible for those whose years permit neither faith nor understanding. Adult baptism implies a different concept of the Church. The anabaptized are the elect of a visible church which is essentially a religious community of the elect. But obviously such a church could in no sense be a State Church. The Prince could neither bring it into being, regulate it, nor enforce membership in it; indeed, any connection between the State and such a church could only be injurious to the Church. Adult baptism on the surface is
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remote from the concept of a separated Church and State, yet such separation is implicit in the rationale of Anabaptism. The call to such a church can never come from the palace of the Prince; it must come from the Kingdom of Heaven…” [Emphasis mine.]

John Calvin pointed out that

“...these two [church and state] ... must always be examined separately; and while one is being considered, we must call away and turn aside the mind from thinking about the other.” He followed this approach in order to expound the ‘[d]ifferences between spiritual and civil government,’ insisting that ‘we must keep in mind the distinction ... so that we do not (as so commonly happens) unwisely mingle these two, which have a completely different nature.’

He taught that “the church does not assume to itself what belongs to the magistrate, nor can the magistrate execute that which is executed by the Church.”

However, when he established his ecclesiocracy (the author uses this term to denote a civil government in which the church and state work together to enforce spiritual and earthly laws unlike the theocracy in Israel in which God himself was directly over the state) in Geneva, absence from the sermon, and missing the partaking of the Sacrament were punished. “Criticism of the clergy was included in the crime of blasphemy and blasphemy was punishable by death” as was the contention that “it is unjust to put heretics and blasphemers to death.”

Government had “the duty of rightly establishing religion” and had as its ‘appointed end’ to ‘cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine of piety and the position of the church.” Calvin’s ecclesiocratic relationship of church and state was “based on ecclesiastical supremacy and the use of state machinery to further religious interests.”

During this same period the Church of England arose from a split or division in the Catholic ranks. Henry VIII, king of England, “threw off papal authority and made himself head of the Church of England” when the Pope refused to grant him a divorce from Catherine of Spain so that he could marry Anne Boelyn. Henry’s successor, Mary, reinstated Catholicism, but her successor, Elizabeth, re-established the Church of England.

“Thus, before the close of the Sixteenth Century, there were five established Churches—churches backed up by civil governments—the Roman and Greek Catholics [the Greek Catholics separated from the Roman Catholics in the ninth century] counted as two, then the Church of England; then the Lutheran, or Church of Germany, then the Church of Scotland now known as the Presbyterian. All of them were bitter in their hatred and persecution of the people called Ana-Baptists, Waldenses and all other non-established churches, churches which never in any way had been connected with the Catholics.... Many more thousands, including both women and children were constantly perishing every day in the yet unending persecutions. The great hope awakened and inspired by the

21 Marnell, pp. 18-20.
24 Pfeffer, p. 22.
Sometime in the early seventeenth century, the Congregational church began. That church repudiated preacher rule and returned “to the New Testament democratic idea” while retaining many other “Catholic made errors such as infant baptism, pouring or sprinkling for baptism, and later adopted and practiced to an extreme degree the church and state idea. And, after refugeeing to America, themselves, became very bitter persecutors.”

The persecution of dissenters moved to America along with colonization. Section IV will cover this topic.

The final persecution is planned for those who, prior to the rapture, remain ‘separate’ by denying the divinity of man—they are to be ‘driven’ from this planet.” This persecution is being planned by Maitreya, who claims that he is a Christ and is simply waiting for humanity to call him forth. Another New Age leader, Barbara Marx Hubbard, wrote that she was told

“That her ‘Christ’ specifically described this purposeful elimination process as ‘the selection process.’ Like Maitreya, she stated that the selection process will be the penalty for anyone who persists in the ‘self-centered’ belief that humanity is not divine and is ‘separate’ from God. By this definition, Bible-believing Christians—the ones who really are Bible believing—would be defined as among those who are ‘self-centered’ and ‘separate.’ In what would be a fulfillment of the prophecy that the Antichrist will ‘make war with the saints’ (Revelation 13:7), Hubbard’s ‘Christ’—sounding much like Maitreya—states that he will ‘make war’ on those who are ‘fearful’ and ‘self-centered.’”

Ms. Hubbard wrote: “At the co-creative stage of evolution, one self-centered soul is like a lethal cancer cell in a body: deadly to itself and to the whole.”

The struggle over separation of church and state moved from the old world to the new, and is probably the most important topic in the history of America. For the first time, God’s truth concerning government, church, and separation of church and state was destined to prevail, first in Rhode Island and then in the United States. Prior to this struggle and since the union of church and state in the fourth century, both Catholic and Protestant sacral doctrine which had seen church and state as a single entity had tried unsuccessfully to stamp out all “heretics” who had never deviated from the true biblical doctrine of “separation of church and state.”

This section will address the biblical principle of separation of church and state. Does a church love and honor the Lord Jesus Christ enough to seek God’s guidance from the Bible concerning the issue of separation of church and state and then to act according to the principles in the Word of God? “Christ loved the church and gave himself for it,” and God “gave [Christ] to be the head over all things to the church;” many Christians do not have the knowledge of what this entails.

Even “Christians” who believe in a literal interpretation of Scripture incorrectly interpret certain scriptures out of context to justify union of church
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and state and perhaps submission of church to the state or state to church. For example, many incorrectly interpret the scripture wherein Christ explained that the state is under God when He said, “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s, and unto God the things which be God’s.”

Many believers, having been Americanized, interpret this statement out of context and on its face to mean that one is to obey every law of the civil government because God gave civil government authority over all matters, spiritual and earthly, except perhaps the matter of salvation. Correctly understanding this statement of Christ requires a thorough understanding of the context in which the statement was made as well as an understanding of the Old and New Testaments.

Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 are other primary scriptures cited out of context to support unlimited submission to the state in all earthly matters, and in all spiritual matters, with the possible exception of preaching salvation.

To correctly understand “separation of church and state” a Christian must put aside America’s teaching concerning and understanding of the concept of civil government as the supreme power. Today’s American “Christians” have been indoctrinated by America’s public schools, institutions of higher learning, media, seminaries, Bible colleges, and many churches concerning the doctrines of the church, the state or civil government, God and state, and separation of church and state. Most American “Christians” are far more American than they are Christian. They choose America and America’s principles which are mostly satanic more often than they choose the doctrines of the Word of God. To a great degree, many traditional churches and “Christians” along with many heretical and apostate “Christians” in America have become Erastian in their belief and practice.

Several topics will be examined in this Section: (1) Dispensational Theology as opposed to Covenant Theology which teaches that the principles of the theocracy in Israel are to be applied by the church thereby requiring a union of church and state; (2) some distinct differences between the church and the state which render them mutually exclusive; (3) Christ’s statement concerning Caesar and God; (3) the false interpretation of Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 which prevails in America and in churches today; (4) and the church’s relationship with Christ. Covenant Theology will be briefly and directly addressed in Chapter 3 of this Section, and much of Sections I, II, III, and IV address many of the major shortcomings of Covenant Theology.

God, the Supreme Ruler of the supreme government, ordained both the church and the state. God desires that civil government choose to be under Him, and to operate according to His principles. God also desires that churches also choose to operate under Him, according to His principles. Our Lord explained through the Apostle Paul that God is over both the church and the state:

“And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power. Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, For above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, and the fullness of him that filleth all in all.”
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At the same time, God desires separation of church and state—that is, He desires that neither the church nor the Gentile state work with or be under the other. Understanding the proper biblical relationship of church and state is of utmost importance because Christ who is likened to the Husband of the church is jealous of His wife the church, as should the Christian likewise be jealous over the church. In today’s America, a church that does not understand this proper relationship will be easily influenced to work hand in hand with the state or to put herself under the state, especially, as will be shown in Section VI, through incorporation and civil government tax exemption provisions.

God ordained civil government and the church at different times, for different purposes, and for peoples with different natures. God ordained the state, the civil government, to deal with earthly matters, and the church to deal with spiritual matters. When either a church or a civil government acts outside its God given authority, trouble lies ahead.

It is the responsibility of every church, not the state—regardless of all persecutions by the state, by the church-state alliance, and/or by the world in general—to be a light and stand for and proclaim truth. This is so because a church is the only institution made up of people privy to God’s spiritual insights, and is “the pillar and ground of the truth.” As will be shown, generally speaking, those who run civil government cannot know spiritual and ultimate truth since most leaders in civil government are unregenerate (or, in rare instances, Christians who usually are still spiritual babies).
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35 1 Timothy 3.15. Many earthly relationships and behaviors involve the application of spiritual insights. For example, God teaches, in His Word, the responsibilities of husbands to wives, wives to husbands, parents to children, children to parents, civil government to marriages and the men and women joined in marriage, civil government to children, and so forth. Although these are spiritual teachings, they are to be applied in earthly relationships to which there is a spiritual parameter. In other words, God is involved in all relationships and has outlined the ultimate consequences for behaviors, and therefore, everything is spiritual even though it may have an earthly dimension. The trouble comes when man tries to exclude God and His principles, an impossible task.

Also, every sphere of ordained government has its own God-given jurisdiction. God desires the state to stay out of family affairs unless criminal acts are involved. He wants civil government to stay out of church affairs, and the church, as an institution to stay out of state affairs. At the same time, he wants Christians to be in authority since only Christians can apply His principles in the realm of government (of course this has almost never happened). Likewise, a church has no God-given jurisdiction over a family.
Chapter 2
Definitions

Definitions of “separation of church and state,” “religious freedom or soul liberty,” and “established church” are necessary in order to understand the principle of separation of church and state. The biblical principle of “separation of church and state” is that God desires both church and state to choose to be under God, but desires neither to be over or to work hand in hand with the other. The state has earthly responsibilities. The church has spiritual responsibilities. The Bible contains distinctive principles for both the church and the state. The two are totally separate entities, both ordained by God who desires both to submit to Him in love and to be guided by His principles as stated in His Word.

Historically, the established church has either been over the state, or the state has been over the established church. When the state has been over the church, the state directs the affairs of the church to a greater or lesser degree and vice-versa. In either case, the spiritual affairs of the church are mixed with the earthly responsibilities of the state. In the past, in either a church-state or state-church, leaders of both church and state operated under a false theology based upon false biblical principles. The result was torture, imprisonment, and/or the killing of those who refused to bow down to the theology of the church-state or state-church.

In today’s incorporated 501(c)(3) church in America, the rules of civil government for the church are secular and the civil government enforces certain public policies even when those policies go against biblical principles. Christians in America suffer a very mild degree of persecution.

“By religious freedom, or soul liberty, is meant the natural and inalienable right of every soul to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and to be unmolested in the exercise of that right, so long, at least, as he does not infringe upon the rights of others; that religion is, and must be a voluntary service; that only such service is acceptable to God; and, hence that no earthly power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, has any right to compel conformity to any creed or to any species of worship, or to tax a man for its support.

“This principle gives to ‘Caesar’ ‘the things that are Caesar’s,’ but it denies to Caesar ‘the things that are God’s.’ It does not make it a matter of indifference what a man believes or how he acts, but it places all on the same footing before God, the only lord of the conscience, and makes us responsible to him alone for our faith and practice. [By 1900 this doctrine was] very generally accepted, not only in Virginia, but also throughout the United States. It [had] been incorporated into our National and State Constitutions, and it [was ] the basis for our civil liberties.”

What is an established church? An established church is a church that is an integral part of the state and receives state support. In effect, with an established church, the church and state reach an agreement or enter into a contract whereby either the state aids the church in attaining earthly and/or spiritual goals or the state runs the church. Put in another way, the church and state work hand in hand to enforce earthly and spiritual laws and principles. In modern America state-churches are influenced, perverted, and/or perhaps dominated by state enforced satanic principles, as shown in Section VI.

---

Chapter 3
Dispensation Theology versus Covenant Theology

Although many biblical principles run from Genesis to Revelation, the rules for church and state and for the Jewish religion-state are not the same. Distinct rules, as discussed in Chapter 4 of this section, are laid down in the Bible concerning Judaism and Israel and the church and state. It is a mistake to Judaize the church, a mistake which has many consequences. Dr. C. I. Scofield was correct in his assertion that:

“It may safely be said that the Judaizing of the Church has done more to hinder her progress, pervert her mission, and destroy her spiritually, than all other causes combined. Instead of pursuing her appointed path of separation from the world and following the Lord in her heavenly calling, she has used Jewish Scriptures to justify herself in lowering her purpose to the civilization of the world, the acquisition of wealth, the use of an imposing ritual, the erection of magnificent churches, the invocation of God’s blessing upon the conflicts of armies, and the division of an equal brotherhood into ‘clergy’ and ‘laity.’”

The “Judaizing” of the church is based upon false biblical interpretation, upon a false philosophy of history. “Karl Lowith defines ‘a philosophy of history as ‘a systematic interpretation of universal history in accordance with a principle by which historical events and successions are unified and directed toward ultimate meaning.’” This definition “centers on three things: (1) the ultimate goal of history; (2) the unifying principle; and (3) the recognition of ‘historical events and successions,’ or a proper concept of the progress of revelation in history.” The Bible contains a philosophy of history because it deals with the issue of meaning, offers a systematic interpretation of history, covers the entire scope of history from beginning to end, including the what and why of the future, presents a unifying principle which ties together and makes sense of the whole gamut of events, distinctions, and successions, and demonstrates that history has an ultimate goal or purpose.

The two main systems which Bible-believing scholars have developed to expost the Bible’s philosophy of history over the last three or four hundred years, Dispensationalism or Dispensational Theology and Covenant Theology, have produced two systems of theology. Dispensational Theology contains all the necessary elements of a valid philosophy of history. “Dispensationalism, [which] can be defined very simply as a system of theology which attempts to develop the Bible’s philosophy of history on the basis of the sovereign rule of God, represents the whole of Scripture and history as being covered by several dispensations of God’s rule.”

“The essence of dispensationalism … is the distinction between Israel and the church. This grows out of the dispensationalist’s consistent employment of normal or plain or historical-grammatical interpretation, and it reflects an understanding of the basic
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purposes of God in all His dealings with mankind as that of glorifying Himself through salvation and other purposes as well.”

Although Dispensationalism was not developed as a scheme in a systematic fashion until the 17th century, early church leaders did recognize some of the biblical principles basic to Dispensational Theology. The word from which dispensation is translated, oikonomia, appears nine times in the New Testament. Only once is it translated dispensation. It refers to a responsible office or ministry entrusted to one’s care by a higher authority in six passages and to a particular way of God’s administering His rule over the world in three other passages. “[T]he term dispensation as it relates to Dispensational Theology could be defined as a particular way of God’s administering His rule over the world as He progressively works out His purpose of world history.” Another way to define “dispensation” is “a distinguishable economy in the outworking of God’s purpose.” “Dispensationalism views the world as a household run by God.”

There are important characteristics and considerations concerning dispensations. There are three characteristics of each dispensation necessary to make it distinct from all other dispensations. First, each dispensation is characterized by a unique ruling factor or combination of ruling factors. “Second, it must involve a particular responsibility for man.” “Third, it must be characterized by divine revelation which had not been given before.” Three secondary characteristics are that each dispensation applies a test to man to see whether or not man will perfectly obey God’s rule, each dispensation demonstrates the failure of man to obey the particular rule of God of that dispensation, and each dispensation involves divine judgment because of man’s failure.

Some important considerations are first, the different dispensations are different ways of God’s administering His rule over the world, not different ways of salvation. Since the fall, individuals have always been saved by grace through faith. The sacrifices of the Israelites in the Old Testament did not provide salvation. “For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin.” “The Israelite’s offering implied confession of sin and of its due desert, death; and God ‘covered’ [or ‘passed over,’ …] his sin, in anticipation of Christ's sacrifice, which did, finally, ‘put away’ the sins ‘done aforetime in the forbearance of God.”

“For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God: Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.”

“And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.”
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Second, “[a] dispensation is a particular way of God’s administering His rule, but an age is a particular period of time”—hence a dispensation is not an age of history. Third, a dispensation may involve God’s administering His rule over all mankind or over only one segment of mankind. Fourth, a dispensation may continue or discontinue some ruling factors of previous dispensations, but it will have at least one new ruling factor never introduced before.” Fifth, each new dispensation requires new revelation.”

Dispensations have characteristics. Primarily, dispensations are stewardships. All in a particular dispensational economy are stewards, although one man usually stands out. For example, Paul was used by God more than any other to reveal His grace. Nonetheless, all the apostles and every other believer are also stewards of God’s grace. All have a responsibility to respond to that grace. God will judge those who fail to do so.

Most theologians recognize seven dispensations:

“Innocence (Gen. 1.28); Conscience (Gen. 3.23); Human Government (Gen. 8.20); Promise (Gen. 12.1); Law (Ex. 19.8); Grace (John 1.17); Kingdom (Eph. 1.10).”

In each dispensation, God used or uses a ruling factor to govern man. Man failed or will fail in every dispensation, even in the last dispensation in which Christ Himself will rule over a perfect government and exceptional conditions. Man’s failure in that dispensation will bring God’s judgment. Those who rebel outwardly during that time will be executed, and “God will crush the huge revolt which will take place immediately after the seventh dispensation sending fire to destroy the human rebels and casting Satan into the lake of fire for everlasting torment (Rev. 20:9-10).”

Dispensational Theology recognizes distinctions of things which differ in history by asserting that distinctions are the result of God’s administering His rule in different ways at different periods of history. “There is no interpreter of the Bible who does not recognize the need for certain basic distinctions in the Scriptures.” The Covenant Theologian also makes rather important dispensational distinctions even though he views them as related to the unifying and underlying Covenant of Grace. For example, Louis Berkhof, after rejecting the usual dispensational scheme of Bible distinctions, enumerates his own scheme of dispensations or administrations—the Old Testament dispensation and the New Testament dispensation. “However, within the Old Testament dispensation Berkhof lists four subdivisions, which although he terms them ‘stages in the revelation of the covenant of grace,’ are distinguishable enough to be listed.” Thus, he recognizes five dispensations—four in the Old Testament and the New Testament dispensation.

“[T]he way in which the two systems meet [the] requirements [for a valid philosophy of history] affirms that dispensationalism is the more valid and
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helpful system." First, Dispensationalists find the goal of history in the establishment of the millennial kingdom on earth, an optimistic view which insists that the glory of the sovereign God must be seen in the present heavens and earth. According to Dispensational Theology, all history moves toward the ultimate goal for God to glorify Himself by demonstrating that He alone is the sovereign God. Throughout Scripture, God is glorified. The First of the Ten Commandments, “Thou shalt have no other Gods before me,” an absolute, rock-hard rule, indicates that God wants to be glorified. Everything is seen in the Bible as being for His glory. The successive dispensations glorify God by (1) demonstrating that God is sovereign throughout history despite Satan’s attempts to overthrow God’s rule and man’s rebellion against God since God can “hold man responsible to obey His methods of administering His rule and can judge man for his” disobedience; (2) “displaying the disorder and tragedy which result from the rejection of God’s rule;” and (3) by “progressively [moving] history toward the fulfillment of its God-intended climax.

On the other hand, the Covenant Theologian seems pessimistic and sees the present struggle between good and evil terminated by the beginning of eternity at which point there will come catastrophe and divine judgment.

Second, in Covenant Theology, the unifying principle for the philosophy of history is the Covenant of Grace, a soteriological principle. Dispensational Theology has a unifying principle—the sovereign rule of God—which “ties the distinctions and progressive stages of revelation together and directs them toward the fulfillment of purpose in history.” Dispensational Theology recognizes that the redemption of the elect plus many other programs are all parts of God’s purpose for history.

“In dispensationalism the [unifying] principle is theological or eschatological or doxological, for the differing dispensations reveal the glory of God as He manifests His character in the differing stewardships, which culminate in history with the millennial glory. This is not to say that dispensationalism fails to give salvation its proper place in the purpose of God…. If the goal of history is the earthly Millennium and if the glory of God will be manifest at that time in the personal presence of Christ in a way hitherto unknown, then the unifying principle of dispensationalism may be said to be eschatological (if viewed from the goal toward which we are moving) or theological (if viewed from the self-revelation of God in every dispensation) or doxological (if viewed from the perspective of the overall manifestation of the glory of God).”

Third, Dispensationalism gives a proper place to the idea of development, whereas Covenant Theology does not. In Covenant Theology in practice there is extreme rigidity even though Covenant Theology does include in its system different modes of administration of the Covenant of Grace, and although those modes would give an appearance of an idea of progressiveness in revelation. Dispensational Theology states that each new dispensation requires a new revelation, thereby supplying the element of a proper concept of the progress of revelation. According to Dispensationalism, under different economies, God gives new revelation which is increasingly progressive in scope. The similarities

---

22 Ibid., p. 17.
23 See Showers pp. 50-51 for an excellent overview of Scripture that substantiates this point.
24 Showers, pp. 50-51.
26 Showers, p. 52.
27 Ryrie, pp. 17-18; see also, Showers, p. 53.
in different dispensations are part of a progression of development by God rather than

“a result of employing the unifying principle of the covenant of grace.... Only dispensationalism can cause historical events and successions to be seen in their own light and not to be reflected in the artificial light of an overall covenant.

“Thus a correct philosophy of history with its requirements of a proper goal, a proper unifying principle, and a proper concept of progress is best satisfied by the dispensational system. Like the need for biblical distinctions, the proper concept of the philosophy of history leads to dispensationalism.”

Three factors are indispensable to Dispensational Theology. First, Dispensational Theology recognizes the distinction between the nation Israel and the Church. Covenant Theology is convinced that Israel and the church are essentially the same. “The theological liberal, no matter how much he speaks of the Judaistic background of Christianity, recognizes that Christianity is different from Judaism.”

Second, Dispensational Theology, unlike Covenant Theology, uses a single hermeneutic or method of interpreting Scripture—the historical-grammatical method. “If plain or normal interpretation is the only valid hermeneutical principle and if it is consistently applied, it will cause one to be a dispensationalist.”

“Covenant Theologians are well known for their use of nonliteral interpretation, especially when interpreting prophecy, and they are equally well known for their amillennialism, which is only the natural outcome of such a hermeneutic.” Thus, the 144,000 of Revelation 7 cannot refer “to literal Israel, but the spiritual Israel, or the church, [etc.].”

Third, Dispensational Theology recognizes that the ultimate purpose of history is the glory of God through the demonstration that He alone is the sovereign God, unlike Covenant Theology which advocates that the ultimate purpose of history is the glory of God through the redemption of the elect.

“[A]lthough Dispensational Theology recognizes that the redemption of elect human beings is a very important part of God’s purpose for history, it is convinced that it is only one part of that purpose.” God is working out many other programs in addition to the program of redeeming people, all of which must be contributing something to the ultimate purpose of history.

Covenant Theology, “a system of theology which attempts to develop the Bible’s philosophy of history on the basis of two or three covenants,” “represents the whole of Scripture and history as being covered by those two or three covenants.” Covenant Theology began as a system in the 16th or 17th century and was introduced into America primarily through the Puritans.

This chapter will not examine Covenant Theology in detail, but some explanation is necessary. Some information will repeat some of the concepts discussed supra. This book is primarily concerned with Covenant Theology, as practiced in the American colonies by established churches (more on this in Section IV), and the resulting unbiblical practices including persecution of dissenters. The two or three covenants involved are called the Covenant of

28 Ryrie, p. 19.
29 Ryrie, p. 16; Showers, p. 52.
30 Ryrie, p. 16, see also, Showers, p. 53.
31 Ryrie, p. 20; Showers, p. 53.
33 Showers, pp. 52-53.
34 Ibid., pp. 7-8; see also, Ryrie, pp. 183-184.
Redemption, the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace. One version of Covenant Theology combines the Covenant of Redemption with the Covenant of Grace. Covenant Theology teaches that God established the Covenant of Redemption in eternity past when God determined to provide redemption during the course of history for the elect. This Covenant placed requirements on the Lord Jesus Christ. God the Father gave the Son the responsibility of paying for the sin of Adam and His elect (those the Father had given Him). He could do that by keeping the law thereby assuring eternal life for His children.\(^{35}\)

According to Covenant Theology, the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace came after God created man. These covenants are deduced by Covenant Theologians and are not specified in Scripture. The Covenant of Works was established between the creation and fall of man. It required “implicit and perfect obedience of Adam.”\(^{36}\) Adam broke the Covenant of Works after which God established the Covenant of Grace.

The Covenant of Grace has been defined as “that gracious agreement between the offended God and the offending but elect sinner, in which God promises salvation through faith in Christ, and the sinner accepts this believingly, promising a life of faith and obedience.”\(^{37}\) God is the first party to the covenant, and, depending upon the theologian, the second party is the sinner, the elect, or the elect sinner in Christ. Some people who never become regenerate are included in the Covenant of Grace since it exists as both ‘a communion of life’ experienced by only the regenerate and as a ‘purely legal relationship’ experienced by both believers and their children. The children of believers experience the Covenant of Grace as a legal relationship in four ways: They are in the Covenant (1) “as far as their responsibility [to repent and believe] is concerned;” (2) “in the sense that they may lay claim to the promises which God gave when He established His covenant with believers and their seed;” (3) “in the sense that they are subject to the ministrations of the covenant;” and (4) “as far as the common covenant blessings are concerned.” A person who is a child of the regenerate is regarded as a member of the covenant even if he does not enter into the communion of life aspect through a confession of faith.\(^{38}\) As one Puritan preacher, in an attempt to remove objections of some against partaking of the Lord’s Supper because of fears of not being born again, preached in order to persuade them:

> “The children of those who are members of the visible church are, by the constitution of God, from their first coming into existence, members of his kingdom in common with their parents. So it was under the Jewish dispensation; and so it is now, [under the Christian] if there is any validity in one of the principal arguments, by which we vindicate our practice, in baptizing the infants of those who are members of Christ’s church.”\(^{39}\)

According to Covenant Theology, the main promise God made in the Covenant of Grace was: “I will … be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee;”\(^{40}\) and “includes the following promises: temporal blessings, justification, adoption, eternal life, the Spirit of God with His many ministries, and final

\(^{35}\) See, e.g., Showers, p. 9.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 10; see also, Ryrie, pp. 188-189.

\(^{37}\) Showers, pp. 10-11; see also, Ryrie, p. 184 citing Berkhof, p. 277.

\(^{38}\) Showers, pp. 11-13.


\(^{40}\) Genesis 17.7.
glorification.”

Establishment of religion in Christianity depends upon this covenant. Isaac Backus taught, “All establishments of worship by human laws, that ever were erected under the Christian name, were built upon calling the covenant in Gen. xvii the covenant of grace.”

Most Covenant Theologians have divided postfall history into two dispensations, the Mosaic dispensation sometimes called the “Old Covenant,” and the Christian dispensation, usually called the “New Covenant;” and they claim that the Covenant of Grace, although administration of that covenant differed between the dispensations, exists throughout these dispensations. “[E]ach dispensation or covenant named in the Bible is simply another stage of the progressive revelation of the nature of the Covenant of Grace.”

Covenant Theology has both commendable and problem features. It is commendable in that it emphasizes the grace of God, the redemptive work of Christ, and salvation by grace through faith, recognizes Jesus Christ as the central figure of world history, and has exhibited a commendable motive in that it has made an honest attempt to be faithful to the Scriptures while expositing the biblical philosophy of history.

On the other hand, Covenant theology has many problems. Many of them are pointed out in this chapter as well as throughout this book. Several significant shortcomings of Covenant Theology follow, repeating some already discussed supra:

First its “ultimate goal of history[, also discussed supra, the Glory of God through the redemption of the elect,] is too narrow…. Second, Covenant Theology denies or weakens some of the distinctions which are in the Bible by insisting that distinctions are simply different phases of the same Covenant of Grace…. In addition, Covenant theology denies the existence of distinctive gospels in the Bible…. Covenant Theology insists that there is no essential distinction between the Mosaic Covenant (the Law) and the New Covenant…. Covenant theology also denies the distinction between the nation of Israel and the Church…. Third, Covenant Theology is mistaken when it teaches that each of the biblical covenants is a continuation and newer phase of the Covenant of Grace…. Fourth, Covenant

42 Mr. Backus goes on to point out that “Those who have seen the nature of original sin, cannot tell how to keep up the idea of children’s being born in the covenant of grace, without some regard to grace in their parents. And in the same chapter where the unbelieving consort is said to be sanctified by the believer, a widow is required to marry only in the Lord…..” [He then refers to a parable wherein to make his point the author thereof describes a church which advised a member to marry a certain woman of grace in the church rather than a woman he loves who is not of grace. Of the woman of grace, the church says:]

“As to some trifles, which a carnal man would object to, it becomes you as a spiritual man, to make no objection. It is true, she is of a mean family, and a very weak understanding; she is peevish and fretful to the highest degree; her shape is semicircular; she is what the world calls monstrous ugly; every feature is adapted to mortify carnal desires, which is much better than to have them gratified; she is the queen of sluts, and without any polite education. But she has grace, saving grace; she is regenerated; let your grace wed with hers, and a sweet bride she will be. Moreover, she is past the flower of her age, and we suppose need so requires.”

Backus goes on to say that this parable can be applied to no church on earth, but says “[H]ow mean and spiteful it is to treat the Word Grace [in the manner treated by Covenant Theologians]! Affixing the word to the covenant of circumcision, where God never put it, is the source of [a difficulty of a church at Stockbridge where to be sanctified by the believer, a widow is required to marry only in the Lord]. Backus, A History of New England…, Volume 2, pp. 238-241.
44 Showers, p. 19.
Theology’s unifying principle is too limited or narrow. [First, Covenant Theology is too limited in that it unifies history through the Covenant of Grace from either the fall of man or the time of Abraham. It is too narrow because it deals only with God’s redemption of the elect, and it does not unify the program of redemption with all God’s other programs.] Second, … it does not unify prefall history with postfall history, which a valid exposition of the biblical philosophy of history must do…. Fifth, in order to make its system work, Covenant Theology must employ a double hermeneutic (a double system of interpretation).”

According to the Covenant Theologian, “the idea of dual covenants functioned as a warning against reliance on good works for salvation.” The Covenant of Works required obedience for salvation. According to the Covenant of Grace one could only be saved by faith in Christ.46

Yet, the Covenant of Works remained in effect.

“This meant, first, that New Englanders whom God had not yet called effectually into salvation remained entirely under a covenant of works and subject to its moral restraint. It meant also, according to Cotton, that the burden of moral expectation should drive the sensitive conscience to Christ. It was ‘the usual manner of God to give a Covenant of Grace by leading men first into a Covenant of works.’ Living under the covenant of works, Shepard explained, they would discover their sinfulness, and their ‘errors, and fears, and hopes’ would turn them to Christ. And it meant, third, that even Christians safely within the covenant of grace remained subject to the moral substance of the first covenant. Abolished as a ‘covenant of life,’ Shepard said, the law still remained a ‘Rule of Life.’ These were the traditional three uses of the law in Reformed theology; covenantal language provided a lively way to restate them.”47

Covenant Theologians teach that God’s commands are “too severe even for Adam in innocency, and that grace[, through the covenant of circumcision and its successor, baptism,] gives an exemption from that severity,” under the Covenant of Grace.

Covenant Theology, which does not recognize or correctly analyze the roles of the Old and New Covenants, is at odds with a correct interpretation of the Bible on this issue. Isaac Backus explained:

“[The law is holy, just, and good]; it [is] spiritual; but [man] a carnal slave to sin, instead of having such high dignity and liberty as he before imagined he had…. A false imagination of good in the forbidden fruit, drew our first parents into rebellion against God; and such imaginations are the only source of sin in all their children. James i. 14, 15. Good is still their pursuit, but they have lost the knowledge of who can give it, or of what it is; but the regenerate soul knows both, and this is the precise difference between them. Psalm iv. 6, 7. Who does not know that debtors and criminals are not fit judges in their own causes? [Y]et that is the case with all reasoners against the truth and perfection of God’s written word…. And to hear many speaking evil of things they know not, but what they know naturally as brute beasts, and in those things to corrupt themselves; to see them tread down the good pastures, and foul the deep waters, and thrust others with side and shoulder, serves to confirm believers in the truth of revelation, and in the hope of a speedy deliverance from such evil beasts. Jude 10. Ezek. xxxiv. 18, 25.”48

47 Ibid.
To show that God has “disannulled the national covenant which he made with Abraham,” Backus offered the following insights:

“First, Abraham had no right to circumcise any stranger, until he had bought him as a servant for money. Gen. xvii. 12, 13. But God says to his children, Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men. I Cor. vii. 23. And he says to his ministers, Feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. Acts xx. 28. He also says, Ye have sold yourselves for nought, and ye shall be redeemed without money. And this is the gospel of peace. Is. iii. 3, 7; Rom. x. 15. Thus do the apostles explain the prophets. Secondly, The children of Israel had no right to receive strangers into the church by households, until the day in which they came out of Egypt, when the Passover was instituted. And then God said, Every man’s servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. Exod. xii. 44—48. Circumcision and the Passover were as binding upon servants as children; and both ordinances pointed to the blood of Christ, which he was to shed for his people. And in reference to that, God said, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt. Jer. xxxi. 31, 32. And an inspired apostle says, In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. Heb. viii. 7—13; x. 9. And can old and new, first and second, mean but one covenant? Surely no. Thirdly, Circumcision is the name which God gave to his covenant with Abraham. Acts vii. 8. And though Jews and Mahometans are still zealous for it, yet all Christians allow that circumcision is repealed. But after the apostolic age, men took away the name which God gave to that covenant, and added the name Grace to it; and they held that dominion is founded in grace. And from thence the nations have made merchandise of all the vanities of time, and of slaves and souls of men. But the plagues of Babylon will come upon all men who add to the word of God, and take away from the words of his book, if they refuse to come out of that practice. Rev. xviii. 4—13; xxi. 18, 19. And there is not a word in all the Bible for bringing any child to baptism without his own profession of faith in Christ, nor for forcing any man to support any religious minister; and all national churches are built upon these two superstitions. Fourthly, Circumcision was the shedding of human blood; and when Abraham received it, it was a seal of righteousness of the faith which he before had in Christ, in whom believers are justified by his blood. Rom. iv. 11, 23; v. 9; Gal. iii. 16; Gen. xv. 6; xvii. 24. It was a seal to him; but neither circumcision nor baptism are ever called seals to any other person in the Bible. But God says to true believers in Christ, In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise. And he also says, Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption. Eph. i. 13; iv. 30. After believing in Christ, the Holy Spirit seals the merits of his death, and the promises of his grace to the soul. And all believers from the beginning, looked through the bloody ordinances which God appointed, to the blood of Christ for justification. And after the beast arose out of the bottomless pit, God said, All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Rev. xiii. 8. Force and cruelty is the general character of the beast; but Jesus, who is the root and offspring of David, will cause all evil beasts to cease out of the land. Ezek. xxxiv. 4, 25; Rev. xxii. 16. Fifthly, the believing Jews were suffered to go on in circumcision for a number of years past the death of Christ, and then God said to them, If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. … Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace. Gal. v. 2—4. So far was the covenant of circumcision from being the covenant of grace. That bloody sign not only pointed to the death of Christ, but also to the death of all true believers in him. Therefore Paul says, I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. … The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against such there is no law. And they that are Christ’s, have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts. Gal. ii. 19, 20; v. 22-24. Adam and Christ are the only two public heads of mankind, as to the great affairs of the soul and eternity. For as by one man’s disobedience, many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous. Rom. v. 19. For parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is of infinite
importance; but we can find no warrant for any to bring them to baptism without a personal profession of faith in Christ….

“God said of Abraham, I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him. Gen. xviii. 19. He will and They shall, was the language of God’s covenant with Abraham; but I will, and They shall, is the language of the new covenant, since the death of Christ. Heb. viii. 10; x. 9. It was the will of God that the visible church should continue in the line of Abraham’s posterity, until Christ came and died for his people, and then the holy spirit was given, and believing Jews and Gentiles were united in his church. And they never were called Christians, until believing Gentiles were received into the church without circumcision….

“[T]he holding that the children of believers are born into the covenant of grace, or that baptism can bring them into it, without their own knowledge or choice, is such a confounding of grace and works together as holds multitudes in blindness and bondage.”

We should look at the Dispensation of Grace to find the duties of believers today.

Who are the true seed of Abraham? Mr. Backus again correctly divided the Word of Truth in answering this question:

“Circumcision was only for males, but females are equally the subjects of baptism, which proves an essential change of the covenant. And our Lord gave the gospel commission to the eleven, who were all born again; and he said to them, Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. Matt. xxviii. 16—20. This promise is only to his children, in the way of obedience to all his commandments. And as the covenant of circumcision gave Israel a right to buy the heathen for servants, and circumcision was only for the males, the gospel says to believers, Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s then ye are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise. Gal. iii.26—29. Abraham was an eminent type of Christ, and none are his spiritual seed but believers in Christ.”

Dispensationalism correctly explains the Covenants of Law and Grace. God made a covenant with the children of Israel called the Mosaic Covenant. The Mosaic Covenant of Law applied to an earthly people.

“The Mosaic Covenant (1) given to Israel (2) in three divisions, each essential to the others, and together forming the Mosaic Covenant, viz.: the Commandments, expressing the righteous will of God (Ex. 20.1-26; the ‘judgments,’ governing the social life of Israel (Ex. 21.1-24.11); and the ‘ordinances,’ governing the religious life of Israel (Ex. 24.12-31.18). These three elements form ‘the law,’ as that phrase is generically used in the New Testament (e.g. Mt. 5.17, 18). The Commandments and the ordinances formed one religious system. The Commandments were a ‘ministry of condemnation’ and of ‘death’ (2 Cor. 3.7-9); the ordinances gave, in the high priest, a representative of the people with Jehovah; and in the sacrifices a ‘cover’ (see ‘Atonement,’ Lev. 16.6 note) for their sins in anticipation of the Cross (Heb. 5.1-3; 9.6-9; Rom. 3.25, 26). The Christian is not under the conditional Mosaic Covenant of works, the law, but under the unconditional New Covenant of grace (Rom. 3.21-27; 6.14, 15; Gal. 2.16, 3.10-14, 16-18, 24-26; 4.21-31; Heb. 10.11-17).”

50 Ibid., pp. 370-371.
51 1917 Scofield Reference Edition, n. 1 to Ex. 20.4, p. 95.
Christ was the mediator of a better covenant, called the New Covenant “But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.”

“The New Covenant, Summary:

(1) “Better’ than the Mosaic Covenant, not morally, but efficaciously [or ‘as of having the power to produce the desired effect’] (Heb. 7.19 ['For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did: by which we draw nigh unto God.']); Rom. 8.3-4 ['For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.']).

(2) “Established on ‘better’ (i.e., unconditional) promises. In the Mosaic Covenant God said, ‘If ye will’ (Ex. 19.5-6a ['Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.']); in the New Covenant, He says, ‘I will’ (Heb. 8.10, 12-13 ['By the which we are all sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.']).

(3) “Under the Mosaic Covenant obedience sprang from fear (Heb. 2.2 ['For if by the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward']); 12.25-27 ['See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven: Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.']); under the New, from a willing heart and mind (Heb. 8.9-10 ['Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:']);

(4) “The New Covenant secures the personal revelation of the Lord to every believer (Heb. 8.11 ['And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.']);

(5) “the complete oblivion of sins (Heb. 8.12 ['For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins, and their iniquities will I remember no more']);

Heb. 10.17 ['And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.']; cf. Heb. 10.3 ['But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year.']);

(6) “rests upon an accomplished redemption (Mt. 26.27, 28 ['And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.']); 1 Cor. 11.25 ['After the manner also he took the cup, when he supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me'];

Heb. 9.11, 12, 18-23 ['But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people.

52 Hebrews 8.6. Hebrews 8.1-5 speaks of the Mosaic Covenant of Law.
Saying. This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should by purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

(7) “and secures the perpetuity, future conversion, and blessing of Israel (Jer. 31.31-40 [‘Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more. Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The LORD of hosts is his name: If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD. Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that the city shall be built to the LOR D from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner. And the measuring line shall yet go forth over against it upon the hill Gareb, and shall compass about to Goath. And the whole valley of the dead bodies, and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the brook of Kidron, unto the corner of the horse gate toward the east, shall be holy unto the LORD; it shall not be plucked up, nor thrown down any more for ever.]; see also ‘Kingdom (O.T.),’ and 2 Sam. 7.8-17). The New Covenant is the eighth, thus speaking of resurrection and of eternal completeness.”\textsuperscript{53}

“In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.”\textsuperscript{54}

Covenant Theology has had clear consequences. Roger Williams pointed out, concerning the religious persecution based upon Covenant Theology: “He [that is, the established churches] that kills and he [those defined as heretics by the established churches] that is killed, they both cry out, ‘It is for God, and for their conscience.’”\textsuperscript{55} Only one side can be right, and the Bible shows that side to be the persecuted Baptists. Both protestants and papists, Williams continued, “pretend they have spoke with Moses and the prophets, who all, say they, before Christ came, allowed such holy persecutions [and] holy wars against the enemies of holy church.”\textsuperscript{56}

It is impossible for a Gentile nation prior to the return of Christ to operate as a true theocracy. As seen in Section I, Chapter 6, a theocracy is a “Government of a state by the immediate direction of God; or the state thus governed.” All alleged “Christian” theocracies (church over state; state over church; or a combination of church and state; called ecclesiocracies by the author) are only poor imitators of the one true God-ordained theocracy in Israel. God never told the church to work with the state, over the state, or under the state.

\textsuperscript{54} Hebrews 8.12.
\textsuperscript{55} Williams and Underhill, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p. 34.
Israel, the only theocracy which has ever existed, operated as a theocracy only until the Israelites rejected God and demanded a king, and God acted on their request and gave them King Saul. In the theocracy, all ten of the commandments were enforced. While operating as a theocracy, Israel was directly under God, and God initially spoke directly to the leaders of the nation of Israel. After God allowed Israel, at Israel’s request, to be ruled by a king, the Jewish religion and the civil government no longer worked together, although God spoke to the kings of Israel through his chosen prophets.

God no longer speaks directly to leaders of civil government, to the leaders of church government, or to others. He speaks to believers, led by the Holy Spirit, through His Word, the Bible. This is consistent with the fact that He only ordained one theocracy, Israel, prior to the second return of Christ. Yet Covenant Theology united church and state, with the church taking the place of God in speaking directly to the civil government. As a result, the “church” used the strong arm of the state to enforce its own particular brand of religion, or the state itself enforced its preferred religion. The only way to justify such a union is to use a false interpretation of Scripture, an interpretation which, since it is based upon Satan’s principles, must have been developed by Satan himself and implemented either by his children or by children of God who were not walking in the spirit according to knowledge.

The most noticeable and atrocious consequence of all church-state and state-church unions has been the confiscation of property, dissemination of lies about “heretics” as defined by the state-church, and other persecutions such as the beating, torture, imprisonment, and killing of untold millions of people who have dissented from the views of the state-church. The ultimate result of church-state or state-church alliances is always the same—the alliance of church and state called for by a perverted interpretation of Scripture forces others to profess allegiance to the doctrines of the official church under penalty of persecution, thereby attempting to stamp out those who practice free will. The state-church or church-state enforces its own peculiar doctrines including all of the Ten Commandments among which are the first four commandments which deal with man’s relationship to God. In effect, it requires many to be dishonest with both man and God. Since no one can be forced to choose to believe a particular religious belief in their heart, a lot of religious hypocrites are thereby created.

As history shows, the official corrupted “church” was vile to the core. The reformers became especially aware of the corruption within the Roman “church.” Corruption is inevitable when church and state are intermixed.

To quote a great Bible teacher: “The church that sets out to spiritualize the world will soon find that the world will secularize the church. When wheat and tares compromise, it is the wheat that suffers. Light and darkness, right and wrong, good and evil, truth and error are incompatibles, and when they compromise it is the light, the right, the good, and the truth that are damaged.”

As Pastor Hank Thompson, has preached: “Holy means set apart for God. You cannot bring that which is holy and unholy together without making the holy things unholy. Holy things combined with unholy things do not make the unholy holy. It always makes the holy unholy. Being around someone who is sick may make a well person sick. Being

---

around a well person won’t make a sick person well. If you are grounded and touch the ground and a power line at the same time, you are cooked. If you try to touch God and touch the world, you will be corrupted.\(^{58}\)

The *Holy Bible*, the basic source for all truth proclaims: “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.”\(^{59}\)

Just as the union of church and state corrupted the Roman “church” and society, it also corrupted the established Protestant churches and the nations which had established Protestant churches.

The church proceeded under the New Covenant, whereas the Jewish theocracy operated under the Mosaic covenant. Isaac Backus, in pointing out that Jesus did away with the Old Testament Covenant of Law, wrote:

“When our Savior came, he fulfilled the law, both moral and ceremonial, and abolished those hereditary distinctions among mankind. But in the centuries following, deceitful philosophy took away the name which God has given to that covenant, (Acts vii.8) [the covenant of circumcision] and added the name Grace to it; from whence came the doctrine, that *dominion is founded in grace*. And although this latter name has been exploded by many, yet the root of it has been tenaciously held fast and taught in all colleges and superior places of learning, as far as Christianity has extended, until the present time; whereby natural affection, education, temporal interest and self-righteousness, the strongest prejudices in the world, have all conspired to bind people in that way, and to bar their minds against equal liberty and believer’s baptism.”\(^{60}\)

Scriptures, other than those already cited to show that the church and state are not to wed or to enter into any kind of relationship, especially for persecution of those who do not submit to the official religion, teach that the church is not to enforce spiritual laws in society in general, even with the help of civil government. The Lord commanded that men not remove the tares “lest [they] root up also the wheat [the children of the kingdom].”\(^{61}\) Instead, they are to be permitted to grow together until the harvest when the Lord shall send forth his angels to gather the tares and cast them into a furnace of fire.\(^{62}\) The Lord commanded His disciples to leave the Pharisees, whom He referred to as the “blind leading the blind,” alone because “every plant, which [His] heavenly father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.”\(^{63}\) He told his disciples: “Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall in the ditch.”\(^{64}\)

As Roger Williams noted, “This sentence against [the blind Pharisee], the Lord Jesus only pronounceth in his church, his spiritual judicature, and executes this sentence in part

---

\(^{58}\) “Separation.” Sermon preached at Capitol City Baptist Church in Austin, Texas by Pastor Hank Thompson, February 12, 2006.

\(^{59}\) II Corinthians 6.14-18. The doctrine of separation is taught extensively in the Word of God.


\(^{61}\) Matthew 13.24-30, 37-43.


\(^{63}\) Matthew 15.13-14.

\(^{64}\) Matthew 15.14.
at present, and hereafter to all eternity. Such a sentence no civil judge can pass, such a death no civil sword can inflict."\(^{65}\)

Other relevant scriptures dealing with the actions of a Christian against his enemies, those who curse, hate, despitefully use, persecute and disagree with him include:

"But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?"\(^{66}\)

The Lord said to his disciples, “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in they synagogues; [a]nd ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles."\(^{67}\) What sheep ever attacked a wolf or anything else?

"And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward."\(^{68}\)

The Lord Jesus said to his disciples, James and John, who desired to command fire down from heaven to devour Samaritans who would not receive Him, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye be of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them."\(^{69}\)

"The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life of the sheep."\(^{70}\)

"And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, [i]n meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; [a]nd they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will."\(^{71}\)

The reason for not attempting to remove heretics, the tares, from the world seems to be, as Roger Williams noted:

“because they who now are tares, may hereafter become wheat; they who are now blind, may hereafter see; they that now resist him may hereafter receive him; that that are now in the devil’s snare, in adverseness to the truth, may hereafter come to repentance; they that are now blasphemers and persecutors, as Paul was, may in time become faithful as he; they that are now idolaters, as the Corinthians once were, 1 Cor. vi. 9, may hereafter become true worshippers as they; they that are now no people of God, nor under mercy, as the saints sometimes were 1 Pet. ii. 10, may hereafter become the people of God, and obtain mercy, as they.

---

\(^{65}\) Williams and Underhill, p. 97.

\(^{66}\) Matthew 5.44-47.

\(^{67}\) Matthew 10.16-18.

\(^{68}\) Mark 9.38. See also Luke 9.49-50.


\(^{70}\) John 10.10-11.

\(^{71}\) II Timothy 2.24-26.
Persecution of “heretics” is contrary to many New Testament teachings. True believers were promised that they would be persecuted, and never were told to persecute anyone. Jesus told the disciples that “the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.”\(^\text{73}\)

The promises to the Jew in the Old Testament were significantly different than the promises to the Christian in the New Testament. No greater example can be cited, I believe, than the contrast between the Old Testament promises that Israel would prosper and be blessed materially if they would keep God’s commandments and statutes or that they would be judged if they failed to do so\(^\text{74}\) and the New Testament promise to Christians that “all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.”\(^\text{75}\)

The church and state wed at the invitation of the Roman Emperor Constantine early in the fourth century. Some churches married the state and became the officially recognized “church.” After that unholy union, the established Roman Catholic “church,” working hand in hand with the state, persecuted believers. The persecution was continued by the Protestant churches which came out of Roman Catholicism, and finally was brought to America and our colonies by the Puritans, Anglicans, and others.

Throughout this book, Scripture and arguments are presented which refute Covenant Theology. Section I, which deals with government, explains that God, because of His covenants with Israel, will establish Israel in the land he has given them. Section II, which deals with the church, shows that Christ desires to be the only head of the church, that He loves the church and gave Himself for it, and that the church is the bride and wife of Christ. The distinct differences between the church and state, as will be shown in Chapter 4 \textit{infra}, render the two mutually exclusive, operating in different spheres—the civil government or the state operates in the earthly sphere and the church operates in the spiritual realm (although application of spiritual principles affect earthly actions).

The Covenant Theology examined in this book cannot coexist with free will. As will be shown in Section IV, the established churches in almost all the American colonies advocated either a church-state or state-church, unions of church and state under which the strong arm of the state punished, sometimes by death, (execution of dissidents in the colonies was forbidden by England after four Quakers were hanged in Massachusetts as will be explained in Section IV) those the state-church labeled as “heretics.” Had the official churches prevailed, America would not have the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Thank God that Baptist dissenters led the fight that resulted in liberty of conscience guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

\(^{72}\) Williams and Underhill, pp. 11-12.

\(^{73}\) John 16.2. This was spoken directly to the apostles, but the Bible and history show that it is applicable to all believers who have been persecuted or will be persecuted for Christ’s sake. Christ is actually speaking to all who are not of the world, but are the chosen of God. See, e.g., John 15.

\(^{74}\) See, e.g., Exodus 15.26; 19.5-8; 24.3, 7; 34.18-35.3; Leviticus 18.3-20.27; 20.22-23; 26 (read in conjunction with Deuteronomy 28-30); Deuteronomy 4-11; 12.30-31; 28-30; 28.1-68; I Samuel 12.1-5; I Kings 6.12-13; 9.1-9; II Chronicles 7.12-22; 15.1-7; etc.

\(^{75}\) II Timothy 3.12.
Chapter 4
Distinct differences between church and state

“Christians must be careful not to apply God’s principles for the Jewish religion and the nation Israel to church and state. The principles for the two are so distinct that they are mutually exclusive. The government of the Church of Christ is as distinct from all worldly governments, as heaven is from earth!”

God gave both church and state certain powers. God gave the state earthly and temporal power within jurisdictional boundaries which He set out.

“EARTHLY, a. Pertaining to the earth, or to this world.
Our earthly house of this tabernacle. 2 Cor. v.
2. Not heavenly; vile; mean,
This earthly load
Of death called life. Milton.
3. Belonging to our present state; as earthly objects; earthly residence.
Whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. Phil. iii.
4. Belonging to the earth or world; carnal; vile; as opposed to spiritual or heavenly.
5. Corporeal; not mental. Spenser.”

The power given the church was meant to provide a spiritual and eternal good.

“SPIRITUAL,
1. Consisting of spirit; not material; incorporeal; as a spiritual substance or being. The soul of man is spiritual.
2. Mental; intellectual; as spiritual armor.
3. Not gross; refined from external things; not sensual; relative to mind only; as a spiritual and refined religion.
4. Not lay or temporal; relating to sacred things; ecclesiastical; as the spiritual functions of the clergy; the lords spiritual and temporal; a spiritual corporation.
5. Pertaining to spirit or to the affections; pure; holy.
God’s law is spiritual; it is a transcript of the divine nature, and extends its authority to the acts of the soul of man.
6. Pertaining to the renewed nature of man; as spiritual life.
7. Not fleshly; not material; as spiritual sacrifices. 1 Peter ii.
8. Pertaining to divine things; as spiritual songs…. Ephesians v.”

Spiritual beliefs determine earthly actions. Much of God’s Spiritual Word deals with actions of individuals, families, churches, and nations here upon the earth. Civil governments are not given jurisdiction over many areas of life.

God ordained a church under God, not a business under civil government, an entity that is to work hand in hand with or perhaps over the state to bring in the kingdom of God, or an entity that is to work under state rules. Admittedly, the ultimate God-given purpose of both the church and state is to glorify God, each acting under God, but neither acting with or under the other. However, the underlying purposes of a church and the state are significantly different: the underlying purpose of the church is heavenly or spiritual; the underlying purpose of the state is earthly.

The purpose of the Gentile civil government is fleshly or earthly. Gentile civil government, according to God, was ordained by God to deal with those temporal earthly matters assigned it by God. God gave man certain authority

---

2 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828).
3 Ibid.
over man. He gave man the responsibility to rule over man under His rules. Gentile civil government has authority to punish those who commit certain crimes against their fellow man and to reward those who do good. The purpose of the Gentile civil government is to control evil men thereby maintaining some degree of peace in this present world. A civil government, as defined by God, is made up of men under God ruling over man in earthly matters.

A church is a local autonomous body of believers; and, as such, it is a holy temple for the habitation of God through the Spirit; is “one flesh” with Christ; and espoused to Him as a chaste virgin to one Husband. A church, under God, owes no allegiance to any tribunal in the universe, except to that of the Lord Jesus Christ unless she willingly and wrongly places herself under the jurisdiction of another, and is the body of Christ of which He is the Head.

Neither the church nor the state was given authority from God to rule over or with the other. Christians are told to obey civil government as regards certain earthly matters. But Christians and churches are not to be under the civil government with regard to spiritual matters, which include many activities and actions as shown in the Bible. God gave churches free will, and churches can therefore choose to disobey God and voluntarily put themselves under the authority of civil government.

Civil government does not meet the qualifications needed to rule over the church and those matters assigned the church by God. Civil government first of all does not have the authority given it from God to oversee or rule the church. Furthermore, since civil government is usually led by the unregenerate, it does not have the nature or wisdom to handle spiritual matters. Christians do have such nature and wisdom, as proclaimed by Paul: “Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath proposed in himself.” Paul was a very well-educated man. He was a Pharisee of Pharisees. Before his conversion, he studied in Tarsus under Gamaliel.

“Tarsus was actually the center of Greek learning to that day. The finest Greek university in Paul’s day was in Tarsus, not in Athens or Corinth which had passed their zenith. Tarsus was a thriving Greek city and an educational center.

“Undoubtedly Paul had been brought up in that university in Tarsus and had a Greek background, but he had also been in Jerusalem where he had studied under Gamaliel. He had worked on his doctorate in Jerusalem under the outstanding scholar of that day, Gamaliel.”

Despite his worldly education, which he obtained before his conversion, Paul declared:

“And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. Howbeit we speak

---

4 Ephesians 2.21, 22.  
5 Ephesians 5.30, 31.  
6 II Corinthians 11.2-4.  
8 Ephesians 1.22, 23  
9 Ephesians 1.9.  
10 Acts 22.3.  
wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought: But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ."

12 [Bold emphasis mine].

Thus Paul first made clear that, as a spiritual man, he discarded his worldly education gained as a lost carnal man. After he got saved he relied only upon his knowledge of God; and he made clear that only the born-again believer, led by the Spirit, was qualified to handle spiritual matters. Paul also asserted that rulers, “the princes of this world,” do not possess spiritual wisdom, indicating that most leaders are not Christians (undoubtedly, almost all leaders, and almost all leaders of civil government when he wrote the above words, are not and were not Christians) and are blind to spiritual matters.

“In Scripture theology, wisdom is true religion; godliness; piety; the knowledge and fear of God, and sincere and uniform obedience to his commands. This is the wisdom which is from above. Ps. xc. Job xxviii.”

“"The wisdom of this world, mere human erudition; or the carnal policy of men, their craft and artifices in promoting their temporal interests; called also fleshly wisdom. 1 Cor. i., 2 Cor. i.”

Persecuted Christians down through the ages have understood this and therefore have refused, even under penalty of torture, imprisonment, and/or death to submit the church and spiritual matters to the ungodly, usually the civil government, and/or the state-church. This was especially apparent under the Roman Empire at the time of Christ and after.

“Scripture and all history tell us, that those Caesars were not only arrogant, without God, without Christ, &c.; but professed worshippers, or maintainers, of the Roman gods or devils; as also notorious for all sorts of wickedness; and lastly, cruel and bloody lions and tigers toward the Christians for many hundred years.

“Hence I [Roger Williams] argue from the wisdom, love, and faithfulness of the Lord Jesus in his house, it was impossible that he should appoint such ignorant, such idolatrous, such wicked, and such cruel persons to be his chief officers and deputy lieutenants under himself to keep the worship of God, to guard his church, his wife. No wise and loving father was ever known to put his child, no not his beasts, dogs, or swine, but unto fitting keepers.

“Men judge it matter of high complaint, that the records of parliament, the king’s children, the Tower of London, the great seal, should be committed to unworthy keepers! And can it be, without high blasphemy, conceived that the Lord Jesus should commit his sheep, his children, yea, his spouse, his thousand shields and bucklers in the tower of his

12 1 Corinthians 2.1-16.
13 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828), definition of “WISDOM.”
14 Ibid.
church, and lastly, his great and glorious broad seals of baptism and his supper, to be preserved pure in their administrations—I say, that the Lord Jesus, who is wisdom and faithfulness itself, should deliver these to such keepers? ...

"[W]hen the Lord appointed the government of Israel after the rejection of Saul, to establish a covenant of succession in the type unto Christ, let it be minded what pattern and precedent it pleased the Lord to set for the after kings of Israel and Judah, in David, the man after his own heart.

"But now the Lord Jesus being come himself, and having fulfilled the former types, and dissolved the national state of the church, and established a more spiritual way of worship all the world over, and appointed a spiritual government and governors, it is well known what the Roman Caesars were, under whom both Christ Jesus himself, and his servants after him, lived and suffered; so that if the Lord Jesus had appointed any such deputies—as we find not a title to that purpose, nor have a shadow of true reason so to think—he must, I say, in the very first institution, have pitched upon such persons for these custodies utriusque tabulae, keepers of both tables, as no man wise, or faithful or loving, would have chosen in any of the former instances, or cases of a more inferior nature…." 15

“Christ never delivered His sheep or children to these wolves, his wife and spouse to such adulterers, his precious jewels to such great thieves and robbers of the world, as the Roman emperors were. Paul never appealed to Caesar as judge appointed by Christ Jesus to give definitive sentence in any spiritual or church controversy; but against the civil violence and murder which the Jews intended against him, Paul justly appealed. For otherwise, if in a spiritual cause he should have appealed, he should have overthrown his own apostleship and power given him by Christ Jesus in spiritual things, above the highest kings or emperors of the world beside….”16

"A civil magistrate may be a good subject, a good magistrate, in respect of civil or moral goodness, which thousands want; and where it is, it is commendable and beautiful, though godliness, which is infinitely more beautiful, be wanting, and which is only proper to the Christian state, the commonweal of Israel, the true church the holy nation, Ephes. ii.; 1 Pet. ii.”17

How can it be that a Christian can be godly, while a non-Christian as a hopeless lost sinner can only have some degree of virtue? Once a person is born again, he becomes a new creature, a spiritual being who is instructed by God to walk in the Spirit. “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.”18 “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.”20 “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”22 Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.”23 The Word of God instructs the believer as to his walk:

15 Williams, The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution, pp. 204-205.
16 Ibid., p. 209.
17 Ibid., p. 212.
18 John 3.3.
19 The water which is spoken of here is the Word of God. This is consistent with all of Scripture, and is specifically stated in the Bible. “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.” 1 Peter 1.23. Jesus, in talking to the Samaritan woman said, “If thou knowest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him and he would have given thee living water…. Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again. But whosoever drinketh of the water that I give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.” John 4.10, 13-14. “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.” Ephesians 5.26.
20 John the Baptist said, “I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” Mark 1.8. See also, Matthew 3.11 and Luke 3.16.
21 John 3.5.
22 John 3.6.
23 1 Corinthians 5.17.
"And you *hath he quickened*, who were dead in trespasses and sins: Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised *us* up together and made *us* sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:"\(^{24}\)

"Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit."\(^{25}\)

Thus, the lost man, the man who has not been born again, is a fleshly man, who walks in the flesh without the indwelling Spirit of God. He is subject only to the law. The believer, a member of a church, a part of the body, is a heavenly man, and a stranger and pilgrim on the earth who is told to be led of the Spirit. He is told that if he is led of the Spirit, he is not subject to the law.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.[]"\(^{26}\)

"But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."\(^{27}\)

"If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?"\(^{28}\)

"WHEREFORE, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus[.]"\(^{29}\)

"Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.[]"\(^{30}\)

The word “heavenly” signifies that which is heavenly in contradistinction to that which is “earthly.”

\(^{24}\) Ephesians 2.1-6.
\(^{25}\) Galatians 5.16-25; see also, Ephesians 5.1-17, John 6.63, Romans 8.1-13.
\(^{26}\) Ephesians 1.3.
\(^{27}\) Ephesians 2.4-5.
\(^{28}\) John 3.12.
\(^{29}\) Hebrews 3.1.
\(^{30}\) 1 Peter 2.11.
The church is made up of believers. “And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.” The church, made up of spiritual beings, is a spiritual or heavenly body whose ultimate purpose is to glorify God. “The word ‘spiritual,’ found 23 times in the Bible, always means heavenly minded, godly, holy, never self-centered.” “Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.” As was pointed out in Section II and as will be further explained in Section VI, a church, as the spiritual body of Christ, is told to be subject to Christ, the Head of the body, in all things.

Spiritual matters include all things involving a church, such as the use of property for the assembly of the saints. These matters are all related to the primary purpose of loving and glorifying God and the Lord Jesus Christ who is likened to the Head, the Husband, and the Bridegroom of the church, and loving our neighbor as well. Jesus stated, concerning the commandments concerning man’s relationship with God, in response to

“[A] lawyer, [who] asked a question, tempting [Jesus], and saying Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and prophets.”

---

32 Acts 2.47.
34 I Corinthians 10.31.
Love is shown by action—that is, it is an act of the will and not lust or just an emotion or a verbal profession. Jesus said,

“He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.”

“If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.... Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.”

Only God’s people can exhibit God’s love. Again, the first and great commandment of God is to “love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;” and the second, like unto it, is “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” Thus, rulers, when they forbid a church and/or individual believers to perform their God given functions to love God and to love their neighbors and usurp that role for themselves, have not only assumed an illegitimate role not given them by God, but also have assumed a role they are unqualified to assume because of both a lack of spiritual wisdom and a lack of the most important ingredient—love given the believer by the Spirit of God.

“They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error. Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another. No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.... There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love. We love him, because he first loved us. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also.”

John Robinson, one of those called Separatist (one who withdrew from the established Church of England), defined the difference between civil and ecclesiastical government leaders in 1610:

“I. Civil officers [are, and] are called in the word of God, princes, heads, captains, judges, magistrates, nobles, lords, kings, them in authority, principalities and powers, yea, in their respect, gods; and according to their names so are their offices. But on the contrary, ecclesiastical officers are not capable of these, or the like titles, which can neither be given without flattery to them, nor received by them without arrogancy. Neither is their office an office of lordship, sovereignty or authority, but of labor and service, and so they, the laborers and servants of the church, as of God. 2. Cor. iv.5; 1 Tim. iii.1. [This same principle applies to government entities such as incorporated churches which, by secular or earthly law, must have officers with certain non-biblical titles. See Section VI.]

37 John 15.10, 14.
38 Matthew 22.37-40. See also, Mark 12.28-34 and Luke 10.25-28. This is repeated to emphasize God’s greatest commandments. These commandments were also in the Old Testament. See Deuteronomy 6.5, 30.6 and Leviticus 19.18. If one loves God and his neighbor as commanded by God, he will automatically keep the Old Testament Commandments.
39 I John 4.5-14, 18-21.
“2. Magistrates may publish and execute their own laws in their own names. Ezra i.1 &c; Esther viii.8; Matt. xx.25. But ministers are only interpreters of the laws of God, and must look for no further respect at the hands of any to the things they speak, that as they manifest the same to the commandments of the Lord. 1 Cor. xvi. 37. [Officers of incorporated churches are subject to and must apply the laws of their sovereign, the state. See Section VI.]

“3. Civil administrators, and their forms of government, may be and oftentimes are altered, for the avoiding of inconveniences, according to the circumstances of time, place and persons. Exod. xviii.13 &c. But the church is a kingdom which cannot be shaken, Heb. xii.28, wherein may be no innovation in office, or form of administration, from that which Christ hath left, for any inconvenience whatsoever.

“4. Civil magistrates have authority by their offices to judge offenders, upon whom also they may execute bodily vengeance, using their people as their servants and ministers for the same purpose; but in the church the officers are the ministers of the people, whose service the people is to use for the administering of the judgments of the church, and of God first, against the obstinate, which is the utmost execution the church can perform.... But here it will be demanded of me, if the elders be not set over the church for her guidance and government? Yes, certainly, as the physician is set over the body, for his skill and faithfulness, to minister unto it, to whom the patient, yea though his lord and [or] master, is to submit; the lawyer over his cause, to attend unto it; the steward over his family, even his wife and children, to make provision for them: yea, the watchman over the whole city, for the safe keeping thereof. Such, and none other, is the elder’s or bishop’s government.”

Mr. Robinson’s distinctions between civil and church government are relevant in America today.

A church is to sit together in heavenly places. God wants His churches to be run according to His spiritual principles. Sadly, most churches are not run according to God’s principles. A “church” run as a corporation, unincorporated association, corporate sole, or charitable trust with an Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”) 501(c)(3) tax exemption is, to a greater or lesser degree, earthly. It is designed and operated, at the very least partially, under the earthly rules of man which are contrary to the spiritual rules of God as will be shown in Section VI.

The contrast between how God treats earthly and heavenly concerns is shown in many ways. This chapter will examine a few: first, the contrasts between the manner of redemption of the nation of Israel and the manner of redemption of the individual; second, the contrasts between the new law of Christ in the renewed heart and the external law of Moses; third, the contrasts between the weapons and means of nations to attain their ends and the weapons and means of a believer and a church to attain their ends; fourth, the contrasts between the different punishments ordered by God for the church and for the state; fifth, the contrasts between Old and New Testament prayer; sixth, the contrasts between the hope of nations as seen in the Old Testament and the hope of the church as seen in the New Testament; seventh, the contrasts between the promises to the nation Israel for obedience and the promises to the Christian for obedience; eighth, the contrasts between the position and fate of the nation Israel and the position and fate of the church; and ninth, the contrasts between the different houses of God for Israel and the church—the Old Testament tabernacle was earthly, the New Testament church is spiritual. A discussion of each of these contrasts follows.

First, the manner of redemption of the nation Israel and that of the individual are different. The book of Exodus teaches that:

“redemption is essential to any relationship with a holy God; and that even a redeemed people cannot have fellowship with Him unless constantly cleansed from defilement.

“In Exodus, God, hitherto connected with the Israelitish people only through His covenant with Abraham, brings them to Himself *nationally* through redemption, puts them under the Mosaic Covenant. In the Commandments God taught Israel His just demands. Experience under the Commandments convicted Israel of sin: and the provision of priesthood and sacrifice (filled with precious types of Christ) gave a guilty people a way of forgiveness, cleansing, restoration to fellowship and worship.”

In Galatians, Paul demonstrates:

“That justification is through the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 15.18), and that the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after the confirmation of that covenant, and the true purpose of which was condemnation, not justification, cannot annul a salvation which rests upon the earlier covenant. Paul [also vindicates] the office of the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier.”

**Second**, the new law of Christ and the external law of Moses are significantly different:

“The new ‘law of Christ’ is the divine love, as wrought into the renewed heart by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5.5 [‘And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.’]; Heb. 10.16 [‘This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them.[.]’]; and *out flowing in the energy of the Spirit, unforced and spontaneous*, toward the objects of the divine love (2 Cor. 5.14-20 [‘For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new...’]; 1 Thes. 2.7-8 [‘But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; So being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us.’]). It is, therefore, the law of liberty (Jas. 1.25 [‘But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.’]; 2.12 [‘So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.’]); *in contrast with the external law of Moses*. Moses’ law demands love (Lev. 19.18 [‘Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the LORD.’]; Deut. 6.5 [‘And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.’]; Lk. 10.27 [‘And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.’]); Christ’s law is love (Rom. 5.5 [‘And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.’]); 1 John 4.7, 19, 20 [‘Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. We love him, because he first loved us. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?’], and so takes the place of the external law by fulfilling it (Rom. 13.10 [‘Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law.’]; Gal. 5.14 [‘For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.’].) **It is the ‘law written in the heart’ under the New Covenant (Heb. 8.8, note).**”

The old law kills, the new law saves. “Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, *but* of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.... Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the

---

42 Ibid., headnote to Galatians, p. 1241.
43 Ibid., n. 1 to II John 5, p. 1326.
Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." When God told Moses to get down from the mountain, he brought the law down, and *three thousand were killed.* When Jesus rejoined his disciples after the resurrection, He told them to “wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." They waited, the Holy Spirit came down, and *three thousand were saved.*

*Third,* the weapons of a church and Christians, who are fighting a spiritual warfare against a spiritual enemy, are spiritual, not carnal, and their goal is spiritual:

“For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds[.])”

“Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of he devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high *places.* Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;”

“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”

The weapons of Israel as a nation, although the real secret to success in their earthly battles was obedience to and faith in God, were carnal. Their goal as a nation was earthly—possession of and prosperity in the land promised them by God. When they entered the land they had to take it by force. For example, they “utterly destroyed all that was in [Jericho], both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword.” The children of Israel, under Joshua, continued to do battle and “took the whole land, according to all that the LORD said unto Moses; and Joshua gave it for an inheritance unto Israel according to their divisions by their tribes. And the land rested from war.” However, they did not expel all the inhabitants as instructed, nor did they possess all the land God had given them. Joshua, before his death, instructed the children of Israel to expel those remaining of the nations in the land, with penalty of banishment from the land should they fail to keep his
They did not drive out all the inhabitants of the land as instructed nor did they take all the land the Lord had given them to possess.

Weapons used for spiritual warfare are not suitable for earthly warfare and vice versa. Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, the first government in history to have religious liberty (See Section IV, Chapter 6) pointed out:

"To take a stronghold, men bring cannon, culverins, saker, bullets, powder, muskets, swords, pikes, &c., and these to this end are weapons effectual and proportionable.

"On the other side, to batter down idolatry, false worship, heresy, schism, blindness, hardness, out of the soul and spirit, it is vain, improper, and unsuitable to bring those weapons which are used by persecutors, stocks, whips, prisons, swords, gibbets, stakes, &c., (where these seem to prevail with some cities or kingdoms, a stronger force sets up again, what a weaker pulled down); but against these spiritual strongholds in the souls of men, spiritual artillery and weapons are proper, which are mighty through God to subdue and bring under the very thought to obedience, or else to bind fast the soul with chains of darkness, and lock it up in the prison of unbelief and hardness to eternity."

Roger Williams maintained that the civil power has five proper political means to attain its end:

"First, the erecting and establishing what form of civil government may seem in wisdom most meet, according the general rules of the word, and state of the people.... The magistrate has power to publish and apply such civil laws in a state, as either are expressed in the word of God in Moses's judicials—to wit, so far as they are of general and moral equity, and so binding all nations in all ages—to be deducted by way of general consequence and proportion from the word of God.

"For in a free state no magistrate hath power over the bodies, goods, lands, liberties of a free people, but by their free consents. And because free men are not free lords of their own estates, but are only stewards unto God, therefore they may not give their free consents to any magistrate to dispose of their bodies, goods, lands, liberties, at large as themselves please, but as God, the sovereign Lord of all, alone. And because the word is a perfect rule, as well of righteousness as of holiness, it will be therefore necessary that neither the people give consent, nor that the magistrate take power to dispose of the bodies, goods, lands, liberties of the people, but according to the laws and rules of the word of God....

"Secondly, the making, publishing, and establishing of wholesome civil laws, not only such as concern civil justice, but also the free passage of true religion: for outward civil peace ariseth and is maintained from them both, from the latter as well as from the former.

"Civil peace cannot stand entire where religion is corrupted, 2 Chron. xv. 3, 5, 6; Judges viii. And yet such laws, though conversant about religion may still be counted civil laws; as on the contrary, an oath doth still remain religious, though conversant about civil matters.

"Thirdly, election and appointment of civil officers to see execution of those laws.

"Fourthly, civil punishments and rewards of transgressors and observers of these laws.

"Fifthly, taking up arms against the enemies of civil peace."

On the other hand, according to Mr. Williams,

"the means whereby a church may and should attain her ends, are only ecclesiastical, which are chiefly five. "First, setting up that form of church government only of which Christ hath given them a pattern in his word.

"Secondly, acknowledging and admitting of no lawgiver in the church but Christ, and the publishing of his laws.

"Thirdly, electing and ordaining of such officers only as Christ hath appointed in his word.

---

55 Joshua 23.4-16.
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“Fourthly, to receive into their fellowship them that are approved, and inflicting spiritual censures against them that offend.

“Fifthly, prayer and patience in suffering any evil from them that be without, who disturb their peace.

“So that magistrates, as magistrates, have no power of setting up the form of church government, electing church officers, punishing with church censures; but to see the church doth her duty herein. And on the other side, the churches, as churches, have no power, though as members of the commonweal they may have power, of erecting or altering forms of civil government, electing of civil officers, inflicting civil punishments—no, not on persons excommunicated—as by deposing magistrates from their civil authority, or withdrawing the hearts of the people against them, to their laws, no more than to discharge wives, or children, or servants, from due obedience to their husbands, parents, or masters: or by taking up arms against their magistrates, though they persecute them for conscience; for though members of churches, who are public officers, also of the civil state, may suppress by force the violence of usurpers, as Jehoiada did Athaliah, yet this they do not as members of the church, but as officers of the civil state.”

Forth, the Bible lays out different punishments to be administered by church and state. As to the church, there is no example in Scripture of the church physically punishing anyone for any type infraction or of the church turning either one guilty of sin (not classified by the state as penal) or one guilty of spiritual wrongdoing over to the state for punishment.

“But as the civil magistrate hath his charge of the bodies and goods of the subject: so have the spiritual officers, governors, and overseers of Christ’s city or kingdom, the charge of their souls, and soul safety. Hence that charge of Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. v. 20, Them that sin rebuke before all, that others may learn to fear. This is, in the church of Christ, a spiritual means for the healing of a soul that hath sinned, or taken infection, and for the preventing of the infecting of others, that others may learn to fear, &c.”

Paul instructed the church at Corinth to deliver a church member who was guilty of fornication with his father’s wife “to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” He goes on to tell them that “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” and that they are not to “company with fornicators” “or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters” “or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner.” The Corinthian church did expel the man and he repented and was restored. As Roger Williams points out, “Where it is observable, that the same word used by Moses for putting a malefactor to death, in typical Israel, by sword, stoning, &c., Deut. xiii.5, is here used by Paul for the spiritual killing, or cutting off by excommunication, 1 Cor. [5] v.13, Put away that evil person, &c.”

Paul tells the church that members of the church are not to go to law against each other for non-criminal actions, rather to take wrong, to “suffer [themselves] to be defrauded.” He tells the church that they are to judge among themselves. Titus was instructed by Paul: “A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject[.].” Roger Williams’ insights into this verse are instructive:
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“[F]or an erroneous and blind conscience, (even in fundamental and weighty points) it is not lawful to persecute any, til after admonition once or twice[.]”

“First then Titus, unto whom this epistle and these directions were written, and in him to all that succeed him in the like work of the gospel to the world’s end, was no minister of the civil state, armed with the majesty and terror of a material sword, who might for offenses against the civil state inflict punishments upon the bodies of men by imprisonments, whippings, fines, banishment, death. Titus was a minister of the gospel, or glad tidings, armed only with the spiritual sword of the word of God, and [with] such spiritual weapons as (yet) through God were mighty to the casting down of strongholds, yea, every high thought of the highest head and heart in the world, 2. Cor. x. 4.

“Therefore, these first and second admonitions were not civil or corporal punishments on men’s persons or purses, which courts of men may lawfully inflict upon malefactors; but they were the reprehensions, convictions, exhortations, and persuasions of the word of the eternal God, charged home to the conscience in the name and presence of the Lord Jesus, in the midst of the church. Which being despised and not hearkened to, in the last place follows rejection; which is not a cutting off by head, hanging, burning, &c., or an expelling of the country and coasts; neither [of] which (no, nor any lesser civil punishment) Titus, nor the church at Crete, had any power to exercise. But it was that dreadful cutting off from that visible head and body, Christ Jesus and his church; that purging out of the old leaven from the lump of the saints; the putting away of the evil and wicked person from the holy land and commonwealth of God’s Israel, 1 Cor. v. [6, 7.] Where it is observable, that the same word used by Moses for putting a malefactor to death, in typical Israel, by sword, stoning, &c., Deut. xiii. 5, is here used by Paul for the spiritual killing, or cutting off by excommunication, 1 Cor. v. 13, Put away that evil person, &c.

“Now, I desire the answerer, and any, in the holy awe and fear of God, to consider that—

“From whom the first and second admonition was to proceed, from them also was the rejecting or casting out to proceed, as before. But not from the civil magistrate, to whom Paul writes not this epistle, and who also is not bound once and twice the admonish, but may speedily punish, as he sees cause, the persons or purses of delinquents against his civil state; but from Titus, the minister or angel of the church, and from the church with him, were these first and second admonitions to proceed.

“And therefore, at last also, this rejecting: which can be no other but a casting out, or excommunicating of him from their church society.

“Indeed, this rejecting is no other than that avoiding which Paul writes of to the church of Christ at Rome, Rom. xvi. 17; which avoiding, however woefully perverted by some to prove persecution, belonged to the governors of Christ’s church and kingdom in Rome, and not to the Roman emperor, for him to rid and avoid the world of them by bloody and cruel persecution.”

A heretic in the church who continues in his heresy after the first and second admonition “is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.”

The state, on the other hand, is to punish men for certain carnal infractions against their fellow man, not for spiritual infractions against God.

Fifth, Old and New Testament prayer are distinct:

“Prayer in the O.T. is in contrast with prayer in the N.T. in 2 respects: (1) in the former the basis of prayer is a covenant of God, or an appeal to his revealed character as merciful, gracious, etc. In the latter, the basis is relationship: ‘When ye pray, say, Our Father’ (Mt. 6.9). (2) A comparison, e.g., of the prayers of Moses and Paul, e.g. will show that one was praying for an earthly people whose dangers and blessings were earthly; the other for a heavenly people whose dangers and blessings were spiritual.”

Whereas, in the Old Testament, prayers were made for temporal destruction of those God had a purpose to pluck up, Christians are to pray for all men.

---
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“Jeremy had a commission to plant and build, to pluck up and destroy kingdoms, Jer. i.10; therefore he is commanded not to pray for that people whom God had a purpose to pluck up, Jer. xiv.11, and he plucks up the whole nation by prayer, Lament. iii.66. thus Elijah brought fire from heaven to consume the captains and the fifties, 2 Kings i. And the apostles desired also so to practise against the Samaritans, Luke ix.54, but were reproved by the Lord Jesus. For, contrarily, the saints, and servants, and churches of Christ, are to pray for all men, especially for all magistrates, of what sort or religions soever, and to seek the peace of the city, whatever city it be, because in the peace of the place God’s people have peace also, Jer. xxix.7; 2 Tim. ii., &c.”

Sixth, nations as seen in the Old Testament and churches as seen in the New Testament have different hopes. Every nation is on probation (if it violates its probation, it loses its land and identity as a nation); believers in a church are a family awaiting glory:

“The scene that happened while Moses was on the mount where the children of Israel broke the law, made a golden calf, etc., affords a striking contrast between law and grace. Cf. Moses’s intercession with Christ’s (John 17). Israel was a nation, under probation [earthly] (Ex. 19.5,6); believers under grace are a family, awaiting glory [heavenly] (John 20.17; Rom. 5.1, 2). For them there is “an advocate with the Father,” whose propitiatory sacrifice never loses efficacy (1 John 2.1, 2). Moses pleads a covenant (Ex. 32.13); Christ points to a sacrifice (John 17.4).”

Seventh, the promises to the nation Israel and its people and the promises to the Christian are different. The Christian was promised, “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” Israel was given conditional promises of material blessings for obeying God’s commands, for keeping His statutes and judgments. Under the Palestinian Covenant, they were told that they would prosper materially if they kept and did all the words of that covenant. God repeated this promise to other leaders of Israel. For example, the LORD spoke to Solomon, King of Israel saying,

“And if thou walk before me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have commanded thee, and wilt keep my statutes and my judgments: Then I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel. But if ye shall at all turn from following me, ye or your children, and will not keep my commandments and my statutes which I have set before you, but go and serve other gods, and worship them: Then will I cut off Israel out of the land which I have given them; and this house, which I have hallowed for my name, will I cast out of my sight; and Israel shall be a proverb and a byword among all people: And at this house, which is high, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss; and they shall say, Why hath the LORD done this to this land and to this house? And they shall answer, Because they forsook the LORD their God, who brought their fathers out of the land of Egypt, and have taken hold upon other gods, and have worshipped them, and served them: therefore hath the LORD brought upon them all this evil.”

Eighth, the position and fate of the nation Israel and the position and fate of the church are distinct. God called the nation Israel the wife of Jehovah to be restored on this earth; the church is symbolized as the bride and wife of Christ:

“That Israel is the wife of Jehovah (see [Hosea 2.] 16-23), now disowned but yet to be restored, is the clear teaching of [Hosea 2:14-23]. This relationship is not to be

---

72 Williams and Underhill, p. 86.
74 II Timothy 3.12.
75 Deuteronomy 30.9.
76 I Kings 9.4-9.
confounded with that of the Church to Christ (John 3.29, refs.). In the mystery of the Divine tri-unity both are true. The New Testament speaks of the Church as a virgin espoused to one husband (2 Cor. 11.1, 2); which could never be said of an adulterous wife, restored in grace. Israel is, then, to be the restored and forgiven wife of Jehovah, the Church the virgin wife of the Lamb (John 3.29; Rev. 19.6-8); Israel Jehovah’s earthly wife (Hos. 2.23); the Church the Lamb’s heavenly bride (Rev. 19.7)).

*Ninth*, the different houses of God for Israel and the church are distinct—the tabernacle was earthly, the Christian and the church heavenly, a spiritual house, not an earthly house:

“When verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary... But Christ, being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building.”

“Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.”

“Now therefore ye [church members] 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; In whom all the building fitly framed together growth into an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.”

“Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid... know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit... What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? ....

“But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.”

“[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.”

“To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, precious, Ye also, as lively stones, are builded up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.”

John the Baptist announced the coming of something new. He spent no time in the temple. With him, a new system that required a decision began. “Jesus’ real temple—as ... with John the Baptist—was the desert.”

Some of the negative miracles he performed (e.g., the cursing of the fig tree so that it...
withered) were a reflection of his attitude toward the temple and the concept of which it was the rallying point.”

Jesus foretold the destruction of the temple, and failed to endorse Jerusalem and the Jewish system of worship stating that the time was coming when she would neither worship in “this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem,” but that “the hour cometh, and now is when true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. For the Father seeketh such to worship him.”

The resources and manpower needed to build the temple (earthly and tremendous, provided by man) and the church (heavenly, provided by God) are distinct. In the Old Testament, we learn that the shekinah-glory of the Lord came to fill the house of the Lord, built by man’s hands. The Holy Spirit comes to live in the believer, who is born again by the spirit of God. As has been shown, the church is a spiritual building, made up of spiritual stones (believers) built on the cornerstone (Jesus Christ).

America has seduced most churches to submit to the state through incorporation and 501(c)(3) status. The civil government has convinced Americans, saved and lost, to embrace its illegitimate authority, and has taught them that people are to worship and glorify God and spread the Gospel only within the four walls of a building (more on this in Section VI). Today, in America, the civil government has made it impossible for an incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organization and Christians to exercise, in many instances, the second great commandment. For example, as pointed out in the Preface, the state will not allow a corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization to run a home for children without being licensed and controlled by the state.

Observing most churches—with no civil law purportedly requiring state control of churches as in Communist China and other nations throughout the world—running to seek affiliation with the state, and born-again believers putting churches under state control is vexing to the Christian who knows that such actions displease God. A church in the United States is not required to affiliate with the state. No one will be persecuted if a church refuses to affiliate with the state unless the church, in some circumstances, attempts to exercise the second great commandment to love one’s neighbor as oneself. Many, probably the majority of born-again church members, love the Lord and would reject civil government entanglement with the church if taught by their pastors and other teachers the biblical truths about the matter. Yet the vast majority of churches affiliate with the state. Why? Because of false teachers—“Christian” lawyers and unregenerate pastors as well as saved pastors who have never studied biblical principles concerning separation of church and state—and the itching ears of some of God’s people; because some church members love the world and what it teaches and offers more than they love the Lord and what He offers. The Lord taught us:

“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.”

---
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What did Jesus teach about separation of church and state? Every word in the Bible is God’s Word. “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.”  

To understand the issue of separation of church and state requires a lot of study of God’s Word. God is the Supreme Authority and is over all institutions and individuals.

Christians who support unlimited obedience to the civil government refer to several scriptures. They sometimes refer to the miracle of the tribute money, but that incident does not apply to the subject. The tax spoken of there was the voluntary atonement money of half a shekel given as an offering to God that was used for maintenance of the Jerusalem temple.

Those who received the tribute money did not ask Jesus if he paid the tribute. They asked Peter if his master paid the tribute. Peter said, “Yes,” again speaking unadvisedly. Nor did Jesus really pay the tax. Jesus first rebuked Peter saying, “What thinkest thou Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.” Then He said to Peter, “Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee.”

Jesus indicated first that He should not be required to pay the tribute and then used the occasion to show that he was God. He could have taken the money from the money bag carried by Judas, but instead he performed a supernatural

---

1 II Timothy 3.16-17. Some other helpful verses and resources are I Corinthians 2.6-15 (gives the process by which a truth passes from the mind of God to the minds of His people); Galatians 1.10-24; II Timothy 3.15-17; I Peter 1.23-25; II Peter 1.10-12 and 20-21.

“The writers of scripture invariably affirm, where the subject is mentioned by them at all, that the words of their writings are divinely taught. This, of necessity, refers to the original documents, not to translations and versions; but the labors of competent scholars have brought our [King James Version] to a degree of perfection so remarkable that we may confidently rest upon them as authoritative.

“Fulfilled prophecy is a proof of inspiration because the Scripture predictions of future events were uttered so long before the events transpired that no merely human sagacity or foresight could have anticipated them, and these predictions are so detailed, minute, and specific, as to exclude the possibility that they were mere fortunate guesses. Hundreds of predictions concerning Israel, the land of Canaan, Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, and numerous personages—so ancient, so singular, so seemingly improbable, as well as so detailed and definite that no mortal could have anticipated them—have been fulfilled by the elements, and by men who were ignorant of them, or who utterly disbelieved them, or who struggled with frantic desperation to avoid their fulfillment. It is certain, therefore, that the Scriptures which contain them are inspired. (continued at bottom of next page).

“The whole attitude of Jesus Christ toward the Old Testament, as disclosed in His words, both before His death and after His resurrection, confirms its truth and divine origin, and He explicitly ascribes the Pentateuch to Moses.” 1917 Scofield Reference Edition, n. 1 to I Corinthians 2.10-16, p. 1213.


3 See Matthew 17.24-27.
miracle and gave the money to them in order not to offend them. Only God could have arranged such a miracle.\(^4\)

Another scripture relied upon to support the false teaching of unlimited submission to the civil government is Luke 20.25 (also recorded in Matthew 22.21, and Mark 12.17). As shown in Section I, God’s government is over all governments including civil government. Nonetheless, many Americans have been Americanized, and in spite of the teaching of the Bible, grab the following words of Jesus and apply the incorrect Americanized conclusion: “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.”\(^5\)

Obviously, Jesus is saying that both Caesar and God have jurisdictions. What are those jurisdictions? Are America and many pastors correct in teaching church members that churches should be under civil government protection and tax exempt status, that they cannot depend totally upon God to supply their needs (in reality, most “Christians” want God to supply all their earthly wants), that they need government contrived protection through incorporation and tax exemption and can better serve the Lord with civil government protection and tax exemption (not realizing that God would rather have their love than more of their money, which He does not need, but only asks for as proof of their love), and/or that America, not God, is to be their omniscient, omnipotent benefactor? Section VI will deal with the incorporation and tax exemption issues.

To understand what Jesus was saying, one must understand both the immediate and the overall context of Scripture. Did Jesus say something contrary to what the rest of Scripture teaches when He said these words? No, Jesus said those words with a perfect knowledge of Scripture. He said those words in the context of Scripture. He said those words to practicing religious Jews who were well versed in Scripture and most likely understood the meaning of what He said in the context of Scripture.

In the immediate context, the Pharisees were instigating an attack upon the Lord Jesus. “Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk.”\(^6\) The chief priests and the scribes “sought to lay hands on [Jesus]; and they feared the people.”\(^7\)

> “And they watched him, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor. And they asked him, saying, Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, neither acceptest thou the person of any, but teachest the way of God truly: Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Caesar, or no?”\(^8\)

They wanted the civil government to do their dirty work which they would not do themselves because they feared the people.

> “If Jesus said, ‘No, you are not to pay tribute to Caesar,’ He could be accused of being a traitor to Rome which ruled over Israel at that time. If He had said, ‘Yes, you are to pay tribute to Caesar,’ He could not be the true Messiah. They thought they had our Lord on the horns of a dilemma.”\(^9\)

---

\(^4\) Insight gleaned from the teaching of Pastor Hank Thompson, as well as others.

\(^5\) Luke 20.25; also Matthew 22.21, and Mark 12.17.

\(^6\) Matthew 22.15; see also, Mark 12.13; Luke 20.19.

\(^7\) Luke 20.19.


Chapter 5: Render unto Caesar….

The Lord, being God, knew their plan: “But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?”\(^\text{10}\) Jesus said, “Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it?”\(^\text{11}\) When “[t]hey answered and said, Caesar’s,”\(^\text{12}\) He gave His famous reply which left them amazed and unable to fulfill their plan.

In the overall context of Scripture, what was the Lord saying? The Pharisees knew the Old Testament. When Jesus asked whose image and superscription were on the coin, they most likely knew that He was saying that mankind, which included Caesar, was created by God in the image of God, and that Caesar as a ruler was given his authority with limitations by God. They knew the Scripture that said, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.”\(^\text{13}\) They knew the Scriptures that taught that God was the Supreme Ruler, that His was the supreme government as well as those Scriptures that taught that God ordained civil government and all other governments. They also knew that Jesus claimed to be God. For example, when Jesus asked the Jews for which of His good works they took up stones to stone Him, “The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.”\(^\text{14}\) In one short statement, the Lord, as only He could, summarized, in the context of Scripture, God’s jurisdiction (rulership over all men and governments including civil governments) and civil government’s God-given jurisdiction (as laid out in the Bible and discussed in Section I).

The result of this interchange was the opposite of what the Pharisees had hoped for. Since it was not yet His time to be crucified, God defeated their purpose by the power of His Word. “And they could not take hold of his words before the people: and they marveled at his answer, and held their peace[,]”\(^\text{15}\) “and left him, and went their way.”\(^\text{16}\)

Men today, as did these Pharisees, prefer to trust in their own doings instead of the perfect righteousness of Christ. Isaac Backus pointed out the darling of such men:

“[Such men] trust in their own doings, instead of the perfect righteousness of Christ, are in covenant with death and at agreement with hell. And earthly monarchy has generally been the darling of such men. [As the Pharisees went to the civil government to carry out their scheme to kill Christ, so do men today go to the civil government.] Therefore God says to them, And thou wentest to the king with ointment, and didst increase thy perfumes, and didst send thy messengers far off, and didst debase thyself even unto hell. Thou art wearied in the greatness of thy way; yet saidst thou not, There is no hope: thou hast found the life of thine hand; therefore thou wast not grieved. Isaiah lvi. 9-10 … [T]he calling any ruler, since the death of Christ, The Lord’s anointed, and the setting up any earthly heads to the church, is a practice which came from hell, from the bottomless pit; and this is the beast who causeth God’s witnesses to prophesy in mourning, and at length kills them. Rev. xi. 7; xiii. 1, 2, 12; xvii. 8.”\(^\text{17}\)

\(^\text{10}\) Matthew 22.18; see also, Mark 12.15; Luke 20.23.
\(^\text{11}\) Luke 20.24; see also, Matthew 21.19-20; Mark 12.15-16.
\(^\text{12}\) Luke 20.24; see also, Matthew 22.21; Mark 12.16.
\(^\text{13}\) Genesis 1.27.
\(^\text{14}\) John 10.32-33.
\(^\text{15}\) Luke 20.26; see also, Mark 12.17.
\(^\text{16}\) Matthew 22.22.
Chapter 6
Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13

“The forming of the constitution and appointment of the particular orders and offices of civil government is left to human discretion, and our submission thereto is required under the name of their being the ordinances of men for the Lord’s sake, I Pet. ii, 13, 14. Whereas in ecclesiastical affairs we are most solemnly warned not to be subject to ordinances after the doctrines and commandments of men, Col. ii, 20, 22.”

Other Scriptures taken out of context to support the argument that men and churches are to totally submit to the civil government in all things both earthly and spiritual, except perhaps giving up the preaching of salvation, are Romans 13, portions of which are quoted below, and I Peter 2.13, quoted along with I Peter 2.14, to put verse 2.13 into its immediate context.

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.”

“Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.”

Are those who believe that individuals and that churches, which are totally spiritual institutions, should submit to the authority of the civil government in all earthly and spiritual matters wrong? Yes, for at least two reasons. First, because to believe that Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 teach blind obedience by individuals and by churches to civil government would make those verses inconsistent with the rest of biblical teaching concerning God’s total authority over the individual believer’s spiritual life, God’s total authority over the church, and God’s total authority over the state. For example, Scripture tells us that the authors of Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 consistently violated these verses as wrongly interpreted by civil government and many “Christians.” Second, Romans 13 would be inconsistent within itself. The Word of God is never inconsistent.

Romans 13.1 first makes clear that every soul is to be subject to the higher powers. Thus, even human leaders, since they also have souls, are subject to a higher power. According to the Bible, God is the power higher than all other governments. As shown in Part One Section I, God ordains all governments, is above all governments, and lays out the jurisdiction of all governments. Man is

2 Romans 13.1-7.
3 I Peter 2.13-14.
to be subject to civil government concerning those matters over which God has
given civil government jurisdiction. On the other hand, man is to be only under
God, regardless of what the rules of civil government declare, concerning those
matters for which God has retained jurisdiction for Himself.

Romans 13, consistent with Old and New Testament principles, proclaims
the God-ordained purpose of civil government, that God is the highest power,
and that God ordained and is over civil government. According to Romans 13.7,
Christians are to render to civil government tribute, custom, fear, and honor—
where due under the God-given jurisdiction of civil government.

Romans 13.3-4 and I Peter 2.13-14 lay out, consistent with the rest of
Scripture, the God-given jurisdiction of civil government over man. In those
verses, God grants civil governments jurisdiction over certain earthly, not
spiritual, matters, and instructs man to do good and to refrain from doing evil.
Many Christians point to those Scriptures and incorrectly declare: “That settles
it. The Bible orders blind obedience to civil government in all matters, period;”
or they proclaim that those verses require Christians to obey civil government in
all things with the possible exception of the preaching of salvation.

As we have seen, even with the establishment of the church, which is re-
corded in the New Testament, God found it necessary to continue the institution
of civil government. The original God-given purpose and jurisdiction of Gentile
civil government was to continue. In Romans 13, He proclaims that “rulers are
not a terror to good works, but to the evil” since if citizens “do that which is
good,” rulers will praise them.4 The word from which “evil” in Romans 13.4 is
translated means “generally opposed to civil goodness or virtue, in a
commonwealth, and not to spiritual good, or religion, in the church.”5 This is
because a ruler is a “minister of God to thee for good,” just as he is “a revenger
to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.”6

Many civil governments go beyond their God-given jurisdiction. Was Rome
a minister of God for good when she executed untold numbers of Christians
before the marriage of church and state in the fourth century? What about those
governments during the Middle Ages that worked in conjunction with the
Roman Catholic “church” to persecute and kill millions of Christians labeled as
heretics for refusing to bow down to a false theology? Was Hitler a minister of
God for good when he forbade, on penalty of imprisonment and/or death,
authentic biblical teaching which condemned his actions against the Jews and
true Christians? How about Lenin and Stalin who were not only responsible for
the murder of tens of millions of Christians, but who also required the teaching
of atheism and established atheism as the official faith of the Soviet Union?
How about the governments of Red China, Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and many
others at the present time? Are such civil governments legitimate civil
governments operating under God and his principles? Is the Christian who lives
under such civil governments expected by God to follow all their rules?

How does God feel about Christians who obey God and thereby disobey
civil governments which go beyond their jurisdiction? Were those Christians
who conspired against Hitler wrong? Were Corrie Ten Boom and others wrong
to save Jews from extermination? Were Moses’ parents wrong to save their son

---

4 Romans 13.3.
5 Williams and Underhill, p. 133.
6 Romans 13.4.
against the order of Pharaoh? Was the writer of the New Testament book of Hebrews wrong to praise them for hiding Moses, not being “afraid of the king’s commandment”? How about the Egyptian midwives when they “feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them but saved the male children alive”? Was God wrong in dealing well with those midwives for saving the male babies and lying to Pharaoh? Was Moses wrong when he “refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; [c]hoosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; [e]steeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recumpence of the reward.”

Was God wrong when he told Moses to defy Pharaoh? Was Moses wrong to exercise his faith, obey God, and defy Pharaoh? Was Rahab the harlot wrong to lie to the authorities about the whereabouts of the Jewish spies in her land in order to save their lives? Was Joshua wrong for allowing her to live as a reward for defying her governing authorities? Was God wrong to include Rahab in the hall of faith, along with such people as Enoch, Noah, Abraham and Sara, Isaac and Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, and other heroes of the faith? What about Ehud who killed King Eglon; Joshua who attacked the governing authorities by God’s command; Jael, who nailed her governing authority to the ground with a tent stake; Samson who revolted against the governing authorities; David who ran from Saul; Mordecai who refused to bow down and worship Haman; Elijah who ignored the order of a wicked King even when fifty soldiers showed up, then stood against King Ahab, Jezebel, and their false prophets; Daniel and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; the apostles including Peter who said, “We ought to obey God rather than men;” Paul who disobeyed many of his ruling authorities; all those down through the ages since Jesus’ resurrection and return to glory who have suffered persecution and death for the cause of Christ, including all the apostles, eleven of whom were ultimately martyred for the faith; Christians down through the last 2000 years from Christ to this very day who were imprisoned, tortured, and killed because they would not submit to the governing authorities in spiritual matters, many times religious organizations such as the Lutheran or Catholic churches, or renounce Christ, or quit rebaptizing, or quit street preaching, or succumb to false doctrines and/or worship the governing authorities; and those Christians in the
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7 Exodus 2.3.  
8 Hebrews 11.23.  
9 Exodus 1.17.  
10 Exodus 1.20.  
12 Exodus 3.2-12; 3.15-22; 4.21-23.  
13 Exodus 5.12; Hebrews 11.27.  
14 Joshua 2.  
15 Joshua 6.22-25.  
18 See the book of Joshua.  
21 See I Samuel 18.8 through chapter 31.  
22 Esther 3.5.  
23 I Kings 18.17-41; II Kings 1.9-16.  
24 See the book of Daniel.  
25 Acts 5.29.
underground churches of China, Cuba, Korea, Indonesia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Vietnam., Laos, Malay, the Sudan, Morocco, Libya, Somalia, Algeria, Malaysia, Afghanistan, Colombia, the former Soviet Union, and many other nations.  

Did the blessed Savior and God, the Lord Jesus Christ, sin when He chose to continue to do His miracles, to preach to the people, to condemn the religious leaders of His day and their errors, to proclaim that He was the Messiah even though He was upsetting the religious rulers of His day who ultimately used the governing authorities to crucify Him?

The Bible, history, and reality show that some rulers, according to Romans 13, exceed their God-ordained power. America does not honor God and His principles. America is a pluralistic nation. All religions are regarded equally, except for Christianity which is now attacked from all quarters. America allows abortion, the murder of unborn babies, to go unpunished. Abortion is the ultimate attack on God and the legitimacy of God’s supreme rule. Abortion is an attack on the first institution ordained by God in that it tells men, and especially women, that they can discard God’s rules concerning sex before marriage and engage in sex outside the marriage vows with impunity. Abortion attacks individuals by tempting them to ignore God’s rules regarding fornication and adultery. Women who have their babies killed risk great emotional, and spiritual damage. Likewise, men who allow their babies to be murdered suffer, at the very least, spiritual and emotional harm. Abortion is the ultimate attack on the God-ordained institution of marriage, the basic building block of society.

America has also redefined marriage and the family contrary to biblical definitions and principles. In fact, what authority has the state to define marriage other than it is defined by God? Who—the state or God—ordained marriage? America has redefined marriage as a contract between two equal people. God said marriage is a covenant between a man, a woman, and God. America has redefined the family to be a group of people living together all of whom should...

---

26 An excellent source to keep abreast of the ongoing persecutions of Christians throughout the world is “The Voice of the Martyrs,” 1-800-747-0085; e-mail: thevoice@vom-usa.org; web site: www.persecution.com; children’s web site: www.kidsofcourage.com; address: The Voice of the Martyrs, P.O. Box 443, Bartlesville, OK 74005-0443.

27 Job 31.15: “Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?” Isaiah 44.24: “Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things; ...” Isaiah 49.1: “... the LORD hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name.” Jeremiah 1.5: “Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.”

28 Genesis 1.27: “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.”

29 See, e.g., Romans 1.29; I Corinthians 5.1; 6.9-10 (“... Be not deceived: neither fornicators ... shall inherit the kingdom of God.”), 13, 18 (“Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.”); 7.2; 10.8; II Corinthians 12.21; Galatians 5.19; Ephesians 5.3; Colossians 3.5-6; I Thessalonians 4.3.

30 In Matthew 19.4-6 Jesus confirms the Genesis narrative of creation ([Jesus said to the Pharisees who were attempting him,] “Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”). See Genesis 1.27 and 2.23-24 (God created male and female in his own image). See also, for example, Matthew 5.31-32, 32; Mark 10.1-12; Luke 16.18; and I Corinthians 7.10-15 which deal with dishonoring the marriage relationship.

31 See, e.g., Matthew 5.31-2; 19.3-9; Mark 10.1-12; Luke 16.18.
have an equal voice, even children. Are fathers and mothers wrong to structure and operate their families according to biblical principles, denying their children an equal voice? Perhaps they are if the state married them since they willingly submitted their marriage and family to the authority of the state. If married by the authority of the state, perhaps they are also wrong to operate their family according to biblical principles because they willingly submitted their family to state authority. Are couples wrong to choose to marry under the authority of a God-ordained minister who refuses to pronounce them man and wife by the authority given him by a God-hating government which operates under Satan’s principles? Section VI will give more insights into this civil government attack on the marriage of man and woman and the family as well as the marriage of Christ and His church.

America has enticed churches, as will be developed, to operate by the authority given them by the state. Are pastors wrong to continue to operate solely under the headship of God? By the way, a church can still preach, teach, and operate solely by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ in this nation. Yet, most pastors choose the government cheese and ease over the principles and promises in the Word of God. Why? The Christian who walks in the flesh does not cherish at least one of the promises of God for the Christian—persecution. “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.”32 Most American “Christians” reject suffering instead of accepting it as instructed (“For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake;”33), as mild as it would be compared to the suffering of Paul, Peter, and the other apostles and Christians down through the last two thousand years; those “Christians” do not know what they are missing (“That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death;”34). And how almost non-existent is the persecution to be suffered by the church and the Christian who refuses to put himself or herself under the American civil government in spiritual matters. What would the American Christian today—who bows down to civil government despite the very mild inconveniences that would result from doing things God’s way—do should he face the persecutions endured by the early Christians; persecutions by, for example, the Apostle Paul who lived in a society in which he, before his conversion, had “imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on [the Lord],”35 and persecution by others after Paul’s conversion. Paul noted, shortly before his martyrdom, that he had endured many persecutions,36 but that “out of them all the Lord delivered [him].”37 Let it be emphasized that despite the fact that America is no longer a nation under God, Christians are required by Scripture to obey, for the Lord’s

---
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sake, every legitimate biblically consistent American ordinance dealing with wrongdoing against one’s fellow man.

Just as the early colonial dissenters such as the Baptists were under bondage to the established churches in the colonies, so are Americans, including Christians in churches which place themselves under civil government, in the twenty-first century. The eighteenth century words of Isaac Backus apply to Americans today:

“Now how often have we been told that he is not a freeman but a slave whose person and goods are not at his own but another’s disposal? And to have foreigners come and riot at our expense and in the fruit of our labors, has often represented as to be worse than death.... But how is our world filled with such madness concerning spiritual tyrants! How far have pride and infidelity, covetousness and luxury, yea, deceit and cruelty, those foreigners which came from Hell, carried their influence, and spread their baneful mischiefs in our world! Yet who is willing to own that he has been deceived and enslaved by them? ... All acknowledge that these enemies are among us, and many complain aloud of the mischiefs that they do, yet even those who lift up their heads so high as to laugh at the atonement of Jesus and the powerful influences of the Spirit and slight public and private devotion are at the same time very unwilling to own that they harbor pride, infidelity, or any other of those dreadful tyrants. And nothing but the divine law ... brought home with convincing light and power, can make them truly sensible of the soul-slavery that they are in. And 'tis only the power of the Gospel that can set them free from sin so as to become the servants of righteousness, can deliver them from these enemies so as to serve God in holiness all their days.

“... Therefore the divine argument to prove that those who promise liberty while they despise government are servants of corruption is this: For of whom a MAN is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage, 2 Pet. ii. 18, 19. He is so far from being free to act the man that he is a bond-slave to the worst of tyrants. And not a little of this tyranny is carried on by such an abuse of language as to call it liberty for men to yield themselves up to be so foolish, disobedient and deceived as to serve divers lusts and pleasures, Tit. iii. 3.”

The biblical truth is that God gives Gentile civil government control only over certain earthly sins involving man’s relationship to man as is attested to by Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 in their immediate context and in the context of Scripture as a whole. As at His original establishment of civil government at the flood, God never mentions one act which involves man’s relationship to God in any Scripture involving the authority of civil government. Even in Israel after God allowed the people to have a king, as they requested, the civil ruler was not to intrude into the affairs of the priest. In Romans 12.9-20 and 13.8-14, the verses immediately surrounding Romans 13.1-4, the Word of God, speaking to Christians, elaborates upon the Christian responsibility to his neighbor and to civil government. Nothing is said about the Christian’s responsibility to God (notwithstanding, treating one’s neighbor as God desires is a responsibility to God.). For example, Romans 12.9-20, the verses immediately preceding Romans 13, state:

“Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another; Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; Distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of

39 See, e.g., I Samuel 13.8-14.
all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.”

Romans 13.8-14 says:

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that love another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. And that knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put you on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof.”

Notice in those verses that, in regard to obeying the ordinances of men, he only dealt with the law of love toward one’s neighbor; that is, with man’s relationship to man, and not man’s relationship to God. God did not give Gentile civil government responsibility for exercising authority over spiritual matters, over the first four commandments dealing with man’s relationship to God.

Civil government has no authority over matters dealing with man’s relationship to God since such matters are spiritual. Spiritual matters, according to God, the Supreme Ruler of the highest government, include both our duties, as individual believers and as members of a church, to God and to man. Christians are to love both God and their neighbor.

Religious and secular rulers, being led by the god of this world to satisfy their own lusts, have always been concerned with their authority. Not knowing God, they are their own gods. We see that over and over again in the Old and New Testaments. Jesus faced that problem.

“Then the Jews took up stones again to stone [Jesus]. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods. If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.”

The apostles always obeyed God in regard to spiritual matters, even when in so doing, they violated ordinances of man. Disregarding threats, imprisonment, and beatings, the apostles continued both to do for their fellow man, and to preach, both in the name of Jesus, repeatedly violating Romans 13, and I Peter 2.13 as interpreted by most contemporary “Christians.” Peter wrote:

“Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.”

40 The Lord here quotes Psalm 82.6a: “I have said, Ye are gods[.]”
41 John 10.31-38.
42 I Peter 2.13-14.
Notice that Peter pointed out the purpose of civil government and therefore the ordinances of man—to punish evildoers, and to praise those who do well. According to him, Christians were to obey every “ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake,” and civil government was to deal only with earthly matters.

Punishment by civil leaders did not cause Peter and John to violate the biblical principle of separation of church and state which was at odds with the worldly principle of separation of church and state. The people, the priests, the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon Peter and John, laid hands on them, and held them, after they performed the first apostolic miracle, healing the lame man. The “rulers, and elders, and scribes” brought them in and asked them, “By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?”

“Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, ... [B]y the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.”

Their response:

“[T]hey conferred among themselves, Saying. What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it. But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name. And they called them and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.”

These rulers would have had no complaint had Peter and John and the other apostles done what they did under the authority of the rulers. Obviously, Peter and John had not yet been taught that Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 required them to obey the earthly authorities over them in all matters, including spiritual matters. Of course, the apostles, under the authority of the rulers, would not have been able to heal and do other miracles, nor to preach in the power of the Holy Ghost. They still understood that the Highest Power, God himself, told them to do what they were doing and gave them the power to do it, that no earthly power was given the authority to direct them concerning spiritual matters, and that even had an earthly power given the authority to do those matters under earthly authority, they could not have done the miracles or preached the true gospel with power. Many “Christians” today believe that they and the church can simultaneously achieve God’s spiritual goals while operating under the authority of the god of this world. “Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”

After their release, the response of Peter and John and their Christian friends was quite different from what can be expected of “Christians” today, who now have America’s interpretation of Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13 at their disposal. Peter and John then went “to their own company” and prayed:
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“Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word. By stretching forth thine hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus. And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness.”

These men knew their Bible. Within their prayer they quoted from Isaiah 51.12, 13 and Psalm 2.1-3. They did not take Scripture out of context so that they could forego confronting the rulers. They just asked God to give them boldness to remain under His authority while speaking the Word of the Lord and doing signs and wonders in the name of Jesus. They were concerned with not only preaching the Word but also with “doing” for their fellow man under the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. They knew that they could not do any good for their fellow man without the power of God and that they could not have the power of God should they operate under the authority of the state or anyone else.

The apostles continued to violate today’s perverted interpretation of Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13, accompanied by God’s own angel; and they were so presumptuous as to do so in public places, which is improper according to many of today’s state indoctrinated “Christians” who advise Christians not to preach on the street, or do door-to-door evangelism or any public ministry because they “feel” that to do so is offensive to others and wrong and the proper place for these activities is within the four walls of the church. The apostles continued to do signs and wonders among the people, “healing many sick folks and them which were vexed with unclean spirits.” Because of this, the high priest and all they that were with him, “laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison.” The angel of the Lord opened the prison doors, released them, and told them to “Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life.” Here God’s own angel was instructing the apostles to violate America’s false version of Romans 13 and I Peter 2.13. The apostles did what the angel told them to do: “[T]hey entered into the temple early in the morning and taught....”

Notice, as a side note, that they were not going into their own meeting-place, but were going into the temple—all through Acts they are depicted as not going into the four walls of their own meeting place, but are preaching and helping their fellow man in synagogues, in public places, and going door to door. Maybe the Lord in His wisdom did not mention that a church should own property for a reason—if a church has to operate in the world, outside the four walls of a building, that church, if its members love the Lord, will probably do what God commissioned her to do: “Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” Luke recorded the words of Jesus:
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“Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promises of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.”

Obviously, God’s intent for the church was to get His message to the whole world, not for the church to seclude itself within four walls. Notice that Christians were to begin at Jerusalem, then to go to all the world, to all nations. Because of persecution in Jerusalem for speaking and acting in public in the name of Jesus, the governing authorities forced them to leave Jerusalem and go to the world. God’s will was accomplished through persecution.

The apostles were again apprehended and brought before the counsel who said to them, “Did we not straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.”

“Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.”

“When they heard that they took council to slay them.” Gamaliel talked them out of killing the apostles. Instead, they beat the apostles and “commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go.” The apostles “rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name. And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.” They also continued to do for their neighbor: Peter healed Aeneas of his palsy of which he had been in bed eight years and raised Tabitha from the dead in Jesus’ name.

Paul was determined to obey God, not man and not civil government, in regard to spiritual matters. Paul wrote on this matter in Romans and many other books in the New Testament. For example, he instructed the Christian:

“For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ[.]”

Paul simply did not obey the civil government in regard to spiritual matters. Nor did he teach submission to civil government with regard to spiritual matters.

---
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He and Silas were beaten and thrown into prison after casting out a demon from a damsel. The masters of the damsel, because they lost the gains of her divination, brought them to the magistrates, charging that they “teach customs, which are not lawful for [them] to receive, neither to observe, being Romans.” Paul was frequently imprisoned as a result of ministering for Christ. He was concerned with obeying God, with “Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.”

Paul, inspired by God, understood that the true Christian was in a warfare initiated by Satan who would do everything in his power to usurp the God-given duties of Christians and churches to love God and to love one’s neighbor. His understanding is reflected in instructions he gave:

> “Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.”

Notice that the armour he mentioned was totally spiritual—loins girt with truth, the breastplate of righteousness, the gospel of peace, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God—not earthly.

As to the prayer mentioned in the above verses, Paul instructed Christians to pray in the Spirit that all men, including kings and others in authority, would be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth. Christ died for all, including rulers, but he gave everyone a choice of whether to submit to Him.

> “I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men: For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.”

He instructed Christians to include rulers in their supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks so that Christians could lead a quiet and peaceable live in all godliness and honesty. In other words, a ruler who is saved and comes to the knowledge of the truth will provide an atmosphere, under God his Supreme Ruler, in which Christians can live quite and peaceable lives. By implication, and as shown consistently throughout history, lost rulers and others in authority likely will not provide such an atmosphere.
Paul knew that Satan would continue to come against the church through earthly powers, through civil government. He also knew that God wanted his children to fight this warfare using only spiritual, not earthly, means. His goal was the glory of God, not the happiness of man.
Chapter 7
Christ-church, Husband-wife, Bridegroom-bride

“Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.” 1

The Word of God reveals the mind of God. The Bible tells the believer how God feels concerning certain actions of His children. The Husband-wife and Bridegroom-bride analogies depicting Christ and His church (discussed in Section II, Chapter 3) have important implications. From the Husband-wife analogy, we know that Christ, likened to a husband, wants to be over His wife, the church, in all things and is jealous when His wife, even if remaining for some purposes under Christ, also puts herself under another head. Why else would God have given this analogy? He wants us to know how important this relationship is.

What godly husband would not be jealous if his wife came to him, arms around another man, and said,

“You know that I love you very much. I appreciate your love for me and all you do for me. I have entered into an agreement with Joe. I want you to know that I have decided that I am going to meet with Joe a couple of times a week for breakfast, or lunch, or dinner; and maybe occasionally meet with him just to talk. He cares for me, and he can give me additional advice and information which will be very helpful to me and which you are not able to give, although the advice you do give is most appreciated and helpful as far as it goes and as far as it is correct. He will also help me financially, since you cannot give me all that I need and want. I will still love and honor you. I know that my relationship with Joe will be alright with you.”

How would a husband feel about such an arrangement? Would it affect the marriage in any way? Would not it affect the way the husband and wife treat and respond to one another? Would the husband be jealous? Is not Christ jealous of His church? Is not the Lord grieved when His wife, the church, puts herself under the state through incorporation and tax exempt status (see Section VI) or in any other manner?

We see pictures of the Husband-wife relationship in the Old Testament, between Jehovah God the Father and the nation Israel:

Isaiah 54 deals with Israel the restored wife of Jehovah & security and blessing of restored Israel. God the Father was the husband of Israel. “For thy maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy one of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.” 2

Jeremiah 2-6 discusses the harlotry of Israel toward her husband, Jehovah and His warnings and promises to her depending upon whether she repents. “Turn, O backsliding children saith the LORD; for I am married unto you.... Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the LORD.” 3

Hosea depicts the dishonored wife (Israel), and the sinful people. “... Plead with your mother, plead: for she is not my wife, neither am I her husband. Let her therefore put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts; Lest
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I strip her naked, and set her as in the day that she was born, and make her as a wilderness, and set her like a dry land, and slay her with thirst. And I will not have mercy on her children; for they be the children of whoredoms. For their mother hath played the harlot: she that conceived them hath done shamefully: for she said, I will go after other lovers, that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink....

Hosea 4.6-11 speaks of the willful ignorance of Israel: “My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou has forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget my children....”

Sadly, many of our leading Christians and pastors today, like the Israelites spoken of by the prophets, are either willfully ignorant or allow their reasoning to blind their eyes as to the importance of this issue to God.

What happens when a wife starts to have an affair, even a non-sexual affair? She may be able to hide her earthly affair from her husband, but she cannot hide the effects of the affair. (Of course, the church cannot hide its affair from the Lord.) The attitude, speech, and actions of the wife change. Does not her relationship with her husband change? Her husband now has to share his time with another who is partially over his wife. Does not the joy leave the marriage? Many times, if she does not repent, is not the marriage destroyed? Even if she repents, she and her husband will never forget. Hopefully, he will forgive.

In many ways it is the same with the local assembly that enters into an unholy union with the civil government. Perhaps the church that does this tries to cover up the fact that the church has dishonored and grieved her Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ—those who even think about what is going on say, “Well, if my new partner ever tells me that I cannot preach salvation, he will have gone too far.” The pastor says, “The Lord and his ways are not sufficient. The civil government takes better care of me than does the Lord. The civil government protects the church, allows the church to enter into contracts, gives the church limited liability, gives the church tax exemption (not realizing that God makes the church non-taxable which is not good enough), allows my people to deduct their contributions, etc.” This pastor either does not understand or ignores the Word of God in these matters. He does not understand that God instructs him that the Lord is to be over His church, that he is at the very least combining the holy with the unholy, or at worst committing spiritual adultery, and that disastrous consequences are ahead. Unlike an earthly husband, God can and will forgive and forget if a church repent and turns back to the Lord.

“Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ: that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.”

---
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God’s principles separate church and state. The God-ordained purpose of both is to glorify God, but neither will do this if operated outside the jurisdictional boundaries set by God. The two are so distinct that the possibility of the two operating together, or the possibility of one assuming leadership over the other without the very nature of the church being distorted and corrupted is a nullity. The church is a heavenly institution to be operated by men who are walking in the Spirit. The state is an earthly institution usually run by fleshly men whose purpose and goals are earthly. Even should born-again believers be the rulers of civil government (a temporary possibility at best), a state-church or church-state society is doomed to failure because God does not desire such a union and has made the two so different that it is impossible for the church to continue to be pure while the two operate together.

Men, walking in the flesh and not in the Spirit, have gone to great lengths to distort Scripture to justify an unholy alliance of church and state. And it is only a church, not the state, that is responsible for an alliance between church and state. Christ instructed Christians:

“Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.”

“The seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches.”

“Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness. No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

“For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.”

“For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.”

---
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“Be not unequally yoked 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.”

“...God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.”

The Lord, who loved His wife and gave Himself for her, desires to be her only Head, her only Mate. But He has given the wife a choice. She can be a light to the world showing forth the purity of the heavenly marriage, or she can spend part of her time with another partner or lover, taking instructions, advice, and material help from him. She can put her light wholly or partially under a bushel where it is subdued. The result will be a partially or wholly worldly “church.” Fewer people will be drawn to the light, since the light is dimmed or completely hidden. The question is. “How much does a church love her Husband and her fellow man?” As Roger Williams said,

“A chaste wife will not only abhor to be restrained from her husband’s bed as adulterous and polluted, but also abhor (if not much more) to be constrained to the bed of a stranger. And what is abominable in corporal, is much more loathsome in spiritual whoredom and defilement.”

---

7 I John 1.5-7.
8 Williams and Underhill, p. 38.
“[B]y the dawn of the American Revolution all the colonies were approaching or had reached a readiness to separate Church and State. Only Rhode Island had traveled no road and followed no route to reach that destination; Rhode Island had been there from the start. For Pennsylvania the route was short and direct; full civil rights had to be granted to Catholics and to disbelievers in the Trinity for full civil liberty to be achieved. In the other colonies … far reaching and profound changes in attitude were necessary before the … concept could become a possibility.”

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceable to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

1 Marnell, p. 93.
2 U.S. CONST. amend. I.
Chapter 1
Introduction

It is unusual for a nation to provide for freedom of conscience even though God desires nations to provide for religious liberty under Him. Nonetheless, God’s people have always, regardless of persecution, come together as local churches, preached the Gospel, and helped their fellow man. Paul wrote in the midst of persecution:

“We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed;”

“We, having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak.”

In the preceding verse, Paul quoted a portion of Psalm 116.10 which says in its entirety, “‘I believed, therefore have I spoken: I was greatly afflicted.’” Tied up in the liberty given believers by Christ is speaking (“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.”), and associating or meeting together (“Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is;”

Furthermore, God gave mankind the Bible, which in certain times past, was banned and burned. The First Amendment was written and ratified with the intent of protecting God’s churches, the exercise of religion or Christianity, the preaching of the Gospel, the coming together to worship God, the dissemination of literature, mainly the dissemination of God’s Word, and the right to petition the civil government for a redress of grievances.

The First Amendment was the culmination of a long spiritual warfare between established churches and dissenters, mainly the Baptists. God’s power moved mightily during that period of conflict. Many believers suffered persecution. The roots of the struggle in America were embedded in New England, spread to the south, to Virginia, and then to the new nation.

Revisionists have obscured the true history of the First Amendment. Revisionism is not new. Catholics and Protestants, including the Puritans, consistent with their biases have long revised in order to further their agendas. Good examples are the claims made by the Presbyterians and the Honorable William Wirt Henry near the close of the nineteenth century. Mr. Henry “told of Virginia’s leadership in bringing in religious liberty but made no allusion to the Baptists, and said it was ‘under the leadership of Patrick Henry that religious liberty has been established as a fundamental part of the fundamental law of our land.’” As a result of Mr. Henry’s assertions, Charles F. James—a Baptist, who had preached that “at the date of the [American] Revolution the Baptists were the only denomination of Christians which, as such, held to the idea of religious liberty, and that, of the political leaders of that day, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson were chiefly instrumental in establishing that principle in the laws of

1  II Corinthians 4.8-9.
2  II Corinthians 4.13.
3  Mark 16.15.
4  Hebrews 10.25a.
5  James, p. f.
our land”—set out to do a thorough historical study of the Baptists in Virginia. His studies and written work which followed set the record straight.

Secular revisionism has influenced the development of the modern concepts of the First Amendment. Influential constitutional “scholars” such as Leo Pfeffer, since they have no concept of God or His sovereignty, have removed the most important aspect of debate from the equation—the spiritual aspect. Pfeffer, misrepresents spiritual matters because he does not understand them. He relegates the spiritual to the merely “ideological.” He attributes Madison’s positions on the issue of separation of church and state to his reliance on John Locke, and quotes Locke; then, even though Locke, in the quotes cited by Pfeffer, talks of government interference with the care and salvation of souls which belongs to God, Pfeffer never mentions God in his discussion but rather emphasizes Locke’s “social contract theory.” He overemphasizes the influence of rationalism and deism in gaining the First Amendment. He falsely proclaims that the “first four presidents of the United States were either Deists or Unitarians.” He asserts that the Great Awakening “emphasized an emotional, personal religion” which appealed directly to the individual, stressing the rights and duties of the individual conscience and its answerability exclusively to God. He, like all secular scholars, simply did not get it even though he did mention God. He had no choice but to mention God, since a controversy over what God taught in the Bible was at the center of the controversy. He simply did not and could not examine that controversy. Lost men and saved men who were spiritually ignorant have led the way in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

The First Amendment, in what is called the establishment clause, forbids Congress to establish a church and reinforces the establishment clause in the free exercise clause by forbidding Congress to prevent the free exercise of religion. Thus, the religion clause of the First Amendment which consists of the establishment and free exercise clauses, especially when read in the context of the entire Amendment, is a legal statement of the principle of religious freedom, or soul liberty, or separation of church and state which conforms to biblical principles. Bible-believing Christians, based upon their spiritual beliefs, fought the fight which resulted in the First Amendment. They made the spiritual Bible-based arguments which gradually convinced others. By practicing their faith despite persecution, they paid the price.

Many of the early colonists were Protestants who thought Luther and/or Calvin were correct in their beliefs concerning church and state. Others, the Anglicans, brought the state-church concepts of England to the colonies. Dissenters believed in and fought for separation of church and state. The First Amendment was primarily the result of a spiritual warfare between those holding opposing Scriptural interpretations, the established churches versus the dissenters, primarily the Baptists.

“Of the Baptists, at least, it may be truly said that they entered the conflict in the New World with a clear and consistent record on the subject of soul liberty. ‘Freedom of conscience’ had ever been one of their fundamental tenets. John Locke, in his ‘essay on Toleration,’ says: ‘The Baptists were the first and only propounders of absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty.’ And the great American historian, Bancroft, says: ‘Freedom of Conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was from the first a trophy of the Baptists.’ Vol. II., pages 66, 67.

---

7 Pfeffer, pp. 81-93.
“The history of the other denominations shows that, in the Old World, at least, they were not in sympathy with the Baptist doctrine of soul liberty, but in favor of the union of Church and State, and using the civil power to compel conformity to the established church...

“The Reformation which began with Martin Luther corrected many errors of faith and practice among those who came out of the corrupt and apostate church, but not all. It was left to the sect once ‘everywhere spoken against’ to teach their Protestant brethren the lesson of soul liberty, and this they did in the school of adversity in the New World.”

At times, persecuting established churches became persecuted churches. When that happened, the persecutors generally became dissenters seeking religious tolerance or religious freedom.

The First Amendment to the Constitution resulted from “a factual relationship that was rapidly solidifying when the Constitution was amended by the Bill of Rights.” The First Amendment was the final product of a long struggle by men who believed strongly in the God of the Bible and who were willing to die rather than bow down to false religion. Their spirit was fused into the ordering of the affairs of the United States. “A wall of separation which would bar that spirit from making itself felt in secular concerns can never be built, because it would have to bisect the human heart.”

William H. Marnell correctly observed that

“[t]he First Amendment was not the product of indifference toward religion. It was not the product of the deism which prevailed in the Enlightenment, however much the spirit of deism may have been present in certain of the Founding Fathers. Above, all, it was not the product of secularism, and to translate the spirit of twentieth-century secularism back to eighteenth-century America is an outrage to history. The First Amendment was rather a logical outcome of the Reformation and its ensuing developments. It was so far removed from secularism as to be the product of its exact opposite, the deep-seated concern of a people whose religious faith had taken many forms, all of them active, all of them sincerely held. It was so far removed from indifference toward religion [specifically Christianity] as to be the result of its antithesis, the American determination that the diversity of churches might survive the fact of political action.”

The dissidents in the colonies, chiefly the Baptists, were able to gain a foothold, and they played it for all it was worth. The Baptist theology of the founding era, initially under the leadership of Roger Williams and John Clarke, successfully challenged the doctrines of the established churches concerning the relationship of church and state. Among the results were the establishment of the first civil government in history with religious liberty, the government of the colony of Rhode Island, and later the First Amendment to the United States Constitution which required religious freedom for churches and freedom of conscience for individuals. The First Amendment allowed churches to operate under God without persecution. The First Amendment did not apply to the states.

Primarily due to the efforts of our Baptist forefathers, a time came, as Baptist pastor and historian John Callender said in 1838, when

“[e]xperience has dearly convinced the world, that unanimity in judgment and affection cannot be secured by penal laws....

“Indulgence to tender consciences, might be a reproach to the Colony [of Rhode Island], an hundred years ago, [that is in 1738, one hundred years before Callender wrote this], but a better way of thinking prevails in the Protestant part of the Christian church at

8 James, pp. 14-15.
9 Marnell, pp. xii-xiii.
10 Ibid.
present. It is now a glory to the Colony, to have avowed such sentiments so long ago, while blindness in this article happened in other places, and to have led the way as an example to others, and to have first put the theory into practice.

“Liberty of conscience is more fully established and enjoyed now, in the other New-English Colonies; and our mother Kingdom grants a legal toleration to all peaceable and conscientious dissenters from the parliamentary establishment. Greater light breaking into the world and the church, and especially all parties by turns experiencing and complaining aloud of the hardships of constraint, they are come to allow as reasonable to all others, what they want and challenge for themselves. And there is no other bottom but this to rest upon, to leave others the liberty we should desire ourselves, the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free. This is doing as we would be done by, the grand rule of justice and equity; this is leaving the government of the church to Jesus Christ, the King and head over all things, and suffering his subjects to obey and serve him.”  

By the time the First Amendment was added to the United States Constitution, only New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut had established churches. In 1833 Massachusetts became the last state to disestablish.

Baptists wanted religious freedom. Some probably could foresee the ideal of a church under God, a civil government under God, with neither church nor state over the other. But few knew how to have a civil government under God without establishing a church. Why? Fifteen hundred years of history had witnessed “Christian” establishments made up of church-state or state-church unions. Therefore, one should not be too hard on those early Protestants in America who continued those unions, since, according to Isaac Backus,

“[many things] prove that those fathers [the leaders of the Puritans in Massachusetts] were earnestly concerned to frame their constitution both in church and state by divine rule; and as all allow that nothing teaches like experience, surely they who are enabled well to improve the experience of past ages, must find it easier now to discover the mistakes of that day, than it was for them to do it then. Even in 1637, when a number of puritan ministers in England, and the famous Mr. Dod among them, wrote to the ministers here, that it was reported that they had embraced certain new opinions, such as ‘that a stinted form of prayer and set liturgy is unlawful; that the children of godly and approved Christians are not to be baptized, until their parents be set members of some particular congregation; that the parents themselves, though of approved piety, are not to be received to the Lord’s Supper until they be admitted set members,’ &c., Mr. Hooker expressed his fears of troublesome work about answering of them, though they may appear easy to the present generation.”

Nor should one be too critical of those leaders of the founding era who struggled with the question of how to construct this nation. They produced the best governing document of any nation in history, but that document had some serious flaws which would play out to the detriment of the nation and individuals, families, and churches within the nation. Nonetheless, because of great revivals which began shortly after ratification of the Constitution, huge numbers of people were saved and those regenerated individuals were responsible for at least postponing the spiritual and moral decline of America.

How can a civil government be under God without entanglement with the church? A civil government can choose to be under God. Since God was directly over only one nation, the nation Israel, the only way God chooses to speak to a Gentile government prior to His second return is through His Word, the Bible. Therefore, for a nation to be under God, the leader(s) of that nation must understand and apply biblical principles including those principles concerning

church, state, and separation of church and state. As has been shown, only born-again believers have the power, through the Holy Spirit, to understand the Word of God. Only regenerate leader(s) of a civil government can operate the government according to those principles laid down for Gentile nations in the Bible. In America, the people choose the leaders. Therefore, America will have a regenerate leadership only if America should have a population made up of a majority of knowledgeable active Christians who choose Christian leaders.

The Constitution provided for separation of church and state, but the Constitution and the amendments thereto, even when the Declaration of Independence is considered, failed to proclaim that this nation is to be under God and that the purpose of this nation is to glorify God. The primary declaration that a nation can make in its constitution to place itself under God is that its purpose is to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ through laws, prayers, and proclamations consistent with biblical principles. That nation can model its laws, including its constitution, after biblical principles and seek God’s direction in all things, including lawmaking, enforcement, and judging. In such a nation, prayers should be made at all civil governmental functions in Jesus’ name. One of the principles a nation under God must proclaim, as does the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, is that every man has free will, as ordained by God, and that, since God wants every man’s love, men are free to choose to worship the one true God, any false god or gods, or no god at all. A civil government under God must also legislate criminal law making certain acts concerning man’s relationship with man—but not acts dealing with man’s relationship with God—criminal, according to God’s Word, and provide for judging and enforcing those acts by the civil government.

The chances of a civil government being under or remaining under God’s principles before the return of Christ are non-existent as shown by the Bible and by all history. No civil government will have (a) leader(s) who believe(s) and implement(s) principles in the Word of God except in the unlikely situation where the leader(s) is (are) saved and no civil government so structured will long remain under God. Godly leaders are inevitably replaced with carnal Christians and/or the unregenerate who cannot and will not lead according to God’s Word.

This chapter will succinctly summarize the true history of religious liberty in America, initially pointing out some of the misleading teachings of secular and Christian revisionists. Ultimately, Christians can accomplish nothing with lies.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Read Beller, \textit{The Coming Destruction of the Baptist People} and Beller, \textit{America in Crimson Red, the Baptist History of America} for a thorough discussion of the theology behind the lies of the Christian nationalists, whom Beller calls catholic Reformed, and a discussion of Christian nationalists other than Peter Marshall and David Manuel.
Chapter 2
Secular and Christian revisionism

The tactics of Christian and secular revisionists do not change. As Isaac Backus noted, concerning the revisionism and lies of the leaders of the established churches in the colonies:

“[I] appeal to the conscience of every reader, whether he can find three worse things on earth, in the management of controversy, than, first, to secretly take the point disputed for truth without any proof; then, secondly, blending that error with known truths, to make artful addresses to the affections and passions of the audience, to prejudice their minds, before they hear a word that the respondent has to say; and thirdly, if the respondent refuses to yield to such management, then to call in the secular arm to complete the argument?”

Religious and secular revisionists (including many United States Supreme Court Justices) of our time are using the tactic mentioned by Backus today, absent the third component which is, to their dismay, unavailable to them.

“Christian” revisionists have either reconstructed and lied about our Christian heritage or relied on “Christian” authors who have reconstructed and lied about history. They refer to what the writers of their persuasion in times past wrote and said without placing those assertions in the context of other writings and facts surrounding their sources and in the context of biblical truth. They would have us believe either that all “Christians” who came to this nation worked together for religious freedom and are to be given credit for giving us a “Christian” nation, that the Puritans and other sects which followed their principle of church-state establishment gave us a Christian nation, or that those sects of which they approved, the established churches and their leaders, had the truth and dissenters, such as the Baptists and others, were proponents of dangerous heresies. The result of revisionism has been chaos and an accelerating slide down a slippery slope to destruction.

What is their reason for doing this? Some are probably just ignorant of historical facts and rely on what others have written (the author of this book was in this category since he relied upon “Christian” authors and speakers until he began to do an independent study). Perhaps the motive of others who may be more knowledgeable is to influence those Christians who do not share their theology concerning church and state to get involved with helping them in their attempt to unite church and state in order to make possible their ultimate unattainable goal of bringing in the kingdom of heaven prior to the return of Christ. Perhaps they believe, contrary to biblical directives for the Christian, that it is all right for Christians to lie to “those who have no right to know the truth” and that Christians can better advance the cause of Christ by lying about irrefutable historical fact which true history has recorded.

Baptist historian James R. Beller builds a strong case to show that the modern day “catholic Reformed Reconstructionists” under the leadership of

---

1 Backus, *A History of New England..., Volume 1*, p. 150. This comment followed and preceded illustrations of how those in favor of church/state marriage, infant baptism, etc. advance their cause. On pp. 151-152, Mr. Backus illustrated how those in favor of infant baptism argued their position, pointing out the fallacies of their arguments. Their tactics have not changed, although in America, due to the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, they no longer can call upon civil government to enforce their beliefs.
Rousas John Rushdoony justifies lying based upon a perverted interpretation of certain biblical passages. Rushdoony believes in “religious establishments in civil government and that it is acceptable to lie” to promote the cause he supports. Andrew Sandlin calls Christian Reconstructionism “a version of the Reformed, Postmillennial Theology that emphasizes the concepts of Theonomy and Dominion.” The theonomist believes that the magistrate has the duty to enforce the Mosaic law.

“Theonomists believe that Matthew 5:13-16 presents the Church with ‘a mandate for complete social transformation of the entire world.’ The Church is to play the key role in this transformation by spreading the gospel throughout the world, taking over the function of government, and enforcing the Mosaic Law. Thus, Chilton stated, ‘Our goal is world dominion under Christ’s Lordship, a ‘world takeover’ if you will; but our strategy begins with reformation, reconstruction of the church. From that will flow social and political reconstruction, indeed a flowering of Christian civilization.’ Again he said, ‘The Christian goal for the world is the universal development of biblical theocratic republics, in which every area of life is redeemed and placed under the Lordship of Jesus Christ and the rule of God’s law.’

‘Another theonomist declared that ‘the saints must prepare to take over the world’s governments and its courts.’

‘Theonomists optimistically believe that ‘As the gospel progresses throughout the world it will win, and win, and win, until all the kingdoms become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

“This optimistic belief makes theonomy a genuine form of Postmillennialism…

“[R.J.] Rushdoony wrote,

‘Postmillennialism thus believes that man must be saved, and that his generation is the starting point for a mandate to exercise dominion in Christ’s name over every area of life and thought. Postmillennialism in its classic form does not neglect the church and it does not neglect also to work for a Christian state and school, for the sovereignty and crown rights of the King over individuals, families, institutions, arts, scientists, and all things else. More, it holds that God has provided the way for this conquest: His Law.’

Postmillennialism teaches that the ultimate progress of history is upward. Led by the church and the spreading of God’s Word by God’s people, eventually the whole world will be brought into subjection by that message. In other words, the church, working with civilization, science, and political agencies will bring in the Kingdom of Heaven before Christ returns.

This movement promotes a strategy of lying which states that Christians have “no obligation to speak truthfully to those who have forfeited the right to hear the truth,” and that the “commandment does not say that ‘thou shalt never tell a lie.’” Even the famous Reformed lawyer, John Whitehead, founder of the Rutherford Institute, apparently approves of this strategy: Rahab risked

3 Ibid., p. 32.
4 Ibid., p. 33.
everything in order to follow God, including telling lies.”\(^7\) Based upon their reasoning, they justify lying about historical facts. Obviously, they do not want an honest debate of American history which would reveal that the theology of the established churches justified persecution to include banishment, taking of property, imprisonment, and murder.

These Christian revisionists lie and continue to lie and also to make their secular arguments, polished with allusions to God and maybe even Jesus Christ, even when the enemy is quoting historical truth. Those who observe what is going on must shake their heads at the ignorance of Christians, especially Christian lawyers. Instead of trying to get out the whole truth, which would aid the cause of Christ (at least if Christians including pastors and Christian lawyers and scholars had stood on truth from the beginning of the nation), they lied and continue to lie. Even the United States Supreme Court is accurate many times as to historical fact. For example, the Court wrote in 1947:

> “See *e. g.* the charter of the colony of Carolina which gave the grantees the right of ‘patronage and advowsons of all the churches and chapels ... together with licence and power to build and found churches, chapels and oratories ... and to cause them to be dedicated and consecrated, according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England.’ Poore, Constitutions (1878) II, 1390, 1391. That of Maryland gave to the grantee Lord Baltimore ‘the Patronages, and Advowsons of all Churches which ... shall happen to be built, together with Licence and Faculty of erecting and founding Churches, Chapels, and Places of Worship ... and of causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated according to the Ecclesiastical Laws of our Kingdom of *England*, with all, and singular such, and as ample Rights, Jurisdictions, Privileges, ... as any Bishop ... in our Kingdom of *England*, ever ... hath had....’ MacDonald, Documentary Source Book of American History (1934) 31, 33. The Commission of New Hampshire of 1680, Poore, *supra*, II, 1277, stated: ‘And above all things We do by these presents will, require and command our said Council to take all possible care for ye discountenancing of vice and encouraging of virtue and good living; and that by such examples ye infidele may be invited and desire to partake of ye Christian Religion, and for ye greater ease and satisfaction of ye sd loving subjects in matters of religion, We do hereby require and command yt liberty of conscience shall be allowed unto all protestants; yt such especially as shall be conformable to ye rites of ye Church of Engd shall be particularly countenanced and encouraged.’ See also *Pawlet v. Clark*, 9 Cranch 292.”\(^8\)

The Court in *Everson* and in other cases also wrote of the persecutions going on in the Old World prior to the settlement of America, the persecutions going on in America, and the religious turmoil out of which our First Amendment emerged. Of course, the Supreme Court placed the above facts in a case which gave a new meaning to “separation of church and state.” However, the Court never addressed the false theology versus the accurate theology that resulted in religious liberty and freedom of conscience in America. They never examined the true biblical principles concerning the sovereignty of God over all governments, religious liberty, and freedom of conscience. Had the whole truth been argued by Christian lawyers at that time, as well as before and after that time, the downfall of America may have been at least stalled. At the very least, the name of Christ would have been exalted rather than abased.

In addition, true Catholicism still despises separation of church and state. Catholic theology still calls for union of the Catholic “church” and state. In the


\(^8\) *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, fn. 6 at 9; 67 S. Ct. 504, fn. 6 at 508; 91 L. Ed. 711, fn. 6 at 720; 1947 U.S. LEXIS 2959; 168 A.L.R. 1392 (1947).
first half of the nineteenth century, Samuel F. B. Morris discovered and publicized a Catholic political conspiracy against the United States of America. “At least 45 fanatically anti-Catholic newspapers and periodicals could be purchased in the ... U.S. of A.... There were also well over 500 books and pamphlets written on this anti-papery theme as well.”

Dr. Morse [wrote]: “From whom is authority to govern derived? Austria and the United States will agree in answering,—from God. The opposition of opinion occurs in the answers to the next question. To whom on earth is this authority delegated? Austria answers, To the EMPEROR, who is the source of all authority,—‘I the Emperor do ordain,...’ The United States answers, To the PEOPLE, in whom resides the Sovereign power,—‘We the People do ordain, establish, grant,’... In one principle is recognized the necessity of the servitude of the people, the absolute dependence of the subject, unqualified submission to the commands of the rulers without question or examination. The Ruler is Master, the People are Slaves. In the other is recognized the supremacy of the people, the equality of rights themselves; the Ruler is a public servant, receiving wages from the people to perform services agreeable to their pleasure; amenable in all things to them; and holding office at their will. The Ruler is Servant; the People are Master.

“The fact and important nature of the difference in these antagonistic doctrines, leading, as is perceived, to diametrically opposite results, are all that is needful to state in order to proceed at once to the inquiry, which position does the Catholic sect and the Protestant sects severally favor? The Pope, the supreme Head of the Catholic church, claims to be the ‘Vicegerent of God,’ supreme ‘over all mortals;’ ‘over all Emperors, Kings, Princes, Potentates and People;’ King of kings and Lord of lords.’ He calls himself, ‘the divinely appointed dispenser of spiritual and temporal punishments;’ ‘armed with power to depose Emperors and Kings, and absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance:’ ‘from him lies no appeal;’ ‘he is responsible to no one on earth;’ ‘he is judged of no one but God.’”

The Pope determines what writings are heretical, and reading those writings, according to the “Congregation of the Index”—an essential department of the papal court—shall be regarded as an offense against the church and against God. In 1832, Pope Gregory XVI referred to “that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favor and defence of ‘liberty of conscience,’ for which most pestilential error, the course is opened to that entire and wild liberty of opinion, which is every where attempting the overthrow of religious and civil institutions.... Hither tends that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, for the diffusion of all manner or writings....” Accordingly, the Provincial Council of Baltimore, in order to guard against error, forbade the reading of Scripture “without the advice and permission of the pastors and spiritual guides whom God has appointed to govern his Church.” If Catholic principles had prevailed in the United States, the First Amendment would never have been adopted because the two are diametrically opposed.

The Vatican planned a Romanized America. The plan was to be expedited through Catholic immigration. Although men such as Samuel F. B. Morse,
Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and others warned against allowing immigration of those whose principles were contrary to those upon which America was founded, their warnings were not heeded and huge numbers of Catholics came into America, bringing with them their abominable religion as well as their base morality. A lot of money was spent on the significant number of immigrant paupers, and mob violence by immigrants became a new part of the American culture. Catholic mobs disrupted meetings where those of other faiths renounced Catholicism, and Roman shepherds bartered the votes of their flocks to politicians, and fought over the reading of the *King James Bible* in American’s public schools.\(^{15}\) Jesuit author F. X. Weninger wrote in 1862, “One of the most glorious enterprises for the Catholic Church to engage in at this day is the conversion of the United States to the Catholic faith.”\(^{16}\) "Vallestigny, a Jesuit priest and deputy of Alva, stated in his address to His Majesty:

> "The mass of the human family are born, not to govern, but to be governed. This sublime employment of government has been confided by Providence to the privileged class, whom he has placed upon an eminence to which the multitude cannot rise without being lost in the labyrinth and snares which are therein found."\(^{17}\)

Catholic clergy themselves admitted that there was a conspiracy against the United States and that Catholicism planned to take over America. For example:

> "The Shepherd of the Valley, the official journal of the Bishop of St. Louis …, declared in 1851: The Church is of necessity intolerant. Heresy she endures when and where she must, but she hates it and directs all her energies to destroy it… If Catholics ever gain a sufficient numerical majority in this country, religious freedom is at an end. So our enemies say, so we believe."\(^{18}\)

Naturally, Catholic spokesmen and writers have attacked the phrase “separation of church and state” since religious liberty and separation of church and state are antithetical to Catholic theology and power. For example,

> "Father John Courtney Murray described the phrase ‘separation of church and state’ as a ‘negative, ill-defined, basically un-American [sic] formula….’ After the McCollum decision the Catholic bishops of the United States, in a statement issued through the National Catholic Welfare Conference in November 1948, called the phrase ‘separation of church and state’ the ‘shibboleth of doctrinaire secularism.’ Father Robert I. Gannon, former president of Fordham University, in an address delivered in St. Louis in November 1951, used the phrase ‘the current fraud of separation of church and state.’ James M. O’Neill, a Catholic writer whose interpretation of the First Amendment was adopted by the Catholic bishops termed ‘spurious’ the ‘so-called’ ‘great American principle of complete separation of church and state,’ and affirmed that ‘There is no such great American principle and there never has been.’ Father Thomas F. Coakely, on the front cover of a pamphlet, ‘Separation of Church and State,’ published by the Catholic Truth Society, says unqualifiedly: ‘Church and State have never been separated in America.’ Even the Attorney General of the United States, in an address before the National Catholic Educational Association, charged that the Supreme Court had ‘distorted’ the First Amendment in referring to ‘a wall of separation of Church and State.’"\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{15}\) *What Hath God Wrought!*, pp. 229-236, 244-253.  
\(^{17}\) Morse, *Imminent Dangers*, cited in Grady, *What Hath God Wrought!*  
\(^{19}\) Pfeffer, p. 118.
In publishing a false history, Christian revisionists have done a great deal of damage to the cause of Christ. Their theology concerning separation of church and state in contravening biblical principles resulted in the persecution of large numbers of believers by established churches and hampered the dissemination of the true gospel for over fifteen hundred years.

Satan’s emissaries have revealed to the public that “Christians” have revised history. Even the unregenerate who possess no true understanding and wisdom, although many have been given brilliant minds by God, can look at history and discover true facts when it is to their advantage. The world, or at least the unregenerate who are aware of the facts of history, even though they themselves are the masters of deceit and revisionism when it furthers their cause, must have been turned off to a “religion” which relies on lies.

The knowledgeable Christian is appalled that supposed brothers would lie about historical fact in an attempt to further the cause of the One who was tortured and killed because of His stand for truth. Our Lord never backed off from truth even though He knew that His stand would take Him to the cross. He instructed Christians to be light, not darkness:

“No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness. If thy whole body therefore be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light.”

“Yes, ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.”

All the apostles except John were martyred because of their stand for truth. David, who was called a man after God’s own heart, said, “I have hated them that regard lying vanities: but I trust in the LORD.” Other Bible verses condemn lying. “I hate and abhor lying: but thy law do I love.” “Deliver my soul, O LORD, from lying lips, and from a deceitful tongue.” God hates lying: “These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, An heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, A false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren.” Notice that lying is the only sin He mentions twice.

Satan is the father of lies. God, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, stands for truth.

Jesus said to the Pharisees, “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth
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me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.”

“Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.”

Christian revisionists seem to forget about those verses while taking other verses and perverting them to rationalize lying to promote their cause. For example, they point out the story of the Hebrew midwives in Exodus 1.15-22 who were rewarded by God because they did not obey Pharaoh’s order to kill all the sons born to the Hebrews and also lied to Pharaoh as to the reason they did not kill those babies; and the story of Rahab the harlot whom God commended in Hebrews 11.31 for lying to the authorities of the land in order to help the Jewish spies. The proper interpretation of those Scriptures, taken in the context of the Bible as a whole, is that the Hebrew midwives and Rahab were confronted with a moral dilemma. The midwives could either lie or be a party to murder. They chose to lie in obedience to God and to protect innocent life. Rahab realized that the spies were of God’s chosen people on an errand for God. “And she said unto the men, I know that the LORD hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you.” Those and other verses do not support lying as defined and practiced by Christian revisionists.

Attempts to hide truth are in vain:

“And he said unto them, Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed? and not to be set on a candlestick? For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad. If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.”

Christian revisionists are obviously not interested in honest debate because that debate would reveal that some of the founders of this nation, such as the Puritans and Anglicans, were deceived and adhered to a theology which, as the world correctly points out, advocated and practiced the union of church and state, enforced all ten of the Ten Commandments, including those having to do with man’s relationship to God, and severely persecuted dissenters such as the Baptists and Quakers whom they labeled as heretics. The author was mislead by Christian revisionism for over twenty years. When he discovered that he had been lied to by other “Christians,” he had to be willing to face the truth. In this book he is publishing what he totally believes to be irrefutable facts and conclusions based upon biblical principles as applied to those facts.

26 John 8.44-47.
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Chapter 3
The consequences of Christian and secular revisionism

“Wherefore hear the word of the LORD, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem. Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves: Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste. Judgment also will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet: and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place. And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.”

Neither Christian nor secular revisionism will bring desirable consequences. If the Christian revisionists had their way, the church and state would be working together in America to bring in the kingdom of heaven on earth. There would be no First Amendment to the United States Constitution, no religious liberty, and the persecution would continue.

Sadly, the secularist Frederick Clarkson is right when he writes:

“[T]he Christian nationalist narrative has a fatal flaw: it is based on revisionist history that does not stand up under scrutiny. The bad news is that to true believers, it does not have to stand up to the facts of history to be a powerful and animating part of the once and future Christian nation. Indeed, through a growing cottage industry of Christian revisionist books and lectures now dominating the curricula of home schools and many private Christian academies, Christian nationalism has become a central feature of the political identity of children growing up in the movement. The contest for control of the narrative of American history is well underway.”

He is partially correct in pointing out that:

“We’ve seen how religious beliefs (and other ideologies) inspire people to view others as subhuman, deviant, and deserving of whatever happens to them, including death. It is the stuff of persecution, pogroms, and warfare. The framers of the U.S. Constitution struggled with how to inoculate the new nation against these ills, and in many respects the struggle continues today.”

He is right when those beliefs are based upon certain false theologies. Such religious beliefs led to the murder of millions of Christians who were viewed by the established churches as dangerous heretics. However, his statement cannot be applied correctly to the true Christianity which fought for freedom of religion in America and which has effects opposite those he mentions. Christians who practiced and taught biblical principles concerning separation of church and state have been persecuted since the time of Christ and their stand in the face of persecution ultimately gave America religious liberty.

Mr. Clarkson then goes on to factually tear apart some of the assertions being made by what he calls the Christian nationalists. For example, he asserts:
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“John Blanchard [a current “Christian” leader] claims that the Jamestown landing signifies that, ‘We were started as a Christian nation and I feel it’s God’s purpose we stay a Christian nation.’ Indeed, to read the Assembly 2007 website, one would think that the King had sent missionaries to Virginia. Far from it. The London Company behind the venture pooled investors interested in making money. For years it floundered badly. Eventually, the company gave up the commercial charter and control reverted to the Crown. The gauzy view of Christians claiming the land for Christ and King is clarified by history.

“When news of the Assembly 2007 and Blanchard’s claim reached Joe Conn at Americans United for Separation of Church and State, he pulled out his history books in rebuttal: ‘According to Anson Phelps Stokes’s *Church and State in the United States*, the London Company’s November 20, 1606 ‘Articles, Instructions, and Orders’ did, indeed, demand that the prospective American colony ‘provide that the true word, and service of God and Christian faith be preached.’ But the charter added that the ‘true word’ must be ‘according to the doctrine, rights, and religion now professed and established within our regime in England.’”

Christian revisionists Peter Marshall and David Manuel include some truth in their revisionism. They wrote, amidst many historical revisions, that Jamestown was a disaster and that the people who settled the colony were motivated by greed and not the love of the Lord. As will be seen, although undoubtedly there probably were godly ministers in the established church, much of the clergy of the Anglican church in Virginia prior to the Revolution had loose morals, were mainly concerned about their financial security, and were lacking in biblical and spiritual knowledge. The clergy of that church fought to keep their establishment to the bitter end. By far their most consistent and determined opponents were the Baptists. A publication of a law firm that encourages churches to become corporate 501(c)(3) religious organizations recently led off with an article laughingly entitled (to one who knows the real facts about the settlement) “Jamestown, Where America Became a Christian Nation.” The author, unnamed, states some truth in the article but also gives a totally distorted view of the early history of Jamestown and fails to mention the depravity of the people who originally settled there. Neither Marshall and Manuel nor the author of the aforementioned article make mention that the theology behind the settlement was ecclesiocratic and against religious liberty: the “Articles, Instructions, and Orders” from the homeland said that the “true word’ must be ‘according to the doctrine, rights, and religion now professed and established within our regime in England.”

Some of what Christian revisionists such as Marshall, Manuel, and Rousas John Rushdoony teach is factual, but it is incomplete, intermixed with lies, and slanted to praise their false theology which teaches that God’s principles for the theocracy in Israel are to be applied by the church. In order to further their cause, the adherents must lie and revise history. They must and do condemn the true theology and its adherents out of which came religious freedom in America.

Since they do not believe in free-will, the Christian revisionist has to attribute everything to the providence of God. Mr. Clarkson is correct when he says,
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“Indeed, the general approach [R.J.] Rushdoony outlined has become widely accepted among Christian nationalists, specifically that God actively intervenes in and guides history, and that God’s role can be retroactively discerned, from creation to the predestined Kingdom of God on Earth. Historical events described as ‘God’s providence’ are then interpreted in terms of what God must have been up to. This is how Rushdoony arrives at what he called Christian history, based on ‘Christian revisionism.’”

Of course there is such a thing as the providence of God. But the Christian revisionist concept of God’s providence is totally unbalanced by an incorrect view of the free will of man. The most that revisionists of the founding era (and probably those of today, if the truth be known) might assert about free will is that if a man has it and uses it wrongly, those with superior insight must step in to correct him, and if he refuses to be enlightened, he must, when the revisionist has the power, be banished, imprisoned, tortured, and/or killed.

Just as the church-state dilemmas of the past and those of the present have not been correctly answered by false theology, even though professed to be from God, neither is the answer supplied by secularists such as Mr. Clarkson. As expected of a secularist, Mr. Clarkson, in trashing the Christian right, adds in some of his own revisionism and inaccuracies, and uses his human reasoning. His proposals cannot and will not work. For example, he says that the rest of society needs not only to

“recognize the role of creeping Christian historical revisionism, but also our need to craft a compelling and shared story of American history, particularly as it relates to the role of religion and society. We need it in order to know not how the religious Right is wrong, but to know where we ourselves stand in the light of history, in relation to each other, and how we can better envision a future together free of religious prejudice, and ultimately, religious warfare.”

Mr. Clarkson, who by his own admission is not a Christian, understandably does not comprehend the doctrine of holiness which runs throughout Scripture. In any institution, including any civil government, anytime the unholy is mixed with the holy, the unholy will corrupt the holy. A civil government made up of Christians and lost people will be corrupted because the worldly wisdom of the lost will pollute the Godly wisdom of the Christians. The good will not prevail, at least in the long run. An unsaved person cannot know, understand, and apply truth and the wisdom which is from above. All Mr. Clarkson’s wisdom is of this world, which is “foolishness with God.”

Mr. Clarkson is right about religion. But what he says about religion cannot be said about true Christianity. True Christianity is a man, the God-man, the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the religious perversion of the teachings of Christ that brings all the tragedies referred to by Mr. Clarkson. The greatest tragedy is that many will never come to the One who can give them true liberty, the Lord Jesus Christ. It appears that many who have come to Him have been deceived about, for one thing, the roles of church and state and their relationship to each other and to God because they have not become partakers of the divine nature, having not added to their faith, virtue, to virtue knowledge, to knowledge temperance, to temperance patience, to patience godliness, to godliness brotherly kindness,

9 Clarkson, p. 2.
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and to brotherly kindness charity.\textsuperscript{13} Perhaps an individual Christian has added some of these ingredients to his life, but what about the others? What about knowledge?

Only a civil government whose leader or leaders are truly Christian can prevent the decline of a nation. This would require solid Christian churches teaching the principles of the Bible accurately operating freely within that nation and made up of the majority of the people of that nation including the leader or leaders of the nation all of whom are sincerely attempting to understand and apply biblical principles.

When a Christian substitutes his reasoning for reality, when he revises historical facts and/or lies to and about other Christians in order to advance his underlying theology, something is wrong with his theology. The consequences of such a strategy will ultimately backfire, as it is backfiring today in America, because even secularists, when truth about facts will aid them, will reveal that truth. And when it is revealed that Christians, whom the secularist calls the “Christian right,” have seemingly borrowed a page from the secular book of tactics and resorted to revising history and to lying, the effectiveness of Christian spiritual warfare is much weakened.

The existence of Mr. Clarkson’s article and much other secular writing reveal the vulnerability of the Christian right position as it has been promoted in America. It is sad that Clarkson includes pertinent quotes (out of context) from men such as Roger Williams, Isaac Backus, and even Thomas Jefferson who are not usually quoted by Christian revisionists. It is sad that Christian revisionists, in their effort to deceive the entire Christian community and advance their agenda of a united church and state so that the resulting union of church and state can bring in the kingdom of heaven, have belittled, misrepresented, and/or totally ignored great men such as Roger Williams, Dr. John Clarke, Isaac Backus, Shubal Stearns, John Leland and others. Their efforts have done great and irreparable damage to the cause of Christ. The author was led by Christian revisionists for over twenty years. In order to be effective in his efforts in his stand for the Lord, he had to be willing to admit that he had been mislead and that the Lord did not honor Christians who were taking part in a spiritual battle having their loins girt about with lies. “Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth….”\textsuperscript{14} [Emphasis mine.]

\textsuperscript{13} See II Peter 1.3-9.
\textsuperscript{14} Ephesians 6.13-14a.
Chapter 4
The light begins to shine

Many forces came together to bring in religious freedom in America. The Protestant Reformation was one step in that direction, even though the resulting Protestant denominations took from the Catholic church the idea of the church-state—the church controls the state. Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire established a church-state. England established a state-church—the state controls the church—and several of the early colonies in the South established a state-church.

With the Reformation, new light was beginning to shine over the English speaking world. The printing press made it possible to print and distribute the Bible in large quantities to the general public. The Bible became available in English and all could compare what they were told with the Word of God. Of course, this would result in some heresies, but no heresy could be more contrary to the Word of God and more destructive to eternal life, temporal human life, and the glory of God than the heresies of the Catholic church. Alongside new heresies would continue the light of truth—which had before been attacked mercilessly by the establishment which had attempted to brutally stamp them out—about matters such as salvation, baptism, and the relationship of church and state. Men were beginning to study the Bible and to debate issues. Those debates were published and disseminated and the light of truth further extended.

God assures man, in His Word, that one can find truth. “Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” 1 In fact, believers are told to “Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” 2 Of course, Catholicism would have one believe that only the clergy has the God-given ability to understand Scripture—such a belief assures the power of the clergy, but the loss of God’s power. The Jews at Berea were commended for studying the Scriptures: “These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” 3

While the debate was going on, dissenters were persecuted. These persecutions gradually began to soften even members of the established churches, as people began to realize that persecution did not stand up to the test of Bible truth. The Baptists were by far the most active of all the colonial dissidents in their unceasing struggle for religious freedom and separation.

Unlike those areas of the New World settled by Catholics where only Catholics could immigrate and hold offices, and where the official religion was maintained by the government, “the English statesmen opened the gates of their American colonies to every kind of religious faith that could be found in Europe.” Additionally, unlike church-state relationships in Spain and France where no significant change occurred, England experienced changes of religion, which ranged from Catholicism (which was a minute minority) to Puritanism

---
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during the colonization of America. As a result, only in Catholic Mexico and Catholic Quebec was uniformity of religion achieved.⁴

“The individualism of the American colonist, which manifested itself in the great number of sects, also resulted in much unaffiliated religion. It is probably true that religion was widespread but was mostly a personal, noninstitutional matter.”⁵ This contributed to the growing movement toward religious liberty since “[p]ersons not themselves connected with any church were not likely to persecute others for similar independence.”⁶

In the English colonies, unlike in Mexico and Quebec, no single faith dominated the others throughout the colonies and religious uniformity was very limited. On the European Continent, “the Reformation from the start was an effort to return the Church itself to the doctrines and practices of its apostolic days.” However, while discarding some of the heresies of the Catholic “church,” Protestantism, under pressure from civil governments, soon resumed the Catholic conceived theology which united church and state. The final, logical thought of the reformers was reached at Geneva, where the church absorbed the state and the church-state originated. The state became an aspect of the church. “That is the tradition which the Puritans of England and later of New England inherited.”⁷ New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut had church-state establishments—the church used the state to enforce the Ten Commandments and dissenters were persecuted.

In England, the problem was to “wean the Church in England away from the Pope, but otherwise to leave it as little changed as possible.”⁸ The monarch created the state-church and became the head of the church. The church became an aspect of the state. The king was the final authority on church doctrine and practice. “[T]he Church in England [became] the Church of England, [and] the Church [became] an aspect of the State.”⁹ Under Queen Elizabeth, such Catholic doctrines as transubstantiation, the communion of saints, and purgatory were abandoned and the Mass was labeled a “blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit,” but ecclesiastical organization remained mainly unchanged, and episcopacy was its principle. Because she wanted a united state, Queen Elizabeth wanted a church where the Anglo-Catholics and the Anglo-Calvinists could worship together. The Anglo-Catholicism of England was later transferred to the southern colonies.¹⁰ Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia had state-church establishments—the state was over the church.

“The Calvinists who governed New England and oppressed Anglicans were themselves persecuted in Virginia, and forced to pay taxes to support the hated Anglican establishment from which they fled.”¹¹ “[T]he Reformed Church was the state-church in New Amsterdam; the Quakers dominated Pennsylvania, the Baptists Rhode Island, and, for a short time, the Catholics Maryland.”¹² In New England—Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Hampshire—Congregationalism was the established church. In Virginia and North and South
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Carolina, the Church of England was established. New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Georgia experienced changes in church-state establishments. “In … Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, no single church ever attained the status of monopolistic establishment.”

“From Maryland south to Georgia there were recurring periods of persecution and repression.” In Maryland, the Calverts tolerated the Puritan settlers who later suppressed Catholicism. Anglicanism was established in 1689 after conflict in charters granted the second Lord Baltimore and William Penn.

The Anglican Church was established in North and South Carolina much as in Virginia. However, dissenters were allowed to immigrate into those states due to the need for settlers. From 1700 on the major political conflict in South Carolina was shaped up around the conflict of the establishment and the dissenters, with the latter growing in the back country and a pronounced shift to Anglicanism on the coast. In 1704 a bill was jammed through to exclude all dissenters from the legislature. In 1706 the Church Act was passed, with dissenters excluded from voting; the land was divided into parishes… Anglican clergy were frequently immoral and guilty of gross neglect of their people. In 1722 nearly one fourth of the taxes went to the established church. With independence in South Carolina came disestablishment.

Emigrants from the persecuted Baptist church in Boston came to Charleston, South Carolina in 1683. The second Baptist church in South Carolina was Ashley River founded in 1736. By 1755, there were four Baptist churches in South Carolina and the second Baptist Association in America, the Charleston Association, was founded in 1751. The General Baptists established several churches in North Carolina between 1727 and 1755. All but three of those churches converted to Particular Baptist churches in 1755 or 1756. By 1755, there were only twelve Baptist churches in North Carolina. However, as will be seen, this was about to change with the arrival of some Baptists from Connecticut.

New York colonial history was unique in some ways. Until 1664, the Dutch reformed church was established and supported by the state. Imprisonment was required for those who failed to contribute to the support of the church minister. All children were required to be baptized by a Reformed minister in the Reformed Church. Only the Reformed, the English Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists could build church buildings. Lutherans were imprisoned for holding services and Baptists were subject to arrest, fine, whipping, and banishment for so doing.

In 1664, New Amsterdam surrendered to the English, and New York extended its jurisdiction over all sects. The Protestant religion, and not one church, was established as the state religion. The head of the state was head over every Protestant church. All Protestant churches were established. Only four counties conferred preferential status upon the Church of England after attempts to confer such status throughout the state were unsuccessful.
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“In New Jersey agitation by Episcopal clergy for the legal establishment of the Church of England failed to attain even the partial success achieved in New York.”

“In Georgia, the original charter of 1732, which guaranteed liberty of conscience to all persons ‘except Papists,’ was voided in 1752, and the Church of England was formally established.” Nonetheless, Georgia had a history of public hostility toward dissenters even before the church-state establishment. Jews and Moravians were persecuted to the extent that nearly all of these peoples fled that state in 1740 or retreated to their own enclaves. “In 1754, the colony reverted to the status of a royal province and several efforts were made to enforce the Anglican establishment.”

There were no Baptist churches in Georgia in 1755. In 1758 the law of Anglican Establishment was passed. By 1786 there were not over five hundred active Christians in Georgia: “there were three Episcopal parishes without rectors and three Lutheran churches, three Presbyterian churches, three Baptist churches—all small and struggling.” The Constitution of 1798 provided for complete religious freedom including Catholicism.

Maryland, established in 1631 and settled by both Catholics and Protestants, practiced a degree of toleration. Catholics attempted to procure the preferred position possessed in European countries with Catholic establishments, but they were unsuccessful since they were never in the majority. Although the Maryland Act of Toleration of 1649 has been lauded as “the first decree granting complete religious liberty to emanate from an assembly,” “even a superficial examination of the law shows quite clearly that it is far from a grant of ‘complete religious liberty.’” The first three of the four main provisions of the act “were denials rather than grants of religious liberty; only the last four dealt with toleration.” The first imposed death for infractions such as blasphemy, denying Jesus Christ to be the son of God, using or uttering any reproachful speeches, words or language concerning the Holy Trinity,” etc. The second imposed fines, whipping, and imprisonment on any who called another any one of certain names. The third imposed fines or imprisonment for profaning the Lord’s day. By 1688, the Anglicans had the upper hand and the Church of England was established in Maryland.

Pennsylvania, like Maryland was colonized partly as business venture and partly as a “holy experiment.” The proprietor of the colony, William Penn, joined the Quakers while a student at Oxford. Penn opposed coercion in matters of conscience and provided for it in the fundamentals of the government of Pennsylvania. “Nevertheless, profanity was penalized, and Sunday observance for church, scripture reading, and rest was required. Political privileges were limited to Christians, and complete freedom of worship, at least at the beginning, was not allowed Catholics or Jews. As in Calvert’s Maryland, Penn’s motivation was at least partly his desire to reap substantial profits and this required attracting large numbers of settlers.”
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King James made New Hampshire a royal colony in 1679. Liberty of conscience was allowed to all Protestants, but the Church of England was “particularly countenanced and encouraged.” Each town in New Hampshire determined the church to be supported with its tax revenues. Dissenters, with submission of a certificate proving regular attendance and financial support of a dissenting church, were exempted from the tax. However, the assembly was slow to accord financial recognition to dissenting sects.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27} McGarvie, p. 153.
Chapter 5
The Pilgrims and the Puritans in Massachusetts

Being the continuation of the religious upheaval in Europe, the early history of New England was one of religious turmoil.

“It is acknowledged, on all hands, the first settlements of New-England were a consequence of the disputes which attended the Reformation in England; and therefore we must observe, that during this time, viz. 1517, learning having revived all over Europe, the Reformation was begun by Luther, and others in Germany, and carried on in several parts of Christendom, particularly in England, where, after a long struggle, it was finally established, by act of Parliament, under Queen Elizabeth, who began to reign November 17, 1558.

“As the whole Christian religion had been corrupted and disfigured by the inventions and impositions of Popery ... it could not but be expected that many, who were justly and equally offended, at the horrid corruptions of Popery, should yet be unable entirely to agree in their sentiments, of what things were to be reformed, or how far they should carry the Reformation at the first.”

The theological turmoil that resulted from the Reformation continued in the new world, and out of that storm emerged a separation of church and state that had never before existed in any nation in the history of the world.

John Calvin had the greatest influence of any continental reformer on the relationship of church and state in America. The founders of the Massachusetts Bay Company modeled the Massachusetts church-state after the church-state constructed by Calvin. Calvin taught predestination—that God predestined men to heaven or hell—and effectively denied freedom of human will. He further taught that the Prince, to whom God grants his power and who is responsible directly to God, is God’s leader on earth, and men had a duty to absolutely honor and obey him. Those who rebel against the ruler rebels against God, even if the ruler rules contrary to the Word of God.

The state, according to Calvin, must enforce God’s spiritual and moral laws. That is, the state is responsible for enforcing all of the commandments, including the first four. Therefore, the state must suppress, for example, “idolatry, blasphemy, and other scandals to religion.” Church and state must work together although the church is “competent to declare what is the godly life.” Calvin believed that “there is but one possible correct interpretation of the Word of God, and it is the only interpretation possible for an honest man of sound intelligence to reach.”

At the same time, “we should obey God rather than men;” when the law of the ruler contradicts the law of God, according to Calvin, man should obey God, but only passively. The Calvinistic ideal, the superiority of an aristocratic republic form of civil government, led naturally to election of both pastors and civil rulers and was implemented in the Mayflower Compact the night before the Puritans first came onto shore in America. Subsequent leaders of Calvinistic thought “added the right of rebellion against the wicked Prince to their spiritual arsenal. The United States of America was born when that right was exercised, and none exercised it with greater enthusiasm that the Calvinists of Boston.”
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One inheritor of Calvinism, John Knox, most forcefully added

“the one conviction at which the legalistic mind of Calvin quailed…. If the Prince does not perform [his God given duty] said Knox, the people have the duty to put him to the sword of vengeance. In Calvinism the Church is the State, but in Knox far more than in Calvin the State and the Church both are the People. In neither man is there the faintest glimmer that even suggests to the backward-looking eye the distant dawn of tolerance. But in Knox the sword of the Almighty’s vengeance in the hands of an outraged People is the first strange symbol of what some day will be democracy.”

Jesus said, “They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.” In fulfillment of prophecies of the Lord, the established churches thought they were doing God’s will. “And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me.” The Old World patterns of church-state union and religious oppression were transplanted to the New World with all their rigor.

Eleven of the original thirteen colonies established a church prior to the Revolution. One of those eleven was Massachusetts which was founded by Puritans who were Congregationalists. All New England colonies, except Rhode Island, had established churches based upon the same theology. As noted by the Rhode Island Baptist, John Callender, in the early nineteenth century:

“[The Puritans] were not the only people who thought they were doing God good service when smiting their brethren and fellow-servants. All other Christian sects generally, as if they thought this was the very best way to promote the gospel of peace, and prove themselves the true and genuine disciples of Jesus Christ—‘sic,’ who hath declared, his kingdom was not of this world, who had commanded his disciples to call no man master on earth, who had forbidden them to exercise lordship over each other’s consciences, who had required them to let the tares grow with the wheat till the harvest, and who had, in fine, given mutual love, peace, long-suffering, and kindness, as the badge and mark of his religion.”

The fight for religious liberty started in the New England colonies and then spread throughout the other colonies. The seventeenth century ended with firmly established church-states in all New England colonies except Rhode Island. The ecclesiocracies there were as absolute as the world has known, with persecution of “heretics” but, because of intervention by England, not as brutal as past ecclesiocracies in Europe.

The Church of England was established in the southern colonies.

In the Southern colonies, “the church enjoyed the favor of the colonial governors but it lacked the one pearl without price which the Congregational Church had. No Anglican ever left England to secure freedom of worship; no Virginia Episcopalean had the fervent motivation of a Massachusetts Puritan. In Massachusetts the church was the state. In Virginia and, to a lesser degree, in the rest of the South the Church was formally part of the State although hardly a part that loomed large in southern minds.”

The theology of the established churches in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire led to a combining of church and state; infant baptism; taxing for payment of clergy, church charities, and other church expenses;
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persecution of dissenters such as Baptists; and many other unscriptural practices.\textsuperscript{10} Persecution of dissenters follows the example of the theocracy in Israel where, for example, Moses killed the three thousand who turned from the Lord into idolatry and immorality while he was on the mountain receiving the Ten Commandments,\textsuperscript{11} and Elijah had the four hundred and fifty false prophets of Baal killed.\textsuperscript{12}

The original settlers of Massachusetts were the Pilgrims who landed at what was to become Plymouth, Massachusetts in 1620. The Pilgrims were Separatists in England who had left the Church of England in the Autumn of 1608 and formed their own church. They were considered dangerous radicals by the Bishops of the Church of England. “They believed that the Reformation had not gone far enough, that the Reformers had assumed an infallibility no more palatable when lodged in a ruler than when lodged in the Pope, that the Church of England had rejected the Pope but not Popery, that the bishops of the Church of England had no more authority than the bishops of the Church of Rome.”\textsuperscript{13}

Under James I, the Bishops were given a free hand to suppress the less than a thousand Separatists before they got out of hand. Peter Marshall and David Manuel, who approved of the persecutions of the dissenters by the Puritan established churches in the colonies, complained that these were “dedicated followers of the Lord” who were

“hounded, bullied, forced to pay assessments to the Church of England, clapped into prison on trumped-up charges, and driven underground. They met in private homes, to which they came at staggered intervals and by different routes, because they were constantly being spied upon. In the little Midlands town of Scrooby, persecution finally reached the point where the congregation to which William Bradford belonged elected to follow those other Separatists who had already sought religious asylum in Holland.”\textsuperscript{14}

As a result of the persecution in England, some Separatists went elsewhere, going first to Leyden, Holland. After over ten years of a hard life in Holland, they decided to try to go to America. They reached an agreement with an English merchant named Thomas Weston under which they were able to set sail. They could not obtain assurance of liberty of their consciences. “However, they determined at length to remove, depending on some general promises of connivance, if they behaved themselves peaceably, and hoping that the distance and remoteness of the place, as well as the public service they should do the King and Kingdom, would prevent their being disturbed.”\textsuperscript{15} One hundred and one Pilgrim souls sailed from Plymouth, England, on September 6, 1620, arriving at Cape Cod on November 11, 1620, and at a place they named Plymouth, in December, 1620.\textsuperscript{16} Upon arrival, they drafted the Mayflower Compact:

\begin{quote}
In the name of God, amen. We whose names are under-written, the loyall subjects of our dread Soveraigne Lord King James by ye Grace of God of Great Britain, France, Ireland king, defender of the Faith, etc., having undertaken, for ye glorie of God, and advanceyme of ye Christian faith and honour of our king & countrie, a voyage to plant ye first colonie in ye Northerne parts of Virginia, doe by these presents solemnly and
\end{quote}
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mutually in ye presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combine our selves together into a civill body politick, for our better ordering & preservation & furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by vertue hereof to enacte, constitute, and frame such just and equall lawes, ordinances, acts, constitutions and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete & convenient for the generall good of ye colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names at Cap-Codd, ye 11. of November, in ye yeare of ye raigne of our soveraigne lord, King James of England, France, & Ireland, ye eighteenth, and by Scotland ye fiftie fourth. Ano: Dom. 1620.

As a matter of human compassion, the Pilgrims were hospitable to all; and, at first, grudgingly tolerated those of other creeds. However, they gradually began to close their doors to those of other creeds. “Plymouth was a Church-State ruled by a governor and a small and highly select theological aristocracy, a Church-State with various grades of citizenship and non-citizenship.” By 1651 the government of Plymouth colony was enforcing the laws of Congregationalist Massachusetts. “By the time Plymouth was united with Massachusetts in 1691 all major differences between the two had disappeared.”

The Pilgrims overcame much adversity, such as hunger, drought, and heat which caused their corn to wither, and the failure of delivery of much needed supplies from England. They increased to three hundred souls and obtained a patent from the New England Company on January 13, 1630. The comparative handful of Pilgrims who were eventually absorbed by the Puritans are much admired by Americans.

The Puritans, unlike the Pilgrims who wanted to separate from the Church of England, wanted to purify the Church from within. “The State, in their view, had the duty to maintain the true Church; but the State was in every way subordinate to the Church.” King James I was far more belligerently opposed to the Calvinistic church-state than even Queen Elizabeth had been, and his “determination toward the Puritans was to make them conform or to harry them out of the land.” The Puritans who suffered under the combined pressure of accelerated persecution and the advanced moral decay in their society began to flee England for the new world. “There was no ground at all left them to hope for any condescension or indulgence to their scruples, but uniformity was pressed with harder measures than ever.” Cheating, double-dealing, the betrayal of one’s word were all part of the game for London’s financial district. Mercantile power brokers loved, honored, and worshipped money, and accumulated as much of it as possible and as fast as possible. The ends justified the means. “London was an accurate spiritual barometer for the rest of the country, for England had become a nation without a soul.” England was morally awful, and this came about under the auspices of a state-church practicing its theology. 1628 marked the beginning of the Great Migration that lasted sixteen years in which twenty thousand Puritans embarked for New
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England and forty-five thousand other Englishmen headed for Virginia, the West Indies, and points south.  

A young Puritan minister named John Cotton preached a farewell sermon to the departing Puritans:

“He preached on 2 Samuel 7.10 (KJV): ‘Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.’  

‘Go forth,’ Cotton exhorted, ‘... With a public spirit,’ with that ‘care of universal helpfulness… Have a tender care ... to your children, that they do not degenerate as the Israelites did....’  

“Samuel Eliot Morison put it thus: ‘Cotton’s sermon was of a nature to inspire these new children of Israel with the belief that they were the Lord’s chosen people; destined, if they kept the covenant with Him, to people and fructify this new Canaan in the western wilderness.’”

The Puritans landed at Salem at the end of June, 1629. They were motivated by religious principles and purposes, seeking a home and a refuge from religious persecution.  

Having suffered long for conscience sake, they came for religious freedom, for themselves only. “They believed [in] the doctrine of John Calvin, with some important modifications, in the church-state ruled on theocratic principles, and in full government regulation of economic life.”

The Puritan churches “secretly call[ed] their mother a whore, not daring in America to join with their own mother’s children, though unexcommunicate: no, nor permit[ed] them to worship God after their consciences, and as their mother hath taught them this secretly and silently, they have a mind to do, which publicly they would seem to disclaim, and profess against.” In 1630, 1500 more persons arrived, several new settlements were formed, and the seat of government was fixed at Boston. Thinking not of toleration of others,” they were prepared to practice over other consciences the like tyranny to that from which they had fled.

Although they differed from the Church of England and others on some doctrines, “[t]he Puritans brought 2 principles with them from their native country, in which they did not differ from others; which are, that natural birth, and the doings of men, can bring children into the Covenant of Grace; and, that it is right to enforce & support their own sentiments about religion with the magistrate’s sword.”

John Cotton was called upon to arrange the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the colony. They set up a ecclesiocracy in which no one could hold office who was not a member of an approved church. “The civil laws were adjusted to the polity of the church, and while nominally distinct, they supported and assisted each other.”

“It was requested of Mr. Cotton,” says his descendant Cotton Mather, ‘that he would from the laws wherewith God governed his ancient people, form an abstract of such as
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were of a moral and lasting equity; which he performed as acceptably as judiciously....
He propounded unto them, an endeavour after a theocracy, as near as might be to that
which was the glory of Israel, the peculiar people.”36

The goal of the Puritans was to build the Kingdom of God on Earth. Two modern day Covenant Theologians wrote:

“They determined to change their society in the only way that could make any lasting
difference: by giving it a Christianity that worked. And this they set out to do, not by
words but by example, in the one place where it was still possible to live the life to which
Christ had called them: three thousand miles beyond the reach of the very Church they
were seeking to purify.

“[T]he legacy of Puritan New England to this nation, which can still be found at the
core of our American way of life, may be summed up in one word: covenant.... [O]n the
night of the Last Supper, to those who were closest to Him, Jesus said, “This is my blood
of the new covenant, which is poured out for many for forgiveness of sins....”37

Covenant cannot be found, as understood by the Puritan theologians, now or
anytime in the past, at the core of our American way of life. The idea of
covenant at the core of our American way of life was that of the Baptists as
expressed by the Warren Association at the close of the War for Independence:

“The American Revolution is wholly built upon the doctrine, that all men are born with
an equal right to what Providence gives them, and that all righteous government is
founded in compact or covenant, which is equally binding upon the officers and members
of each community.... And as surely as Christianity is true, Christ is the only lawgiver
and head of his church....”38

Nor is there a biblical principle that allows a nation to covenant with God
contrary to the principles laid down in God’s Word. The Puritans incorrectly
believed that every nation is in covenant with the Lord to enforce his principles,
all of them. They misunderstood the biblical teachings that God gives every
nation a choice as to whether to follow His rules, and that nowhere in Scripture
is there authority for a nation to initiate a non-biblical covenant with God. God
alone initiated the Old Testament covenants to which He was a party, thereby,
among other things, establishing Israel as a theocracy, and He made no such
covenant with any other nation. All other nations, as was shown in Section I, are
called Gentile, and are judged by God primarily based upon their treatment of
Israel.

As has been pointed out, Covenant Theology asserts that there are only two
covenants, or three, in the Bible, with the other covenants which came after the
Covenant of Grace being only a continuation thereof. The Covenant of Law,
according to the covenant theologian, was made in the Garden of Eden.
Covenant Theology superimposes the New Testament over the Old. Herein lies
some of the fatal flaws in this interpretation of the Bible. In the Puritan
formulation of those covenants, the principles and practices of the nation Israel
and the Jewish religion were applied to the church and state. As has been shown,
this presents irreconcilable conflicts with Old and New Testament teachings
concerning law and grace and the relationship of church and state.

God permits a mutual compact or covenant between a ruler or the rulers and
the people—a covenant that does not include God and His principles and that is
not initiated or ordained by God. God allowed even the people of the theocracy
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of Israel to reject Him and, like the Gentile nations, to have a king. 

Isaac Backus taught as follows:

“No now the word of God plainly shows, that this way of mutual compact or covenant, is the only righteous foundation for civil government. For when Israel must needs have a king like the rest of the nations, and he indulged them in that request, yet neither Saul nor David, who were anointed by his immediate direction, ever assumed the regal power over the people, but by their free consent. And though the family of David had the clearest claim to hereditary succession that any family on earth ever had, yet, when ten of the twelve tribes revolted from his grandson, because he refused to comply with what they esteemed a reasonable proposal, and he had collected an army to bring them back by force, God warned him not to do it, and he obeyed him therein. Had these plain precedents been regarded in later times, what woes and miseries would they have prevented? But the history of all ages and nations shows, that when men have got the power into their hands, they often use it to gratify their own lusts, and recur to nature, religion or the constitution (as they think it will best serve) to carry, and yet cover, their wretched designs.”

The Puritan ideal is disproved by correct interpretation of the Word of God, by biblical history and prophecy, and secular history, including the history of the colony of Massachusetts. Israel, populated by God’s chosen race, was directly under God, yet the Israelites rejected His theocracy so that they could have a king like all the other nations. Israel fared ill when they did things their way and were ruled by kings. Under both God and king, Israel refused to do things God’s way, and rejected his commandments and statutes. After the death of King Solomon, the nation divided in two. All of the kings of the northern kingdom, Israel, were bad. The southern Kingdom, Judah, had twenty kings—eight were good, and twelve were bad. Both Israel and Judah, in accord with God’s philosophy of history, experienced religious apostasy, moral awfulness, and political anarchy. They failed to keep the commandments and statutes of God and were taken into captivity as a result.

The Puritans failed to correctly interpret both the Old and New Testament and secular history which clearly show that all nations that have ever existed have been judged by God, are in the process of being judged by God, or will be judged by God. They misinterpreted prophecy concerning the end times to say that the church, working hand in hand with the state will establish the kingdom of heaven on earth. Oh, had and would they (have) realize(d) that the New Covenant for the church had so much better promises and procedures than the Old Testament covenants. “But now hath he [Jesus Christ] obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.”

The Puritans wrongly, but truly, believed they could build the Kingdom of God on earth, in their lifetime—all they needed, they felt, was “the right time, the right place, and the right people” who “were willing to commit themselves totally.” The Puritans did not realize that the philosophy of history in the Bible and the basic nature of man rendered their goal impossible. God describes the cycle of every civil government, Jewish and Gentile.
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“The book of Judges is a philosophy of history. ‘Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people’ (Proverbs 14.34).”

“We see that philosophy in the book of Judges. Israel at first, for a short time, served God. Then they did evil in the sight of the Lord and served Baal and Ashtaroth. The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He delivered them into the hands of their enemies. Israel then entered into a time of servitude. Israel cried out to God in their plight and distress. They turned to God and repented. God heard their prayers and raised up judges through whom they were delivered.

“This cycle was repeated over and over. The book of Isaiah opens with God giving his philosophy of history. Isaiah outlines three steps that cause the downfall of a nation: (1) spiritual apostasy, (2) moral awfulness, (3) and political anarchy.’

“Every nation goes down in this order: (1) religious apostasy; (2) moral awfulness; (3) political anarchy. Deterioration begins in the [church], then to the home, and finally to the state. That is the way a nation falls.”

“In Judges 17-21, we have presented that philosophy of history [that was mentioned above]. In Judges 17-18, we see spiritual apostasy. In Judges 19, we see moral awfulness. In Judges 20-21, we see political anarchy. This period ends in total national corruption and confusion. ‘In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes. (Judges 21.25).’

“If you want to know just how up-to-date the book of Judges is, listen to the words of the late General Douglas McArthur: ‘In this day of gathering storms, as moral deterioration of political power spreads its growing infection, it is essential that every spiritual force be mobilized to defend and preserve the religious base upon which this nation is founded; for it has been that base which has been the motivating impulse to our moral and national growth. History fails to record a single precedent in which nations subject to moral decay have not passed into political and economic decline. There has been either a spiritual reawakening to overcome the moral lapse, or a progressive deterioration leading to ultimate national disaster.’

All nations, prior to the establishment of the kingdom of heaven, are doomed to judgment because of the depravity of man which always seeks the lowest common denominator, the principles of the god of this world. As to the nature of man, the Word of God points out that “all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.”

Even after salvation, men have a great struggle with the flesh. False teachers from within and without the church immediately began to introduce heresy and apostasy into the first churches. God’s people, led by compromising pastors, have been deceived by many pernicious doctrines. The church, as was shown in Section II, will become lukewarm before the rapture and many professing members of the church will be unregenerate.

The Puritans felt that they were dedicated to serving the Lord and to doing things His way. They believed that they could set up a civil government modeled after biblical principles. They did not realize that even should they have been upright in God’s eyes, future leaders would depart from the faith and lead the civil government downhill into depravity just as happened in Israel and in all church-state marriages starting with the Catholics and up to the established churches after the Reformation, including the Church of England from which they were fleeing.

Soon after the founding of Massachusetts, events there proved the folly of their false theology and the truth of accurate biblical and historical interpretation. As Isaac Backus reported, by 1660 or 1670 Puritan theologians and pastors in New England were pointing out the “general religious
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declension” that was already taking place as the first generation of settlers passed away.50 “Mr. Willard published a discourse in the year 1700 entitled, ‘The Perils of the Times Displayed,’ in which he said:

“That there is a form of godliness among us is manifest; but the great inquiry is, whether there be not too much of a general denying of the power of it. Whence else is it, that there be such things as these that follow, to be observed? that there is such a prevalency of so many immorality among professors? that there is so little success of the gospel? How few thorough conversions [are] to be observed, how scarce and seldom.... It hath been a frequent observation that if one generation begins to decline, the next that follows usually grows worse, and so on, until God pours out his Spirit again upon them. The decays which we do already languish under are sad; and what tokens are on our children, that it is like to be better hereafter.... How do young professors grow weary of the strict profession of their fathers, and become strong disputants for the [those] things which their progenitors forsook a pleasant land for the avoidance of.

“And forty years after, Mr. Prince said, ‘We have been generally growing worse and worse ever since.’ The greatest evils that [the founders of New England] came here to avoid were the mixture of worthy and unworthy communicants in the churches, and the tyranny of secular and ministerial Courts over them; but these evils were now coming in like a flood upon New England.”51

The Halfway Covenant, established by the Massachusetts synod in 1662, was witness to the spiritual decline of the Puritan Congregationalist church. This resulted in a large number of church members being baptized into the church without conversion. Any person who professed belief in the doctrines of Calvinism and who lived an upright, moral life were allowed to join the parish church and sign the covenant or membership contract. Such persons were only allowed halfway into the church—they could have their children baptized but they could not take communion or vote in church affairs. This was the method practiced in the church to which Isaac Backus’ parents belonged.52

The Puritans, unlike the Separatists, although continuing to acknowledge canonical authority, desired to purify the church from within. Puritans were enlisted by the Massachusetts Bay Company, a trading corporation with powers of ownership and government over a specified area. The leaders of this company devised a plan to effectively remove the colony of Massachusetts from control of the Crown.53 Their purpose was to become a self-governing commonwealth able to enforce the laws of God and win divine favor—a citadel of God’s chosen people, a spearhead of world Protestantism, a government of Christ.54 They believed this was a common goal which all must seek together, with church and state working side by side.55 They believed that the pure church they intended to establish in New England would someday, somehow, rescue its English parent from the mire of corruption.56

Since the Puritans believed that every nation existed by virtue of a covenant with God in which it promised to obey His commands, as a modern legal scholar has pointed out, “They knew, in the most elementary terms, that they must punish every sin committed in Massachusetts. And punish they did, with the
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eager cooperation of the whole community, who knew that sin unpunished might expose them all the wrath of God.”

Sins punished included those in the first four commandments, those dealing strictly with man’s relationship to God, as well as other sins, including those dealing with man’s relationship to man. Thus, the churches were thronged every Sunday with willing and unwilling worshipers—everyone was required to attend. Although the church could not enforce the commandments, the state, which was charged with the colony’s commission, had the final and supreme responsibility for suppressing heresy as well as drunkenness and theft and murder.

In 1629 the trading company in Massachusetts was transformed into a commonwealth. According to the Puritan theology of these early Massachusetts settlers, after the people joined in covenant with God, agreeing to be bound by his laws, they had to establish a government to see those laws enforced, for they did not have enough virtue to carry out their agreement without the compulsive force of government.

 “[They] soon discovered themselves as fond of uniformity, and as loath to allow liberty of conscience to such as differed from themselves, as those from whose power they had fled. Notwithstanding all their sufferings and complaints in England, they seemed incapable of mutual forbearance; perhaps they were afraid of provoking the higher powers at home, if they countenanced other sects; and perhaps those who differed from them took the more freedom, in venting and pressing their peculiar opinions, from the safety and protection they expected, under a charter that had granted liberty of conscience.

“In reality, the true grounds of liberty of conscience were not then known, or embraced by any sect or party of Christians; all parties seemed to think that as they only were in the possession of the truth, so they alone had a right to restrain, and crush all other opinions, which they respectively called error and heresy, where they were the most numerous and powerful; and in other places they pleaded a title to liberty and freedom of their consciences. And yet, at the same time, all would disclaim persecution for conscience sake, which has something in it so unjust and absurd, so cruel and impious, that all men are ashamed of the least imputation of it. A pretence of public peace, the preservation of the Church of Christ from infection, and the obstinacy of the heretics, are always made use of, to excuse and justify that, which stripped of all disguises, and called by its true name, the light of nature, and the laws of Christ Jesus condemn and forbid, in the most plain and solemn manner....”

After arriving in Massachusetts, they quickly formed churches. Mainly under the leadership of the Reverend John Cotton, they arranged ecclesiastical and state matters. “Whatever he delivered in the pulpit was soon put into an order of court, if of a civil, or set up as a practice in the church, if of an ecclesiastical concernment.” The established Congregational church differed from other churches in four main points:

“(1) The visible church was to consist of those who made an open profession of faith, and did not ‘scandalize their profession by an unchristian conversation.’

“(2) A particular visible church should preferably explicitly covenant to walk together in their Christian communion, according to the rules of the gospel.
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“(3) Any particular church ought not to be larger in number than needed to meet in one
place for the enjoyment of all the same numerical ordinances and celebrating of divine
worship, nor fewer than may conveniently carry on church work.
“(4) Each particular church was subject to no other jurisdiction.”

“But this people brought two other principles with them from their native
country, in which they did not differ from others; which are, that natural birth,
and the doings of men, can bring children into to the Covenant of Grace; and,
that it is right to enforce and support their own sentiments about religion with
the magistrate’s sword.”

Compulsive uniformity “was planted at a General
Court in Boston, May 18, 1631 when it was ordered that no one could be
admitted ‘to the freedom of [the] body politic’ who was not a member of a
church.”

“This test in after times had such influence, that he who ‘did not
conform, was deprived of more civil privileges than a nonconformist is deprived
of by the test in England.”

Since rulers, however selected, received their
authority from God, not from the people, and were accountable to God, not to
the people, their business was to enforce the nation’s covenant with God.
Ministers were not to seek or hold public office, but were counted on to give the
people sound advice and to instruct them about the kind of men who were best
fitted to rule.

Although only church members had political rights, this was a
larger group than had political rights in England.

By 1635, the General Court regulated the affairs of the local churches and
passed on the qualifications of preachers and elders, since

“[t]he civil authority … hath the power and liberty to see the peace, ordinances, and rules
of Christ observed in every Church, according to His word…. It is the duty of the
Christian magistrate to take care that the people be fed with wholesome and sound
doctrine.”

The Court continued to put its theology into force by act of law. At the
General Assembly held March 3, 1636, it was held (1) that no church would
form and meet without informing the magistrates and elders of the majority of
the churches of their intentions and gaining their approval and (2) that no one
who was a member of a church not approved by the magistrates and the majority
of state-churches would be admitted to the freedom of the commonwealth.

Soon thereafter, the Court passed an act that stated that they were entreated
to make “a draught of laws agreeable to the Word of God, which may be the
fundamentals of this commonwealth, and to present the same to the next General
Court,” and that “in the mean time the magistrates and their associates shall
proceed in the courts to hear and determine all causes according to the laws now
established, and where there is no law, then as near the laws of God as they
can.” This act immediately led to the persecution by banishment,
disfranchisement and the forbidding of speaking certain things, removal from
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public office, fines, and the confiscation of arms. Soon to that act was added that anyone convicted of defaming any court, “or the sentence or proceedings of the same, or any of the magistrates or other judges of any such court, would be punished by ‘fine, imprisonment, or disfranchisement of banishment, as the quality and measure of the offence shall deserve.’”

The banishment and the voluntary exile of many dissidents “did not put an end to the unhappy divisions and contentions in [] Massachusetts.” As a result of animosities and contentions between what were called the Legalists and the Familists or Antinomians, a synod was held, eighty erroneous opinions were presented, debated, and condemned; and a court was held which “banished a few of the chief persons, among those who were aspersed with those errors, and censured several that had been the most active, not it seems, for their holding those opinions, but for their pretended seditious carriage and behavior; and the church at Boston likewise excommunicated at least one of her members, not for those opinions, but for denying they ever held them, and the behavior which these heats occasioned[.]”

On September 6, 1638, the Assembly at Boston made 2 laws: (1) anyone excommunicated lawfully from a church would be, after six months and if not restored, be presented to the Court and there fined, imprisoned, banished or further “as their contempt and obstinacy upon full hearing shall deserve;” and (2) that every inhabitant would be taxed to pay for all common charges as well as for upholding the ordinances of the churches; and, if not so doing, would be compelled thereto by assessment and distress, to be levied by the constable or other officer of the town. The first law was repealed the next fall, but the second remained.

On March 13, 1639, acts were passed which fined, disenfranchised if no repentance made, and/or committed certain men for certain acts or pronouncements against the established churches. On November 13, 1644, the General Court passed an act which provided

> “that if any person or persons, within this jurisdiction, shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistry, or their lawful right and authority to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, and shall appear to the court willfully and obstinately to continue therein after due time and means of conviction, every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment.”

As to this law, Isaac Backus appropriately commented:

> “A like method of treating the Baptists, in Courts, from pulpits and from the press has been handed down by tradition ever since. And can we believe that men so knowing and virtuous in other respects, as men on that side have been, would have introduced and continued in a way of treating their neighbors, which is so unjust and scandalous, if they could have found better arguments to support that cause upon? I have diligently searched all the books, records and papers I could come at upon all sides, and have found a great number of instances of Baptists suffering for the above points that we own; but not one instance of the conviction of any member of a Baptist church in this country, in any
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In 1644 a law against the Baptists was passed asserting that the Anabaptists “have been the incendiaries of the commonwealths, and the infectors of persons in main matters of religion, and the troublers of churches in all places where they have been.”

In 1646 the General Court adopted the Act, imposing “banishment on any person denying the immortality of the soul, or the resurrection, or sin in the regenerate, or the need of repentance, or the baptism of infants, or ‘who shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of that ordinance’ or endeavor to reduce others to any of these heresies.” Also, in 1646 an act against “contemptuous conduct toward’ preachers and nonattendance on divine service were made punishable, the former by ‘standing on a block four feet high’ having on the breast a placard with the words ‘An Open and Obstinate Contemner of God’s Holy Ordinances.’”

The magistrates passed a bill in March, 1646 which required “the calling a synod to settle ... ecclesiastical affairs,” the synod to be convened not by command, but to motion only to the churches (This was agreed because some questioned the power of civil magistrates over the churches.). In August 1648 the synod met and “completed the Cambridge platform; the last article of which sa[id]:

“If any church, one or more, shall grow schismatical, rending itself from the communion of other churches, or shall walk incorrigibly or obstinately in any corrupt way of their own, contrary to the rule of the word; in such case the magistrate [Josh. 22] is to put forth his coercive power, as the matter shall require.

“This principle the Baptists and others felt the cruel effects of for many years after.”

The Assembly passed laws against gathering churches without the consent of the assembly, and another “wherein they enacted, ‘that no minister would be called unto office, without the approbation of some of the magistrates, as well as the neighboring churches.’”

In 1657 laws were passed which imposed fine or whipping on those who entertained a Quaker, required citizens to report Quakers, fined those who allowed Quakers to meet on their property, and fined anyone who brought in a Quaker or notorious heretic. Although these laws were repealed on June 30, 1660, they were reenacted immediately, “with slight modifications, or to give place to new laws quite as oppressive.” In September, 1658, the Commissioners of the United Colonies recommended that all the New England colonies “make a law, that all Quakers formerly convicted and punished as such, shall (if they return again) be imprisoned, and forthwith banished or expelled out
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of the said jurisdiction, under pain of death.”

“Many [Quakers] were whipped, some were branded, and Holder, Copeland and Rouse, three single young men, had each his right ear cut off in the prison at Boston....” Three of them who were banished, on pain of death returned again to Boston, and were condemned to die. Two of them, men, were executed. One, Mary Dyre, was released and sent away. She returned and was hanged on June 1, 1660. William Leddra was hanged on March 14, 1661. Charles II ordered that such persecutions cease, and that Quakers that offended were to be sent to England to be tried. “How justly then did Mr. Williams call the use of force in such affairs, ‘The bloody tenet!’”

Members of the first Baptist church in Boston were imprisoned. Thomas Gould, Thomas Osborne, William Turner, Edward Drinker and John George were imprisoned for starting that Baptist church without approbation from other ministers and their rulers.... Isaac Backus recorded:

“But when their ministers were moved to exert such force against Baptists, though they saw the chief procurers of that sentence struck dead before the time came for its execution, and many more of them about that time, yet their posterity have approved their sayings even to this day. Robert Mascall of England wrote his Congregationalist brethren in Massachusetts pointing out that they, in England, admitted those who practiced believer’s baptism to their churches as required by the Love of God, that their persecutions of the Baptists were contrary to Scripture, that they themselves had been persecuted, and now their brethren were persecuting so that ‘Whatever you can plead for yourselves against those that persecute you, those whom you persecute may plead for themselves against you,’ and ‘Whatever you can say against these poor men, your enemies say against you;’ that ‘[Y]ou cast a reproach upon us, that are Congregational in England, and furnish our adversaries with weapons against us;’ and ‘Persecution is bad in wicked men, but it is most abominable in good men, who have suffered and pleaded for liberty of conscience themselves.’

The persecutions of the Baptists in Massachusetts for withdrawing from public meetings continued.

“On May 15, 1672, the Assembly ordered their law-book to be revised and reprinted.” In it, banishment was required for those who broached and maintained any damnable heresies among which were denying justification by faith alone, denial of the fourth commandment, condemnation of or opposition to infant baptism, denial of the power of the magistrate to punish breaches of the first four commandments, and endeavoring to influence others to any of the errors and heresies mentioned in the law.

After some Baptists organized a church in Boston, and erected a meeting house there, the General Court ordered:

“That no persons whatever, without the consent of the freemen of the town where they live, first orderly had, and obtained, at a public meeting assembled for that end, and license of the County Court, or in defect of such consent, a license by the special order of the General Court, shall erect or make use of any house as above said; and in case any person or persons shall be convicted of transgressing this law, every such house or houses wherein such persons shall so meet more than three times, with the land whereon such
However, a special act was procured to exempt Boston “from any compulsive power for the support of any religious ministers.” As a result, the Baptist church in Boston, which had begun in 1665, was able to build a meeting-house. Thus Baptist churches in Boston had equal liberties with other denominations since 1693, but this liberty was denied throughout the rest of Massachusetts.

As a result of these repressive laws, the king of England sent a letter requiring that liberty of conscience should be allowed to all Protestants, that they be allowed to take part in the government, and not be fined, subjected to forfeiture, or other incapacities, “whereas,” he said, “liberty of conscience was made a [one] principle motive for your first transportation to these parts.”

Soon a synod was called which condemned Quakers and Anabaptists. The General Court agreed. The magistrates had the doors of the Baptist meeting house boarded up, fined some of their members, forbade the Baptists to meet anywhere else, and fined some who were found to have gone to Baptist meetings. Following this came much controversy between the Baptists and the establishment.

The established church ignored pleas to leniency toward those with whom it disagreed. For example, they ignored the plea Sir Henry Vane wrote John Winthrop, governor of Massachusetts, in 1645: “The exercise and troubles which God is pleased to lay upon these kingdoms, and the inhabitants in them teaches us patience and forbearance one with another in some measure, though there be difference in our opinions, which makes me hope that, from the experience here, it may also be derived to yourselves....”

Because of their strong bias, the Congregationalists wrote much against the dissenters, their method being asserting the disputed point taken by them:

“for truth, without any evidence, they blended that with many known facts recorded in Scripture, and thereupon rank the opposers to that point with the old serpent the devil and Satan, and with his instruments Cain, Pharaoh, Herod, and other murderers; yea, with such as sacrifice their children to devils! This history contains abundant evidence of their adding the magistrate’s sword to all these hard words, which were used in their prefaces before they came to any of the Baptists arguments.”

The atmosphere in Massachusetts, amidst the persecutions and debate of the issues, began to shift toward toleration and even freedom of conscience. Even Governor John Winthrop, who had been a leader of the Puritans from the beginning of the colony, refused on his death bed in 1649 to sign a warrant to banish a Welsh minister, “saying, ‘I have had my hand too much in such things...”
already.”

“...The second Massachusetts charter, which was dated October 7, 1691, allowed equal liberty of conscience to all Christians, except Papists.”

Many of the establishment resisted the allowance of liberty of conscience contained in the 1691 charter. The ministers of the established churches construed the liberty of conscience provided for in the 1691 charter to mean “that the General Court might, by laws, encourage and protect that religion which is the general profession of the inhabitants.”

“For thirty-six years after ... Massachusetts received [the 1691 charter], they exerted all their power, both in their legislative and executive courts, with every art that ministers could help them to, in attempts to compel every town to receive and support such ministers as they called orthodox.” Thus, despite the new charter, on October 12, 1692, in 1695, 1715, and 1723, the Assembly in Massachusetts enacted new laws requiring that every town provide a minister to be chosen and supported by all the inhabitants of the town, gave the Assembly and General Court power to determine, upon recommendation of three approved ministers, the pastor of a church, and a law requiring the towns of Dartmouth and Tiverton to tax to support ministers. In 1693, the 1692 law was changed to allow each church to choose its own minister and exempted Boston from the requirement that all citizens be taxed to support that pastor.

Thus, equal religious liberty was enjoyed in Boston, but was denied in the country. Many, including Baptists and Quakers, were taxed to support paedobaptist ministers. Those who did not pay the tax were imprisoned for failing to pay the tax, and some officials were taxed for failing to assess the tax. The cattle, horses, sheep, corn, and household goods of Quakers were from time to time taken from them by violence to support the approved ministers. In 1723, Richard Partridge presented a memorial to King George requesting that inasmuch as the Massachusetts charter allowed equal liberty of conscience to all Christians except Papists, the laws contravening the charter be declared null and void, and the prisoners who refused to pay the tax be released. In 1724, the King ordered that the prisoners be released and the taxes remitted. The Massachusetts assembly passed an act in November 1724 requiring the release of the prisoners held for failing to assess the tax.

In 1728, the Assembly passed a law exempting poll tax for ministerial support and forbidding imprisonment of those Baptists and Quakers, who gave their names and regularly attended their church meetings, for failure to pay ministerial taxes assessed on their “estates or faculty.” In November 1729, an act was added that exempted their estates and faculties also, under the same conditions.

The law exempting Baptists was renewed when it expired and persecutions continued. The law exempting taxes to Baptists expired in 1747, but was renewed for ten years. Nonetheless, the establishment found ways to persecute members of Baptist churches in various towns in Massachusetts for not paying the tax—some imprisoned, and property such as cows, geese, swine, oxen, cooking utensils, implements of occupation such as carpenter’s tools and
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spinning wheel, etc. of some was confiscated. The law expired in 1757, but a new one to continue in force thirteen years was made which exempted Baptists and Quakers if certain requirements were met. The law was renewed in 1771, even though Isaac Backus wrote Samuel Adams, never a supporter of separation of church and state, warning that the Baptists “might carry their complaints before those who would be glad to hear that the Legislature of Massachusetts deny to their fellow servants that liberty which they so earnestly insist upon for themselves.” Isaac Backus said of the oppressions under this law, “[N]o tongue nor pen can fully describe all the evils that were practiced under it.” Baptists, including single mothers with children, were unjustly taxed in violation of the law, property was unjustly taken from Baptists to pay established ministers, lies were disseminated about Baptists and their beliefs, and courts of law conducted grossly unfair trials and rendered obviously unjust opinions against Baptists.

In 1786 the legislature passed a law which allowed each town to tax for the support of ministry, schools, and the poor, and other necessary charges arising within the same town. This tax resulted in collectors’ efforts to get their taxes, which caused much business in courts, and a great increase in lawyers. Some citizens arose in arms but were subdued by force of arms. Before fourteen men who were condemned for their rebellion could be hanged, the Governor and over half the legislature were voted out and the men were all pardoned.

On February 6, 1788, delegates from Massachusetts who were meeting in Boston voted to adopt the newly drafted and proposed constitution for the states. One of the greatest objections against it had been that no religious test for any government officer was required. During debate, prior to adoption, a Congregational minister, Reverend Philips Payson, of Chelsea, arose and said, “… I infer that God alone is the God of the conscience, and consequently, attempts to erect human tribunals for the consciences of men, are impious encroachments upon the prerogatives of God.” Isaac Backus arose also and said:

“Nothing is more evident, both in reason, and in the Holy Scriptures, than that religion is ever a matter between God and individuals; and therefore no man or men can impose any religious test, without invading the essential prerogatives of our Lord Jesus Christ. Ministers first assumed this power under the Christian name; and then Constantine approved of the practice, when he adopted the profession of Christianity as an engine of State policy. And let the history of all nations be searched, from that day to this, and it will appear that the imposing of religious tests hath been the greatest engine of tyranny in the world.... The covenant of circumcision gave the seed of Abraham a right to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, and to take their houses, vineyards, and all their estates as their own; and also to buy and hold others as servants. And as Christian privileges are much greater than those of the Hebrews were, many have imagined that they had a right to seize upon the lands of the heathen, and to destroy or enslave them as far as they could extend their power. And from thence the mystery of iniquity carried many into the practice of making merchandise of slaves and souls of men.”
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By 1794, very few if any were collecting taxes to pay ministers, but establishment remained in Massachusetts until 1833.

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution did not prevent establishment on the state level. Opponents of establishment in Massachusetts never gained a majority. Rather, law, under the contract clause of Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution of the United States of America proved to be the tool used by the legal system to bring about disestablishment in that state. Massachusetts held a constitutional convention in 1820, but declined to eliminate a religious test for officeholders, control of Harvard, and public support for religion. However,

“[i]n 1821, the Massachusetts Supreme Court, in [Baker v. Fales, 16 Mass. 487 (1821) (known as the Dedham case),] a holding consistent with the Supreme Court of the United States in Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. (3 Wheat) 1 (1819), ruled that only corporations could hold property, not amorphous societies of believers. Only in response to these court decisions did the citizens support disestablishment, putting all the churches on equal footing in 1833. Contract law succeeded where politics would not, in overcoming support of religion.”

It should be noted that even with disestablishment, a church was not forced to incorporate and other methods of possessing (not owning) property on which to assemble as a body of believers were available. In reality as shown in Section II, a true church is a spiritual, not an earthly, entity. Therefore, a New Testament church cannot own property. Said another way, an entity that owns property cannot be a New Testament church. This concept will be developed further in Section VI.
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Chapter 6  
The Baptists in Rhode Island

As pointed out by John Callender in 1838:

“Bishop Sanderson says [] that ‘the Rev. Archbishop Whitgift, and learned Hooker, men of great judgment, and famous in their times, did long since foresee and declare their fear, that if ever Puritanism should prevail among us, it would soon draw in Anabaptism after it.—This Cartwright and the Disciplinarians denied, and were offended at.—But these good men judged right; they considered, only as prudent men, that Anabaptism had its rise from the same principles the Puritans held, and its growth from the same course they took; together with the natural tendency of their principles and practices toward it especially that ONE PRINCIPLE, as it was then by them misunderstood that the scripture was adeequate agendorum regula, so as nothing might be lawfully done, without express warrant, either from some command or example therein contained....”

History certainly proves that to have been the case in the English colonies, as shown by the establishment of Rhode Island. Biblical disagreement with Puritan theology was the force behind the creation of the first government in history with religious freedom, the government of the colony of Rhode Island.

“Mr. R[oger] Williams and Mr. J[ohn] Clark[e], two fathers of [Rhode Island], appear among the first who publicly avowed that Jesus Christ is king in his own kingdom, and that no others had authority over his subjects, in the affairs of conscience and eternal salvation.”

“Roger Williams was the first person in modern Christendom to maintain the doctrine of religious liberty and unlimited toleration.” Although America owes its present form of government to Roger Williams, along with Dr. John Clarke, as much or more than to any men, Mr. Williams is vilified and Dr. Clarke is generally ignored by Peter Marshall and David Manuel, who assert, against the facts, that the “Puritans were the people who, more than any other, made possible America’s foundation as a Christian nation.”

Because Roger Williams disagreed with those in the established church in Massachusetts, Marshall and Manuel condemn him as a hopeless heretic. For example, Marshall and Manuel, in condemning and lying about Williams, reveal that the Christian nationalist or revisionist condemns, in a way that praises their own views, anyone who disagrees with their contorted interpretation of Scripture and justifies the intervention of the civil government, at the behest of the established church, into spiritual matters. Marshall and Manuel sharply criticize Williams for his views and for refusing to change his views because those views were contrary to those of the established church in Massachusetts:

“Williams insistence upon absolute purity in the church, beyond all normal extremes, grew out of his own personal obsession with having to be right—in doctrine, in conduct, in church associations—in short, in every area of life. This need to be right colored everything he did or thought; indeed, it drove him into one untenable position after another. For the alternative—facing up to one’s self-righteousness and repenting of it on a continuing basis—was more than he could bring himself to accept.

“For Williams, then, Christianity became so super-spiritualized that it was removed from all contact with the sinful realities of daily living. In his view, the saints of New England belonged to a spiritual Israel, in the same way as did all Christians everywhere.
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But there should be no talk of any attempt on God’s part to build His Kingdom on earth through imperfect human beings. For Winthrop and the others to even suggest that God might be creating a new Israel in this Promised Land of America was to “... pull God and Christ and Spirit out of Heaven, and subject them unto natural, sinful, inconstant men...”\(^5\)

Never do they glorify Roger Williams, as they glorified the Puritans for disagreeing with the established Church in England. Never do they condemn the Puritans for persecuting dissenters as they condemn the Church of England for persecuting the Puritans and Pilgrims.

Their account of Williams not only is given from their incorrect theological point of view which believes that the church, working with the civil government, is going to bring in the millennium before the return of Christ but also is a downright distortion of facts. Williams did not super-spiritualize Christianity. He just pointed out that the church operates under different rules than did the nation Israel. He did not remove Christianity from all contact with the sinful realities of daily living. He just correctly argued that the church deals with those realities in a manner differing from that of Judaism and the nation Israel in the theocracy. He did believe that Christians everywhere belonged to a “spiritual Israel” called the church. He did not believe that there should be no talk of any attempt on God’s part to build His kingdom on earth through imperfect human beings. Rather, he believed that man should have freedom of conscience in all things spiritual, a concept diametrically opposed to the theology of the established church of Massachusetts. He believed that the state should punish those who violate penal laws which should deal only with man’s relationship with his fellow man. He also believed, contrary to Puritan theology, that the church should not merge with the state for any reason, and that the church should not use the arm of the state to enforce all of the Ten Commandments or for any other reason.

Marshall and Manuel continue their distortions and inaccuracies. They define liberty of conscience as meaning, “Nobody is going to tell me what I should do or believe.”\(^6\) As to the issue of “liberty of conscience” they state:

>“Liberty of conscience is indeed a vital part of Christianity—as long as it is in balance with all the other parts. But taken out of balance and pursued to its extremes (which is where Williams, ever the purist, invariably pursued everything), it becomes a license to disregard all authority with which we do not happen to agree at the time. This was the boat which Williams was rowing when he landed at Boston. Since, at its extreme, liberty of conscience stressed freedom from any commitment to corporate unity, Williams was not about to hear God through Winthrop or anyone else. (And tragically, he never did.)”\(^7\)

Williams did not believe that liberty of conscience becomes a license to disregard all authority with which we do not happen to agree. Rather he believed, contrary to the beliefs of John Winthrop and the other leaders of the establishment in Massachusetts, that the church and state were separate—that is, that God ordained both church and state, each with its sphere of authority, the church over spiritual matters and the state over earthly matters, and both with totally different God-given guidelines.

Williams believed that both church and state were to be under God. He wrote and taught this extensively. Here is one example:

\(^{5}\) Ibid., p. 193.  
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“I acknowledge [the civil magistrate] ought to cherish, as a foster-father, the Lord Jesus, in his truth, in his saints, to cleave unto them himself, and to countenance them even to the death, yea, also, to break the teeth of the lions, who offer civil violence and injury to them.

“But to see all his subjects Christians, to keep such church or Christians in the purity of worship, and see them do their duty, this belongs to the head of the body, Christ Jesus, and [to] such spiritual officers as he hath to this purpose deputed, whose right it is, according to the true pattern. Abimelech, Saul, Adonijah, Athalia, were but usurpers: David, Solomon, Joash, &c., they were the true heirs and types of Christ Jesus, in his true power and authority in his kingdom.”

Marshall and Manuel attribute the qualities of the leaders of the established church in Massachusetts to Roger Williams instead. They assert that he “desperately needed to come into reality and see his sin—how arrogant and judgmental and self-righteous he was.” They assert that he could have been “a great general in Christ’s army” since “he was tremendously gifted: in intellect, preaching, personality, and leadership ability.” But he had one tragic flaw: he believed in freedom of conscience and held other views contrary to that of the established church and could not be persuaded otherwise, or, as Marshall and Manuel put it:

“[H]e would not see his wrongness, and he was so bound up in his intellect that no one could get close to the man, because he was forever hammering home points on ‘the truth.’ Trying to relate to him on a personal level was like trying to relate to cold steel—highly polished and refined.”

As to the Puritans on the other hand, Marshall and Manuel have nothing but praise. Every page of The Light and the Glory dealing with the Puritans and their leaders are filled with praise and notations as to how the providence of God was opening the door for the right people, at the right time, in the right place to correct all the errors of Christendom. For example, they write:

“Since God’s will was made known to them [the Puritans] through His inspired Word in the Bible, they naturally wanted to get as close to a Scriptural order of worship as possible. Indeed, what they ultimately wanted was to bring the Church back to something approximating New Testament Christianity.

“The Puritan dilemma was similar to that of many newly regenerate Christians of our time. They faced a difficult choice: should they leave their seemingly lifeless churches to join or start a live one, or should they stay where they were, to be used as that one small candle to which William Bradford referred?

“God was bringing the Puritans into compassion and humility.

“As historian Perry Miller would say, “Winthrop and his colleagues believed ... that their errand was not a mere scouting expedition: it was an essential maneuver in the drama of Christendom. The [Massachusetts] Bay Company was not a battered remnant of suffering Separatists thrown up on a rocky shore; it was an organized task force of Christians, executing a flank attack on the corruptions of Christendom. These Puritans did not flee to America; they went in order to work out that complete reformation which was not yet accomplished in England and Europe.”
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The Puritans grew into such compassion and humility that they were able to horribly persecute Christians and others who did not agree with their unbiblical doctrines which the Puritans proudly believed to be inerrant.

Williams, in his relationship to the religious leaders of Massachusetts, was a lot like the Lord Jesus and the apostles in their relationship to the religious Jews. The religious leaders of Massachusetts made a mistake—they did not call upon the civil government (which was at their disposal) to kill Williams as they did with some other dissenters. Had they done so, we might not have our present form of civil government. They only banished him, a tragic error of highest proportions from their point of view.

As to the issue of persecution by the established church, Marshall and Manuel are hypocrites. They condemn the persecution of the Separatists (later called Pilgrims) and the Puritans in England, but then glorify the Puritans when they were persecuted and when they became the persecutors and persecuted those dissenters such as the Baptists and Quakers who did not conform to their theology in the New World. They complain that the Separatists

“were hounded, bullied, forced to pay assessments to the Church of England, clapped into prison on trumped-up charges, and driven underground. They met in private homes, to which they came at staggered intervals and by different routes, because they were constantly being spied upon. In the little Midlands town of Scrooby, persecution finally reached the point where the congregation to which Bradford belonged elected to follow those other Separatists who had already sought religious asylum in Holland.”

As to the Puritans … they write, “[The Puritans accepted the pressure of the mounting persecution] with grace and, as persecution often does, it served to rapidly deepen and mature the movement, bonding them together in common cause and making them more determined than ever to live as God had called them.... For a number of Puritans, [the marking of the Puritans for suppression by Charles I] was a watershed. It appeared no longer possible to reform the Church of England from within.”

Marshall and Manuel condemn the Church of England for persecuting Puritans and Pilgrims, but glorify the Puritans for persecuting Baptists.

Under the theology of Marshall and Manuel, and those of like mind, the government of Rhode Island—the first civil government in history which guaranteed religious liberty and freedom of conscience and which provided much more a model for the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America than did the government of the Puritans or that of any other established church—would not have existed nor would the United States exist in its present form. America would have no First Amendment to the United States Constitution, the amendment which was written to guarantee freedom of conscience. Men would still be forced to accept infant baptism, pay taxes to support the established church, attend the established church, proclaim allegiance to the established church, etc. Dissenters would still be persecuted. The church would still be working with the state to “bring in the kingdom,” something that the Word of God teaches is never going to happen.

Roger Williams, like the Puritans, fled tyranny over thought and conscience and sought refuge for conscience amid the wilds of America. He arrived in Boston on February 5, 1631. He was highly educated and well acquainted with the classics and original languages of the Scriptures, and had been in charge of a parish in England. Immediately upon arrival, Mr. Williams, not being a man who could hide his views and principles, declared that “the magistrate might not
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punish a breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offence, as it was a breach of the first table."  

He also, contrary to the practice of the church at Boston, hesitated to hold communion with any church which held communion with the Church of England. “He could not regard the cruelties and severities, and oppression, exercised by the Church of England, with any feelings but those of indignation.”

Over the next few years, Mr. Williams remained at odds with the established church and government ministers in Massachusetts. He was accepted by the church at Salem, but that was blocked by the General Court of the Colony. Plymouth warmly received him into the ministry where he labored two years. Exercising their right under congregational governance, the church at Salem called him, over the objections of the magistrates and ministers, to be their settled teacher. At Salem he filled the place with principles of rigid separation tending to anabaptism. In spite of the fact that “Mr. Williams appears, by the whole course and tenor of his life and conduct, to have been one of the most disinterested men that ever lived, a most pious and heavenly minded soul,” the Court soon summoned him “for teaching publicly ‘against the king’s patent, and our great sin in claiming right thereby to this country’” by taking the land of the natives without payment, “and for terming the churches of England antichristian.” Charges were brought. “He was accused of maintaining:

“(1) That the magistrate ought not to punish the breach of the first table of the law, otherwise in such cases as did disturb the civil peace.
“(2) That he ought not to tender an oath to an unregenerate man.
“(3) That a man ought not to pray with the unregenerate, though wife or child.
“(4) That a man ought not to give thanks after the sacrament nor after meat.”

The ministers of the Court, when Mr. Williams appeared before them, “had already decided ‘that any one was worthy of banishment who should obstinately assert, that the civil magistrate might not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy.’” The “grand difficulty they had with Mr. Williams was, his denying the civil magistrate’s right to govern in ecclesiastical affairs.”

He was banished from the colony and ordered to board ship for England. Instead, he went, in the dead of winter, to what was to become Rhode Island where he was supported by the Indians whom he, throughout his long life, unceasingly tried to benefit and befriend. He bought land from the Indians and founded the town of Providence where persecution has never “sullied its
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annals.”

“The harsh treatment and cruel exile of Mr. Williams seem designed by his brethren for the same evil end [as that of the brethren of Joseph when they sold him into slavery], but was, by the goodness of the same overruling hand [of divine providence] turned to the most beneficent purposes.”

“What human heart can be unaffected with the thought that a people who had been sorely persecuted in their own country, so as to flee three thousand miles into a wilderness for religious liberty, yet should have that imposing temper cleaving so fast to them, as not to be willing to let a godly minister, who testified against it, stay even in any neighboring part of this wilderness, but it moved them to attempt to take him by force, to send him back into the land of their persecutors!”

Thirty-five years later Mr. Williams wrote, “Here, all over this colony, a great number of weak and distressed souls, scattered, are flying hither from Old and New England, the Most High and Only Wise hath, in his infinite wisdom, provided this country and this corner as a shelter for the poor and persecuted, according to their several persuasions.” By 1838 in Rhode Island there were no less than thirty-two distinct societies or worshipping assemblies of Christians of varying denominations, including eight of the Quaker persuasion, eight Baptist churches, four Episcopal, and three Presbyterian or Congregationalist.

Roger Williams has been praised for his contributions in the quest for religious freedom. For example:

Isaac Backus wrote that Rhode Island “was laid upon such principles as no other civil government had ever been, as we know of, since antichrist’s first appearance; “and ROGER WILLIAMS justly claims the honor of having been the first legislator in the world, in its latter ages, that fully and effectually provided for and established a free, full and absolute LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.”

“We cannot forbear to add the oft-quoted tribute paid to Roger Williams by the historian Bancroft:—‘He was the first person in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law; and in its defence he was the harbinger of Milton, the precursor and the superior of Jeremy Taylor. For Taylor limited his toleration to a few Christian sects; the philanthropy of Williams compassed the earth. Taylor favored partial reform, commended lenity, argued for forbearance, and entered a special plea in behalf of each tolerable sect; Williams would permit persecution of no opinion, of no religion, leaving heresy unharmed by law, and orthodoxy unprotected by the terrors of penal statutes.... If Copernicus is held in perpetual reverence, because, on his deathbed, he published to the world that the sun is the centre of our system; if the name of Kepler is preserved in the annals of human excellence for his sagacity in detecting the laws of the planetary motion; if the genius of Newton has been almost adored for dissecting a ray of light, and weighing heavenly bodies in a balance,—let there be for the name of Roger Williams, at least some humble place among those who have advanced moral science and made themselves the benefactors of mankind.”

Rhode Island was settled in 1638 by others who were driven from Massachusetts by the ruling clerical power. Massachusetts had such great hate for Rhode Island that it passed a law prohibiting the inhabitants of Providence from coming within its bounds.
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Another leader instrumental in the formation of the government of the Rhode Island colony was Dr. John Clarke, a physician. Dr. John Clarke of England moved to Boston in November of 1637. He proposed to some friends “for peace sake, and to enjoy the freedom of their consciences, to remove out of that jurisdiction.”

Their motion was granted & Dr. Clarke and eighteen families went to New Hampshire which proved too cold for their liking. They left and stopped in Rhode Island, intending to go to Long Island or Delaware Bay. There Dr. Clarke met Roger Williams. The two “immediately became fast friends and associates, working together in a most harmonious manner, both socially and politically, throughout the remainder of Clarke’s life.”

With the help of Mr. Williams they settled in that colony at Aquidneck. “The first settlement on the Island was called Pocasset; after the founding of Newport, it was renamed Portsmouth.”

Perhaps Marshall and Manuel had good reason, from their point of view, for making not a single mention of Dr. Clarke in The Light and the Glory. Isaac Backus found it to be very extraordinary that he could find from any author or record no reflection cast upon Dr. Clarke by any one. Dr. Clarke left as spotless a character as any man [Isaac Backus] knew of, that ever acted in any public station in this country. “The Massachusetts writers have been so watchful and careful, to publish whatever they could find, which might seem to countenance the severities, they used towards dissenters from their way, that [Mr. Backus] expected to find something of that nature against Mr. Clarke.”

The first government in history that was to have complete freedom of conscience and religious liberty also declared that the government was to be under the Lord Jesus Christ. Signed on March 7, 1638, the Portsmouth Compact read:

“We whose names are underwritten do swear solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, to incorporate ourselves into a body politic, and as he shall help us, will submit our persons, lives and estates, unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and to all those most perfect and absolute laws of his, given us in his holy word of truth, to be guided and judged thereby.”


Three passages were marked in support of the compact: Exodus 24.3, 4; II Chronicles 2.3; and II Kings 11.17.

The chief architect of this concise and powerful piece of political history was either William Aspinwall or Dr. John Clarke, probably Dr. Clarke. This
compact placed Rhode Island under the one true God, the Lord Jesus Christ and His principles and laws given in the Bible. That Dr. Clarke “sought to help establish a government free of all religious restriction, one which in no way infringed upon the freedom of any religious conscience” is “evident from his remarks to the leaders of the established colonies upon his first arrival in Boston and by his subsequent activities throughout New England.” A civil government under Jesus Christ with freedom of religion is consistent with biblical principles.

Isaac Backus commented on this compact:

This was doubtless in their view a better plan than any of the others had laid, as they were to be governed by the perfect laws of Christ. But the question is, how a civil polity could be so governed, when he never erected any such state under the gospel?

Mr. Backus asked a good question. Too bad our founding fathers did not find and apply the answer.

On the same day the Portsmouth Compact was signed, “[n]ineteen men incorporated into a body politic, and chose Mr. Coddington to be their judge or chief magistrate.” The first General Meeting of the Portsmouth government convened on May 13, 1638. “The apportionment of land, a mutual defense of territory, and provision for a ‘Meeting House’ were ordered.”

Soon, a civil government was formed which invested power in the freemen, none of whom were to be “accounted delinquents for doctrine,” “provided it be not directly repugnant to or laws established.” In August of 1638, the people of Providence approved the first public document establishing government without interference in religious matters, the Providence Compact:

“We whose names are here underwritten being desirous to inhabit in the town of Providence, do promise to submit ourselves in active or passive obedience to all such orders or agreement as shall be made for public good to the body in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together into a township, and such others whom they shall admit into the same, only in civil things.” [Signed by Stukely Westcoat, William Arnold, Thomas James, Robert Cole, John Greene, John Throckmorton, William Harris, William Carpenter, Thomas Olney, Francis Weston, Richard Waterman, and Ezekiel Holliman.]

As James R. Beller proclaims, the document was “the first of a series of American political documents promulgating government by the consent of the governed and liberty of conscience.” Thus, liberty of conscience was the basis for legislation in Rhode Island, and its annals have remained to this day unsullied by the blot of persecution.

Rhode Island was ruled according to the original covenant, “til on January 2, 1639, an assembly of the freemen said:

“By the consent of the body it is agreed that such who shall be chosen to the place of Eldership, they are to assist the Judge in the execution of the justice and judgment, for the
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regulating and ordering of all offences and offenders, and for the drawing up and determining of all such rules and laws as shall be according to God, which may conduce to the good and welfare of the commonweal; and to them is committed by the body the whole care and charge of all the affairs thereof; and that the Judge together with the Elders, shall rule and govern according to the general rules [rule] of the word of God, when they have no particular rule from God’s word, by the body prescribed as a direction unto them in the case. And further, it is agreed and consented unto, that the Judge and [with the] Elders shall be accountable unto the body once every quarter of the year, (when as the body shall be assembled) of all such cases, actions or [and] rules which have passed through their hands, by they to be scanned and weighed by the word of Christ; and if by the body or any of them, the Lord shall be pleased to dispense light to the contrary of what by the Judge or [and] Elders hath been determined formerly, that then and there it shall be repealed as the act of the body; and if it be otherwise, that then it shall stand, (till further light concerning it) for the present, to be according to God, and the tender care of indulging [indulgent] fathers.”

In March 1639 Mr. Williams became a Baptist, together with several more of his companions in exile. Mr. Williams, who was baptized by one Holliman, in turn baptized ten others. Thus, according to some accounts, was founded the first Baptist church in America. Mr. Williams stepped down as pastor of the church after only a few months because his baptism was not administered by an apostle, but the church continued. Isaac Backus commented on the requirement of apostolic succession for baptism at length, stating, “And if we review the text (II Tim. ii. 2-Ed.) that is now so much harped upon, we shall find that the apostolic succession is in the line of ‘faithful men;’ and no others are truly in it, though false brethren have sometimes crept in unawares.”

Mr. Williams “turned seeker, i.e. to wait for the new apostles to restore Christianity. He believed the Christian religion to have been so corrupted and disfigured in what he called the ‘apostasy, as that there was no ministry of an ordinary vocation left in the church, but prophecy,’ and that there was need of a special commission, to restore the modes of positive worship, according to the original institution. It does not appear to [Mr. Callender], that he had any doubt of the true mode, and proper subjects of baptism, but that no man had any authority to revive the practice of the sacred ordinances, without a new and immediate commission.”

Mr. Williams set sail for England in June 1643, to attempt to secure a charter for Rhode Island. With help from his friend, Sir Henry Vane, he quickly obtained a charter, dated March 14, 1644 which empowered the Providence Plantations “to rule themselves, and such as should inhabit within their bounds, by such a form of civil government as by the voluntary agreement of all, or the greater part, shall be found most serviceable, in their estate and condition; and to make suitable laws, agreeable to the laws of England, so far as the nature and constitution of the place shall admit, &c.”

50 “Others suspect ‘that Mr. Williams did not form a Church of the Anabaptists, and that he never joined with the Baptist Church there. Only, that he allowed them to be nearest the scripture rule, and true primitive practice, as to the mode and subject of baptism. [Some who] were acquainted with the original settlers never heard that Mr. Williams formed the Baptist Church there, but always understood that [certain others] were the first founders of that church.... [Some asserted that this church hereupon crumbled to pieces.] But [John Callender] believe[d] this to be a mistake, in fact, for it certainly appears, there was a flourishing church of the Baptists there, a few years after the time of the supposed breaking to pieces; and it is known by the names of the members, as well as by tradition, they were some of the first settlers at Providence[,]” Callender, p. 110-111.
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The knowledge which was being disseminated through the power of the press was affecting the religious leaders as well as the general population in America. People were now able to read the Bible and other works and thereby make decisions as to the accuracy of what others were asserting. “Many books [were] coming out of England in the year 1645, some in defence of anabaptism and other errors, and for liberty of conscience, as a shelter for a general toleration of all opinions, &c....” Mr. Williams wrote The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience which was published in London in 1644. “In this work he maintains the absolute right of every man, to a ‘full liberty in religious concerns,’ supported by the most luminous and powerful reasoning ... [w]hich have excited admiration in the writings of Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Locke and Furneau.” John Cotton’s reply, The Bloody Tenent washed, and made white in the Blood of the Lamb, was printed in London in 1649. Mr. Williams reply entitled The Bloody Tenent yet more Bloody, was published in 1652. “The same clear, enlarged and consistent views of religious freedom are maintained in this last work, as in his preceding, with additional arguments, evincing an acute, vigorous, and fearless mind, imbued with various erudition and undissembled piety.”

“To the point we have arrived, the history of Roger Williams and the state he founded were indissolubly allied together. Others imbued with his principles henceforth took part in working out the great and then unsolved problem—how liberty, civil and religious, could exist in harmony with dutiful obedience to rightful laws.”

The first Baptist church in Newport was formed under the ministry of Dr. John Clarke. According to some who suppose that the church was founded by Clarke and his company upon their arrival in Rhode Island, it could have been established as early as 1638.

Under the leadership of Dr. Clarke, Rhode Island became a government of religious liberty. Dr. Clarke added law and politics to his already crowded professions of medicine and religious ministry when he was elected General Treasurer and General Assistant for Newport in 1650. “As a servant of the people, Dr. Clarke would steer the colony toward a government of unprecedented civil and religious liberty—convinced that any other move would be in the direction of a self-centered autocratic theocracy.” Under his leadership, the people followed him as he steered a course between democracy with its “attending threat of anarchy and all of its evils of disorder, violence, and ultimate chaos,” and aristocracy and its restrictions on all forms of liberty.

---

55 Backus, A History of New England..., Volume 1, p. 145, quoting Hubbard, [413-415.]
56 Callender, Appendix IV, p. 191.
57 For an excellent summary of some of the more important arguments presented by both sides see Backus, A History of New England..., Volume 1, pp. 134-145.
58 Callender, pp. 191-192.
59 Williams and Underhill, p. xxx.
60 Backus, A History of New England..., Volume 1, pp. 125-26 and fn. 1, p. 125; see also, Beller, America in Crimson Red, pp. 31-33 (Mr. Beller argues that the Baptist church in Newport, meeting in the wilderness in 1637 with Dr. John Clarke as pastor, was the first Baptist church to meet in America. Mr. Beller considers the writings of Isaac Backus, John Callender, and John Winthrop on this subject.)
61 Asher, p. 35.
62 Ibid., pp. 35-36.
When Dr. Clarke and two friends went to Massachusetts they were persecuted. In 1651, he, Obadiah Holmes, and John Crandal went to visit a friend in Boston. They were on “an errand of mercy and had traveled all the way from their church in Newport to visit one of their aging and blind members, William Witter.” They stayed over, and held a service on Sunday. During that service, they were arrested and jailed. Before they were brought to trial, they were forced to attend a Congregational Puritan religious meeting. There, they refused to remove their hats, and Dr. Clarke stood and explained why they declared their dissent from them. They were charged with denying infant baptism, holding a public worship, administering the Lord’s Supper to an excommunicated person, to another under admonition, proselytizing the Baptist way and rebaptizing such converts, and failing to post security or bail and other ecclesiastical infractions. He asked for a public debate on his religious views, which the Puritans avoided. “Clarke said they were examined in the morning of July 31 and sentenced that afternoon without producing any accuser or witness against them,” and that “Governor John Endicott even insulted the accused and denounced them as ‘trash.’” Dr. Clarke was “fined twenty pounds or to be well whipped;” Mr. Crandal was fined five pounds, only for being with the others; and Mr. Holmes was held in prison, where sentence of a fine of thirty pounds or to be well whipped was entered. A friend paid Mr. Clarke’s fine. Mr. Clarke and Mr. Crandal were released.

Mr. Holmes was beaten mercilessly. His infractions were denying infant baptism, proclaiming that the church was not according to the gospel of Jesus Christ, receiving the sacrament while excommunicated by the church, and other spiritual infractions. Mr. Holmes refused to pay his fine, prepared for the whipping by “communicat[ing] with [his] God, commit[ting] himself to him, and beg[ging] strength from him.” Holmes was confined over two months before his whipping. He related the experience of being whipped for the Lord as follows, in part:

“And as the man began to lay the strokes upon my back, I said to the people, though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet my God would not fail. So it please the Lord to come in, and so to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I broke forth praying unto the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge; and telling the people, that now I found he did not fail me, and therefore now I should trust him forever who failed me not; for in truth, as the strokes fell upon me, I had such a spiritual manifestation of God’s presence as the like thereof I never had nor felt, nor can with fleshly tongue express; and the outward pain was so removed from me, that indeed I am not able to declare it to you, it was so easy to me, that I could well bear it, yea, and in a manner felt it not although it was grievous as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength (yea spitting in [on] his hand three times as many affirmed) with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he had loosed me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart, and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, You have struck me as with roses; and said moreover,

---

63 Obadiah Holmes moved from England to Massachusetts. He and several others decided the Baptist way was right and were baptized. He and others were excommunicated in 1650. They moved to Rhode Island where Mr. Holmes became a member of the church pastored by Dr. John Clarke.
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Although the Lord hath made it easy to me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charge."

Mr. Holmes “could take no rest but as he lay upon his knees and elbows, not being able to suffer any part of his body to touch the bed whereupon he lay.”

Two men who shook Mr. Holmes’ hand after the beating were, without trial and without being informed of any written law they had broken, sentenced to a fine of forty shillings or to be whipped. Although they refused to pay the fines, others paid their fines and they were released.

Of course, the Puritans were fully persuaded of the righteousness of persecution. Here are two examples of their reasoning. Sir Richard Saltonstall wrote to Messrs. Cotton and Wilson of Boston condemning them for this tyranny in Boston, for “compelling any in matters of worship to do that whereof they are not fully persuaded” thus making “them sin, for so the apostle (Rom. 14 and 23) tells us, and many are made hypocrites thereby,” etc. Mr. Cotton replied in part:

“If it do make men hypocrites, yet better be hypocrites than profane persons. Hypocrites give God part of his due, the outward man, but the profane person giveth God neither outward nor inward man. We believe there is a vast difference between men’s inventions and God’s institutions; we fled from men’s inventions, to which we else should have been compelled; we compel none to men’s inventions. If our ways (rigid ways as you call them) have laid us low in the hearts of God’s people, yea, and of the saints (as you style them) we do not believe it is any part of their saintship.”

A second example occurred when some protested being taxed to support the state-church with which they did not agree. The main point of the answer received was as follows:

“What we demand of you is equal and right; what you demand of us is evil and sinful; and hence we have the golden rule upon our side, while you are receding and departing from it; for if we were in an error, and out of the right way, as we see and know that you are in several respects, and you see and know it is of us, as we do of you, we think the golden rule would oblige you to tell us of our error, and not let us alone to go on peacefully in it, that is without proper means to recover and reclaim us; whether by the laws of God, or the good and wholesome laws of the land, as we now treat you.”

In November 1651, Dr. Clarke went to England with Roger Williams to promote the interests of Rhode Island. The objects of their commissions were different, but they mutually aided each other in removing a dangerous threat to their experiment of democracy—a Parliamentary Commission granted Governor Coddington, whose autocratic rule threatened the future of Rhode Island, on April 3, 1751, which installed him as governor of Aquidneck for life. “Mr. Clark[e] was the sole agent of the island towns, to procure a repeal of Mr. Coddington’s commission” and “Mr. Williams was the sole agent of Providence and Warwick, to procure a new charter for these two towns.”

Dr. Clarke published his book Ill News from New-England: or a Narative of New-Englands Persecution...Also four conclusions touching the faith and order
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of the Gospel of Christ out of his last Will and Testament, confirmed and justified shortly after he arrived in London.

The work clearly demonstrated “Clarke’s subjection to an orderly state” showing that, to “him the secular rule is ordained of God, but it should not interfere with one’s religious convictions.”76 “Both the church and the status of mankind, he argued, are ‘a two fold administration of power suitable to the two fold state of being of man.’ Love and conscience are emphasized by Clarke as inducements toward state honor and subjection rather than as engagements by force and fear. He implored rulers to distinguish between these two ‘administrations of Christ’s power here on earth’ and to leave the spiritual realm to the control of God’s Spirit.”77

“The book combines a spirited defense on liberty of individual conscience toward God in religious matters, with pleas directed to England’s consideration in such matters.”78 “While the letter appears as an apology for the Baptist faith, it seems that Clarke probably intends it as a timely and effective instrument, aimed at drawing British sympathy.”79 Of Dr. Clarke’s book, Louis Franklin Asher commented, in part:

“Clearly and forcefully, Clarke calls attention to what he conceives as the necessary separation between the two real administrations of Christ’s power as exercised in the world—that is, the sword of steel, ‘whose Sword-bearers you are,’ as he styles the magistrates. The other administration he calls Scripture, the ‘sword that proceeds out of the mouth of his servants, the word of truth.’ Thus Clarke views ‘this spiritual administration as far as it concerns the outward man…[as] managed not by a sword of Steel,’ he argues, but by the Scripture of truth.

“In a bold but subservient manner, Clarke sets forth four simple but imploring proposals to the British Counsel of State. He begs the magistracy not to forcibly inhibit spiritual ministers but allow time to minister according to each one’s own conscience toward God. In so doing, he advises—even if they are heretics—they merely represent the tares among the wheat, to which Christ referred in his prohibition of their harvest or persecution by the secular arm of government. Clarke then asks that the secular power or ‘sword’ be withheld from use against the spiritual ‘tares’ rather than heaping abuse on them. In the fourth proposal, Clarke compares his majesty to that of a prophetic nursing Father in the Old Testament; thus he pleads for encouragement by spiritual ministers....

“[Included in the book is a letter to the Puritan clergy at Massachusetts.] [That] letter served as a fitting climax to Clarke’s encounter with the Bay officials and, it seems, he made use of it to maneuver the Rhode Island Colony into an advantageous posture with the English government. [He pointed out his persecution, contrasting it with] ‘the much kinder treatment and other curtesies with far greater liberties in point of conscience,’ which previously the Puritan messengers had enjoyed on their tour through Rhode Island....

“[He also] denounces the Puritan church order ..., and [t]he firm allegiance of the Puritans to the magistrates in matters of religion.... Clarke’s entire letter appears as a scorching public censure against the Massachusetts Puritanical system and its integrated form of civil power over ecclesiastical liberties.

“Never, under any circumstances, Clarke preached, should Christians force their persuasion on others nor should they resort to obeying magistrates in matters of religious concerns.”80

Through Mr. Clarke’s mediation and statesmanship, Coddington’s commission was revoked in 1652. Mr. Clarke was then further commissioned to stay in England to obtain a better and more substantial safeguard against “any
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Mr. Clarke remained in England until, on July 8, 1663, he secured a new charter from Charles II. “By this Charter all the powers of government were conferred on the Colony, the King not having reserved to himself the right of revising its proceedings.” This charter was in effect until the constitution, which was adopted in November, 1842, became operative the first Tuesday of May, 1843. In addition to other matters, the charter cleared up land disputes with Massachusetts and some of the other colonies, provided for the organization of the government, and provided for freedom of conscience. That charter stated, in part:

> Inhabitants of Rhode Island “pursuing, with peaceable and loyal minds, their sober, serious, and religious intentions, of godly edifying themselves, and one another, in the holy Christian faith and worship, as they were persuaded ... did ... transport themselves out of this kingdom of England into America,” and did then “leave their desirable stations and habitations, and with excessive labor and travel, hazard and charge did transport themselves into the midst of Indian natives” ... “whereby, as is hoped, there may, in time, by the blessing of God upon their endeavors be laid a sure foundation of happiness to all America: And whereas, in their humble address, they have freely declared, that it is much on their hearts (if they may be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained, and that among our English subjects, with a full liberty in religious concerns; and that true piety rightly grounded upon gospel principles, will give the best and greatest security to sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyalty... and to secure them in the free exercise and enjoyment of all their civil and religious rights, appertaining to them, as our loving subjects; and to preserve unto them that liberty in true Christian faith and worship of God, ... that no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter shall be any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any differences in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony.”

The charter granted “unprecedented liberties in religious concerns. Moreover representation for the people and the limit of power to public officials provided a basic check and balance to popular sovereignty. The Royal Charter of 1663 proved to be distinctive, installing safeguards in the election process through the governing body of the State Assembly, made up of a governor, deputy-governor, assistants, and representatives from each of the towns,” each elected by the people.

The most important biblical principle of the government they founded was incorporated into the supreme law of the United States of America by the First Amendment to United States Constitution. Sadly, America’s founding documents, although the best governing documents ever conceived, as a whole fell short of the ideal. For example, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution blended some enlightenment with many biblical principles. The Founding Fathers hoped for virtue, not piety. The Founding Fathers desire was to secure the “happiness of man,” whereas, under the Portsmouth Compact and
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the Rhode Island Charter, the goal was the Glory of God; that is, they desired that the colony be under God and His principles contained in the Bible.

As to the effect of the Rhode Island government thus established, John Callender wrote in 1838:

“The civil State has flourished, as well as if secured by ever so many penal laws, and inquisition to put them to execution. Our civil officers have been chosen out of every religious society, and the public peace has been as well preserved, and the public counsels as well conducted, as we could have expected, had we been assisted by ever so many religious tests.

“All profaneness and immorality are punished by the laws made to suppress them; and while these laws are well executed, speculative opinions or modes of worship can never disturb or injure the peace of a State that allows all its subjects an equal liberty of conscience. Indeed, it is not variety of opinions, or separation in worship, that makes disorders and confusions in government. It is the unjust, unnatural, and absurd attempt to force all to be of one opinion, or to feign and dissemble that they are; or the cruel and impious punishing those, who cannot change their opinions without light or reason, and will not dissemble against all reason and conscience. It is the wicked attempt to force men to worship God in a way they believe He hath neither commanded nor will accept; and the restraining them from worshipping Him in a method they think He has instituted and made necessary for them, and in which alone they can be sincere worshippers, and accepted of God; in which alone, they can find comfort and peace of conscience, and approve themselves before God; in which alone, they can be honest men and good Christians. Persecution will ever occasion confusion and disorder, or if every tongue is forced to confess, and every knee to bow to the power of the sword: this itself is the greatest of all disorders, and the worst of confusions in the Kingdom of Christ Jesus.

“[T]his Colony with some since formed on the same model, have proved that the terrible fears that barbarity would break in, where no particular forms of worship or discipline are established by the civil power, are really vain and groundless; and that Christianity can subsist without a national Church, or visible Head, and without being incorporated into the State. It subsisted for the first three hundred years; yea, in opposition and defiance to all the powers of hell and earth. And it is amazing to hear those who plead for penal laws, and the magistrate’s right and duty to govern the Church of Christ, to hear such persons call those early times the golden age of Christianity.”

Mr. Clarke, on his return to Rhode Island, was elected Deputy-Governor three successive years. “He continued the esteemed pastor of the first Baptist Church of Newport, till his death” on April 20, 1676. Of Mr. Clarke, Isaac Backus wrote: He “left as spotless a character as any man I know of.”

“The testimony which Backus proceeds to give of the purity of [Mr. Clarke’s] character and to his good name, even among his enemies, has been fully corroborated by later writers.”

“To no man, except Roger Williams, is Rhode Island more indebted than to him.”

“An eminent American historian justly observed:

“The annals of Rhode-Island, if written in the spirit of philosophy, would exhibit the forms of society under a peculiar aspect. Had the territory of the State corresponded to the importance and singularity of the principles of its early existence, the world would have been filled with wonder at the phenomena of its early history.”

An example of the manner in which Rhode Island honored the doctrine of freedom of conscience is the way they upheld the standard in regards to the
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Quakers. Other colonies persecuted the Quakers from 1656 until 1661. Massachusetts hanged four Quakers who returned to the colony after being banished. The Commissioners of the United Colonies threatened Rhode Island with cutting off all commerce or trade with them if Rhode Island did not likewise persecute the Quakers by enacting penal legislation against them. Rhode Island “refused, and pointed out that it had no law for punishing people because of their utterances ‘concerning the things and ways of God, as to salvation and to eternal condition.’”92 The Commissioners of Rhode Island notified John Clarke. As a result, King Charles II ordered that “neither capital nor corporal punishment should be inflicted on Quakers, but that offenders should be sent to England.”93 This decree of the King probably saved the lives of other dissenters.

All that was happening was not for naught. Isaac Backus wrote, “It is readily granted that the sentiments of Mr. Williams and Mr. Clarke, about religious liberty, have had a great spread since that day, so that men of a contrary mind cannot carry their oppressive schemes so far now as they did then,”94 but they still had a ways to go to achieve religious liberty. But it was not that long until John Callender declared in 1838 that “[t]he principles of religious freedom, which they [of Rhode Island] clearly and consistently maintained, are now the rule of action adopted by all Christian sects.”95
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Chapter 7
The Separates and the Baptists in New England

“Congregationalism claimed a large class of inferior church members by 1720, baptized into the churches without conversion.”1 Generally speaking, by 1740, religious decay had spread throughout New England. However, “the relentless preaching of Jonathan Edwards of complete surrender to the will of God introduced the novel phenomenon of revival in Massachusetts.”2 Although the revival spread down the Connecticut Valley into Connecticut3, the initial revival was of short duration ... and did not touch the people of New England generally.4 Then, George Whitefield, the world-famous English evangelist arrived at Newport. Great crowds greeted Whitefield wherever he went to preach. In Connecticut, he was greeted with great enthusiasm. All Connecticut was at his feet.

As a result of that great revival, many were converted and churches experienced unprecedented growth. The Great Awakening emphasized individual conversion and the new birth.5 “[T]he new converts were dubbed ‘New Lights’ by their critics because the awakened people emphasized the immediacy of the Holy Spirit’s illumination and leadership in their personal lives.”6 The members of the old churches were called “Old Lights.” “The former favored Whitefield’s type of evangelism and the idea of the regenerate church; the latter opposed revivalism and defended the state church order.”7

Many itinerant preachers arose as a result of this revival. Consequently, the General Court of Connecticut “forbade all itinerant preaching under penalty of loss of the right to collect one’s legal salary and imprisonment. Itinerant lay preachers or strange ministers were to be silenced or expelled from the colony.”8 “In Connecticut, legal action was taken against the revivalists, their churches were deprived of legal status, and some of the preachers were thrown into jail.”9

The Great Awakening brought as many as 50,000 new converts, and brought into being, between 1740 and 1760, one hundred and fifty new Congregationalist churches and added to the number of Separatist and Baptist churches. “It brought the personal and pietistic religious tradition into a section previously dominated without challenge by Calvinistic rationalization.... As
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always and everywhere, the New England situation shows that such separation and disestablishment arose out of religion and not its opposite.”

A number of New Lights who initially tried to influence the church to return to the concept of the pure church were forced out of the established churches. The term “Separates” referred to those who believed that the church should only include regenerate members and those who separated from the state-churches on this conviction. The Separate movement started in Connecticut and moved to Massachusetts. Separate churches began to appear at various towns.

There was great prejudice against Baptists. England forced New England to exempt Baptists from taxation in 1728, but the establishment found ways to circumvent this exemption. Operating clandestinely because of opposition by the authorities, Baptist preachers had come into Connecticut from Rhode Island, as they had done in Massachusetts, starting in 1674. They made some converts and even started some churches in Connecticut in 1704, 1710, 1735, and 1740. All dissenters were taxed to support the established church unless certified to pay the tax to their own churches. To be exempted they had to attend regularly their own church and live within five miles of their meeting place. Those who belonged to no church were also assessed the tax. However, Separates were not given the privileges accorded Baptists, Quakers, and Anglicans.

One of the most prominent of the Separates was Isaac Backus. Although he spent much of his ministry in Massachusetts, he was a native of Norwich, Connecticut. In the new movement, he became the leading figure; and his shift from the Separate to the Baptist camp is central to the religious history of New England.

Mr. Backus was saved in 1741. On August 24, 1741, Mr. Backus, in his own words, speaking of himself, realized

“that he had done his utmost to make himself better, without obtaining any such thing; but that he was a guilty sinner in the hands of a holy God, who had a right to do with him as seemed good in God’s sight; which he then yielded to and all his objections against it were silenced. And soon upon this a way of relief was opened to his soul, which he never had any true idea of before, wherein truth and justice shine with luster, in the bestowment of free mercy and salvation upon objects who have nothing in themselves but badness. And while this divine glory engaged all his attention, his burthen of guilt and evil dispositions was gone, and such ideas and inclinations were implanted in his heart as were never there before, but which have never been rooted out since, though often overclouded."

Two years later, he, his mother, and some of his other relatives walked out of the established Norwich Church they belonged to and started holding meetings of their own. They left the church because the church voted to admit new members by a majority vote without evidence of conversion, the minister appeared to think that the Lord’s Supper was a converting ordinance, and the church exhibited a “strong affection for the Saybrook scheme.”

A revolution had begun.

“The essence of the religious revolution which the Separate movement began (and the Baptists finished) lay in church government and not in theology—though it became necessary eventually to modify Calvinism in order that it might conform more nearly to the unforeseen ramifications of the new practices in church discipline and polity. The
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major issues involved in church government were the autonomy and purity of the church, the nature of the ministry, and the relationship between Church and State.\footnote{McLoughlin, \textit{The American Pietistic Tradition}, pp. 23-24.}

The church and state were interwoven in New England. Into the eighteenth century the Puritan tradition continued in greater strength in Connecticut than elsewhere. All citizens were taxed for the support of religion. The Saybrook Platform was ordained by the Connecticut legislature in 1708. Under it, county associations of ministers met frequently to deal with matters of common interest, regional bodies called consociations were to handle all kinds of ecclesiastical difficulties, and a general state association exercised a general superintendency over churches and ministers. Under the Saybrook Platform, the county associations approved, licensed, and ordained the ministers of the parishes.\footnote{Lumpkin, p. 11; Backus, \textit{A History of New England...}, \textit{Volume 1}, pp. 472-474; Backus, \textit{A History of New England...}, \textit{Volume 2}, p. 319.}

The state supported the actions of the county associations, and could deny the right of a minister to preach and collect his salary.\footnote{McLoughlin, \textit{The American Pietistic Tradition}, p. 24.}

Various struggles arose. In 1742 and 1743 laws were passed forbidding itinerant preachers from preaching without permission of the parish minister with penalty of imprisonment, excluding settled ministers who preached in any other parish without consent of the parish minister from any benefit of the laws for their support, removing from Connecticut any minister from any other colony who preached in Connecticut, and giving the legislature authority to license dissenting churches which complied with the British Toleration Act of 1689.\footnote{Backus, \textit{A History of New England...}, \textit{Volume 2}, pp. 319-320.}

The Legislature disciplined members of the Council and General Assembly known to sympathize with the New Lights. “Unauthorized schools and colleges were forbidden and only university graduates were eligible for ministerial standing before the law.”\footnote{Lumpkin, p. 15; see also, Backus, \textit{A History of New England...}, \textit{Volume 2}, p. 57, fn. 3.}

The county associations began to act. The New Haven Consociation in 1742 expelled pastors of established churches for preaching to a group of Separates and Baptists against the wishes of the established minister. In Canterbury, Windham County the majority of the church, New Lights, voted for a certain man to be pastor, but the Old Lights who were the majority in the parish voted for another. By law, both the church and parish had to concur, but the Windham Consociation declared that the minority of Old Lights in the church were the true church and ordained their choice.\footnote{Backus, \textit{A History of New England...}, \textit{Volume 2}, pp. 68-74; McLoughlin, p. 26.}

In Plainfield, the Windham Consociation “reversed the position it had taken in Canterbury and sided with a minority of Old Lights in the church to choose an Old Light minister over the objection of the majority of New Lights in the parish.”\footnote{McLoughlin, \textit{The American Pietistic Tradition}, pp. 26-27.}

The inequities and the persecutions by the established church and civil government resulted in more and more defections to the New Light position. The civil government used repressive measures to compel the Separates to return to the fold. “Revivalistic ministers were shut out of meeting houses; members were moved from civic office and, when they refused to pay taxes for support of the regular ministry, imprisoned.”\footnote{Lumpkin, p. 14, citing Backus, \textit{A History of New England...}, \textit{Volume 2}, p. 176.} At first most Separates that left the state-churches seemed destined to become Baptists. However, great
disagreement arose between those who still adhered to infant baptism and those who insisted upon believer’s baptism—baptism after a confession of faith only. As a result of this disagreement, the Baptist members left the Separate churches and formed their own churches.

This Separate movement had enduring consequences. One writer appropriately noted:

“[T]he Separatist movement is not appreciated as it deserves. We have too nearly forgotten our obligations to those men who dared to break away from the corrupt and worldly churches of the Standing Order, though they were armed with all the power of the State, of which they were a part, and to establish other churches in which vital godliness was the condition of membership. It was a transition movement, it is true, and of necessity only temporary, but its results were enduring. Many of the Baptist churches in New England spring from it directly, and through them, indirectly, almost all the rest; and other evangelical churches are largely indebted to it for their vitality and efficiency.—ED.”

From the point of his conversion, Mr. Backus gradually became a leader of the Baptist movement. He was asked to preach to a church at Titicut in 1748, a revival resulted, people were saved, and a Separate church was formed in February, 1748 in defiance of the authorities. Mr. Backus and sixteen men signed the church covenant which provided for election and dismissal of the ministers, deacons, and elders by a majority vote, repudiated the claim that the minister was superior in authority to the brethren, stated that the minister was to be supported by free contribution of the members, and asserted the priesthood of all believers and the right and duty of all members to exercise any ability they had to preach or pray in public.

Mr. Backus was opposed by scurrilous opposition. As he said, “I had many things thrown upon me to represent my Carecter odious and hinder me in this glorious Work.” Lies were told about him, such as that he had a wife and children in the country, that he had “bastards in this place or that, that there was a girl or two with his child.”

The members of the church were taxed to support the established church. The church protested the tax, but parish committee refused to exempt Mr. Backus and his followers from religious taxes. Their rationale was basically that the golden rule required them to do so, and that the committee would want their neighbors to force them to pay such a tax if they were in error. “[N]either doth God himself countenance or give Liberty to any men to follow the ‘Dictates of a misguided Eronius Conscience.’” The reply gave an argument over the separation of church and state with which Backus had to wrestle the rest of his life.

“Oppression ‘can’t mean and intend that Tis unwarrantable or sinfull for men to urge and press others to a compliance with their Duty as it is pointed out by the Laws of God or the good and wholesome Laws of the Land and in case men through obstinacy and willfulness [refuse] and so will not make good either Lawfull Contracts [&#] Covenants the original good and Design of their being incorporated into Distinct [religious] societies [or parishes] and so Tis no oppression....’ Under the Golden Rule the committee said it would want their neighbors to force them to do their duty if they were in error. ‘Liberty of Conscience according to the word of god is not for men to Live as they list or Do as they please while they maintain Erors in Judgment, Disown the truth of god, Exclaim against a
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faithful ministry, make Light of that good order and government which Jesus Christ has set up in his church; neither does God himself countenance or give Liberty to any men to follow the Dictates of a misguided Eronius Conscience.... ‘Let it be observed that there is a great difference between persecution and prosecution.’”  

In February, 1749, Backus was arrested for not paying a ministerial tax, but someone paid it for him, and he was released. Other members of the church were imprisoned or had their property confiscated for failing to pay the tax.

“Three-quarters of a century were to pass and Backus was to be in his grave before the people of Massachusetts yielded to the radical New Light view that the state should indeed allow individuals to ‘act and Conduct as they pleas’ in matters of religion even if it meant imperiling their souls, the destruction of the parish system, the end of compulsory religious taxation, and the abandonment of the Puritan ideal of a corporate Christian commonwealth.”

Backus struggled with the issue of baptism, studied Scripture, rejected infant baptism, and was baptized by dipping on August 22, 1751. He set out to refute the anti-pedobaptist position by first turning to the Bible, and then to the claims of Baptist scholars in England that infant baptism was a corruption brought into the Christian church in the 2nd or 3rd century. What he found surprised him.

Next, Backus examined the Covenant Theology which lay at the heart of New England Puritanism. The relevance of this theology to Backus was mainly its affect on the church-state issue.

First, “[T]he Jewish church was clearly a national church, a theocracy in which Moses and Aaron ruled together, and thus the Puritans were able to utilize the covenant theology to justify their ecclesiastical laws and their system of territorial parishes and religious taxes. Second, the covenant theology provided the Puritans with justifications for the Halfway Covenant, thus polluting the purity of the mystical body of Christ. And in the third place the covenant theology, by emphasizing that grace ran ‘through the loins of godly parents,’ that the baptized children of visible saints were somehow more likely than others to obtain salvation, thereby established a kind of hereditary spiritual aristocracy; it also undermined the sovereignty of God by implying that God was bound by this covenant to save certain persons rather than others. [Etc.]”

The Puritans supported the unity of the Abrahamic Covenant in Romans 11.17.

“Here, the apostle Paul spoke of the Christian covenant as being grafted on to the Jewish covenant as a branch is grafted on to an olive tree, from whence the Puritans ‘argued the right of professors now to baptize their children, because the Jews circumcised theirs.’ This Backus rejected as misinterpretation. ‘The Jews were broken off thro’ unbelief, and the Gentiles were grafted in, and stand only by faith.’ Faith was essential to baptism. What Puritans stressed as organic continuity, Backus and the Baptists stressed as a complete break.”

Backus concluded that the Separates must explicitly reject the Covenant Theology, the whole conception of the corporate Christian state which the Puritans had so painstakingly constructed in the wilderness of New England. Backus decided against infant baptism and was baptized. “[H]e rejected the
Covenant Theology of the Puritans by arguing as the Baptists had long done that the Bible contained two covenants, the old Covenant of Works made with the Jews, and the Covenant of Grace made with those who believe in Christ..."

"[T]he Puritans had confused the gospel of grace with the doctrine of works and transformed the gospel church of visible saints into a national church with a birthright membership,"32 "Backus and the Baptists stressed the discontinuity, the antithetical nature of the two, the complete and distinct break between the past and the present dispensations. That Americans were ready to grasp this new outlook after 1740 and to pursue it to its logical conclusions marks the real break with the Old World, the medieval mind and the Puritan ethos..."33

At first the Separatists and Baptists desired to meet together. This proved untenable.

"[They] were bound together by the closest ties. The [Baptists] left the [Separate Congregational churches] with no ill feeling but with heartiest love, and this love continued, on both sides, after their separation. Their members had been converted together in the Great Awakening; together they had come out from the Standing Order; together they had suffered and were still suffering for the truth; they had the same enemies and oppressors; they felt the force of the same unjust and cruel laws; their plundered goods were sold at the same auctions, and their bodies confined in the same prisons; they had many kindred views and feelings, by which they sympathized most closely, and in which there were no others to sympathize with them. Moreover, they mutually desired inter-communion. Council after council and conference after conference recommended it, and there seemed to be no voice against it. And yet it failed. Practical difficulties arose.... The truth could not be escaped that Baptist churches, by renouncing infant baptism and sprinkling, and then practically recognizing them again as a proper declaration of discipleship and initiation to membership in the visible church, placed themselves in a position of direct inconsistency. One by one, reluctantly, but at last universally, they abandoned the untenable ground.—ED."34

By 1754, “the alliance between the two groups within Separatism was practically at an end, and the Baptist members left to form new churches or join existing ones."35

A Baptist church was instituted in Middleborough, Massachusetts by a number of brethren led by Mr. Backus from the Titicut Separatist church who were convinced communion should be limited to believers baptized upon a profession of their own faith. On July 23, 1756, Mr. Backus was installed as their pastor.

"He... published a discourse from Gal. iv. 31, to show that Abraham’s first son that was circumcised was the son of the bond-woman, an emblem of the national church of the Jews; in distinction from regenerate souls, the spiritual seed of Abraham, of whom the Christian church was constituted; into which neither natural birth, nor the doings of others, can rightly bring any one soul, without its own consent. Upon these principles was the first Baptist church in Plymouth county then founded[.]"36

The revival died out almost as fast as it had appeared. Conversions became rare. People turned their attention to politics and controversy. The Separate churches and groups either died, or found their way into the Baptist camp. The Baptists denomination experienced an unprecedented growth. In 1740 no more
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than six Calvinistic Baptist churches existed in New England; but by 1800 there were more than 325 Baptist churches, most of them Calvinistic.\(^{37}\)

The Warren Association, an association of Baptist churches, was formed in 1770. The main goal was to obtain religious liberty. This marked an important movement in the history of New England. An advertisement to all Baptists in New England was published requesting them to bring in exact accounts of their cases of persecution to the first annual meeting on September 11, 1770. The establishment feared the association and countered by dealing deceitfully with it and spreading lies about the association.\(^{38}\)

Isaac Backus was the key member of the grievance committee of the Warren Association in September, 1771. “[He soon] became the principal spokesman for the Baptists in their efforts to disestablish the Puritan churches. As such he did more than any other man to formulate and publicize the evangelical position on Church and State which was ultimately to prevail throughout America.”\(^{39}\)

“An Appeal to the Public for Religious Liberty Against the Oppression of the Present Day” was the most important of the 37 tracts which Backus published during his lifetime and was central to the whole movement for separation of Church and State in America. “It remains the best exposition of the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century pietistic concept of separation.”\(^{40}\) In that tract, Backus argued, among other things:

“Basic to the Baptist position was the belief that all direct connections between the state and institutionalized religion must be broken in order that America might become a truly Christian country. Backus, like Jefferson and Madison, believed that ‘Truth is great and will prevail’—but by ‘Truth’ he meant the revealed doctrines of grace. His fundamental assumption was that ‘God has appointed two different kinds of government in the world which are different in their nature and ought never to be confounded together; one of which is called civil, the other ecclesiastical government.’ The two had been ‘confounded together’ by the Emperor Constantine and the Papacy and had ultimately been brought to New England by the Puritans ‘who had not taken up the cross so as to separate from the national church before they came away.’ A ‘Brief view of how civil and ecclesiastical affairs are blended together among us [in 1773] to the depriving of many of God’s people of that liberty of conscience which he [God] has given us’ utilized also the long–forgotten arguments of Roger Williams to defend the doctrines of separation.”\(^{41}\)

Amidst persecutions of Baptists for failing to pay ministerial taxes, the association met on September 1773 and voted to refrain from giving any more certificates for tax exemption to pay the established minister. Backus listed the reasons why they would no longer obey “a law requiring annual certificates to the other denomination.” “Jefferson in his preamble to the Religious Liberty Act of Virginia and Madison in his famous Remonstrance of 1785 utilized essentially deistic arguments based upon reason and natural law. Backus’s arguments were pure pietism[.]”\(^{42}\)

---
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1. [To get a certificate] “implies an acknowledgement that religious rulers had a right to set one sect over another, which they did not have.” 2. Civil rulers have no right to impose religious taxes. 3. Such practice emboldens the “actors to assume God’s prerogative.” 4. For the church, which is presented as a chaste virgin to Christ, to place her trust and love upon others for temporal support is playing the harlot. 5. “By the law of Christ every man is not only allowed but also required to judge for himself concerning the circumstantial as well as the essentials of religion, and to act according to the full persuasion of his own mind.” The practice tends to envy, hypocrisy, and confusion, and the ruin of civil society.41

“An Appeal to the Public” was Pietistic America’s declaration of spiritual independence. Like Jefferson’s Declaration three years later, it contained a legal brief against a long train of abuses, a theoretical defense of principle, and a moral argument for civil disobedience.44 No answer was ever given to “An Appeal to the Public” which was published in Boston. The collection of taxes for support of the established religion continued with confiscation of property and imprisonments occurring.45

Attempts to gain religious freedom continued. The Warren Association sent Isaac Backus to the Continental Congress in 1774 where he met with an Association of other Baptist churches from several adjacent colonies which had elected a large committee to assist. They presented their appeal for religious liberty. John Adams and Samuel Adams, neither of whom was a friend to separation of church and state, falsely asserted that Massachusetts had only a “very slender” establishment, hardly to be called an establishment, that the General Court was clear of blame and always there to hear complaints and grant reasonable help.46 While Mr. Backus was gone, the lie was spread that he had gone to Philadelphia to break the union of the colonies.

All the time these happenings were going on, the issues were being debated in the newspapers. The Warren Association continued to publish to the public instances of persecution as well as to actively seek religious liberty from the government. The Warren Association presented a memorial on July 19, 1775 requesting religious liberty and pointing out the inconsistency of rebelling against England for taxing without representation while doing the same thing in the colonies. Ultimately, nothing came of this. In 1777, Mr. Backus prepared an address which was supported by a large number from various denominations urging religious liberty to the Assembly which had been empowered to frame a new Constitution which was accomplished in 1780. The Third Article of the new constitution “excluded all subordination of one religious sect to another,” but imprisonment, and confiscation of property from men who refused to acknowledge such subordination continued.47

In 1778 Mr. Backus wrote “Government and Liberty Described and Ecclesiastical Tyranny Exposed.” He quoted Charles Chauncy:

“We are in principle against all civil establishments in religion. It does not appear to us that God has entrusted the State with a right to make religious establishments.... We claim no right to desire the interposition of the State to establish that mode of worship, [church] government, or discipline we apprehend is most agreeable to the mind of Christ. We
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desire no other liberty than to be left unrestrained in the exercise of our principles in so far as we are good members of society.” This, said Backus, was all that Baptists asked.  

“Perhaps as a result of this tract, the General Assembly tried to conciliate the Baptists by appointing a Baptist minister to deliver the election sermon in May, 1779. That minister, in his sermon, remained faithful to the principle of separation.”  

Massachusetts began efforts to adopt a new constitution in 1777. The proposed constitution was defeated, but a new effort which began in 1779 proved successful. John Adams worked against the Baptist position at the convention. Mr. Backus, although not a delegate, went to Boston to stand for Baptist principles during the constitutional convention. He lobbied, wrote newspaper articles, published new tracts, and informed his brethren of what was going on.  

Mr. Backus worked at the convention for a Bill of Rights. The first basic rights he listed were:

“All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent and unalienable rights, among which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.”

“As God is the only worthy object of all religious worship, and nothing can be true religion but a voluntary obedience unto his revealed will, of which each rational soul has an equal right to judge for itself; every person has an unalienable right to act in all religious affairs according to the full persuasion of his own mind, where others are not injured thereby. And civil rulers are so far from having any right to empower any person or persons to judge for others in such affairs, and to enforce their judgments with the sword, that their power ought to be exerted to protect all persons and societies, within their jurisdiction, from being injured or interrupted in the free enjoyment of his right, under any pretence whatsoever.”

Backus’ position, although seeking the same end, was from a different point of view than that of George Mason, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison.

“Three years earlier George Mason, with Jefferson’s approval and Madison’s amendments, had written a statement on religious freedom into the Bill of Rights in the Virginia Constitution:

“That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.’

“Backus’s tone was that of a New Light pietist; Mason’s that of an Enlightened latitudinarian. The Virginians spoke of the ‘Creator,’ Backus spoke of ‘God.’ Mason stressed reason and duty, Backus stressed ‘religious worship.’ Backus referred directly to God’s ‘revealed will’ and to the ‘soul.’ Mason omitted any reference to them.

“The difference was obvious and fundamental. The Virginia separationists were interested in leaving the mind free to follow its own rational direction. The Massachusetts pietists believed that separation was necessary in order to leave the ‘rational soul’ free to find ‘true religion’ as expressed in the Bible, ‘the revealed will’ of God. Implicit in both
The humanistic view of Mason, Jefferson, and Madison, that man, through his reason could successfully address all his problems, and the humanistic goal of the “happiness of man” were inherent in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the two greatest governing documents of all time, although blended with biblical principles. The goal of “the glory of God” was not in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution.\(^53\)

The Warren Association, on September 13, 1780, published a remonstrance, authored by Mr. Backus, against Article Three of that proposed constitution stating, among other things, that the provision therein requiring the majority of each parish “the exclusive right of covenanting for the rest with religious teachers,” thereby granting a power no man has a right to; and further stating that “the Legislature, by this Article, are empowered to compel both civil and religious societies to make what they shall judge to be suitable provision for religious teachers in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.”\(^54\) But support for ministry could only be through voluntary support, not coercion which denied freedom of conscience. Backus and other Baptists “did not object to the view that Massachusetts should remain a Christian commonwealth; piety, religion, and morality could only be maintained with the institution of the public worship of God and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality” were “generally diffused throughout the community.”\(^55\)

“Jefferson, Mason, and Madison, designing the creation of a secular state, not only opposed all such practices but also objected to the use of chaplains in the Congress and armed forces, the authorization by the state of certain days of fasting, thanksgiving, and prayer; and the compulsory religious services in state universities. Jefferson explicitly stated that America was not and ought not to be a Christian country…. Backus never qualified his belief in a Christian commonwealth. He consistently argued for ‘a sweet harmony between’ Church and State. ‘It is readily granted,’ he wrote in 1784, ‘that piety, religion, and morality are essentially necessary for the good order of civil society.’”\(^56\)

The Baptists fought on. They took their case to the courts. Attleboro, Massachusetts assessed a religious tax on everyone. Some members of a Baptist church in Attleboro refused to file a certificate and refused to pay the tax. The property of some was sold to pay the tax. Elijah Balkcom, after being arrested, paid the tax under protest, then sued to test the constitutionality of Article Three. They won an initial victory in county court.

However, the case was overturned two years later on appeal of the favorable trial court decision in the case of Cutter v. Frost. Cutter also held that only incorporated religious societies were entitled to legal recognition. Since most, if not all, of the Baptist churches in Massachusetts were unincorporated, they were

\(^{52}\) Ibid., pp. 142-144.

\(^{53}\) Again, the Constitution is the greatest governing document ever conceived by a nation, but the biblical principle of “leaven”—bad doctrine always corrupts the good—has proven again, by the national experience, to be true. To understand and address a problem, one must be willing to face all the facts head on.


\(^{56}\) Ibid., pp. 149-150.
not qualified for exemption. A lawyer advised Mr. Backus and the grievance committee to file the certificates, pay their taxes, and sue if the parish treasurer refused to turn the money over to their own pastor. The committee voted to follow this advice, Mr. Backus casting the lone negative vote. This was a reversal of the 1773 stand against giving of the certificates. “The spirit of the times did not call for martyrdom and fanaticism. The other members of the committee were more interested in improving the status and respectability of their denomination.”

As a result, three cases were brought in three different courts and the Baptists prevailed at trial court and on appeal. In other cases over the years, much time and expense was expended to get tax money earmarked for Baptist ministers. One case required fourteen lawsuits before the town treasurer yielded the taxes. In some towns, when it was shown the Baptists would sue, the “Standing Order” ceased to argue the matter.

Mr. Backus, being disappointed with his twelve-year battle against certificates, turned his zeal to other outlets—to fighting the threat to Baptist doctrines.

As new Baptist churches continued to be constituted, and the number of Baptists continued to increase, the persecution continued in Connecticut. In 1784 Connecticut made a new law continuing the support of established ministers by taxation. However, another act exempted all persons from that tax who filed a certificate to the effect that they regularly attended and supported worship services in any type of gospel ministry. Mr. Backus said of this act, “[I]s not this a mark of the beast? ... Blood hath ever followed the support of worship by the sword of the magistrate.... And how can any man keep himself unsotted from the world, if he forces the world to support his worship?”

Then, in May of 1791, Connecticut passed an addition to the ineffectual law of 1784 which held that “no certificate could be legal, until it was approbated by two justices of the peace, or only by one, if there was no more in the town where the dissenter lived,” and that such certificate was ineffective as to taxes granted before the certificate was lodged. However, after a remonstrance and petition were presented, the law was repealed in October 1791 and another law made to allow every man to give in his own certificate, if he dissented from the ruling sect.

The quest for religious freedom in Connecticut continued until 1818 when state support was withdrawn from the Congregationalist Church.

---

57 Ibid., pp. 160-161; see Backus’ reaction to the decision in the Balkcom case in McLoughlin, Isaac Backus on Church, State, and Calvinism, “A Door Opened for Christian Liberty,” pp. 428-438.
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Chapter 8
From New England to the South

By 1755 only a few Baptist churches had been constituted in the South. This was about to change. The change came partly as a result of the Great Awakening.

Shubal Stearns and Daniel Marshall, both members of Congregationalist churches in Connecticut, separated from the established churches, later became Baptists, as had Isaac Backus, and became chief instruments in carrying the Great Awakening to the South. The Separates were subject to persecution—fines, imprisonment, placing in stocks, and whipping—for their defiance of the laws of the commonwealth. They were subjected to a more intense persecution than the dissenters such as Baptists and Quakers, and many of them were imprisoned for practicing their beliefs.

Shubal Stearns was born in Boston on January 28, 1706. His family moved to Connecticut in his youth and joined the Congregational church in Tolland. He was converted to New Light views in 1745 as a result of the Whitefield revival. Mr. Stearns led others in his church to become a Separate church. After a thorough study of the Scriptures, he declared himself a Baptist and was baptized.

Daniel Marshall was born in 1706 in Windsor. He became a prosperous farmer and a deacon in the established Congregational church. Deeply affected by George Whitefield, by 1747 he was a Separate; and by 1751 he, along with Shubal Sterns, was a radical Separate.

George Whitefield’s preaching had a grand effect on his converts. A “twofold conviction was borne in and upon the hearts of the Separates around 1750.” Since all men can be saved, the urgency of missions and the need for men to hear the gospel now was impressed upon their hearts. “Love for [all] others, said Whitefield, stands alongside aversion to sin, a spirit of supplication, and a spirit of conquest over the world as a mark of having the Holy Spirit.”

In 1751 or 1752, as had others before him, Mr. Marshall set out with his wife and three children and possibly with one other couple, with no prospect of material reward, to minister to the Indians in New York. They settled at the Indian town of Onnaquaggy, but had to leave after eighteen months because strife among the Indians caused by the French and English struggle and attempts to gain the support of various tribes disrupted his work and threatened his family. He went to Connogogig, Pennsylvania for a short stay, then moved to Opekon, Virginia. He was baptized by the pastor of Mill Creek Baptist Church. His powerful preaching ability was recognized and a revival ensued.

Shubal Stearns and his wife, along with five other families, possessed with missionary zeal, left Tolland, Connecticut in August, 1754. They moved to

---

1 Lumpkin, p. 21.
2 Ibid., pp. 21-23.
Virginia where they were greeted by Daniel Marshall. They settled in Cacapon Creek, Virginia, but did not stay there long. Members of some neighboring churches (later called “Regular” Baptist churches), which upheld dignity and orderliness in worship, were upset with the “noisy and emotional preaching of the Separates,” by some of the preaching, which “may have suggested Armenianism to them,” and by “the prominent place occupied by women in some Separate meetings which hinted at disorder.” Also, in 1755 the Indians broke into open hostility. Consequently, Mr. Stearns and his party moved to Sandy Creek, North Carolina, “a strategic center from which he could itinerate to a growing and spiritually destitute population.”5 There they constituted the Sandy Creek Church with Mr. Stearns as minister and Daniel Marshall and Joseph Breed as assistant ministers.

Mr. Stearns immediately began to preach. People from neighboring farms began to attend, for the first time hearing the doctrine of the new birth.

“The enthusiastic manner of preaching, too, was unprecedented. Stearns’ delivery was warm and appealing, full of persuasive zeal, not at all the commonplace, lecture-type discourses which the people had formerly heard. Strong gestures and a fervent plea told the people that the preacher was intensely involved in his message. It was obvious he wanted a verdict.

“The preachers deep feeling and personality passed to the members of the church and from them to the visitors. The music in the little pastor’s voice soon penetrated every heart, and his piercing, discursive eye seemed to peer into every soul. The tears, trembling, and shouts of the members quickly affected the visitors, and from the little meetinghouse a tumult of grief at sin and joy at salvation ascended to heaven. Men who came to the meetings to mock returned home praising and glorifying God. The church began to grow!

“Then the Separates knew that they had found their home and that God’s will was being perfected in them. The heart of their little community held a plan worthy of the heart of an empire.”6

The population of North Carolina was growing rapidly. People were coming from Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania; and large families were common. Although the Church of England was established by law in 1701 in North Carolina, it had a feeble career there, and the colony gained a reputation as an asylum for the religiously persecuted. By 1755 the population of North Carolina was nearly a hundred thousand.7

The Quakers preached the first sermon in North Carolina in 1672 and were the earliest dissenters. The Moravians also flourished there. The Anglicans were few in number, had only one or two ministers in the colony at any given time, and were looked upon with indifference and hostility by the people of North Carolina. Except for the Quakers and Moravians, until the middle of the eighteenth century, “[r]eligious concerns among the early dissenters were doomed to steady decline because of the shortage of churches, religious instruction, and pastors.”8

The work at Sandy Creek soon began to produce much fruit. Mr. Stearns and the other preachers in his church were in great demand to go preach at other settlements. He and Daniel Marshall decided, before having been at Sandy Creek a year, to go on a preaching mission all the way to the coast. Converts

5 Ibid., pp. 28-30.
6 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
7 Ibid., pp. 33-34, citing G. W. Paschal, History of North Carolina Baptists (Raleigh: General Board of North Carolina Baptist State Convention, 1930), I, pp. 252-254.
8 Ibid., pp. 34-36.
were being called into ministry, and the Separate Baptist movement was seeing the birth of new churches. Within three years, there were three churches with a combined membership of over nine hundred, and these churches had numerous branches. Young evangelists were “beginning to occupy the land of promise.” In 1758, the Sandy Creek Association was organized. The plan for the association “required careful planning, for the associational movement would usher in a grand new chapter in Separate Baptist expansion.”

The movement exploded. Ministers and converts went all over North Carolina, then into South Carolina and Georgia. The power of God was with these Separate Baptist preachers. Churches were planted and many were converted. In North Carolina, the Anglicans and the Presbyterians were displaced by the Baptists. Daniel Marshall went to South Carolina with some others in his church and started a church there. From there, he went on preaching trips into Georgia. He was so successful in some of his forays there that he was arrested, convicted, and commanded to preach no more in Georgia. “The arresting constable and even the magistrate who tried Marshall were soon converted and baptized.” In 1771 Mr. Marshall moved to Kiokee Creek, Georgia and formed the first Baptist church in Georgia at Appling in 1772.

In 1771 the so-called War of the Regulation broke out. The government of North Carolina tried to suppress the Separate Baptists, but succeeded only in spreading their movement all along the southern frontier. Before the suppression began, the established church, the Anglican Church, was ineffectual in North Carolina and only had five ministers in the state in 1765.

Before 1765 the western counties, made up of frontiersmen, a large percentage of whom had become Baptists, were disproportionately taxed and represented in the Assembly. “Sheriffs, judges, and other officials of county government, were notorious for their injustice, and in the western counties they were, as a rule, dishonest, haughty, and overbearing.” A license was required for teachers, and no place of higher education could be administered, except by ministers of the Church of England. The Church of England was given exclusive rights to perform marriages. In 1755, poll and vestry taxes were imposed upon North Carolinians. The settlers mounted protests against these injustices.

When William Tryon became governor of North Carolina in 1765, the troubles moved quickly to a crisis. Governor Tryon set out to strengthen the position of the Church of England. He called for twenty-seven more Anglican clergymen and increased taxes and raised a military force. By 1770, Governor Tryon had established eighteen Anglican priests in thirty-two parishes in North Carolina. Property was seized for back taxes, people accused of rioting were arrested and set for trial, and others were fined and imprisoned. “In several places the Regulators yielded to mob spirit, broke up courts, and whipped the officers” and “some court records were destroyed.” Armed conflict finally broke out. On May 16, 1771, a poorly trained and supplied force of two thousand regulators was routed by the state militiamen. Although Shubal Stearns and the Sandy Creek Association forbade Baptists to take up arms against the government, many did.

---
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After the defeat of the regulators, Tryon “laid waste to plantations, burned homes, and sent numbers of men in chains to Hillsboro. The countryside was terrorized.”\textsuperscript{14} Tryon seized Benjamin Merrill, who appears to have been a church leader. Merrill was convicted as a traitor, hung publicly, cut into pieces—quartered—and his body scattered.\textsuperscript{15}

The Baptists had a mass exodus from North Carolina. By 1772, Sandy Creek Church had only fourteen members, down from six hundred and six. Little River Church went from five hundred to a dozen members. But as with the persecution of the first Christians in Jerusalem, the persecuted spread to other parts and carried out the Great Commission—the departing Baptists went into South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee, spreading the Gospel and reaping the harvest. What Satan meant for evil, God used for His glory.

Shubal Stearns, the chief light and the guiding genius behind the Separate Baptist movement, died on November 20, 1771 at the age of sixty-five. Forty-two churches and one hundred and twenty-five ministers had sprung from the Sandy Creek Church by 1772. Fires had been started in North Carolina and in other states, which could not be quenched.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 83.
\textsuperscript{15} Beller, America in Crimson Red, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{16} Lumpkin, p. 59.
Chapter 9
To Virginia

Although the final expression of religious freedom that would be incorporated into the Constitution came from Virginia, the final motivation came as a result of the convictions of the dissenters, mainly the Baptists, and the thrust for their growth and influence came from the Great Awakening.

"[T]he early Baptists of Virginia, … while they could not boast of great wealth, or culture, or refinement, they possessed some things of more real value, and which the Commonwealth greatly needed. In the first place they had religion—genuine religion; not a sham, nor an empty form, but the old time religion of the heart. Then they had a personal worth or character, that character which always follows from having genuine religion. And then, again, those early Baptists had an unquenchable love of liberty. The truth of the New Testament makes men free indeed, and it inspires them with a love of freedom, not for themselves only, but for all men. And it was because they possessed these traits that they resisted the temptations of the General Incorporation and General Assessment, and stood their ground amid the general desertion. They resolved to continue to fight."¹

The conflict in Virginia originally involved the Anglicans and Presbyterians, neither of which originally believed in either religious freedom or separation of church and state. Religious freedom and separation are owed mainly to the Baptists who believed in both. What Jefferson and Madison wrote about and did for religious freedom[,] although leavened with enlightenment principles[,] resulted from their observance of the conflict among “Christians” and is not to be found in the pages of philosophers of the enlightenment.²

"The Presbyterians [in Virginia] won religious liberty for themselves against the opposition of the Episcopalians. Next the Baptists won religious liberty for themselves against the opposition of the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians. By 1775 about three quarters of the people of Virginia were outside the Church of England, but many of the most influential Virginians were inside. When the war started, there were ninety-five Anglican parishes in Virginia. The war killed off at least a quarter of them. Nowhere in the colonies was Tory sentiment stronger than among the Anglican clergy of Virginia, and they found themselves at the gravest of odds with their flocks.³

The Episcopal church, the Church of England, in Virginia was established from the founding of Jamestown in 1607.

“It was known, also, as the ‘Established Church,’ because it was made, by legal enactment, the church of the State and was supported by taxation. Not only so, but it was designed to be the established church, to the exclusion of all others. Rigid laws, with severe penalties affixed, were passed, having for their object the exclusion of all Dissenters from the colony, and the compelling of conformity to the established, or State, religion. Even after the Revolution of 1688, which placed William and Mary upon the throne of England and secured the passage of the ‘Act of Toleration’ the following year, the ‘General Court of the Colony’ of Virginia construed that act to suit themselves, and withheld its benefits from Dissenters … until they were compelled to yield to the force of circumstances.”⁴

¹ James, Appendix A, pp. 207-208.
² See, e.g., Marnell, pp. 89-90.
³ Ibid., p. 93.
⁴ James, pp. 10-11.
The Church of England was stronger in Virginia than in any colony.

In Virginia, the established Anglican church was controlled by the state, unlike in New England where the established church controlled the state. From the beginning of the colony, the “company knew not how to control the members composing the colony but by religion and law.” The original “Lawes Divine, Moral and Martial” which were decreed in 1612, were severe. Speaking impiously of the Trinity or of God the Father, Son, or Holy Spirit, blaspheming God, incorrigibly cursing, a third failure to attend religious services, and a third “Sabbath-breaking,” were punishable by death. Other spiritual offenses were punished by whipping and other penalties.

These laws were repealed upon appeal to England, and the laws enacted in support of the Anglican establishment were less severe. Still, the Anglican church was established (and this establishment continued until the revolution with one short interruption), nonattendance at church services was the subject of fines, the payment of tithes were mandatory, every parson was entitled to the glebe—a piece of land—parish churches were built by taxes, and ministers were required to “conform themselves in all things according to the canons of the Church of England.”

“Puritan clergy were banished for failing to conform to Anglican services; Quakers [and Baptists] were fined, imprisoned, and banished. Catholics were disqualified for public office, and any priest who ventured to enter the colony was subject to instant expulsion. Penalties were imposed on those who having scruples against infant baptism, neglected to present their children for that purpose.”

A 1643 law forbade anyone to teach or preach religion, publicly or privately, who was not a minister of the Church of England, and instructed governor and council to expel all nonconformists from the colony. In 1643, three Congregationalist ministers from Boston were forced to leave the colony. Also in 1643, “Sir William Berkeley, Royal Governor of Virginia, strove, by whippings and brandings, to make the inhabitants of that colony conform to the Established church, and thus drove out the Baptists and Quakers, who found a refuge in … North Carolina.” Quakers first came to Virginia in “1659-60, and … the utmost degree of persecution was exercised towards them.” “During the period of the Commonwealth in England, there had been a kind of interregnum as to both Church and State in Virginia; but in 1661, the supremacy of the Church of England was again fully established.” Only ministers of the Church of England were permitted to preach, and only ministers of that church could “celebrate the rites of matrimony,” and only “according to the ceremony prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.”

Although some Presbyterians settled in Virginia from 1670 to 1680, the number & influence of Presbyterians in Virginia was small until the mid-1700s. In the mid-1700s an influential body of Presbyterians settled in Hanover County as a result of a 1738 agreement between the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia.
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and Virginia governor William Gooch which allowed “emigrants to occupy the frontier portions of Virginia and enjoy the benefits of the Act of Toleration.”  

The first non-Anglican minister to receive a license under the Act of Toleration passed by the British Parliament in 1689, which instructed liberty of conscience for all but Papists, was Francis Makemie, a Presbyterian minister in Accomac County. By 1725, no more than five conventicles, “three small meetings of Quakers and two of Presbyterians,” were licensed, and these in poorer counties who were unable to pay the established minister enough to stay. In 1725, a similar license was granted to “certain parties (doubtless Presbyterians)” in Richmond County.  

Presbyterian families from Pennsylvania and Maryland began to move to remote parts of Virginia on the western frontier in 1738. The Presbyterian Synod of Pennsylvania wrote Governor Gooch of Virginia asking for religious freedom for those Presbyterians. Governor Gooch, knowing these people “to be firm, enterprising, hardy, brave, good citizens and soldiers,” and desiring “to form a complete line of defense against the savage inroads,” welcomed them. “At so great a distance from the older settlements, he anticipated no danger to the established church.” The conditions of settlement were that they “were not only to settle in the frontier counties as a buffer between the Churchmen and the Indians, but they had to swear allegiance to ‘His Magestys’s person and government,’” pay the taxes levied in support of the Established Church, and never by word or deed seek to injure the said church…. “Houses for public worship could not be occupied without permission from the civil authorities, and each application for a house of worship was heard on its own merits.” “[Those early Presbyterians] did not break their promise nor violate their oaths.” Up to the Revolution, “they never demanded anything more than their rights under the Act of Toleration, and … not until the Revolution was accomplished, and Virginia had thrown off allegiance to Great Britain, did they (the Presbyterians) strike hands with the Baptists in the effort to pull down the Establishments.” However, with the fury of the French and Indian War which broke out in 1755, Presbyterians east of the Blue Ridge occupied houses of worship without license or molestation.  

Different bodies of Baptists came to Virginia during the colonial period. The “Regular Baptists,” like the Presbyterians, “applied for license and took the prescribed oaths.” As for the “Separate Baptists,” the “body spread so rapidly throughout the State from 1755 to the … Revolution,” and “did not recognize the right of any civil power to regulate preaching or places of meeting.” They were the “most active in evangelizing Virginia and most severely persecuted, and … had the largest share of the work of pulling down the ‘Establishment’ and securing religious liberty for all.” “While yielding a ready obedience to the civil authorities in all civil affairs, in matters of religion they recognized no lord but Christ. They were truly apostolic in refusing to obey man rather than God.”  

Conditions were favorable for the rapid growth of Baptist principles. “First, the distress of the colonists, consequent upon the French and Indian wars, inclined them towards religion.” Secondly, the distressed people could find no solace or comfort in the immoral established clergy.

10 Ibid., pp. 11-12.
11 Ibid., pp. 20-22.
13 Ibid., pp. 12-14, 26.
“The great success and rapid increase of the Baptists in Virginia must be ascribed primarily to the power of God working with them. Yet it cannot be denied but that there were subordinate and cooperating causes; one of which, and the main one, was the loose and immoral deportment of the Established clergy, by which the people were left almost destitute of even the shadow of true religion. ‘Tis true, they had some outward forms of worship, but the essential principles of Christianity were not only not understood among them, but by many never heard of. Some of the cardinal precepts of morality were discarded, and actions plainly forbidden by the New Testament were often proclaimed by the clergy as harmless and innocent, or, at worst, foibles of but little account. Having no discipline, every man followed the bent of his own inclination. It was not uncommon for the rectors of parishes to be men of the lowest morals. The Baptist preachers were, in almost every respect, the reverse of the Established clergy.”  

The bad character and actions of the established clergy are proven by their own authorities. Many of that clergy came to Virginia “to retrieve either lost fortune or lost character....” “Many of them had been addicted to the race-field, the card-table, the theatre—nay, more, to drunken revel, etc....” “They could babble in a pulpit, roar in a tavern, exact from their parishioners, and rather by their dissoluteness destroy than feed the flock.”  

The Baptists grew stronger and more numerous in Virginia. The first Baptist church in Virginia was established in 1714 by Robert Nordin who arrived from England. By 1755, there were six Baptist churches in Virginia.  

1758 to 1769 was a period of slow but persistent growth in the face of a determined popular hostility. The early opposition to the Baptists came from the lower classes and was based upon prejudice. 

The Virginia expansion was intimately tied up with the ministry of Colonel Samuel Harris. Harris who served at various times as church warden, sheriff, justice of the peace, colonel of the county, and captain and commissary of Fort Mayo and its military garrison, was the first person of prominence to join the Separates in Virginia and was just one of many examples of the power of this movement. He was saved at a house meeting after hearing a sermon preached by a Separate Baptist from North Carolina. He resigned from his official positions and narrowed his business interests almost to the vanishing point in order to preach. He began to preach throughout Virginia, and many were converted as a result of his ministry. 

Harris was a fearless preacher. “The excellence of his preaching lay chiefly in ‘addressing the heart,’ and Semple holds that ‘perhaps even Whitefield did not surpass him in this.’” He had the assistance of several North Carolina itinerant evangelists planting the earliest Separate churches in south central Virginia. The Dan River Church was started in 1760 by Daniel Marshall and Philip Mulkey with seventy-four charter members, eleven of whom were Negroes. Other churches were soon constituted from the Dan River Church. 

Wherever the Baptist itinerants preached, great crowds came to hear them. Many were converted in Virginia, and many Baptist churches were started. In 1770, there were only two Separate churches north of the James River, four 
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south of it. The General Association of Separate Baptists of Virginia was held in May, 1771 in Orange County with twelve churches represented, and three not represented.

By 1772 the Separate Churches outnumbered those of the Regular churches. In that year, as many as forty thousand Virginians may have heard the gospel. By 1773 thirty-four churches were represented at the General Association meeting, and they reported a combined membership of 3,195. By May, 1774, when Baptist expansion and Baptist persecution were at high tide, the Southern District in Virginia had twenty-seven churches with 2,033 members and the Northern District had twenty-four churches with 1,921 members. By the end of 1774, there was at least one Separate Baptist church in twenty-eight of the sixty counties of Virginia. During the Revolution, Baptist growth continued, but at a much slower pace.\textsuperscript{20}

From 1768 through 1774, the Baptists were persecuted severely. “Baptist preachers were whipped, arrested, fined, imprisoned on bread and water, although the authorities sanctimoniously denied that punishment was for ‘preaching’; the crime they said, was ‘breach of the peace.’”\textsuperscript{21} The first instance of actual imprisonment was on June 4, 1768 when John Waller, Lewis Craig, James Childs, James Reed, and William Marsh were arrested at Craig’s meetinghouse in Spotsylvania and charged with disturbing the peace. The magistrates offered to release them if they would promise to preach no more for a year and a day. They refused and were jailed. Many more were jailed and otherwise persecuted until 1774.\textsuperscript{22}

\textquotedblleft[The persecutors] seemed sometimes to strive to treat the Baptists and their worship with as much rudeness and indecency as was possible. They often insulted the preacher in time of service, and would ride into the water and make sport when they administered baptism. They frequently fabricated and spread the most groundless reports, which were injurious to the characters of the Baptists. When any Baptist fell into any improper conduct, it was always exaggerated to the utmost extent.\textsuperscript{23}\right.

“The enemy, not contented with ridicule and defamation, manifested their abhorrence to the Baptists in another way. By a law then in force in Virginia, all were under obligation to go to church several times a year; the failure subjected them to fine. [Little action against members of the Established church was taken under this law, but] as soon as the ‘New Lights’ were absent, they were presented by grand jury, and fined…. [Others were imprisoned for preaching without a license.] ‘When persecutors found religion could not be stopped … by ridicule, defamation, and abusive language, the resolution was to take a different step and see what they could do; and the preachers in different places were apprehended by magisterial authority, some of whom were imprisoned and some escaped. Before this step was taken, the parson of the parish was consulted [and he advised that] the ‘New Lights’ ought to be taken up and imprisoned, as necessary for the peace and harmony of the old church….\textsuperscript{24}“

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., pp. 90-103.
\textsuperscript{22}James, pp. 29-30. Included is a listing of some of those jailed and otherwise persecuted. See also, Beller, \textit{America in Crimson Red}, pp. 230-250; Lumpkin, pp. 105-120; Grady, \textit{What Hath God Wrought}, Appendix A, pp. 593-598 citing Lewis Peyton Little, \textit{Imprisoned Preachers and Religious Liberty in Virginia}, (Galatin, Tenn.: Church History Research and Archives, 1987), pp. 516-520 (lists many Baptists and the persecutions they endured in Virginia; persecutions such as being jailed for preaching, civil suit, being annoyed by men drinking and playing cards, being jerked off stage and head beaten against the ground, hands being slashed, beaten with bludgeons, being shot with a shotgun, ousted as a justice for preaching, being brutally beaten by a mob, severely beaten with a stick, etc.).
\textsuperscript{23}James, p. 30, citing Semple, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., pp. 30-31, citing William Fristoe, “History of the Ketocton Baptist Association,” p. 69.
“[An Episcopalian wrote,] No dissenters in Virginia experienced, for a time, harsher treatment than did the Baptists. They were beaten and imprisoned, and cruelty taxed its ingenuity to devise new modes of punishment and annoyance.”25

As a result of the persecutions and oppressions, Baptists began to petition the House of Burgesses for relief. Their first petition in 1770 requesting that Baptist ministers “not be compelled to bear arms or attend musters” was rejected. Other petitions from Baptists in several counties were submitted in 1772 requesting that they “be treated with the same indulgence, in religious matters, as Quakers, Presbyterians, and other Protestant dissenters enjoy.” The petitions continued until 1775.26 The Presbyterians petitioned also, but for the right to incorporate so that they could receive and hold gifts of land and slaves for the support of their ministers. One of the Presbyterian petitions was improperly hailed as proof “that the Presbyterians anticipated the Baptists in their memorials asking for religious liberty.” An examination of that petition reveals that it “contemplate[d] nothing more than securing for Presbyterians and others in Virginia the same privileges and liberties which they enjoyed in England under the Act of Toleration,” and contained no “attack upon the Establishment, or any sign of hostility to it.”27

During this time, James Madison wrote to his old college friend, Bradford of Philadelphia in a letter dated January 24, 1774. He expressed his belief that if

“uninterrupted harmony had prevailed throughout the continent [in matters of established religion as practiced in Virginia] it is clear to me that slavery and subjection might and would have been gradually insinuated among us. Union of religious sentiments begets a surprising confidence, and ecclesiastical establishments tend to great ignorance and corruption, all of which facilitates the execution of mischievous projects…. Poverty and luxury prevail among all sorts; pride, ignorance, and knavery among the priesthood, and vice and wickedness among the laity. This is bad enough; but it is not the worst I have to tell you. That diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution rages among some, and to their eternal infamy, the clergy can furnish their quota of imp's for such purposes. There are at this time in the adjacent country not less than five or six well-meaning men in close jail for publishing their religious sentiments, which in the main are very orthodox. I have neither patience to hear, talk, or think of anything relative to this matter; for I have squabbled and scolded, abused and ridiculed, so long about it to little purpose, that I am without common patience…. So I must beg you to pity me, and pray for liberty of conscience to all.”28

[In another letter to Bradford dated April 1, 1774, Madison wrote that he doubted that anything would be done to help the dissenters in the Assembly meeting beginning May 1, 1774.] He spoke of “the incredible and extravagant stories [which were] told in the House of the monstrous effects of the enthusiasm prevalent among the sectaries, and so greedily swallowed by their enemies…. And the bad name they still have with those who pretend too much contempt to examine into their principles and conduct, and are too much devoted to ecclesiastical establishment to hear of the toleration of the dissentents…. The liberal, catholic, and equitable way of thinking, as to the rights of conscience, which is one of the characteristics of a free people, and so strongly marks the people of your province, is little known among the zealous adherents to our hierarchy…. [Although we have some persons of generous principles in the legislature] the clergy are a numerous and powerful body, have great influence at home by reason of their connection with and dependence on the bishops and crown, and will naturally employ all their arts and interest to depress their rising adversaries; for such they must consider dissentents, who rob them of the good will of the people, and may in time endanger their lifings and security.

25 Ibid., citing Dr. Hawks, “History of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Virginia,” p. 121.
26 Ibid., pp. 31-35.
27 Ibid., pp. 42-47.
28 Ibid., p. 36.
“… Religious bondage shackles and debilitates the mind, and unfits if for every enterprise, every expanded prospect.”

1775 closed the period of “Intolerance, Toleration, and Persecution.”

“The colony is involved in trouble with the mother country. Virginia has denounced the ‘Boston Port Bill,’ and made common cause with Massachusetts. The First Continental Congress has already met in Philadelphia. Patrick Henry has electrified the country by his memorable speech in the popular Convention which met March, 1775. ... The Battles of Lexington and Concord have been fought (April 19), and Virginia has taken steps to enroll companies of volunteers in every county. The war of the Revolution is on, and the times call for union and harmony among all classes. Hence, there is no more persecution of Baptists. There are no more imprisonments in 1775, and that obnoxious Toleration Bill is indefinitely postponed. The same ruling class that admitted the Presbyterians to Virginia and to the benefits of the Act of Toleration, on condition that they occupied the frontier counties, and thus protected them against Indian raids, are now inclined to tolerate, not only the Presbyterians, but the Baptists also, with all their ‘pernicious doctrines,’ if only they will help in the struggle with Great Britain. The Baptists will help, and not a Tory will be found among them. But they will strike for something more and something dearer to them than civil liberty—for freedom of conscience, for ‘just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty.’”

The Baptists were ready to push for religious freedom and abolition of the establishment. In their Association meeting on the fourth Saturday of May, 1775, “they were to a man favorable to any revolution by which they could obtain freedom of religion. They had known from experience that mere toleration was not a sufficient check, having been imprisoned at a time when that law was considered by many as being in force.” They decided to circulate petitions throughout the state calling for abolition of the church establishment and freedom of religion, and also to appoint commissioners to present their address for military resistance to British oppression and “offering the services of their young men as soldiers and asking only that, so far as the army was concerned, their ministers might enjoy like privileges with the clergy of the Established church” to the State Convention which was the House of Burgess under a new name and in a different character. The Convention, still controlled by “the same class that had, a few years before made concessions to the ... Presbyterians on condition that they settle on the western counties forming a line of defense against the Indians, resolved to allow those dissenters in the military who so desired to attend divine worship administered by dissenting preachers. This first step towards placing all Virginia clergy on an equal footing, came as a result of the need for the numerical strength of the Baptists in what was considered by the establishment in 1775 a “struggle for their rights ‘in the union’ [with England].” The Convention maintained their “faith and true allegiance to His Majesty, George the Third, [their] only lawful and rightful King.” “It would have been very impolitic, even if their petitions had been ready, to have sprung the question of disestablishment upon [the Convention] before they had committed themselves to the cause of independence.”

Virginia adopted a new constitution in 1776. The Convention of 1776 was, by its act, made the “House of Delegates” of the first General Assembly under the new constitution. There were twenty-nine new members in this meeting that were not in the 1775 Convention. “[W]hen there was anything near a division
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among the other inhabitants in a county, the Baptists, together with their influence, gave a caste to the scale, by which means many a worthy and useful member was lodged in the House of Assembly and answered a valuable purpose there.”32 Among those favorable to Baptist causes was James Madison. On May 12, the Congress met in Philadelphia “and instructed the colonies to organize independent governments of their own. The war was on.” On May 15, the Convention resolved to declare the “colonies free and independent states” and that a committee be appointed to prepare Declaration of Rights and a plan of government which would “maintain peace and order” and “secure substantial and equal liberty to the people.”33

Other than Rhode Island, Virginia was the first colony to recognize religious liberty “in her organic law, and this she did in Article XVI. of her Bill of Rights, which was adopted on the 12th day of June, 1776.”34 In 1776 the Virginia state convention was beset by petitions from all over Virginia seeking religious freedom and freedom of conscience. Patrick Henry proposed the provision to section sixteen of the Virginia Bill of Rights which granted religious tolerance.35 On June 12 the House adopted a Declaration of Rights. The 16th Article provided for religious tolerance. However, on motion on the floor by James Madison, the article was amended to provide for religious liberty. In committee, Madison opposed toleration because toleration “belonged to a system where there was an established church, and where it was a thing granted, not of right, but of grace. He feared the power, in the hands of a dominant religion, to construe what ‘may disturb the peace, the happiness, or the safety of society,’ and he ventured to propose a substitute, which was finally adopted.”36 He probably moved to change the amendment before the whole house in order to demonstrate his position to the Baptists who were viewing the proceedings. The proposed amendment read:

“That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.”37

“The adoption of the Bill of Rights marked the beginning of the end of the establishment.”38

Where did Madison learn the distinction between religious freedom and religious toleration?

“It had not then begun to be recognized in treatises on religion and morals. He did not learn it from Jeremy Taylor or John Locke, but from his Baptist neighbors, whose wrongs he had witnessed, and who persistently taught that the civil magistrate had nothing to do with matters of religion.”39

Madison studied for the ministry at Princeton University, then the College of New Jersey, under John Witherspoon. When he returned to Virginia, he
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38 Pfeffer, p. 96.
39 James, p. 63 quoting Dr. John Long.
continued his theological interests and developed a strong concern for freedom of worship.

“At the time of Madison’s return from Princeton, several ‘well-meaning men,’ as he described them, were put in prison for their religious views. Baptists were being fined or imprisoned for holding unauthorized meetings. Dissenters were taxed for the support of the State Church. Preachers had to be licensed. Madison saw at first hand the repetition of the main evils of the Old Country. But he also saw a deep dissatisfaction among the people—the kind of dissatisfaction that would grow and that would serve as a mighty battering ram for religious freedom.”

It appears that the Baptists were the only denomination of Christians that addressed the 1775 and 1776 conventions on the subject of the rights of conscience. Not until the Revolution in Virginia were the Presbyterians free from the agreement with Governor Gooch. When the Assembly met in October 1776, they were “powerful allies of the Baptists and other dissenters in the war against the Establishment.”

“From that time down to January 19, 1786, when Jefferson’s ‘Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom,’ became the law of the State, the battle for soul liberty was on,” and the process of disestablishment gathered momentum. The legislature of 1776 repealed the laws punishing heresy and absence from worship and exempted dissenters from paying taxes for support of the Church. Although this bill was a compromise, it sounded the death knell of the Anglican establishment. A later statute removed the law fixing the salaries of clergymen, and the position of the Established church was limited more and more until the Declaratory Act of 1787 ended establishment in Virginia.

“From 1776 to 1779 the assembly was engaged almost daily in the desperate contests between the contending factions.” Whereas only one Baptist petition had been presented to the first Convention in 1776, and that after the adoption of the Bill of Rights, the Legislature which assembled on October 7, 1776 was immediately flooded with petitions both for and against establishment. “None of the petitions against establishment were from Baptists as such. However, historians of the times admit that Baptists ‘were not only the first to begin the work, but also the most active in circulating petitions for signatures.’” Among the signers were some of all denominations of Christians, and many of no denomination. This explains why the Baptist petition or petitions were from dissenters in general, instead of from Baptist dissenters in particular.

The Reverend E. G. Robinson, in his review of Rives’ Life and Times of James Madison, Christian Review of January, 1860, said, “The [Presbyterians] argued their petitions on various grounds, and indeed sought for different degrees of religious freedom, while the [Baptists] were undeviating and uncompromising in their demands for a total exemption from every kind of legal restraint or interference in matters of religion.” The Methodists and the established church presented petitions for establishment.

---
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The established church did not give up. Thomas Jefferson gave an account of the struggle through which the Legislature, meeting in late 1776, had just passed:

“The first republican Legislature, which met in 1776, was crowded with petitions to abolish this spiritual tyranny. These brought on the severest contest in which I have ever been engaged… The petitions were referred to a Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Country; and, after desperate contests in the committee almost daily from the 11th of October to the 5th of December, we prevailed so far only as to repeal the laws which rendered criminal the maintenance of any religious opinions (other than those of the Episcopalian), the forbearance of repairing to the (Episcopal) church, or the exercise of any (other than the Episcopal) mode of worship; and to suspend only until the next session levies on the members of that church for the salaries of its own incumbents. For, although the majority of our citizens were dissenters, as has been observed, a majority of the legislature were churchmen. Among these, however, were some reasonable and liberal men, who enabled us on some points to obtain feeble majorities. But our opponents carried, in the general resolutions of November the 19th, a declaration that religious assemblies ought to be regulated, and that provision ought to be made for continuing the succession of the clergy and superintending their conduct. And in the bill now passed was inserted an express reservation of the question whether a general assessment should not be established by law on every one to the support of the pastor of his choice; or whether all should be left to voluntary contributions; and on this question, debated at every session from 1776 to 1779 (some of our dissenting allies, having now secured their particular object, going over to the advocates of a general assessment,) we could only obtain a suspension from session to session until 1779, when the question against a general assessment was finally carried, and the establishment of the Anglican church entirely put down.”

Legislative meetings from 1776 to December 1779 were presented with memorials both for and against establishment.\textsuperscript{49}

When the House met in June 1779, petitions presented to the Assembly showed that the old establishment and its friends were fighting for some sort of compromise on the basis of a general assessment. In 1779, the assembly repealed all laws requiring members of the Episcopal Church to contribute to the support of their own ministry.\textsuperscript{50} In December 1779, a bill passed which “cut the purse strings of the Establishment, so that the clergy could no longer look for support to taxation. But they still retained possession of the rich glebes, and enjoyed a monopoly, almost, of marriage fees.”\textsuperscript{51} It took until 1779 to pass a bill taking away tax support for the clergy because the dissenters, with the exception of the Baptists, “having been relieved from a tax which they felt to be both unjust and degrading, had no objection to a general assessment.”\textsuperscript{52}

“Jefferson sought to press the advantage, and introduced his Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, but Virginia was not quite ready to formalize the separation which had in effect taken place, and the bill was not voted on.”\textsuperscript{53} Instead “a bill was introduced which declared that “the Christian Religion shall in all times coming be deemed and held to be the established Religion of this Commonwealth.” This bill required everyone to register with the county clerk stating which church he wished to support.\textsuperscript{54}
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Although various petitions were presented to the Assembly during the period from 1780 until the end of the Revolution on September 3, 1783, the General Assembly did very little regarding the cause of religious liberty. In 1783 “the project … of incorporating, or establishing as the religion of the State, all the prevailing denominations, and assessing taxes upon the people to support the ministers of all alike, was now warmly advocated by Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Methodists, and becoming quite popular. To this scheme the Baptists still gave the most determined opposition, and sent up against it the most vigorous remonstrances.” The Baptists also continued to petition for the adoption of the Act to Establish Religious Freedom.55

After the Revolution, numerous petitions and memorials were presented to the House of Delegates in 1784 and 1785 by the above-mentioned denominations in support of their positions.56 The Episcopalians sought to recover lost ground. “In the late spring of 1784, a resolution was introduced in the Virginia Assembly seeking official recognition for the Episcopal Church. The resolution was debated for two days, with notable opposition from Baptists and Presbyterians.”57 Madison, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson dated July 3, 1784, wrote concerning this resolution:

“The Episcopal clergy introduced a notable project for re-establishing their independence of laity. The foundation of it was that the whole body should be legally incorporated, invested with the present property of the Church, made capable of acquiring indefinitely—empowered to make canons and by-laws not contrary to the laws of the land, and incumbents when once chosen by vestries, to be immovable otherwise than by sentence of the Convocation.”58

The Baptists continued their uncompromising stand against any vestige of union of church and state. They gave their reasons for their position against a general assessment:

“First, it was contrary to their principles and avowed sentiments, the making provision for the support of religion by law; that the distinction between civil and ecclesiastical governments ought to be kept up without blending them together; that Christ Jesus hath given laws for the government of his kingdom and direction of his subjects, and gave instruction concerning collections for the various purposes of religion, and therefore needs not legislative interference.

“Secondly, should a legislative body undertake to pass laws for the government of the church, for them to say what doctrines shall be believed, in what mode worship shall be performed, and what the sum collected shall be, what a dreadful precedent it would establish; for when such a right is claimed by a legislature, and given up by the people, by the same rule that they decide in one instance they may in every instance. Religion is like the press; if government limits the press, and says this shall be printed and that shall not, in the event it will destroy the freedom of the press; so when legislatures undertake to pass laws about religion, religion loses its form, and Christianity is reduced to a system of worldly policy.

“Thirdly, it has been believed by us that that Almighty Power that instituted religion will support his own cause; that in the course of divine Providence events will be overruled, and the influence of grace on the hearts of the Lord’s people will incline them to afford and contribute what is necessary for the support of religion, and therefore there is no need for compulsory measures.

“Fourthly, it would give an opportunity to the party that were numerous (and, of course, possessed the ruling power) to use their influence and exercise their art and
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cunning, and multiply signers to their own favorite party. And last, the most deserving, the faithful preacher, who in a pointed manner reproved sin and bore testimony against every species of vice and dissipation, would in all possibility, have been profited very little by such a law, while men-pleasers, the gay and the fashionable, who can wink at sin and daub his hearers with untempered mortar, saying, ‘Peace, peace,’ when there is no peace, who can lay out his oratory in dealing out smooth things mingled with deception, the wicked, it is clear, would like to have it so; and it follows the irreligious and carnal part of the people would richly reward them for their flattery, and the undeserving go off with the gain.”

The Presbyterians took “a sort of middle ground, which caused confusion in their own ranks and compromised them in the estimation of others.” It appears that the Presbyterian clergy advocated a plan of general assessment supporting all denominations who believed in union of church and state, but not those who believed in religious liberty and absolute freedom of conscience. James Madison commented on the position of the Presbyterians:

“The laity of the other sects (other than Episcopalian) are generally unanimous [against the general assessment]. So are all the clergy, except the Presbyterian, who seem as ready to set up an establishment which is to take them in as they were to pull down that which shut them out. I do not know a more shameful contrast than might be found between their memorials on the latter and former occasions. Rives, I., 630.” [Quoting a letter to James Monroe, April 12, 1775]

Thus, “[in these] later stages of disestablishment there was a curious alliance formed between the Episcopalian and Presbyterian clergy with an eye to creating a new line of defense.”

“In 1784, the Virginia House of Delegates having under consideration a ‘bill establishing provision for teachers of the Christian religion,’ postponed it until the next session, and directed that the Bill should be published and distributed, and that the people be requested ‘to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of such a bill at the next session of assembly.’ This last action was a result of a resolution offered by the Baptists and adopted by the Legislature. The Baptists, appearing to be losing ground as the only opponents of a general assessment, the majority of the Legislature being churchmen, the only hope of the opponents of the assessment was an appeal to the people.

The bill—which was proposed by Patrick Henry and supported by George Washington, Richard Henry Lee, and John Marshall—provided for the establishment a provision for teachers of the Christian religion, in effect providing for the “establishment of Christianity, but without precedence in such an establishment to any particular church.” The bill required all persons

“to pay a moderate tax or contribution annually for the support of the Christian religion, or of some Christian church, denomination or communion of Christians, or for some form of Christian worship.”
Leo Pfeffer noted that

“the bill was predicated on the legislative determination in its preamble that ‘the general diffusion of Christian knowledge hath a natural tendency to correct the morals of men, restrain their vices, and preserve the peace of society; which cannot be effected without a competent provision for licensed teachers.

“The preamble is of great significance, because it recognized the widely held belief that religion was not within the competence of civil legislatures. It sought to justify intervention not on any theocratic ground but on what today would be called the ‘police’ or ‘welfare’ power. Government support of religion is required to restrain vice and preserve peace, not to promote God’s kingdom on earth.”

Pfeffer does not understand, nor does the modern Supreme Court, that God has given civil government the choice of whether to honor His principles. The government is to intervene, according to God’s Word, to control and restrain certain crimes. Government does not support religion in order to do its job. Government merely makes a choice of whether to honor God and His principles for the purpose of restraining vice and preserving peace.

James Madison, among others, opposed the bill. Mr. Madison had witnessed and opposed the persecution of the Baptists in his own state.

“Madison wrote to a friend in 1774: ‘That diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution rages among some.... This vexes me the worst of anything whatever. There are at this time in the adjacent country not less than five or six well-meaning men in close jail for publishing their religious sentiments, which in the main are very orthodox. I have neither patience to hear, talk, or think of anything relative to this matter; for I have squabbled and scolded, abused and ridiculed, so long about it to little purpose, that I am without common patience. So I must beg you to pity me, and pray for liberty of conscience to all.’ I Writings of James Madison (1900) 18, 21.”

Mr. Madison prepared his famous “Memorial and Remonstrance,” in which he maintained “that religion, or the duty we owe the Creator,” was not within the cognizance of civil government. The “Memorial” presents fifteen arguments against the assessment bill. One historian says of this document, “For elegance of style, strength of reasoning, and purity of principle, it has, perhaps, seldom been equaled, certainly never surpassed, by anything in the English language.”

“Dr. George B. Taylor says: ‘It may certainly be called a Baptist document this far, that they only, as a people, held its views, and pressed those views without waverings.” Dr. E. G. Robinson wrote of the document:

“In a word, the great idea which he [Madison] put forth was identical with that which had always been devoutly cherished by our Baptist fathers, alike in the old world and the new, and which precisely a century and a half before had been perfectly expressed in the celebrated letter of Roger Williams to the people of his settlement, and by him incorporated into the fundamental law of the colony of Rhode Island. By Mr. Madison it was elaborated with arguments and wrought into the generalizations of statesmanship, but the essential idea is precisely the same with the ‘soul liberty’ so earnestly contended for by the Baptists of every age.”

---
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One must keep in mind that although the document advocated freedom of conscience, something for which Baptists had long struggled, the tone was that of deistic or humanistic arguments based upon reason and natural law. As pointed out supra, Jefferson and Madison and other deistic separatists “were interested in leaving the mind free to follow its own rational direction.” A trust in man’s reason without consideration of principles in the Word of God is a leaven which eventually totally pollutes. Tragically, the pietistic arguments of Isaac Backus never prevailed in America. America never fully proceeded upon the lessons taught by the Bible, and implemented by Roger Williams, John Clarke, and the other founders of Rhode Island.

Some excerpts from Madison’s “Memorial and Remonstrance” follow:

“Because we hold it for a fundamental and unalienable truth, ‘that religion, or the duty which we owe to the Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence,’ the religion, then of every man, must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. The right is, in its nature, an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable, also, because what is here a right towards man, is a duty towards the Creator…. The duty is precedent both in order and time, and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the Universe…. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion, no man’s rights is abridged by the institution of civil society; and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance….

“Because if religion be exempt from the authority of society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body. The latter are but the creatures and viceregents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited…. The preservation of a free government requires, not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power, be invariably maintained; but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers, who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it, are governed by laws made neither by themselves, nor by an authority derived from them, and are slaves.

“Because it is proper to take a alarm at the first experiment on our liberties, we hold this prudent jealousy to be first duty of citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late revolution…. Who does not see that the same authority, which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects; that the same authority, which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property, for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment, in all cases whatsoever?

“Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law; and which is more indispensable, in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached…. Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those, whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man. To God, therefore, and not to man, must account of it be rendered….

“Because the bill implies, either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the extraordinary opinion of rulers, in all ages, and throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

“Because the establishment proposed by the bill, is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion itself; for every page of it disavows a dependence on the power of the world; it is a contradiction to fact, for it is known that this religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them; and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence and the ordinary care of Providence: nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a religion not invented by human policy, must have pre-existed and been supported, before it was established by human policy: it is, moreover, to weaken in those, who profess this religion, a pious confidence in its innate excellence, and the patronage of
its Author; and to foster in those, who still reject it, a suspicion that its friends are too
conscious of its faculties, to trust it to its own merits.

“Because experience witnesses that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of
maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During
almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What
have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy;
ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution. Inquire
of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those
of every sect point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy. Propose a
restoration of this primitive state, in which its teachers depended on the voluntary
rewards of their flocks, many of them predict its downfall....

“Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil
government.... If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its
legal establishment be said to be necessary for civil government? What influences, in
fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances, they have
been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of the civil authority; in more instances,
have they been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they
been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the
publick liberty, may have found on established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just
government instituted to secure and perpetuate it needs them not. Such a government will
be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion, with the
same equal hand which protects his person and property; by neither invading the equal
hand which protects his person and property; by neither invading the equal rights of any
sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

“Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which,
offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion,
promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens.... [The
proposed bill] is a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens, all of
those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority. Distant
as it may be, in its present form, from the inquisition, it differs from it only in degree; the
one is the first step, the other the last, in the career of intolerance....

“Because it will have a tendency to banish our citizens.... Torrents of blood have been
spilt in the old world, by vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord,
be proscribing all differences in religious opinion....

“Because the policy of the bill is adverse to the light of Christianity. The first wish of
those, who ought to enjoy this precious gift, ought to be, that it may be imparted to the
whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those, who have as yet received it, with
the number still remaining under the dominion of false religions, and how small is the
former? Does the policy of the bill tend to lessen the disproportion? No; it at once
discourages those who are strangers to the light of truth, from coming into the regions of
it; and countenances, by example, the nations who continue in darkness, in shutting out
those who might convey it to them....

“Because, finally, 'the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion
according to the dictates of his conscience,' is held by the same tenure with all our other
rights.... Either then we must say, that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of
their authority; and that in the plentitude of this authority, they may sweep away all our
fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and
sacred: either we must say, that they may control the freedom of the press; may abolish
the trial by jury; may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State; nay,
that they have no authority our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an
independent and hereditary assembly; or we must say that they have no authority to enact
into a law, the bill under consideration. We the subscribers say, that the General
Assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority; and that no effort may be
omitted on our part, against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it this
Remonstrance, earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of
the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn
their councils from every act, which would affront his holy prerogative, or violate the
trust committed to them; and on the other guide them into every measure which may be
worthy of His blessing, may redound to their own praise, and may establish more firmly
the liberties, the property, and the happiness of the Commonwealth.”72

---
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Madison, who led the opposition, was able to obtain a postponement of consideration of the bill from December, 1784 to November, 1785. Before adjourning, the legislature passed a bill which incorporated the Protestant Episcopal Church,

“deemed necessary in order to regulate the status of that church in view of the severance of its subordination to the Church of England that had resulted from the Revolution. The bill gave the Episcopal ministers title to the churches, glebes, and other property, and prescribed the method of electing vestrymen.

“Even Madison voted for the incorporation bill, though reluctantly and only in order to stave off passage of the assessment bill. Nonetheless, the incorporation bill aroused a good deal of opposition.”

The people were against the assessment bill, and the Presbyterians reversed their position, opposed the bill, and for the first time, on August 10, 1785, the whole Presbyterian body supported Jefferson’s “Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom,” “although that bill had been before the Legislature since June, 1779.” The Baptists asked all counties which had not yet prepared a petition to do so and agreed to prepare a remonstrance and petition against the assessment. Thus the Presbyterians and Baptists stood together, but for different motives. Mr. Madison’s opinion was that the Presbyterians were “moved by either a fear of their laity or a jealousy of the Episcopalians. The mutual hatred of these sects has been much inflamed by the late act incorporating the latter…. Writings of Madison, I., 175.”

Patrick Henry, the leading proponent of the assessment bill was elected governor, “depriving the bill of its ablest legislative leader.” The Memorial and Remonstrance had received wide distribution. At the next session the General Assembly was flooded with petitions and memorials from all parts of the State, overwhelmingly against the bill. The bill was defeated by three votes.

On January 16, 1786, the Virginia Act for Religious Liberty, drafted by Thomas Jefferson, was passed instead. That bill provided for religious liberty and freedom of conscience. It stated:

“I. Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the Holy Author of our religion, who being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do;

that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such, endeavoring to impose them on others hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time;

that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, … that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions any more than [on] our opinions in physics or geometry;

that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion is depriving him injuriously of those

73 Pfeffer, p. 99, citing Eckenrode, p. 100.
74 James, pp. 134-139. Madison’s quote was from a letter to Mr. Jefferson.
privileges and advantages to which in common with his fellow citizens he has a natural right;...
that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles, on supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he being of course judge of that tendency, will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with, or differ from his own;
that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt [open, or public] acts against peace and good order;
and, finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, that she is proper and sufficient antagonist to error and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate, errors [cease] to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

“II. Be it enacted by the General Assembly that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

“III. And though we well know that this assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding assemblies, constituted with powers equal to her own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable would be of no effect in law, yet, as we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural right of mankind, and that if any act shall hereafter be passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural rights.”

The act included three factors: church, state, and individual. It protected the individual from loss at the hands of the state incursion into his church affiliation, and implicitly banned church establishment. “It did not attempt to define the relations between Church and State except in terms of the individual.”

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the above bill, never swerved from his devotion to the complete independence of church and state. He wrote:

“‘The care of every man’s soul belongs to himself. But what if he neglect the care of it? Well, what if he neglect the care of his health or estate, which more clearly relate to the state. Will the magistrate make a law that he shall not be poor or sick? Laws provide against injury from others; but not from ourselves. God himself will not save men against their wills.’

“But our rulers can have no authority over such natural rights, only as we have submitted to them. The rights of conscience we never submitted, we could not submit. We are answerable for them to our God.…. 

“Is uniformity attainable? Millions of innocent men, women, and children, since the introduction of Christianity, have been burnt, tortured, fined, imprisoned; yet we have not advanced one inch towards uniformity. What has been the effect of coercion? To make one half the world fools, and the other half hypocrites. To support roguery and error all over the earth.”

---
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According to biblical principles, the bill was right about some things and wrong about others. It was right about its position on freedom of conscience from interference by civil and ecclesiastical governments, about compelling contributions to opinions to which one is opposed, about forcing any contributions to any pastor whatsoever, and about its assertion “that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order.”

However, the act was wrong in four ways. First, it was wrong in not recognizing that the Word of God is the source of all ultimate truth. Second, it was wrong in not recognizing that God desires all nations to be under Him, and that judgment is the ultimate fate of all nations which are not under Him. Third, it was wrong in not recognizing that the only way to determine what acts against peace and good order against one’s fellow man is through God-given conscience and the study of the Word of God as led by the Holy Spirit. Fourth, the act was also wrong when it asserted “that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, that she is proper and sufficient antagonist to error and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate, [for] errors [cease] to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.” As mankind has proven over and over, truth never prevails. Ultimately, mankind always reverts to satanic principles instead of truth which is of God. Not recognizing this accelerates the ultimate deterioration and judgment of a nation.

The Baptists continued their struggle to remove all vestiges of the establishment until 1802 when the glebes were sold and all religious societies were placed on equal footing before the law. The glebes were tracts of land and buildings built thereon for the accommodation of the minister and his family, all at the expense of the people within the parish. The Baptists fought to have the act incorporating the Episcopal church repealed. Reuben Ford and John Leland attended the first 1787 assembly meeting as agents in behalf of the Baptist General Committee. On August 10, 1787, the act incorporating the Episcopal church was repealed, and until 2001—when Jerry Falwell and trustees of the Thomas Road Baptist Church, who were joined by the American Civil Liberties Union, challenged the Virginia Constitutional provision forbidding the incorporation of churches in federal district court—no church in Virginia could be incorporated.

“The Baptists continued to memorialize the Legislature … and in 1799 that body passed an act entitled ‘An Act to Repeal Certain Acts, and to Declare the Construction of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution Concerning Religion,’ which act declared that no religious establishment had legally existed since the Commonwealth took the place of the regal government, repealed all laws giving to the Protestant Episcopal church any special privileges, and declared that ‘the act establishing religious freedom’ contains the true construction of the Bill of Rights and of the Constitution; but no order was given for the sale of the glebes.”

As the Anglican establishment in Virginia yielded to pressure from Baptists [and to a much lesser extent Presbyterians] so that religious liberty was established in that state, “[t]he same pressure, reinforced by the conditions of
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frontier living, ended the Anglican establishment in the Carolinas and Georgia. ... [T]he conditions which made establishment possible never existed in the states admitted after Vermont, nor in the territories with the exception of unique Utah.”

By the time the Constitutional Convention convened in 1787, “three states, Rhode Island, New York, and Virginia granted full religious freedom. Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland demanded in different degrees adherence to Christianity. New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia demanded Protestantism.”

82 Marnell, p. 130.
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Chapter 10
To the new nation

A convention was called in Philadelphia in 1787 to revise the Articles of Confederation.

“In a little more than a year after the passage of the Virginia Act for Religious Liberty the convention met which prepared the Constitution of the United States. Of this convention Mr. Jefferson was not a member, he being then absent as minister to France…. Five of the states, while adopting the Constitution, proposed amendments. Three—New Hampshire, New York, and Virginia—included in one form or another a declaration of religious freedom in the changes they desired to have made, as did also North Carolina, where the convention at first declined to ratify the Constitution until the proposed amendments were acted upon. Accordingly, at the first session of the first Congress the amendment now under consideration [the First Amendment] was proposed with others by Mr. Madison. It met the views of the advocates of religious freedom, and was adopted.”1

After the drafting of the Constitution, it was submitted to the states for ratification. The Baptists of Virginia were against ratification because the Constitution did not have sufficient provision for religious liberty. Patrick Henry had declined to serve at the Convention and was against it. He posed as the champion of the Baptists in opposition to the Constitution. Of course, Madison was for ratification. However, John Leland, the most popular preacher in Virginia, was chosen by the Baptists as candidate of Orange County to the state ratification convention opposed to ratification, and his opponent was to be James Madison. Mr. Leland likely would have been elected had he not later withdrawn. Mr. Madison, when he returned from Philadelphia, stopped by Mr. Leland’s house and spent half a day communicating to him about “the great matters which were then agitating the people of the state and the Confederacy” and relieving Baptist apprehensions as to the question of religious liberty. As a result of this meeting, Mr. Leland withdrew in favor of Mr. Madison and the Baptists of Orange County were won over to the side of Madison.2

The Constitution was ratified and election of the officers of government was the next order of business. Patrick Henry, using his influence in the Legislature, prevented Madison from being elected as Senator. In addition, the Legislature drew the lines for Representative district so as to prevent Madison from being elected as Representative. However, he was able to “relieve Baptist apprehensions as to any change in his principles, and assure them of his readiness to aid in securing a proper amendment to the Constitution on the subject of religious liberty.” He was elected.

His first act, after the First Congress was organized, in 1789, was to propose, on June 8, certain amendments, including what is now the First Amendment. His purpose was to “conciliate and to make all reasonable concessions to the doubting and distrustful”—to those, the Baptists, who were concerned about the issue of religious liberty. “Of all the denominations in Virginia, [the Baptists] were the only ones that had expressed any dissatisfaction with the Constitution on that point, or that had taken any action into looking to an amendment.” The Baptists of Virginia had also corresponded with Baptists of

1 Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. at 164.
2 James, pp. 150-158; Grady, What Hath God Wrought?, pp. 166-167.
other states to “secure cooperation in the matter of obtaining” a religious liberty amendment. No other denomination asked for this change.³ A general committee of Baptist churches from Virginia presented an address to President Washington, dated August 8, 1789, expressing concern that “liberty of conscience was not sufficiently secured,” perhaps because “on account of the usage we received in Virginia, under the regal government, when mobs, bonds, fines and prisons, were [their] frequent repast.”⁴ President Washington assured them that he would not have signed the Constitution if he had had the slightest apprehension that it “might endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society.”⁵

Some Baptists and others did not see the need for a religious freedom amendment. Indeed, the First Amendment may not have been necessary to guarantee separation of church and state. Isaac Backus was elected as a delegate to the Massachusetts convention of January, 1788, which considered the issue of ratification of the new Constitution. He spoke at the convention.

“On February 4, [Backus] spoke of ‘the great advantage of having religious tests and hereditary nobility excluded from our government.’ These two items in the Constitution seemed to him a guarantee against any establishment of religion and against the formation of any aristocracy. ‘Some serious minds discover a concern lest, if all religious tests should be excluded, the congress would hereafter establish Popery, or some other tyrannical way of worship. But it is most certain that no such way of worship can be established without any religious test.’ He said ‘Popery,’ but he probably feared, as many Baptists did, that some form of Calvinism of the Presbyterian or Consociational variety was more likely. His interpretation of this article helps to explain why the Baptists [of Massachusetts] made no effort to fight for an amendment on freedom of religion along with the others which the convention sent to Congress.”⁶

Even Madison, who proposed and fought for the First Amendment, did not believe that it was necessary for the security of religion. He wrote in his Journal on June 12, 1788:

“… Is a bill of rights a security for Religion? … If there were a majority of one sect, a bill of rights would be a poor protection for liberty. Happily for the states, they enjoy the utmost freedom of religion. This freedom arises from that multiplicity of sects, which pervades America, and which is the best and only security for religious liberty in any society. For where there is such a variety of sects, there cannot be a majority of any one to oppress and persecute the rest. Fortunately for this commonwealth, a majority of the people are decidedly against any exclusive establishment—I believe it to be so in the other states…. But the United States abound in such a variety of sects, that it is a strong security against religious persecution, and it is sufficient to authorize a conclusion, that no one sect will ever be able to outnumber or depress the rest.”⁷

Others were against a bill of rights. “James Wilson argued that ‘all is reserved in a general government which is not given,’ and that since the power to legislate on religion or speech or press was not given to the Federal government, the government did not possess it, and there was therefore no need for an express prohibition.”⁸ “Alexander Hamilton argued that a bill of rights, not only was unnecessary, but would be dangerous, since it might create the inference that a power to deal with the reserved subject was in fact conferred.”⁹

---
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The amendment was adopted on September 25, 1789 and was approved by the required number of states in 1791.
Chapter 11
Conclusion

Early in the colonial period, the first government in history which provided for religious liberty and separation of church and state was formed as a result of the conflict of the two currents which flowed in opposite directions.

“A large number of people fled out of the old world into this wilderness for religious liberty; but had not been here long before some put in high claims for power, under the name of orthodoxy; to whom others made fierce opposition professedly from the light within; and their clashings were so great that several lives were lost in the fray. This made a terrible noise on the other side of the water. But as self-defence is a natural principle, each party wrote volume after volume to clear themselves from blame; and they both conspired to cast a great part of it upon one singular man [Roger Williams], whom they called a weathercock and a windmill. Now let the curious find out if they can, first how men of university learning, or of divine inspiration, came to write great volumes against a windmill and a weathercock? secondly, how such a strange creature came to be an overmatch for them all, and to carry his point against the arts of priesthood, the intrigues of court, the flights of enthusiasm and the power of factions, so as after he had pulled down ruin upon himself and his friends, yet to be able, in the midst of heathen savages, to erect the best form of civil government that the world had seen in sixteen hundred years? thirdly, how he and his ruined friends came to lie under those reproaches for a hundred years, and yet that their plan should then be adopted by thirteen colonies, to whom these despised people could afford senators of principal note, as well as commanders by sea and land? The excellency of this scene above those which many are bewitched with, consists in its being founded upon facts and not fictions; being not the creature of distempered brains, but of an unerring Providence.”

Besides Roger Williams, many brave men and women, with Baptists at the forefront, paid a high price on the path to religious liberty and freedom of speech, association, and the press. One should not forget that those people were motivated by a deep love for God and His Word, not by earthly concerns.

As a result of the fight, Christians (and everyone else) in America have religious freedom. The United States Supreme Court to this day still upholds the wall of separation between church and state and freedom of conscience. Christians in America have been blessed above measure and can choose to please God and not be persecuted for it. The brief time mankind as a whole will be on earth is miniscule compared to eternity past and eternity future. The time an individual Christian is here is nothing more than a blink of the eye.

“A Christian will never have another opportunity like this. Every breath he takes out of God’s will is a wasted breath. When he gets to heaven, it will be nothing but praising God naturally. He will not praise God as a matter of choice. This is his one chance during his eternal existence to live for Christ of his own free will. This is the one shot he has to choose to please the Lord, to praise Him, to glorify Him. When he gets to heaven, he will glorify God, but he may remember that he never glorified Him when he had the choice.”

Oh how the Savior must be pleased when a church uses this opportunity to exercise her free will and glorify Him, her Husband/Bridegroom/Head.

---

2 See Section V.
3 From sermon preached at Capitol City Baptist Church in Austin, Texas by Evangelist Samuel Gipp, February 17, 2008.
“When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.”¹ “Evil men understand not judgment: but they that seek the LORD understand all things.”² “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.”³

“The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach.”⁴

With Everson, “establishment of religion” became something entirely different from what it had been to that point. Eventually, the new rationale of the Court in Everson, all taken together, while honoring the historical First Amendment and biblical principle of separation of church and state, would lead to the removal, or the attempt to remove, any vestige of God from civil government affairs. Even when the Court would allow the mention of God, it was with the understanding that God was only historical and of no significance. God, the Ruler of the universe, the Ultimate Lawmaker, and the Judge of the Supreme Court of the universe, gave United States Supreme Court Justices the right to rebel.

¹ Proverbs 29.2.
² Proverbs 28.5.
³ Psalm 9.17.
⁴ Everson, p. 18.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Because of failure to understand, believe, and apply God’s principles, the “religious” jurisprudence in the United States has been on a slippery downhill slope of confusion and destruction since the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. At first the slope was slight or nonexistent, but starting in the mid-twentieth century the grade increased. The United States Supreme Court added new meaning to “separation of church and state,” meaning which was used to remove all vestiges of God from public life and public view.

While upholding the original meaning of the First Amendment religion clause, the Supreme Court has supplemented the original meaning of that clause. The original meaning of the religion clause was to protect the church from state regulation and the state from church regulation.

“The constitutional inhibition of legislation on the subject of religion has a double aspect. On the one hand it forestalls compulsion by law of the acceptance of any creed or the practice of any form of worship…. On the other hand, it safeguards the free exercise of the chosen form of religion…. The interrelation of the ‘establishment’ and ‘free exercise’ clauses [according to the United States Supreme Court] has been well summarized as follows: ‘The structure of our government has, for the preservation of civil liberty, rescued the temporal institutions from religious interference. On the other hand, it has secured religious liberty from the invasion of the civil authority.”

The Court still maintains that there is a “high and impregnable” wall between church and state. A wall separates two sides each from the other. This concept of separation of church and state is the principle God established for Gentile nations.

However, the twentieth century Court has added an additional aspect to the First Amendment religion clause. The Supreme Court, while proclaiming that the First Amendment guarantee of biblical separation of church and state is still in effect, also supplemented the religion clause to require separation of God and state.

The nineteenth century Supreme Court held a different view from the modern Court. The nineteenth century Court looked to historical facts to support its contention that this was a Christian nation. When the unregenerate dominated the Court in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the Court looked to an incomplete version of historical facts and to a new twist on the First Amendment to remove God from all public affairs and to effectively declare that this is not a Christian nation. At the same time, the Court proclaimed that the original meaning of the First Amendment religion clause is still in effect.

The Supreme Court did two things which ultimately resulted in the assurance that God and His principles would not in any way be over the United States or any state therein. First, it gradually deconstructed the intent of the Fourteenth Amendment to the point where the Court began to apply the First Amendment to state, county, and city governments.

Second, the Supreme Court redefined separation of church and state in such a way that allowed the Court to begin to separate God and state on the national, state, county, and city government levels. The twentieth century Court operated in a nation where the state got into areas where it had no God-given and/or Constitutional jurisdiction—education of children, welfare, retirement (social security), childcare, income taxation, etc. In this new environment, the Court redefined “separation of church and state” in such a way that God and state were separated, thereby ensuring the ultimate judgment of God upon the nation. God was excluded from the public life of the nation and a pluralistic nation resulted. For the Supreme Court, the term “religion” became a way to categorize spiritual matters in any way connected to “church,” to “God,” or to “a god.” Even should the Court permit a vestige of God to remain, such permission was granted in a pejorative manner which dishonored God. An example is recent Ten Commandments jurisprudence which is discussed infra.

According to the modern Supreme Court, the civil government is to remain neutral as to “religion.”

“The First Amendment reflects the philosophy that church and state should be separated. Yet it neither says nor requires that in every conceivable respect there must be a total separation of church and state. Thus, while laws giving direct aid to religion are not permitted, laws which incidentally benefit religion are not, for that reason alone, invalid.... All that is required is that the government stand neutral between one religion and another, and between religion and nonbelief, and not become excessively entangled in the affairs of religion....”

This neutrality toward “religion,” as defined and applied by the Court, was interpreted to be not only neutrality toward religion, but also hostility toward God. God, His authority, and His principles were deemed inapplicable to the affairs of the civil government. The Court made the decision for the nation: “God, you are out. You are at best equal to nonbelief and to the gods of all other ‘religions.’” Too bad for the nation that the nation is not the sovereign. God is the Sovereign who has allowed the nation to make its temporary and self-destructive choice.

At the same time, the original meaning of the religion clause is generally upheld by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court still declares that the original meaning of the First Amendment, forbidding the state to interfere in the affairs of a church and vice-versa, is still in effect. The Court still declares the “wall of separation between church and state” to be “high and impregnable.” The original intent of the First Amendment establishment clause—that the state not be over the church nor the church over the state and that people be free to exercise their religious beliefs (as long as those beliefs do not run afoul of criminal law)—has consistently been proclaimed by the Supreme Court.

As will be explained in Section VI, the position of the Supreme Court which has upheld the separation of church and state has been skirted by the legislative and executive branches through laws which have lured most churches to place themselves under the civil government through incorporation and 501(c)(3) status. As far as the author has been able to ascertain, the courts have never been asked to rule on the constitutionality of such legislation.

Certainly many “Christian” and all secular authors have no knowledge or understanding of the Word of God. Therefore, their arguments are foolish. Many Christians and secularists correctly point out that the terms “separation of church

---

2 Kramer, § 2.
and state,” “church,” “state,” and “separation” do not appear in the Constitution. Christians use that fact to argue that church and state should work together, or that the church should be involved with the state. Admittedly, individual Christians, not churches, should, if God so directs, become involved in the civil government; and both New Testament churches and Christians should communicate their political beliefs including who to vote for based upon the beliefs of the candidates. Nonetheless, this is a poor argument for Christians to use because God wants separation of church and state in Gentile nations and because the Constitution provided for separation of church and state. The correct argument for the Christian is that leaders should place the Sovereign, that is, God over the state in the manner already explained and that God desires that every man have free will as guaranteed by the First Amendment.

Secularist arguments in support of a complete removal of God from all civil governmental affairs are equally invalid. For example, Leo Pfeffer, a constitutional scholar, asserted that “it was inevitable that some convenient term ['separation of church and state'] should come into existence to verbalize a principle so clearly and widely held by the American people.” I question whether the overwhelming majority of Americans clearly and widely can or could intelligently discuss the subject now or when Pfeffer wrote. In support of this argument, he asked, “Who would deny that 'religious liberty' is a constitutional principle [even though] that phrase is not in the Constitution?”

His writings and advocacy as a lawyer, including his advocacy before the Supreme Court, make clear that his idea of religious liberty—to remove God from state affairs—was entirely different from the biblical principle. He had absolutely no spiritual understanding. He was used by the god of this world to advocate for a “Godless” civil government.

Thus, one reason for the rapid slide downhill has been the lack of knowledge and understanding of biblical principles—this can be related to the fact that the Constitution itself was a blend of biblical and enlightenment principles. Even though some biblical principles were inherent in the structure of the Constitution and the First Amendment provided for religious liberty and separation of church and state, the Constitution did not declare that the goal of the nation was the glory of God. The Constitution did not declare that God, and specifically the Lord Jesus Christ, was Sovereign over the nation. The nation was not, according to its highest statement of law, required to turn to the principles of the Bible in deciding its questions of law, to recognize God in its official prayers and organic utterances, or to point out that the God of the Bible, the Lord Jesus Christ, was the Sovereign over all institutions including individual, family, nation, and church. Since the body of the Constitution made no mention of God, and since certain enlightenment principles were embodied into the Constitution, the document itself is of little help to those who support biblical principles and argue that this nation as founded was a “Christian” nation, or a nation under God. This can be discerned from numerous Supreme Court opinions as exemplified infra in this section.

The Constitution, while separating church and state, also failed to declare that God was to be over the state. In the early history of the new nation, many referred to the need for religion, or even “God” to be involved in the state.

---
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The New York Methodist church in 1808 promoted the spread of the Gospel over the entire earth, and fought humanism with Scriptural truth and holy living. Christians used their vote to elect Christians who would uphold their Christian ideas.

“The Rev. John Mason preached that ‘the principles of the gospel are to regulate [people’s] political as well as their other conduct.’ He scoffed at the idea that ‘religion has nothing to do with politics!’ asking rhetorically, ‘Where did you learn this maxim?’ To the contrary, he offered, ‘the Bible is full of directions for your behavior as citizens,’ citing in example Col. 3:17 ‘And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, to do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.’ Other New York ministers expressed similar sentiments to their congregations, representing civil government as a ‘subsidiary’ to God’s grand design of preparing saints for the future and ‘the civil magistrate as God’s officer.’ …

“[Thomas Jefferson stated ‘The legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others. But it does me no injury for my neighbors to say there are twenty gods or no god. It neither picks my pockets, nor breaks my leg.’]. Mason wrote: ‘This is nothing less than representing civil society as founded in Atheism. For there can be no religion without God. And if it does me or my neighbor no injury, to subvert the very foundation of religion, by denying the being of God, then religion is not one of the constituent principles of society, and consequently society is perfect without it.’”

It is disputed whether Jefferson advocated public abstention in matters of religion, but many clergymen felt that he was atheistic.

“Public abstention amounted to the denial of a single religious truth; and once a government rejects the idea of one religious truth, it is rendered unable to act upon any religious doctrine in constricting the laws, values, and policy aims of that society. But the idea that any God could himself, or herself or itself, be relativistic is absurd—how can any true living God accept all suggestions of his, her, or its own existence as merely speculative or one of many unprovable theories? If God could not accept religious relativism, how could America? The advocacy of religious relativism is logically inconsistent with the acceptance of any true, living God. Accordingly, the ministers insisted that when a government assumed such a position, it rejected the existence of God as well as God’s role in governing.”

Generally speaking, the people of the United States, against an increasing current of liberalism, have determined the course of the nation. As long as the nation had a predominantly Christian population, God was honored to a degree in the public life of the nation, although Christian values, even in the early life of the new nation, were gradually being undermined by non-Christian principles in the legal arena. America, with all its faults, to an extent proceeded “under God” for over a hundred and fifty years even though the nation’s highest law, the Constitution, had, on its face, been about “the happiness of man” and not the “glory of God” from the beginning—this fact is apparent from a facial reading of the document as well as from a study of history before, during, and after ratification.

Great revivals occurred at the time the Constitution was ratified and for some time thereafter, and multitudes were saved. As a result, the nation was saturated with Christians, and the integrity of the nation was thereby preserved to an extent. On the other hand, the legal system began to apply enlightenment principles to redefine marriage, the family, the church, criminal law, and the law in general. Although an examination of this movement is beyond the scope of this book, it is important to have at least a rudimentary understanding of the context in which future First Amendment jurisprudence unfolded.

---

5 McGarvie, pp. 124-125.
6 Ibid.
Because the population was predominantly Christian, or at least honored the Bible and God to an extent, American civil government, to a great degree, initially operated under God. Many Supreme Court justices and the majority of Americans in the nineteenth century were either Christian or at least had a reverence for the Bible and Christianity. In 1892, the Court declared that this nation would go by the principles of Christianity, not by the principles of other religions which the Court called imposters of the true religion. God was honored by some, if not most, civil government organizations and officials in their official public proclamations, speeches, and prayers. Official prayers were given in Jesus’ name. God was recognized by leaders and judges who acknowledged that only the God of the Bible could bring blessings and curses to the nation. Among the myriad examples is the Thanksgiving Day Proclamation of President George Washington:

“Whereas it is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey his will to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly implore his protection and favor, and Whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me to ‘recommend to the People of the United States a day of public thanks-giving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness.

“Now, therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday, the 26th day of November, next, to be devoted by the people of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be; that we may then unite in rendering unto Him our sincere and humble thanks for His [many blessings before becoming a nation, during the late war, etc.].

“And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions….”

Things have changed. Although the First Amendment to the Constitution states that “Congress shall make no law regarding an establishment of religion or preventing the free exercise thereof,” the civil government, contrary to the mandate of that amendment, through laws passed by Congress and approved by the President, controls and even defines the corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization and undermines such organizations with the promotion and support of most and participation by some “Christians.”

The Supreme Court has not had to attack the churches to subjugate them to the civil government. Most churches have taken themselves from under the jurisdiction of God and placed themselves under the civil government through incorporation and Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”) § 501(c)(3) status. Churches have done this even though the federal government acknowledges that churches are different from “religious organizations” and that the civil government has no requirement for a church to be under the state—a church can only voluntarily place itself under the state. Satan would much prefer that churches come to him willingly. Regrettably, most Christians are members of a corporate 501(c)(3) church. This aspect of civil government control of churches will be covered in Section VI. Many Christians in incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations are discovering the truth, but have no knowledge about how to disentangle their churches from the state.

---

8 Cousins, pp. 71-72; quoted only in part. Notice that even President Washington included the purpose of the nation as being the “safety and happiness” of the people.
Why have some “Christians,” as well as the Supreme Court and other branches of government, not recognized that a church is to be entirely under God and that the civil government has limited jurisdiction under God? The answers to these questions are very simple: Some “Christians” and Supreme Court justices and other civil government leaders and officials have no understanding of biblical principles or of the history of their nation concerning government (which includes the all-powerful government of God, self-government, family government, civil government, and church government), church, separation of church and state, and the proper relationship between God and state and God and His church. They simply do not understand that God is the Sovereign over all, that God gives all civil governments the choice of whether to recognize His sovereignty and operate under His rules, and the consequences of the choices made. They have been deceived by false secular and “Christian” teaching in those areas. As a result, even “Christians” advance secular principles and arguments rather than God-honoring biblical principles and arguments.

Since man does not gravitate towards God’s principles, but rather toward Satan’s principles, the Christian population of the nation decreased steadily and is now a small minority. A Christian population honored God individually and as a nation, to a degree, regardless of the wording of the Constitution. A Christian population applied a more biblical interpretation and understanding of the First Amendment. A non-Christian population seeks the lowest level. America is rapidly sinking to that level.

Much of the writing concerning the First Amendment is confusing and certainly untrue since the understanding of the history of the amendment has been revised by both secular and Christian writers. Generally, either nothing is said about, or lies and revisions are disseminated about, the power of God, His principles, and the warfare between those principles and the false versions of those principles in the history of colonial America and the United States. When God and His principles are left out, revised, and/or lied about in the discussion of anything (as is almost always the case), the path is only downward toward judgment. “The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom: and the knowledge of the holy is understanding.” ⁹ “Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.” ¹⁰ “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”¹¹ “For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.”¹²

---

⁹ Proverbs 9.10.
¹⁰ 1 Corinthians 1.25.
¹¹ 1 Corinthians 2.14.
¹² 1 Corinthians 3.19-20.
Chapter 2
The 19th Century Supreme Court interpretation of “separation of church and state”

The religion clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution states, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or preventing the free exercise thereof.”\(^1\) What did the authors of this clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States mean? What was meant by “religion” and “the free exercise of religion” or “freedom of religion?” Was the First Amendment intended to create “separation of church and state?” If so, what was meant by “separation of church and state?” Many Christians have addressed this issue, and most of their debating points have been off base, as have the arguments of secularists.

In the earthly realm, because of Supreme Court tyranny in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the final authority on the meaning of religious liberty and separation of church and state in the United States is the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, in the nineteenth century, started out reasonably well on this issue, but in the mid-twentieth century, although not yet removing the original meaning of the First Amendment separation of church and state, moved into another area and completely perverted the true meaning of “separation of church and state,” turning the First Amendment religious clause into a tool that would be used to remove God from any state activity.

The nineteenth Century Court did relatively well, but could have done much better had it gone directly to the Bible for its guidelines. In the nineteenth century, the Supreme Court defined “religion,” “the free exercise of religion,” “freedom of religion,” and “separation of church and state” much differently than does our modern Supreme Court. In 1879, the Court wrote in its opinion in *Reynolds v. United States*:

> “The word ‘religion’ is not defined in the constitution. We must go elsewhere, therefore, to ascertain its meaning, and nowhere more appropriately, we think, than to the history of the times in the midst of which the [First Amendment to the United States Constitution] was adopted. The precise point of inquiry is, what is the religious freedom which has been guaranteed?”\(^2\)

According to the Court, “religion” meant “Christianity” and “freedom of religion” meant freedom to practice the one true religion, “Christianity,” or any imposter of the true religion as long as such practice did not violate or conflict with the moral or social laws of Christianity.

The Reynolds Court referred, as did the mid-twentieth century Court,\(^3\) to an obscure letter written by Thomas Jefferson. Regarding the First Amendment religion clause:

> “Mr. Jefferson afterwards, in reply to an address to him by a committee of the Danbury Baptist Association (8 id. 113), took occasion to say: ‘Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God; that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship; that the legislative powers of the government reach actions only, and not opinions,—I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole

---

American people which declared that their legislature should ‘make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,’ thus building a wall of separation between church and state. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore man to all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties. Coming as this does from an acknowledged leader of the advocates of the measure, it may be accepted almost as an authoritative declaration of the scope and effect of the amendment thus secured. Congress was deprived of all legislative power over mere opinion, but was left free to reach actions which were in violation of social duties or subversive of good order.”

According to Jefferson, the laws of government could reach actions, but not opinions. What actions could government reach? He desired that those laws should not reach, but rather should restore, the natural rights of man. And “[man] has no natural right in opposition to his social duties?”

What is the origin of man’s “natural rights” and his “social duties” which cannot oppose one another? Jefferson signed the Declaration of Independence which stated, “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, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. . . We, therefore, [appeal] to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions.” The Declaration referred to “the separate but equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitles them.” Thus, according to Jefferson and the other signers of the Declaration of Independence, man's “natural rights” come from God.

What defined man's social duties? What was to tell us the meaning of good order? What actions violated social duties and subverted good order? From Reynolds one can certainly conclude that the Mormon religion, the ways of the Asiatic people, and the ways of the African people were not to be the guide America. Instead, social duties and good order were to be defined by looking at the laws of the northern and western nations of Europe, especially England. In England the ecclesiastical (church) courts punished polygamy, and presided over testamentary causes and the settlement of the estates of deceased persons. Marriage was declared to be a “sacred obligation,” and a “civil contract . . . regulated by law.”

What did Jefferson mean by “separation between church and state?” The Reynolds Court stated:

“[T]o suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty. [I]t is time enough for the

---

4 Reynolds, 98 U.S. at 164.
5 Ibid.
6 The Declaration of Independence para. 2, 32 (U.S. 1776).
7 Ibid., para. 1.
8 98 U.S. at 164.
9 Ibid., pp. 164-65.
10 Ibid., p. 165.
11 Ibid. This last statement of the Court concerning marriage was flawed. Contract law is based upon enlightenment, not Biblical, principles. Marriage as defined in the Bible is a covenant between God, man, and woman. Marriage, according to Enlightenment thought is a contract between two equal people. The contract clause—Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution—was ultimately used to reconstruct marital law, family law, criminal law, and other areas of the law including relationship of church and state according to enlightenment principles of contract law. See Section VI.
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rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order. In these two sentences is found the true distinction between what belongs to the church and what to the state.12

[Emphasis mine.]

The Court went on to further clarify the intended meaning of the phrase by explaining that “the scope and effect of the [First Amendment religion clause] was to deprive Congress of all legislative power over mere opinion, while leaving Congress free to reach actions which were in violation of social duties or subversive of good order.”13 The Court referred to Thomas Jefferson’s letter to the Danbury Baptist Association as quoted above.

Reynolds held that laws criminalizing polygamy did not violate the First Amendment even though the offender practiced polygamy because of his religious beliefs.14 The Court said that the act of polygamy violated social duties and subverted good order.15

Mr. Justice Field, who was appointed to the Supreme Court by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863, more clearly explained why, according to the Court, bigamy and polygamy are actions which violate social duties and subvert good order and why laws against bigamy and polygamy are constitutional:

“Bigamy and polygamy are crimes by the laws of all civilized and Christian countries. They are crimes by the laws of the United States, and they are crimes by the laws of Idaho. They tend to destroy the purity of the marriage relation, to disturb the peace of families, to degrade woman and to debase man. Few crimes are more pernicious to the best interests of society and receive more general or more deserved punishment. To extend exemption from punishment for such crimes would be to shock the moral judgment of the community. To call their advocacy a tenet of religion is to offend the common sense of mankind. If they are crimes, then to teach, advise and counsel their practice is to aid in their commission, and such teaching and counseling are themselves criminal and proper subjects of punishment, as aiding and abetting crime are in all other cases.

The term ‘religion’ has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for his being and character, and of obedience to his will. The first amendment to the Constitution, in declaring that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or forbidding the free exercise thereof, was intended to allow every one under the jurisdiction of the United States to entertain such notions respecting his relations to his Maker and the duties they impose as may be approved by his judgment and conscience, and to exhibit his sentiments in such form of worship as he may think proper, not injurious to the equal rights of others, and to prohibit legislation for the support of any religious tenets, or the modes of worship of any sect. The oppressive measures adopted, and the cruelties and punishments inflicted by the governments of Europe for many ages, to compel parties to conform, in their religious beliefs and modes of worship, to the views of the most numerous sect, and the folly of attempting in that way to control the mental operations of persons, and enforce an outward conformity to a prescribed standard, led to the adoption of the amendment in question.16 It was never intended or supposed that the amendment could be invoked as a protection against legislation for the punishment of acts inimical to the peace, good order and morals of society. With man’s relations to his Maker and the obligations he may think they impose, and the manner in which an expression shall be made by him of his belief on those subjects, no interference can be permitted, provided always the laws of society, designed to secure its peace and prosperity, and the morals of its people, are not interfered with. However free the

12 Ibid., p. 163.
13 Ibid., p. 164.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid., pp. 164-167.
16 The Court failed to point out that the spiritual atrocities were continued in the colonies, in the conflict between the established churches and the dissenters.
exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the criminal laws of the country, passed with reference to actions regarded by general consent as properly the subjects of punitive legislation. There have been sects which denied as a part of their religious tenets that there should be any marriage tie, and advocated promiscuous intercourse of the sexes as prompted by the passions of its members. And history discloses the fact that the necessity of human sacrifices, on special occasions, has been a tenet of many sects. Should a sect of either of these kinds ever find its way into this country, swift punishment would follow the carrying into effect of its doctrines, and no heed would be given to the pretense that, as religious beliefs, their supporters could be protected in their exercise by the Constitution of the United States. Probably never before in the history of this country has it been seriously contended that the whole punitive power of the government for acts, recognized by the general consent of the Christian world in modern times as proper matters for prohibitory legislation, must be suspended in order that the tenets of a religious sect encouraging crime may be carried out without hindrance...."17 [Emphasis mine]

"Marriage, while from its very nature a sacred obligation, is, nevertheless, in most civilized nations a civil contract,18 and usually regulated by law. Upon it society may be said to be built, and out of its fruits spring social relations and social obligations and duties, with which government is necessarily required to deal."19

"Whilst legislation for the establishment of religion is forbidden, and its free exercise permitted, it does not follow that everything which may be so called can be tolerated. Crime is not the less odious because sanctioned by what any particular sect may designate as religion."20

"Certainly no legislation can be supposed more wholesome and necessary in the founding of a free, self-governing commonwealth, fit to take rank as one of the coordinate States of the Union, than that which seeks to establish it on the basis of the idea of the family, as consisting in and springing from the union for life of one man and one woman in the holy estate of matrimony; the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization; the best guarantee of that reverent morality which is the source of all beneficent progress in social and political improvement."21

To summarize what the Court said, the First Amendment religion clause gave us freedom of religion, freedom of conscience.22 It separated church and state. However, when an act violated the criminal laws of the nation, the perpetrator was to be punished even if the act were in conformity with the beliefs of his sect.23 The Court declared that the criminal laws of this nation were founded on Christian principles. In other words, the Court said that the United States looked to God for its principles.24 The sect which the Court

---

17 Davis v. Beason, 133 U.S. 333, 341-43, 345 (1890). In Davis, a man was convicted of a crime under Idaho law and filed a writ of habeas corpus claiming that the law under which he was convicted violated the First Amendment "free exercise of religion" clause. The law prohibited one who belonged to a church organization that holds or teaches bigamy and polygamy as a doctrine of the church from voting or holding office.

18 The Court was wrong in pronouncing that marriage is a civil contract. Section VI will deal with the fallacy that marriage is a civil contract. Although polygamy is contrary to the will of God, where does the Bible teach that polygamy should be subject to criminal sanctions?

19 Ibid., pp. 343-344. Although one can argue as to whether the Bible prescribes a criminal penalty for bigamy, it is certain that God’s Word commands one husband with only one wife.

20 Ibid., p. 345.

21 Ibid., citing Murphy v. Ramsey, 114 U.S. 15, 45. The court is right that marriage and family are important to the well-being of a nation. But, as has been pointed out, the God-given goal of a nation should be the glory of God. If the glory of God is the goal, correct marital and familial principles will follow. Nowhere in Scripture can one infer that the civil government has the authority to legislate and enforce laws dealing with marriage and familial relationships. A civil government does have the God-given authority to criminalize sexual sins which include sodomy and adultery.

22 Ibid., p. 342.

23 Ibid., pp. 341-347.

24 Ibid. The Court made this clear although it did not use these exact words. For example, on page 343 of the opinion the Court said, “Probably never before in the history of this country has it been seriously contended that the whole punitive power of the government for acts, recognized by the
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referred to was the Mormon “church” and the crime designated as a practice of a sect or “religion” was polygamy and bigamy. The First Amendment gave the Mormon “church” the right to exist in America. The First Amendment gave those who belonged to the Mormon “church” the right to practice what was designated by their “church” as "religion." The First Amendment did not give those who belonged to the Mormon “church” the right to put into practice the duties imposed by their sect when those duties were recognized by the general consent of the Christian world as proper matters for prohibitory legislation.

The Court spoke of “Maker,” of “acts recognized by the general consent of the Christian world in modern times as proper matters for prohibitory legislation,” and of “morals of a [nation’s people].” The United States of America got its guidelines for what was criminal and for what is moral and what is immoral from looking at the “Christian world,” not by looking at the Bible. Thus, although the jurisprudence purported to be Christian, it was polluted to a degree.

In Rector, Etc., of Holy Trinity Church: v. United States in 1892, the court stated a somewhat flawed history of Christianity within the United States:

“[The … charters of the original colonies, the Mayflower Compact, governing documents of early colonies, the Declaration of Independence, the constitutions of the various states, and the Constitution of the United States] are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons. They are organic utterances. They speak the voice of the entire people. [They declare that this is a Christian nation]. 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. Com. 11 Serg & R 394, 400, ‘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 and tithes and spiritual courts, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men.’ [The Court was not entirely accurate in its historical assessment.] And in People v. Ruggles, 8 Johns 290, 294, 295, 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; and to scandalize the author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but even in respect to the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order…. The free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and free and decent discussions on any religious subject, is granted and secured; but to revile, with malicious and blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound by any expressions in the constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mahomet or of the Grand Lama; and for this plain reason, that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors.’ And in the famous case of Vidal v. Girard's Ex'rs, 2 How. 127, 198, this court, while sustaining the will of Mr. Girard, with its provision for the creation of a college into which no minister should be permitted to enter, observed: ‘It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania.’

“If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life, as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same
truth. [The laws, business, customs, and society of America, including the Constitution, were not entirely Christian but a blend of Christian and other thought.] Among other matters note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the almighty; the custom 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. 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.\textsuperscript{31} [Emphasis mine. Bracketed sentence added by this author.]

The majority of the justices at that time were Christians or at least men who respected Christianity. However, they obviously were weak spiritually since they relied upon man’s reasoning instead of the Word of God. They handed down opinions which attempted to honor God. Even though the Church of the Holy Trinity, the plaintiff in the case, was a corporation and therefore out of the perfect will of God, the Court still recognized some biblical principles in its decision.

The suit in \textit{Holy Trinity Church} arose because the church, a corporation, hired an Englishman to serve as pastor. A federal law made it unlawful for “any person, company, partnership, or corporation” to bring in an immigrant into the United States “under contract or agreement” “to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.”\textsuperscript{32}

The Court noted that “a thing may be within the letter of the statute and yet not within the statute, because not within its spirit, nor within the intention of its makers” and that “[t]he reason of the law in such cases should prevail over its letter.”\textsuperscript{33} The Court then stated, in examining the intent of the legislature in making the law:

“Obviously the thought expressed in this reaches only to the work of the manual laborer, as distinguished from that of the professional man. No one reading such a title would suppose that Congress had in its mind any purpose of staying the coming into this country of ministers of the gospel, or, indeed, of any class whose toil is that of the brain. The common understanding of the terms labor and laborers does not include preaching and preachers; and it is to be assumed that words and phrases are used in their ordinary meaning. So whatever of light is thrown upon the statute by the language of the title indicates an exclusion from its penal provisions of all contracts for the employment of ministers, rectors and pastors.”\textsuperscript{34}

The Court further examined the intent of the statute, then stated:

“But beyond all these matters 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.”\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Rector}, 143 U.S. at 470-71, 12 S. Ct. at 516. Christopher Columbus was a Catholic, and regardless of his declarations that his journey to the New World was inspired by God, Catholicism in the part of the New World dominated by that religion has produced entirely different and substantially inferior consequences than those seen in America prior to the denunciation of God by the American government.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 458, 12 S. Ct. at 511.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 459, 461, 12 S. Ct. at 512.

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 463, 12 S. Ct. at 513.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 465, 12 S. Ct. at 514.
From there, the Court proceeded to give a flawed history of the nation concluding that this is a Christian nation.

Many of the quotations in Holy Trinity Church used the word “religion” in referring to Christianity. The opinion then traces the Christian heritage of America, although the Court failed to point out the theological conflict that resulted in the First Amendment. Christianity and religion were synonymous to the majority of Americans, including the majority on the Supreme Court. This had been so universally accepted as truth that the courts had seldom addressed it!

From God’s perspective as reflected in His Word, the reasoning in even these nineteenth century opinions was flawed. For example, the Court referred to Jefferson’s obscure letter to the Danbury Baptists. In that letter, Jefferson used deistic terms and enlightenment reasoning. He referred to “restoring man to all his natural rights, convinced that he has no natural rights in opposition to his social duties.” The Court referred to “the laws of all civilized and Christian countries” and not to the Bible or to God and His principles. The history given was definitely modified and revised to a degree. Although the reasoning was far better overall than that of the Court in the mid-twentieth century and thereafter—which would successfully attempt to remove God from all public affairs—it was still a compromise in God’s eyes. The holy had been mixed with the unholy, and the holy was thereby corrupted and on its way out.

A time would come during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries when the majority on the Court, and the majority of Americans, were not born-again Christians. When that happened, the failure of the Constitution to declare the sovereignty of God and the proper goal for the nation—the glory of God—and the inclusion of enlightenment principles in the Constitution (and the Declaration of Independence) would make the undermining of Christian values and the removal of the nation from “under God” much easier.

36 Ibid., pp. 465-470, 12 S. Ct. at 514-516.
37 Ibid., p. 470, 12 S. Ct. at 516.
Chapter 3
Application of the First Amendment to the states: 1868-1947

The Supreme Court used the Fourteenth Amendment to open the door for the federal government to get into state government affairs. Since state governments had illegally gotten into the affairs of individual, family, and church governments, the United States Supreme Court was able to intercede into those governments. The purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment, which was ratified after the Civil War, was to protect the status of Black Americans and insure their freedom, but it has been used for other purposes with no regard for its intent. The Fourteenth Amendment says, in relevant part:

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”1

Although the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified in 1868, the complete sovereignty of the states in matters of religion was not challenged until well into the twentieth century. When that challenge came, “the constitutional prohibition of an establishment or religion was expanded into a prohibition of the reading of the Bible, the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer in public schools, posting the Ten Commandments in public schools of America,”2 and many other prohibitions intended to remove all vestiges of God over civil government. Endless debates continue concerning the limitations imposed by the First Amendment by the Supreme Court through the Fourteenth Amendment. One thing is certain—only a view that allows the Supreme Court to invoke their philosophies and beliefs and impose them on the American people can explain the perversion by the Court of the fundamental law of America.

Two “distinct and totally divergent trends” in Supreme Court Fourteenth Amendment jurisprudence emerged. Initially, after the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court declared unconstitutional laws passed to uphold the rights of Negroes. At the same time, the Court relied upon the Fourteenth Amendment to control state legislative power over corporations. The Court extended “to corporations by a series of ever widening interpretations of the amendment a measure of freedom from state regulation that accorded with the spirit of the times but hardly with the spirit of the men who framed the amendments and the American people who adopted them.” Thus the amendment became the “Magna Charta of corporation freedom” “while its application to its real purpose, the achievement of legal equality for all Americans, was lulled to a fitful slumber.”3 However, the incorporation of the First Amendment into the Fourteenth Amendment was almost eighty years in the future.

The first instance where the Supreme Court may have applied the First Amendment to the states through the Fourteenth was in 1871. The case involved

---

1 U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1.
2 Marnell, p. 132.
3 Ibid., p. 144.
a dispute between majority (who disbelieved in slavery) and minority (who supported slavery) membership in a Presbyterian Church in Louisville, Kentucky, each claiming the exclusive use of the property held and owned by that local church.\(^4\) The Court stated, “The full and free right to entertain any religious belief, to practice any religious principle, and to teach any religious doctrine which does not violate the laws of morality and property, and which does not infringe on personal rights, is conceded to all. The law knows no heresy, and is committed to support no dogma, the establishment of no sect.”\(^5\) “The statement is not explicit, but in its context this is obviously a declaration of religious freedom for minorities. For over seventy years, the Fourteenth Amendment would be applied for the protection of minority freedom.”\(^6\)

In 1879, an opinion delivered by Supreme Court Justice Stephen J. Field

“at least intimated that the Fourteenth Amendment was applicable to the protection of religious liberty. He stated, ‘In our country hostile and discriminating legislation by a statute against persons of any class, sect, creed or nation, or whatever form it may be expressed is forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment’ (Ho Ah Kow v. Numan, 12 Fed. Cas. No. 6546, pp. 252, 256. In 1885 he expanded this doctrine: ‘The Fourteenth Amendment … undoubtedly intended not only that there should be no arbitrary deprivation of life or liberty, or arbitrary spoliation of property, but that equal protection and security should be given to all under like circumstances in the enjoyment of their personal and civil rights…’ (Barber v. Connolly, 113 U.S. 27, 31). His point of view was shared in various dissenting opinions by Justice John M. Harlan (1833-1911), but the Supreme Court majority continued to … disregard its possible applicability to cases involving religion.”\(^7\)

It took fifty more years for a majority of the Court to imply that the Fourteenth Amendment gave religious liberty to the citizens of the states. In 1923 the Supreme Court in Meyer v. State of Nebraska took another step toward incorporation of the First Amendment into the Fourteenth:

“The issue was whether a Nebraska state statute as construed and applied unreasonably infringed upon the liberty guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution: ‘No state … shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law.’ The Court stated that education and acquisition of knowledge were matters of supreme importance that should be diligently promoted. The Court held that the liberty guaranteed by U.S. Const. amend. XIV protected plaintiff's right to teach and the right of parents to engage plaintiff to teach their children.”\(^8\)

The Court “gave an oblique rather than a direct guarantee to religious freedom from state action.”\(^9\) In defining the liberty guaranteed the Court stated:

---

\(^5\) Ibid. at 728.
\(^6\) Marnell, pp. 145-146.
\(^7\) Ibid., pp. 148-149. See also, Spies v. Illinois, 123 U.S. 166 (1887) and in re King, 46 F. 905, 912 (a circuit court opinion) for evidence of this viewpoint.
\(^9\) Marnell, p. 150.
“While this Court has not attempted to define with exactness the liberty thus guaranteed, the term has received much consideration and some of the included things have been definitely stated. Without doubt, it denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and generally to enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men.... The established doctrine is that this liberty may not be interfered with, under the guise of protecting the public interest, by legislative action which is arbitrary or without reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State to effect. Determination by the legislature of what constitutes proper exercise of police power is not final or conclusive but is subject to supervision by the courts.”10

[Emphasis mine.]

What was not addressed in Meyer “was the fact that training in this school had religious connotations; indeed, Meyer based his defense upon that fact. On the basis of the precedent set in Meyer … there came two years later a finding, much better known….“11 In Pierce12 the Court held that Oregon Compulsory Education Act of 1922, which practically construed requires all normal children between ages of 8 and 16 years to attend public schools. The issue in the case was the constitutional right of religious organizations to operate a religious-oriented, alias parochial, school in the face of a contrary state statute affirmed by the voters. The Court held that the Act violated the Fourteenth Amendment in that it deprived parents and children of their rights in matter of selection of schools and … destroys private schools and diminishes the value of their property. The Court said:

“Under the doctrine of Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, we think it entirely plain that the Act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State. The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.”13

Meyer and Pierce gave parochial schools their legal guarantee of existence. “[T]he Court protected a religious minority in the exercise of a right which could hardly be said to have a common border with the corresponding right of the majority.”14

Little by little, the Court used the Fourteenth Amendment to secure the rights of Americans against state infringement, although the Court, in 1937, restricted application of the Fourteenth Amendment to fundamental liberties which included freedom of thought and speech.15 In Gitlow a New York Statute prohibited language advocating, advising, or teaching the overthrow of organized government by unlawful means.16 Although the constitutionality of
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10 262 U.S. at 397-400.
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13 Marnell, p. 153 citing 268 U.S. at 534-535; 45 S. Ct. at 573.
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the statute and the conviction were upheld, the Court stated, “For present purposes we may and do assume that freedom of speech and of the press—which are protected by the First Amendment from abridgment by Congress—are among the fundamental personal rights and ‘liberties’ protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment from impairment by the States.”

“It was widely inferred that freedom of speech and of the press carried as an inevitable corollary freedom of religion.”

Justice Cordoza, in a concurring opinion in *Hamilton*, a case which upheld a law requiring military training at a state university, stated, “I assume for present purposes that the religious liberty protected by the First Amendment against invasion by the nation is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment against invasion by the states.”

In 1938 the Court, in a case involving a Jehovah’s Witness arrested, convicted, and fined for distributing religious tracts without a permit, held that the ordinance requiring a permit was unconstitutional, ruling that “it strikes at the very foundation of the freedom of the press by subjecting it to license and censorship.” Liberty of circulating is as essential to that freedom as liberty of publishing; indeed, without the circulation, the publication would be of little value.

Soon thereafter, Jehovah’s Witnesses in Connecticut were arrested, tried, and convicted for violating an ordinance requiring approval by a certain public official before one could solicit funds for “any alleged religious, charitable, or philanthropic cause.” The Supreme Court reversed the state court stating:

“We hold that the statute, as construed and applied to the appellants, deprives them of their liberty without due process of law in contravention of the Fourteenth Amendment.... The First Amendment declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The Fourteenth Amendment has rendered the legislatures of the states as incompetent as Congress to enact such laws. The constitutional inhibition of legislation on the subject of religion has a double aspect. On the one hand, it forestalls compulsion by law of the acceptance of any creed or the practice of any form of worship. Freedom of conscience and freedom to adhere to such religious organization or form of worship as the individual may choose cannot be restricted by law. On the other hand, it safeguards the free exercise of the chosen form of religion. Thus, the Amendment embraces two concepts -- freedom to believe and freedom to act. The first is absolute, but, in the nature of things, the second cannot be. Conduct remains subject to regulation for the protection of society. The freedom to act must have appropriate definition to preserve the enforcement of that protection. It is equally clear that a State may, by general and nondiscriminatory legislation, regulate the times, the places, and the manner of soliciting upon its streets, and of holding meetings thereon, and may in other respects safeguard the peace, good order, and comfort of the community without unconstitutionally invading the liberties protected by the Fourteenth Amendment....

“It will be noted, however, that the Act requires an application to the secretary of the public welfare council of the State; that he is empowered to determine whether the cause is a religious one, and that the issue of a certificate depends upon his affirmative action. If he finds that the cause is not that of religion, to solicit for it becomes a crime. He is not to issue a certificate as a matter of course. His decision to issue or refuse it involves appraisal of facts, the exercise of judgment, and the formation of an opinion. He is authorized to withhold his approval if he determines that the cause is not a religious one. Such a censorship of religion as the means of determining its right to survive is a denial
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of liberty protected by the First Amendment and included in the liberty which is within the protection of the Fourteenth.”

For the first time, the Court explicitly held that the Fourteenth Amendment secures the religious guarantees of the Bill of Rights against state infringement. Prior to Cantwell, the few religion-clause cases decided by the Court involved actions against the federal government. After Cantwell, the majority of religion clause cases going to the Supreme Court were aimed at state actions.

Next came two flag-salute cases, Minnnesota School District v. Gobitis, 310 U.S. 586 (1940) and West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943). Barnette reversed Minnnesota which upheld a state law that required all public school students to salute the American flag. Jehovah’s Witnesses refused to do so based upon a literal interpretation of Exodus 20.4, 5—they considered the flag an “image.” Minnnesota held that the promotion of national cohesion through the compulsory flag salute was an interest more important than the preservation of religious freedom.

Barnette held that the required flag salute was a violation of the first and Fourteenth amendments in the case of students with a conscientious objection to it grounded upon religious belief. Justice Jackson, writing for the majority stated:

“The freedom asserted by these appellees does not bring them into collision with rights asserted by any other individual. It is such conflicts which most frequently require intervention of the State to determine where the rights of one end and those of another begin. But the refusal of these persons to participate in the ceremony does not interfere with or deny rights of others to do so. Nor is there any question in this case that their behavior is peaceable and orderly. The sole conflict is between authority and rights of the individual….

“To sustain the compulsory flag salute we are required to say that a Bill of Rights which guards the individual's right to speak his own mind, left it open to public authorities to compel him to utter what is not in his mind….

“The problem is whether under our Constitution compulsion as here employed is a permissible means for its achievement…. Ultimate futility of such attempts to compel coherence is the lesson of every such effort from the Roman drive to stamp out Christianity as a disturber of its pagan unity, the Inquisition, as a means to religious and dynastic unity, the Siberian exiles as a means to Russian unity, down to the fast failing efforts of our present totalitarian enemies. Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.”

The above assertions of the court were biblically correct, but the societal context as compared to that of the founding of the nation had been changed considerably in an unconstitutional and unbiblical manner. For example, the education of the majority of children had been placed in the hands of a public school system. Justice Jackson noted:

“These principles [in the Bill of Rights] grew in soil which also produced a philosophy that the individual was the center of society, that his liberty was attainable through mere absence of governmental restraints, and that government should be entrusted with few controls and only the mildest supervision over men's affairs. We must transplant these rights to a soil in which the laissez-faire concept or principle of non-interference has withered at least as to economic affairs, and social advancements are increasingly sought through closer integration of society and through expanded and strengthened governmental controls. These changed conditions often deprive precedents of reliability

23 Barnette, 319 U.S. at 630, 634, 641.
and cast us more than we would choose upon our own judgment. But we act in these matters not by authority of our competence but by force of our commissions.”

The court also examined the question of power of the civil government versus individual liberty, and then discussed whether the proper place to address the issue was within the legislature:

“The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.”

As to this assertion, the Court can and does hand down decisions which make law and which go beyond interpretation of the Constitution. Some such decisions are within the Constitutional powers of the Court, but some are not. As it has turned out, many decisions of the Court are contrary to the principles of the highest law and will contribute to the ultimate destruction of the nation.

24 Ibid., pp. 639-640.
25 Ibid., p. 638.
Chapter 4

“Excessive power concentrated in the hands of sinful men is a formula for tyranny and disaster.”¹ The Founding Fathers attempted to prevent such a concentration of powers by balancing the power of civil government among legislative, executive, and judicial branches. Nonetheless, the modern Supreme Court has become an uncontrolled tyrant by usurping power not given it by the Constitution. Instead of interpreting law, the Court makes law and overturns legitimate laws made by the representatives of the people. Judges, like all men, vary all along the scale from good to bad. Some judges have been “mentally impaired, venal, and even racist.”² Most have been spiritually blind, many guided by the god of this world. “As few as five justices can and do dictate economic, cultural, criminal, [spiritual] and security policy for the entire nation….”³

“Activist judges have taken over schools systems, prisons, private-sector hiring and firing practices, and farm quotas; they have ordered local governments to raise property taxes and states to grant benefits to illegal immigrants; they have expelled God, prayer, and the Ten Commandments from the public square; they’ve protected virtual child pornography, racial discrimination in law school admissions, flag burning, the seizure of private property without just compensation, [abortion,] and partial-birth abortion. They’ve announced that morality alone is an insufficient basis for legislation. Courts now second-guess the commander in chief in time of war and confer due process rights on foreign enemy combatants. They intervene in the electoral process.”⁴

The Supreme Court in effect legislates and overturns constitutional laws passed by the state and federal governments, ignoring the constitutional constraints upon its authority. The tyrannical turn of the Court could have been predicted by anyone with a firm grasp of biblical principles. Even during the debates over ratification of the Constitution, some men predicted such a turn by the Court. For example, Robert Yates, an ardent anti-federalist and delegate to the Constitutional Convention from New York, in opposing the Constitution, predicted the process by which the federal judiciary would achieve primacy over the state governments and other branches of the national government:

“Perhaps nothing could have been better conceived to facilitate the abolition of the state governments than the constitution of the judicial. They will be able to extend the limits of the general government gradually, and by insensible degrees, and to accommodate themselves to the temper of the people. Their decisions on the meaning of the constitution will commonly take place in cases which arise between individuals, with which the public will not be generally acquainted; one adjudication will form a precedent to the next, and this to a following one.”⁵

The balance of power intended by the founders was upset soon after ratification of the Constitution.

¹ Eidsmoe, God and Caesar, pp. 16-17.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
In its 1803 Marbury v. Madison[,] 5 U.S. 137 (1803)决定，the Supreme Court determined that it had the power to decide cases about the constitutionality of congressional (or executive) actions and—when it deemed they violated the Constitution—overturn them. The shorthand label given to this Court-made authority is ‘judicial review.’ And this, quite literally, is the foundation for the runaway power exercised by the federal courts to this day…. [Chief Justice John] Marshall’s ruling in Marbury was nothing short of a counter-revolution. For 200 years, the elected branches have largely acquiesced to the judiciary’s tyranny.6

For a century and a half, Supreme Court and civil government interference with churches and attempts to make sure all vestiges of God were erased from public life were practically nonexistent. However, armed with the power of judicial review, the twentieth century Court, without the benefit of a biblical worldview, began to decide issues in a society which had abandoned many of its founding principles and to attempt to define the liberties and rights of the individual, of the minority and the majority, which had been based upon biblical principles—of which many or most of the Justices had no knowledge or understanding—written into the First Amendment. As a result, some of the Court’s assertions were and are correct but were polluted with unbiblical assertions and reasoning. The reasoning of the Court was applied in a society generally ignorant of biblical principles and which was becoming more secular with each passing day. “The application to particular factual situations of the … general rules [concerning the First Amendment religion clause as laid down by the Court], simplistic as they appear to be in the abstract, has involved a complex pattern of turns and twists of legal reasoning, cutting across almost all facets of human life.”7

The foundational law, the Bible, agrees with a correct interpretation of the First Amendment, an interpretation which has never been fully applied by our courts or understood by the vast majority of Americans. Even Christian lawyers have looked to Court decisions, not the Bible, as the foundational law upon which they make their arguments and place their hope. The result has been a steady downward spiral toward a totally secular state and populace. Although “Christian” lawyers have sought to fight this downward spiral, for the most part they have fought in a manner, as exemplified in recent cases dealing with the display of the Ten Commandments on public property, which dishonors God. Even though “claiming” some “victories” in the legal arena, those “victories” are nothing more than compromises at best which chip away at or totally destroy recognition of the sovereignty of God, and lead deeper into a pluralistic state and society, while Christianity and the true and only God are degraded by civil government and society in general. At the same time that victories (which are rare and which are not victories) are being proclaimed by “Christian” lawyers, those lawyers and their firms are leading Bible believing pastors and church members, who have not studied the issues, down the road to destruction.

The American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”) has been the preeminent instigator of lawsuits attacking the recognition of God in state affairs. The

6 Ibid., pp. 30, 33; see pp. 29-33 for an excellent overview of the history surrounding Marbury.
7 Kramer, 37 L. Ed. 2d 1147 § 2. Kramer lists the “facets of human life” across which the religion clause as applied by the Court has cut. Then Kramer examines the cases. The reader of Kramer’s annotation must keep in mind that Kramer leaves God out of the analysis. A Christian who studies his annotation must also read and study the cases themselves (not just Kramer’s summaries and analyses) and analyze those cases in light of biblical principles. Kramer misses the most important point—the religion clause has been used to remove God from the public life of America and to insult God by eliminating Him from all consideration in civil government affairs.
ACLU first sends threatening letters to coerce schools, agencies of civil governments and others into terminating their practice which recognizes God. Should that fail, many times they initiate lawsuits, and many of those legal battles have gone all the way to the Supreme Court. Even should they lose in court, they, and their cohorts in the secular media and in society in general sometimes begin a mass disinformation campaign to turn the tide of public opinion and eventually the tide of the law. That tactic was successful after they lost the 1925 “Scopes Trial,” which involved a state law which punished by fine the teaching of evolution in the public school classroom in Tennessee. Only creationism was allowed to be taught. After the trial, in which a public school teacher who had supposedly taught evolution in a Tennessee classroom was convicted, popular writers falsely portrayed the fight as “science against a resistant fundamentalism which clung to the tenets of the Bible,” glorified science and belittled the Bible and those who believed it, portrayed the trial as a decisive defeat for old-time religion, and belittled witnesses in the trial who had been on the side of creationism while making saints of those on the other side.

Even then, although the great majority of the population was Christian, much of the media was liberal, having been given a closed-minded education in secular colleges and universities. Ultimately, fundamentalism withdrew from the main culture and constructed “a separate subculture with independent religious, educational, and social institutions.”

“For eight decades, the ACLU has been America’s leading religious censor, waging a largely unchallenged (until recently) war against America’s core values—all not only without protest but with the support of much of the media—cloaking its war in the name of liberty.”

“The result of this conflict is that Americans find themselves living in a country that, with each passing day, resembles less of what our nation’s Founding Fathers intended…. We now live in a country where our traditional Christian … faith and religion—civilizing forces in any society—are openly mocked and increasingly pushed to the margins. We live in a country where parental authority is undermined and children have less protection from pornography, violent crime, and the promotion of dangerous and selfish sexual behaviors. We live in a country where the value of human life has been cheapened—from the moment and manner of conception to natural or unnatural death.”

In the area of religion, “in the last 40 years, [the ACLU] has banned school prayer (including silent meditation), eliminated graduation invocations, driven creches and menorahs from public parks, taken carols out of school assemblies, purged the Ten Commandments monuments, and … called into question God in the Pledge of Allegiance.”

The civil government supports humanism with its dollars. “If you doubt this, next time you go to a national park notice how much you and your children are exposed to the theory of evolution.” Books, displays, presentations, and tours promote evolution. The Supreme Court has banned God from the public schools, and the curricula of the public school classroom is based on the religion of humanism. Humanists know the importance of getting Satan’s message to the young. As one humanist leader puts it:

9 Ibid., pp. 225-246.
12 Eidsmoe, God and Caesar, p. 134.
“I am convinced that the battle for humankind’s future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being. These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preacher, for they will be ministers of another servant, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subjects they teach regardless of the educational level—preschool daycare or large state university. The classroom must and will become an area of conflict between the old and the new—the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery and the new faith of humanism resplendent in its promise of a world in which the never realized Christian idea of ‘love thy neighbor’ will finally be achieved.”

The *Everson* decision finished laying the groundwork for the secular pluralistic state, for totally eradicating all mention of God, at least of God as who He is, from civil governmental functions in America. *Everson* reached the same conclusion as *Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370 (1930), but by a different rationale.

In *Meyer* and *Pierce*, the First Amendment, as implemented by the Fourteenth, established the right of religious minorities to send their children to parochial schools. In *Cochran* and *Everson*, the right of minorities attending church-operated schools to share in the benefits of social legislation was established.

A Bible-believing Christian should ask, “Why was there a public school in a supposedly Christian nation since civil government was given no authority by God to educate children and since God had placed such responsibility in the hands of parents?” Obviously, the nation began early to move away from God’s principles. As could be anticipated, the movement of the public schools away from God began not long after their origin in this nation.

“[T]he religion of the public schools has changed. In the 1700s, the religion of American education was orthodox and mostly Calvinist Christianity. In the 1800s this religion was replaced by a more liberalized version of Christianity bordering on Unitarianism. And in the twentieth century the religion of the American public schools appears to be something closer to secular humanism.”

The issue in *Cochran* was whether taxation by the state of Louisiana for the purchase of school books for school children including school children going to private, religious, sectarian, and other schools not embraced in the public educational system violated the First Amendment. The Court, in a unanimous decision delivered by Chief Justice Hughes,

“drew a distinction among the People, the State, and the Church. It held that there was no violation of the Fourteenth Amendment in a specific legislative act designed to benefit the people and the State…. The fact of education benefits the people and the State; that it may also benefit the Church is a correlative fact but not an indistinguishable one. So long as the textbooks lent were the same ones lent in the public schools and so long as they were lent for the same purpose, education in the areas of secular study, the act was a piece of social legislation within the constitutional prerogative of the State…. If a piece of legislation aids the People and the State but does not aid the Church directly, it is constitutional.”

---
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All the cases considered in Chapter 3, and in this chapter to this point, dealt with the protection of religious rights of minorities under the “free exercise clause.” *Everson* was decided under the “establishment clause.” *Everson* completely changed the meaning of “establishment of religion.”

The issue in *Everson* was whether the state could use tax money to reimburse the parents of children who attended a church school for their bus fares for riding to school. The majority reached the same conclusion as did *Cochran*, but using a different rationale.

“The People] and [the Church] were fused in contradistinction to the [State], in the majority opinion as well as in the minority. Out of this fusion emerges a new pattern of thinking. Does the Constitution forbid an establishment of religion, or does it forbid an establishment of religion? … When the word establishment is italicized, the phrase has a definite historical meaning. An establishment is a state-supported church[,] But when the word religion is italicized, then an undetermined and indeterminable swarm of implications, inferences, corollaries, and conclusions emerges from the philological cacoon. They began to merge in 1948[.]”\(^{16}\)

The majority and minority in *Everson* agreed that any aid to a church through legislation that was intended to aid the people and the state was “an establishment of religion which was forbidden by the Constitution. The majority thought that the bus fare paid for students riding to parochial schools did not aid the church. The minority disagreed.

Thus, with *Everson*, “establishment of religion” became something entirely different from what it had been to that point. As described by Marnell in the above quote, “establishment of religion” or establishment of a state supported church became “establishment of religion,” which was something entirely different. The court further stated that the Constitution created “a wall of separation between church and state.”\(^{17}\) Eventually, this rationale, all taken together, while honoring the historical First Amendment and biblical principle of separation of church and state, would lead to the removal, or the attempt to remove, any vestige of God from civil government affairs. Even when the Court would allow the mention of God, it was with the understanding that it was only historical and of no significance. God, the Ruler of the universe, the Ultimate Lawmaker, and the Judge of the Supreme Court of the universe, gave United States Supreme Court justices the right to rebel.

Supreme Court Justices in the 1940s were operating in a nation where the underlying framework of civil government had already been remolded into something contrary to the principles of God concerning civil government and something not allowed by the Constitution—the federal government was aiding individuals through all types of social legislation. Justice Black, in the majority opinion in *Everson*, commented upon some of the changes in direction the nation had taken:

“It is true that this Court has, in rare instances, struck down state statutes on the ground that the purpose for which tax-raised funds were to be expended was not a public one…. But the Court has also pointed out that this far-reaching authority must be exercised with the most extreme caution…. Otherwise, a state's power to legislate for the public welfare might be seriously curtailed, a power which is a primary reason for the existence of states. Changing local conditions create new local problems which may lead a state's people and its local authorities to believe that laws authorizing new types of public services are necessary to promote the general well-being of the people. The Fourteenth


\(^{17}\) *Everson*, 330 U.S. at 16.
Amendment did not strip the states of their power to meet problems previously left for individual solution.

“It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a secular education serves no public purpose…. Nor does it follow that a law has a private rather than a public purpose because it provides that tax-raised funds will be paid to reimburse individuals on account of money spent by them in a way which furthers a public program…. Subsidies and loans to individuals such as farmers and home-owners, and to privately owned transportation systems, as well as many other kinds of businesses, have been commonplace practices in our state and national history.”\textsuperscript{18}

As to the issue of separation of church and state, as pointed out in the above statement and in the dissent, states were now taxing to support individuals. Prior to independence and the Constitution, the colonies had done this, but with a difference. The difference—the money to support members of the public went to churches in the colonies and the churches used the money to pay ministers, build church buildings, and support charities. Tax money now went to government agencies, whose religion was secular humanism and which were becoming the new source of help and instruction for many Americans. The United States went from one type of illegal and destructive taxation to another. On the national level, the New Deal spearheaded by President Franklin D. Roosevelt had gone far in replacing a faith in God with a faith in government. President Roosevelt, with his proposed court-packing scheme, coerced the Justices of the Supreme Court into going along with his civil government programs. The nation was switching from the way of faith in God to the way of faith in the god of this world; and, in its instructive capacity, was leading the people down the same path.

Bible believing Christians should note that Supreme Court Justices and other government officials and agents who were not operating under God were called upon to formulate principles to guide its citizens. Supreme Court Justices in \textit{Everson} were deciding an issue by incorrectly using underlying First Amendment law which had come about as a result of a spiritual conflict and which reflected a biblical principle in a nation that was becoming more and more divorced from God’s principles.

The majority opinion in \textit{Everson}, of course, contained some truth in reaching its unconstitutional and unbiblical conclusion. The god of this world has from the beginning been a master of deceit and always introduces some truth into the debate. Justice Black, writing for the majority, and the dissent written by Justice Rutledge, selectively extracted accurate portions of First Amendment history while leaving out vital aspects. Justice Black wrote:

“A large proportion of the early settlers of this country came here from Europe to escape the bondage of laws which compelled them to support and attend government-favored churches. The centuries immediately before and contemporaneous with the colonization of America had been filled with turmoil, civil strife, and persecutions, generated in large part by established sects determined to maintain their absolute political and religious supremacy. With the power of government supporting them, at various times and places, Catholics had persecuted Protestants, Protestants had persecuted Catholics, Protestant sects had persecuted other Protestant sects, Catholics of one shade of belief had persecuted Catholics of another shade of belief, and all of these had from time to time persecuted Jews. In efforts to force loyalty to whatever religious group happened to be on top and in league with the government of a particular time and place, men and women had been fined, cast in jail, cruelly tortured, and killed. Among the offenses for which these punishments had been inflicted were such things as speaking disrespectfully of the views of ministers of government-established churches, non-attendance at those
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churches, expressions of non-belief in their doctrines, and failure to pay taxes and tithes to support them.

“These practices of the old world were transplanted to and began to thrive in the soil of the new America. The very charters granted by the English Crown to the individuals and companies designated to make the laws which would control the destinies of the colonials authorized these individuals and companies to erect religious establishments which all, whether believers or non-believers, would be required to support and attend. An exercise of this authority was accompanied by a repetition of many of the old-world practices and persecutions. Catholics found themselves hounded and proscribed because of their faith; Quakers who followed their conscience went to jail; Baptists were peculiarly obnoxious to certain dominant Protestant sects; men and women of varied faiths who happened to be in a minority in a particular locality were persecuted because they steadfastly persisted in worshipping God only as their own consciences dictated. And all of these dissenters were compelled to pay tithes and taxes to support government-sponsored churches whose ministers preached inflammatory sermons designed to strengthen and consolidate the established faith by generating a burning hatred against dissenters.

“These practices became so commonplace as to shock the freedom-loving colonials into a feeling of abhorrence. The imposition of taxes to pay ministers' salaries and to build and maintain churches and church property aroused their indignation. It was these feelings which found expression in the First Amendment. No one locality and no one group throughout the Colonies can rightly be given entire credit for having aroused the sentiment that culminated in adoption of the Bill of Rights’ provisions embracing religious liberty. But Virginia, where the established church had achieved a dominant influence in political affairs and where many excesses attracted wide public attention, provided a great stimulus and able leadership for the movement. The people there, as elsewhere, reached the conviction that individual religious liberty could be achieved best under a government which was stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions, or to interfere with the beliefs of any religious individual or group.

“The movement toward this end reached its dramatic climax in Virginia in 1785-86 when the Virginia legislative body was about to renew Virginia’s tax levy for the support of the established church. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison led the fight against this tax. Madison wrote his great Memorial and Remonstrance against the law. In it, he eloquently argued that a true religion did not need the support of law; that no person, either believer or non-believer, should be taxed to support a religious institution of any kind; that the best interest of a society required that the minds of men always be wholly free; and that cruel persecutions were the inevitable result of government-established religions. Madison's Remonstrance received strong support throughout Virginia, and the Assembly postponed consideration of the proposed tax measure until its next session. When the proposal came up for consideration at that session, it not only died in committee, but the Assembly enacted the famous ‘Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty’ originally written by Thomas Jefferson. [Quotations from the ‘Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty’ follow in the opinion.]”

The majority gave its interpretation of the meaning of the First Amendment:

“The ‘establishment of religion’ clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect ‘a wall of separation between church and State.’ Reynolds v. United States, supra at 164….”
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Then, the majority upheld the New Jersey law which required the state to aid parents of students of Catholic schools, in effect aiding not only parents, but also a “church.”

“New Jersey cannot consistently with the ‘establishment of religion’ clause of the First Amendment contribute tax-raised funds to the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church. On the other hand, other language of the amendment commands that New Jersey cannot hamper its citizens in the free exercise of their own religion. Consequently, it cannot exclude individual Catholics, Lutherans, Mohammedans, Baptists, Jews, Methodists, Non-believers, Presbyterians, or the members of any other faith, because of their faith, or lack of it, from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation. While we do not mean to intimate that a state could not provide transportation only to children attending public schools, we must be careful, in protecting the citizens of New Jersey against state-established churches, to be sure that we do not inadvertently prohibit New Jersey from extending its general state law benefits to all its citizens without regard to their religious belief.

“Measured by these standards, we cannot say that the First Amendment prohibits New Jersey from spending tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part of a general program under which it pays the fares of pupils attending public and other schools. It is undoubtedly true that children are helped to get to church schools. There is even a possibility that some of the children might not be sent to the church schools if the parents were compelled to pay their children's bus fares out of their own pockets when transportation to a public school would have been paid for by the State. The same possibility exists where the state requires a local transit company to provide reduced fares to school children including those attending parochial schools, or where a municipally owned transportation system undertakes to carry all school children free of charge. Moreover, state-paid policemen, detailed to protect children going to and from church schools from the very real hazards of traffic, would serve much the same purpose and accomplish much the same result as state provisions intended to guarantee free transportation of a kind which the state deems to be best for the school children's welfare. And parents might refuse to risk their children to the serious danger of traffic accidents going to and from parochial schools, the approaches to which were not protected by policemen. Similarly, parents might be reluctant to permit their children to attend schools which the state had cut off from such general government services as ordinary police and fire protection, connections for sewage disposal, public highways and sidewalks. Of course, cutting off church schools from these services, so separate and so indisputably marked off from the religious function, would make it far more difficult for the schools to operate. But such is obviously not the purpose of the First Amendment. That Amendment requires the state to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them.

“This Court has said that parents may, in the discharge of their duty under state compulsory education laws, send their children to a religious rather than a public school if the school meets the secular educational requirements which the state has power to impose. See Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U. S. 510. It appears that these parochial schools meet New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.”

True, the state has the power, but not the God-given authority, to enforce secular educational requirements. Then, Justice Black wrote:

“‘The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here.’” [Emphasis mine.]

---
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The effect of the new rationale regarding separation of church and state was twofold. First, the Court still honored biblical separation of church and state. A church can operate under God if it so chooses. That “high and impregnable” wall allows both the civil government and a church, according to their individual choices, to remain under God only. Civil government is not over a church—if a church so chooses—and a church is not over civil government. Sadly, most churches eagerly submit to civil government by incorporating and applying for 501(c)(3) status.

Second, the opinion laid the groundwork for removal of God from the public life of America. Mr. Justice Jackson’s dissent, joined by Mr. Justice Rutledge was prophetic:

“The Court's opinion marshals every argument in favor of state aid and puts the case in its most favorable light, but much of its reasoning confirms my conclusions that there are no good grounds upon which to support the present legislation. In fact, the undertones of the opinion, advocating complete and uncompromising separation of Church from State, seem utterly discordant with its conclusion yielding support to their commingling in educational matters. The case which irresistibly comes to mind as the most fitting precedent is that of Julia who, according to Byron's reports, 'whispering I will ne'er consent,' – consented.”

Thus, under the Act and resolution brought to us by this case, children are classified according to the schools they attend and are to be aided if they attend the public schools or private Catholic schools, and they are not allowed to be aided if they attend private secular schools or private religious schools of other faiths…. If we are to decide this case on the facts before us, our question is simply this: Is it constitutional to tax this complainant to pay the cost of carrying pupils to Church schools of one specified denomination? … [States] cannot, through school policy any more than through other means, invade rights secured to citizens by the Constitution of the United States. West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624. One of our basic rights is to be free of taxation to support a transgression of the constitutional command that the authorities 'shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ...'. U.S. Const.

“The function of the Church school is a subject on which this record is meager. It shows only that the schools are under superintendence of a priest and that 'religion is taught as part of the curriculum.' But we know that such schools are parochial only in name -- they, in fact, represent a world-wide and age-old policy of the Roman Catholic Church. Under the rubric ‘Catholic Schools,’ the Canon Law of the Church, by which all Catholics are bound, provides concerning the education of Catholic children, among other things, that the Catholic faith and morals are to be taught in Catholic schools; that the religious teaching of youth in any schools is subject to the authority and inspection of the Church.”

The state cannot maintain a Church and it can no more tax its citizens to furnish free carriage to those who attend a Church. The prohibition against establishment of religion cannot be circumvented by a subsidy, bonus or reimbursement of expense to individuals for receiving religious instruction and indoctrination.

“The Court, however, compares this to other subsidies and loans to individuals and says, ‘Nor does it follow that a law has a private rather than a public purpose because it provides that tax-raised funds will be paid to reimburse individuals on account of money spent by them in a way which furthers a public program.’ Of course, the state may pay out tax-raised funds to relieve pauperism, but it may not under our Constitution do so to induce or reward piety. It may spend funds to secure old age against want, but it may not spend funds to secure religion against skepticism. It may compensate individuals for loss of employment, but it cannot compensate them for adherence to a creed.

“It seems to me that the basic fallacy in the Court's reasoning, which accounts for its failure to apply the principles it avows, is in ignoring the essentially religious test by which beneficiaries of this expenditure are selected. A policeman protects a Catholic, of course -- but not because he is a Catholic; it is because he is a man and a member of our
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society. The fireman protects the Church school -- but not because it is a Church school; it is because it is property, part of the assets of our society. Neither the fireman nor the policeman has to ask before he renders aid ‘Is this man or building identified with the Catholic Church?’”

Mark R. Levin points out that Justice Black, a former Ku Klux Klan member who probably hated the Catholic Church, wrote the majority opinion “for the purpose of undercutting the true meaning of the religion clauses.” He “joined the majority in order to thwart them from the inside—and he succeeded.”

“[Justice Black’s opinion in Everson] drew criticism from all quarters. Black’s rhetoric and dicta contrasted too sharply with his conclusion and holding to satisfy anyone. If he had not written it as he did, he later said, ‘[Supreme Court Justice Robert] Jackson would have. I made it as tight and gave them as little room to maneuver as I could.’ [Justice Black] regarded it as going to the verge. His goal, he remarked at the time, was to make it a Pyrrhic victory and he quoted King Pyrrhus, ‘One more victory and I am undone.’”

Liberals still constantly rely on Jefferson’s words, “wall of separation between church and state,” to justify their opposition to virtually any civil government intersection with God. If indeed Justice Black’s motivation was to hurt the Catholic Church, he instead hurt the nation by laying the groundwork for the severing of a recognition of the biblical doctrine of the sovereignty of God and an incorrect extension of the biblical doctrines of “government,” “church,” and “separation of church and state,” doctrines alien to the Catholic Church.

The Court was adopting the First Amendment to the conditions of a civil government that had gone outside its God-given and constitutional boundaries. All religions were to be treated equally and obviously to be given equal deference. Although the “wall of separation” originated by this Court still allowed a church to remain under God, when and if applied consistently, that wall would also be used to assure that God would not be honored as Supreme Sovereign by the United States of America. The new aspect of the First Amendment would ultimately result in chaos, especially since the other branches opened the door for churches to subjugate themselves to the civil government, as will be shown in Section VI. Even though a church can still choose to be under God only, most have chosen—by incorporating and taking “tax exemption” under an unconstitutional act of the federal government—not to do so. Justice Rehnquist was correct in stating that “[t]he ‘wall of separation between church and State’ [as interpreted by the Everson Court] is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned.”

“Despite this, the ‘wall’ is part of the lexicon of many Supreme Court cases that involve religion and it has led to an inconsistent and illogical series of decisions.” However, one must keep in mind that the decision was partially correct in that it still proclaims that churches may choose to be under God because of the “high and impregnable wall” between church and state.
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Many cases between the decision in *Everson* in 1947 and the present continued to separate God and state. First, the federal and state governments had extended their authorities into areas where they were given no authority by God, into areas God desired to be left under the authority of governments other than civil government. Then the “impregnable wall of separation between church and state” was used to separate God from the United States of America. America made its God-allowed choice. The nation and its unlawful institutions and agencies are more and more guided by secular Godless and unbiblical principles.

A biblical examination of Supreme Court jurisprudence involving the removal of the nation from under God would be voluminous. The cases following in this chapter are just a sampling, with two 2005 cases involving public display of the Ten Commandments examined in some detail to show the depraved state of Supreme Court “separation of church and state” jurisprudence.

The “undetermined and indeterminable swarm of implications, inferences, corollaries, and conclusions which emerges from the philological cacoon” brought about by the newly defined establishment of *religion* began to emerge in 1948 in the *McCollum* case. The released time law of the state of Illinois provided for voluntary attendance by students whose parents agreed to allow their children to attend such instruction at thirty or forty-five minute religious classes conducted in the classrooms of public schools. The teachers of such classes were volunteers of various religions approved by school authorities who provided their services at no expense to the schools. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish classes were conducted, and other religions could have established classes under the law had there been a demand. The issue in *McCollum* was whether the state could use its power “to utilize its tax-supported public school system in aid of religious instruction insofar as that power may be restricted by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.” The five-judge majority wrote:

“This is beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith. And it falls squarely under the ban of the First Amendment (made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth) as we interpreted it in *Everson v. Board of Education*.... There we said: ‘Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force or influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbelief in any religion. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups, and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect ‘a wall of separation between Church and State.’’”

Although the Supreme Court retreated somewhat from its *Everson* position in 1952, since *Everson*, America has been sliding down hill and away from recognition of God at an accelerating pace. In *Zorach*, the Court upheld a New
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York law which allowed schools to dismiss students for religious instruction given off campus and financed entirely by churches. The issue was “whether New York by this system has either prohibited the ‘free exercise’ of religion or has made a law ‘respecting an establishment of religion’ within the meaning of the First Amendment.”

The Court, as it has done many times, demonstrated its misunderstanding of the difference between “separation of church and state” and “separation of God and state” by equating the two:

“The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other…. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; ‘so help me God’ in our courtroom oaths - these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the First Amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: ‘God save the United States and this Honorable Court.’”

Church and God are not the same. The First Amendment deals with separation of church and state, not separation of God and state. This seems such a simple truth; but one which, like God’s simple plan of salvation, has eluded many brilliant but foolish and vain religious and non-religious men.

“To replow some ground, God the Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, instituted the church, with Himself to be over each local church. When He instituted the church, He had already instituted civil government and made known that He desired that each nation choose to submit itself to His sovereignty. Prayers, references, oaths, messages of chief executives, etc. have nothing to do with the establishment of a church. If made with proper motive, they have to do with recognition of and submission to the Sovereign of the universe.

Zorach demonstrated that, even though temporarily retreating somewhat from its Everson position, the Court, ignorant of truth, was unknowingly confused and at odds with its Sovereign. The Court continued:

“We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the zeal of its adherents and the appeal of its dogma. When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions…. The government must be neutral when it comes to competition between sects. It may not thrust any sect on any person. It may not make a religious observance compulsory. It may not coerce anyone to attend church, to observe a religious holiday, or to take religious instruction. But it can close its doors or suspend its operations as to those who want to
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repair to their religious sanctuary for worship or instruction. No more than that is undertaken here."  

If “we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being,” then why do not the Court and the nation bow down to that Supreme Being? “Supreme” means “highest in rank or authority.” Maybe it is because we are, for the most part, “religious” but lost. The apostle Paul said:

“But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”

The retreat in Zorach was only temporary. Gradually Satan’s principles and activities were implemented, taught, and encouraged by the Supreme Court. In 1961, in *McGowan* the Supreme Court secularized the “Sabbath.”

“Indeed, the purpose apparent from government action can have an impact more significant than the result expressly decreed: when the government maintains Sunday closing laws, it advances religion only minimally because many working people would take the day as one of rest regardless, but if the government justified its decision with a stated desire for all Americans to honor Christ, the divisive thrust of the official action would be inescapable. This is the teaching of *McGowan v. Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420, 6 L. Ed. 2d 393, 81 S. Ct. 1101 (1961), which upheld Sunday closing statutes on practical, secular grounds after finding that the government had forsaken the religious purposes behind centuries-old predecessor laws. *Id.*, at 449-451, 6 L. Ed. 2d 393, 81 S. Ct. 1101.”

In 1961, in *Torcaso* Leo Pfeffer and Lawrence Speiser argued the cause for appellant who was denied a commission as notary public in Maryland because he would not declare his belief in God. The Maryland Constitution provided that “[N]o religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God....” The Supreme Court wrote:

“The power and authority of the State of Maryland thus is put on the side of one particular sort of believers - those who are willing to say they believe in ‘the existence of God.’ ... When our Constitution was adopted, the desire to put the people ‘securely beyond the reach’ of religious test oaths brought about the inclusion in Article VI of that document of a provision that ‘no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.’ ... This Maryland religious test for public office unconstitutionally invades the appellant's freedom of belief and religion [under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution] and therefore cannot be enforced against him.”

The Court, as did our forefathers, related a belief in the Sovereign of the universe with “religious test.”

The Court further noted:

In discussing Article VI in the debate of the North Carolina Convention on the adoption of the Federal Constitution, James Iredell, later a Justice of this Court, said:
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“... [I]t is objected that the people of America may, perhaps, choose representatives who have no religion at all, and that pagans and Mahometans may be admitted into offices. But how is it possible to exclude any set of men, without taking away that principle of religious freedom which we ourselves so warmly contend for?”

“Among religions in this country which do not teach but would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism, and others.”

Under the First Amendment, as it was intended, followers of humanism, and all followers of any other false religion were intended to be given freedom from persecution because of their beliefs. God desires that no one come to Him by force. However, the 1961 Court failed to know that there is but one God, but one Sovereign of the universe, Sovereign of nations, individuals, families, religious institutions and churches. The Court failed to understand the certain consequences brought by the failure of Judges of the Supreme Court, all civil government officials, and all people everywhere to choose to recognize Him as Sovereign.

In 1962 in Engel the Court declared that prayer in public school breaches the constitutional wall between church and state. State officials wrote the following prayer which was required to be said aloud by each class in the presence of a teacher at the beginning of each school day:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our Country."

Satan is not satisfied with merely the watering down of prayer and failure to recognize God the Son. He hates to hear the name of the God of the Bible in any form. The state of New York had made every attempt to adapt a non-sectarian prayer.

“Every effort was made in New York to adapt what was considered a traditional American right to the mid-twentieth-century situation in the state. The churches of the state were broadly represented in the composition of the prayer. It was limited in its theological foundation to the expression of a belief in God and a belief that human welfare was His concern. It represented, as well as human care could achieve, a non-sectarian common denominator of religious belief. It did affirm, however, a belief in God and in His providence. This belief conflicted with a minority belief.... The minority had a right not to say it, but in the view of the Court that was not enough. The Engel decision translated a minority right into minority rule.”

The Court stated:

“[W]e think that the constitutional prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion must at least mean that in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government.”

One statement of the Court in Engel shows its total ignorance of the history, issues, and principles involved:

---
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“It is true that New York's establishment of its Regents' prayer as an officially approved religious doctrine of that State does not amount to a total establishment of one particular religious sect to the exclusion of all others - that, indeed, the governmental endorsement of that prayer seems relatively insignificant when compared to the governmental encroachments upon religion which were commonplace 200 years ago.”

That is an incredibly arrogant and misinformed statement indeed. One can interpret this to mean that the Court declares that the founders were more guilty of violating the First Amendment than were those who formulated the New York prayer being struck down!

In 1963, the Court in *Abington* again, as in *McCollum* and cases since, placed minority rights above the rights of the majority. The Court struck down state laws requiring the reading of Bible verses to students each day and the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer in the public schools. Two cases were combined. The Bible reading case was initiated in Abington Township, Pennsylvania, by Edward and Sidney Schempp. The Lord’s Prayer case was initiated by Madalyn Murray and her son William J. Murray, two professed atheists. At trial, parents Edward Lewis Schempp, his wife Sidney, and their children testified that as to specific religious doctrines purveyed by a literal reading of the Bible “which were contrary to the religious beliefs which they held and to their familial teaching.”

“Dr. Solomon Grayzel testified that there were marked differences between the Jewish Holy Scriptures and the Christian Holy Bible, the most obvious of which was the absence of the New Testament in the Jewish Holy Scriptures. Dr. Grayzel testified that portions of the New Testament were offensive to Jewish tradition and that, from the standpoint of Jewish faith, the concept of Jesus Christ as the Son of God was ‘practically blasphemous…. Dr. Grayzel gave as his expert opinion that such material from the New Testament could be explained to Jewish children in such a way as to do no harm to them. But if portions of the New Testament were read without explanation, they could be, and in his specific experience with children Dr. Grayzel observed, had been, psychologically harmful to the child and had caused a divisive force within the social media of the school.’”

As it was in the times of Christ and the infant church, so it remains. The Jewish religion used the arm of the state to crucify Christ and to persecute His followers after His resurrection and ascension. “[T]he unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren.”

Jewish religious leaders have always opposed and been offended by the Lord Jesus Christ, but this nation arose because of true believers who stood on New and Old Testament principles, including the Lordship of Christ. Just as those who practiced Judaism crucified Christ in a nation destroyed because of their rebellion against God, unbelieving Jews continue their rebellion in America, many of whose founders and citizens believed in New and Old Testament principles, and as a result provided for religious freedom for all men, including religious Jews.
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As to the purpose of the First Amendment, the Court quoted Mr. Justice Rutledge, joined by Justices Frankfurter, Jackson and Burton from the *Everson* opinion:

“The [First] Amendment's purpose was not to strike merely at the official establishment of a single sect, creed or religion, outlawing only a formal relation such as had prevailed in England and some of the colonies. Necessarily it was to uproot all such relationships. But the object was broader than separating church and state in this narrow sense. It was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority….” [Emphasis mine.]

How could the Court be any clearer in its statement of its 1947 *Everson* principle of separation of God and state—that is, in its renunciation of God over civil affairs?

The Court decided the case based upon the “establishment clause” and not on the “free exercise” clause which would have required a showing of coercion, according to the Court. Since the reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord’s prayer were prescribed as classroom activities, the Court held that “the exercising and the law requiring them are in violation of the establishment clause.”

Not knowing that they were bucking the sovereign God, the Court belittled God and His principles by both its rationale and its conclusions. The Court in *Abington* stated that the Bible may constitutionally be used in an appropriate study of history, civilization, ethics, comparative religion, or the like. In other words, The Bible cannot be taught as the Word of God in a public school classroom.

In *Walz*, another example of such lunacy, an owner of real estate in Richmond County, New York, sought an injunction in the New York courts to prevent the New York City Tax Commission from granting property tax exemptions to religious organizations for religious properties used solely for religious worship. The Court upheld the state law, stating that the law did not violate the First Amendment. Explaining that complete separation was impossible, but that neutrality was necessary, the Court declared:

“The legislative purpose of the property tax exemption is neither the advancement nor the inhibition of religion; it is neither sponsorship nor hostility. New York, in common with the other States, has determined that certain entities that exist in a harmonious relationship to the community at large, and that foster its ‘moral or mental improvement,’ should not be inhibited in their activities by property taxation or the hazard of loss of those properties for nonpayment of taxes. It has not singled out one particular church or religious group or even churches as such; rather, it has granted exemption to all houses of religious worship within a broad class of property owned by nonprofit, quasi-public corporations which include hospitals, libraries, playgrounds, scientific, professional, historical, and patriotic groups. The State has an affirmative policy that considers these groups as beneficial and stabilizing influences in community life and finds this classification useful, desirable, and in the public interest. Qualification for tax exemption is not perpetual or immutable; some tax-exempt groups lose that status when their activities take them outside the classification and new entities can come into being and qualify for exemption.” [Emphasis mine.]

---
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The justices equated property owned by God’s church with other property owned by nonprofit, quasi-public corporations which include hospitals, libraries, playgrounds, scientific, professional, historical, and patriotic groups. A Christian should understand that the church, a spiritual entity, should never own any property.61 Sadly, as will be shown in Section VI, although churches in America can occupy property in a manner which pleases God, most churches choose to hold property as owners under the plan laid out by the Satan through the civil government.

The Court in 1980, in Stone,62 held that a Kentucky statute requiring the posting of a copy of the Ten Commandments, purchased with private contributions, on the wall of each public school classroom in the State has no secular legislative purpose as required by Lemon; and, therefore, is unconstitutional as violating the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. The Court stated:

“The Commandments do not confine themselves to arguably secular matters, such as honoring one’s parents, killing or murder, adultery, stealing, false witness, and covetousness. See Exodus 20:12-17; Deuteronomy 5:16-21. Rather, the first part of the Commandments concerns the religious duties of believers: worshipping the Lord God alone, avoiding idolatry, not using the Lord’s name in vain, and observing the Sabbath Day. See Exodus 20:1-11; Deuteronomy 5:6-15…. "Posting of religious texts on the wall serves no such educational function. If the posted copies of the Ten Commandments are to have any effect at all, it will be to induce the schoolchildren to read, meditate upon, perhaps to venerate and obey, the Commandments. However desirable this might be as a matter of private devotion, it is not a permissible state objective under the Establishment Clause.”63

The Courts opinion indicates that had the Kentucky statute left off the first four commandments (perhaps without the numbers so that no connection could be made to the commandments and God’s Word), those which deal with man’s relationship to God, the statute may have been constitutional. However, without all ten of the commandments being honored, without God being honored, students and other human beings are powerless to keep the last six commandments which deal with man’s relationship to man (prohibitions against murder, theft, adultery, dishonoring parents, lying, coveting). We see the results today in the zoos called public schools—murder, aggravated assault, lying, drug addiction, sexual sins of all kinds, prostitution, and all manner of evil. God told man the consequences of dishonoring the Sovereign of the universe. These undereducated judges had no idea about the consequences they were unleashing upon the American people.

In Wallace64 in 1985, the Court held that, although a one-minute period of silence for meditation was constitutional, an Alabama law authorizing such a period is a law respecting the establishment of religion and thus violates the First Amendment. The Court used the Lemon test:

“Thus, in Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602, 612-613 (1971), we wrote:

‘Every analysis in this area must begin with consideration of the cumulative criteria developed by the Court over many years. Three such tests may be gleaned from our cases. First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principal
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or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion, Board of Education v. Allen, 392 U.S. 236, 243 (1968); finally, the statute must not foster ‘an excessive [472 U.S. 38, 56] government entanglement with religion.’ Walz [v. Tax Comm'n, 397 U.S. 664, 674 (1970)].”

Wallace stated that the Alabama law violated the first part of the Lemon test, noting that “[t]he sponsor of the bill that became [the law in issue] Senator Donald Holmes, inserted into the legislative record—apparently without dissent—a statement indicating that the legislation was an “effort to return voluntary prayer to the public schools.”

In 1987, in Edwards, the Court held unconstitutional a Louisiana statute, the “Creationism Act,” which required the state’s public schools to give balanced treatment to creation science and evolution science. The statute did not require a school to teach either creation science or evolution science, but provided that if either one was taught, the other must also be taught. Edwards held that, although the Act’s stated purpose was to protect academic freedom, the actual purpose was to endorse religion, and therefore was in violation of Lemon’s first prong. The Court stated:

“because the primary purpose of the Creationism Act is to endorse a particular religious doctrine, the Act furthers religion in violation of the Establishment Clause. The Act violates the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment because it seeks to employ the symbolic and financial support of government to achieve a religious purpose.”

In reaching this conclusion, the majority opinion “reasoned:”

“The preeminent purpose of the Louisiana Legislature was clearly to advance the religious viewpoint that a supernatural being created humankind. The term ‘creation science’ was defined as embracing this particular religious doctrine by those responsible for the passage of the Creationism Act. Senator Keith's leading expert on creation science, Edward Boudreaux, testified at the legislative hearings that the theory of creation science included belief in the existence of a supernatural creator…. Senator Keith also cited testimony from other experts to support the creation-science view that ‘a creator [was] responsible for the universe and everything in it.’ … The legislative history therefore reveals that the term ‘creation science,’ as contemplated by the legislature that adopted this Act, embodies the religious belief that a supernatural creator was responsible for the creation of humankind.

“Furthermore, it is not happenstance that the legislature required the teaching of a theory that coincided with this religious view. The legislative history documents that the Act's primary purpose was to change the science curriculum of public schools in order to provide persuasive advantage to a particular religious doctrine that rejects the factual basis of evolution in its entirety. The sponsor of the Creationism Act, Senator Keith, explained during the legislative hearings that his disdain for the theory of evolution resulted from the support that evolution supplied to views contrary to his own religious beliefs. According to Senator Keith, the theory of evolution was consonant with the 'cardinal principle[s] of religious humanism, secular humanism, theological liberalism, aestheticism [sic].’ … The state senator repeatedly stated that scientific evidence supporting his religious views should be included in the public school curriculum to redress the fact that the theory of evolution incidentally coincided with what he characterized as religious beliefs antithetical to his own. The legislation therefore sought to alter the science curriculum to reflect endorsement of a religious view that is antagonistic to the theory of evolution.

“In this case, the purpose of the Creationism Act was to restructure the science curriculum to conform with a particular religious viewpoint. Out of many possible
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science subjects taught in the public schools, the legislature chose to affect the teaching of the one scientific theory that historically has been opposed by certain religious sects. As in Epperson, the legislature passed the Act to give preference to those religious groups which have as one of their tenets the creation of humankind by a divine creator. 69 [Emphasis mine.]

In Edwards, the Court again substituted its religious preference for that of the majority of the people of a state. The preference of the Court was to remove the God of the universe, the Creator of all, from consideration in the public schools. The Court used its twisted interpretations of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to achieve its goal. The Court used its God-given free will to establish law that is already resulting in dire consequences and will ultimately lead to the total destruction of this nation. What better way for the god of this world to achieve his purposes than providing for the perversion of the minds of children who will one day be adults. There is nothing new under the sun.

The Court, in the 1992 Lee v. Weisman decision, 70 held that the long time tradition of inviting clergy to give invocations and benedictions at high school graduation ceremonies was coercive and therefore unconstitutional. Justice Anthony Kennedy, writing for the majority, wrote:

"[T]he school districts supervision and control of a high school graduation ceremony places public pressure, as well as peer pressure, on attending students to stand as a group or, at least, maintain respectful silence during the invocation and benediction. This pressure, though subtle and indirect, can be as real as any overt compulsion."

"So the nonexistent constitutional right not to feel uncomfortable trumped, in the Court’s logic, the First Amendment’s guarantee of the free exercise of religion, which Providence, Rhode Island, had exercised for a very long time."

In 2004 the Court decided Elk Grove Unified School District. 73 The issue was whether the voluntary recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, including the phrase “under God,” in a public school setting violates the establishment clause. The Justices were unanimous in ruling against Newdow, but the various opinions demonstrate the Court’s confusion. Justice Stevens ruled that Newdow had no standing, Justice O’Connor invented a new establishment clause test, Kennedy ruled against Newdow based upon lack of standing, and Thomas admitted that if the coercion test were honestly applied, the recitation would have to be struck down, arguing therefore that the establishment clause needed to be rethought by the Court. Rehnquist argued that the pledge was constitutional because “reciting the Pledge, or listening to others recite it, is a patriotic exercise, not a religious one; participants promise fidelity to our flag and our Nation, not to any particular God, faith or church.” 74

Two 2005 cases which dealt with the issue of whether the Establishment Clause allows the display of a monument inscribed with the Ten Commandments on public property illustrate how far down the slippery slope to destruction this nation has fallen. In neither of those cases is there an establishment of religion. In each, there is an establishment of religion. As Douglas Laycock said, “With respect to new religious displays, the lesson to
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politicians is never to mention the religious reasons that are, in fact, the only source of pressure to create such displays; to talk blandly of the display’s alleged historical, cultural, or legal significance; to place some secular [or non-Christian religious] text or object nearby, whether or not it has any real relation to the religious display; and, whether plausible or not, to vigorously claim a predominantly secular purpose and effect.”

A close examination of the cases reveals that Professor Laycock’s statement is totally accurate. Most, if not all but one, of the arguments for the commandments in the brief and amicus briefs for those in favor of the monuments emphasized that the monuments were not religious and had a secular purpose, while those against the commandments argued that the monuments were religious. Those for the displays made secular arguments, and those against the displays made religious arguments. God will not honor such insanity by “Christians.”

In Van Orden a plurality of four conservatives, along with the liberal Justice Breyer, upheld the display. The plurality stated that the test laid down in Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971) was not useful in dealing with the sort of passive monument that Texas had erected on its capitol grounds. Instead, in holding that the Establishment Clause allowed the display, the analysis used by the Court looked to the monument’s nature and the nation’s history. In McCreary, the Court, using the test laid down in Lemon, declared that since the County’s purpose for the display was religious, the display was forbidden by the Establishment Clause.

In Van Orden Chief Justice Rehnquist, a conservative, joined by Justices Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas noted that the Ten Commandments monolith challenged was one of “17 monuments and 21 historical markers commemorating the ‘people, ideals, and events that compose Texan identity located upon the 22 acres surrounding the Texas State Capitol.’” The court stated that the attempt to reconcile the strong role played by religion and religious traditions throughout the nation’s history with the principle that governmental intervention in religious matters can itself endanger religious freedom, “requires that we neither abdicate our responsibility to maintain a division between church and state nor evince a hostility to religion by disabling the government from in some ways recognizing our religious heritage.” The church that is to be divided from the state in this case is not there. The Court effectively declared that God is severed from the state and that the display was a mere historical marker which they would allow in this limited factual situation.

Chief Justice Rehnquist then writes of the two directions toward which our Establishment Clause jurisprudence looks—first toward the strong role played by religion and religious traditions which he exemplifies by the religious people who prayed to a Supreme Lawgiver to guide them on the one hand and secondly toward the principle that governmental intervention in religious matters can itself endanger religious freedom. A better way to describe the first direction would be the strong role played by God. As has been pointed out, in some ways, the people and leaders of the nation were, for a significant period of our nation’s history, under God, although the Constitution did not state that the nation was
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under God. This was because a majority of the people were probably Christians for some time after the adoption of the Constitution. The opinion makes clear that at least Chief Justice Rehnquist is trying to sort all this out in a way to justify the display, and he almost has it right. He just does not seem to understand the issue of the sovereignty of God over nations and the folly of not recognizing the headship of God the Son over the nation.

The second direction he mentions is biblically correct. Chief Justice Rehnquist then writes of what he calls the role of religion in our nation’s heritage in one place and the role of God in our nation’s heritage in another. He gives examples supporting the role of religion and the role of God. It is as though he equates religion with God. He never defines religion. Religion and God are not the same. He does not understand, or if he does, he does not state his understanding in the opinion, that God wishes the nation to choose to operate under Him, nor does he understand the consequences that will come to a nation that chooses to operate outside God’s principles. He then gives examples of acknowledgements of the role played by the Ten Commandments in government buildings, including the Supreme Court building, in America’s capital and throughout America. He points out that “our opinions, like [our Supreme Court building] have recognized the role the Decalogue plays in America’s heritage.” He then acknowledges that the Ten Commandments are religious and have a religious significance, but that just having a religious content does not run afoul of the Establishment clause. He asserts that there are “limits to the display of religious messages.”

“Stone v. Graham, 449 U.S. 39 (1980) (per curiam) held that a Kentucky statute requiring the posting of the Ten Commandments in every public schoolroom ‘had an improper and plainly religious purpose.’ In the classroom context, we found that the Kentucky statute had an improper and plainly religious purpose. Id. at 41. As evidenced by Stone’s almost exclusive reliance upon two of our school prayer cases, Id., at 41-42 (citing School Dist. of Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), and Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962)), it stands as an example of the fact that we have ‘been particularly vigilant in monitoring compliance with the Establishment Clause in elementary and secondary schools,’ Edwards v. Aguillard, 482 U.S. 578, 583-584 (1987). Compare Lee v. Weisman, 505 U.S. 577, 596-597 (1992)(holding unconstitutional a prayer at a secondary school graduation), with Marsh v. Chambers, [463 U.S.783 (1983)], (upholding a prayer in the state legislature). Indeed, Edwards v. Aguillard recognized that Stone—along with Schempp and Engel—was a consequence of the ‘particular concerns that arise in the context of public elementary and secondary schools.’ 482 U.S., at 584-585. Neither Stone itself nor subsequent opinions have indicated that Stone’s holding would extend to a legislative chamber, see Marsh v. Chambers, supra, or to capitol grounds.”

Chief Justice Rehnquist concluded:

“The placement of the Ten Commandments monument on the Texas State Capitol grounds is a far more passive use of those texts than was the case in Stone, where the text confronted elementary school students every day. Indeed, Van Orden, the petitioner here, apparently walked by the monument for a number of years before bringing this lawsuit. The monument is therefore also quite different from the prayers involved in Schrempp and Lee v. Weisman. Texas has treated her Capitol grounds monuments as representing the several strands in the State’s political and legal history. The inclusion of the Ten Commandments monument in this group has a dual significance, partaking of both religion and government. We cannot say that Texas’ display of this monument violates the Establishment clause of the First Amendment.”
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Justice Scalia was much closer to God’s principles. He wrote that he “would prefer to reach the same result by adopting an Establishment Clause jurisprudence that is in accord with our nation’s past and present practices, and that can be consistently applied—the central relevant feature of which is that there is nothing unconstitutional in a State’s favoring religion generally, honoring God through public prayer and acknowledgment, or in a nonproselytizing manner, venerating the Ten Commandments.”

Justice Thomas’ concurrence was, according to the Constitution, the correct resolution. Justice Thomas was correct in asserting that the Establishment Clause does not restrain the States and should not have been incorporated against the states. He pointed out the Court should adopt the original meaning of the word “establishment”—that the “Framers understood establishment [to] involve actual legal coercion” and that “government practices that have nothing to do with creating or maintaining … coercive state establishments” simply do not “implicate the possible liberty interest of being free from coercive state establishments.”

Justice Thomas then first points out the display in the case is not coercive; and, therefore, it is constitutional. He says, “All told, this Court’s jurisprudence leaves courts, governments, and believers and nonbelievers alike confused—an observation that is hardly new.” Amen! As to confusion, he first cites and summarizes cases where the slightest public recognition of religion have been held to be an establishment of religion (e.g., a sign at a courthouse alerting the public that the building was closed for Good Friday and containing a 4-inch high crucifix; a cross erected to honor World War I veterans on a rock in the Mohave Desert Preserve—that is, a cross in the middle of a desert establishes a religion—etc.).

Second, he states that

“in seeming attempt to balance out its willingness to consider almost any acknowledgment of religion an establishment, in other cases Members of this Court have concluded that the term or symbol at issue has no religious meaning by virtue of its ubiquity or rote ceremonial invocation.... But words such as ‘God’ have religious significance. For example, just last Term this Court had before it a challenge to the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, which includes the phrase ‘one Nation under God.’ The declaration that our country is ‘one Nation under God’ necessarily ‘entails an affirmation that God exists.’ [Elk Grove Unified School Dist. v. Newdow, 542 U.S. 1, 48, (2004)](Thomas, J., concurring in judgment). This phrase is thus anathema to those who reject God’s existence and a validation of His existence to those who accept it. Telling either nonbelievers or believers that the words ‘under God’ have no meaning contradicts what they know to be true. Moreover, repetition does not deprive religious words or symbols of their traditional meaning. Words like ‘God’ are not vulgarities for which the shock value diminishes with each successive utterance.

“Even when this Court’s precedents recognize the religious meaning of symbols or words, that recognition fails to respect fully religious belief or disbelief.... [Justice Thomas continues his criticism. then he concludes:] Finally, the very ‘flexibility’ of this Court’s Establishment Clause precedent leaves it incapable of consistent application.... The inconsistency between the decisions the Court reaches today in this case and in McCready County v. American Civil Liberties Union of Ky. ... only compounds the confusion.

“The unintelligibility of this Court’s precedent raises the further concern that, either in appearance or in fact, adjudication of Establishment Clause challenges turns on judicial
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predilections…. The outcome of constitutional cases ought to rest on firmer grounds than the personal preferences of judges.

“Much, if not all, of this would be avoided if the Court would return to the views of the Framers and adopt coercion as the touchstone for our Establishment Clause inquiry.” 84

Justice Breyer, the lone liberal who joined with the majority in Van Orden, states that this is a borderline case where none of the Court’s various tests for evaluating Establishment Clause questions can substitute for the exercise of legal judgment. He points out that the display here, taken in context, communicated not only a religious, but also a secular moral message and a historical message. He pointed out that the views of people of several faiths with ethics based motives went into finding a sectarian text. Then he stated that

“The physical setting of the monument … suggests nothing of the sacred.” That setting “does not readily lend itself to meditation or any other religious activity,” but “it does provide a context of history and moral ideals.” Since the monument went unchallenged for 40 years, “those 40 years suggest more strongly than can any set of formulaic tests that few individuals, whatever their system of beliefs, are likely to have understood the monument as amounting, in any significantly detrimental way, to a government effort to favor a particular religious sect, primarily to promote religion over nonreligion, to ‘engage in’ any ‘religious practice[e],’ to ‘compel’ any ‘religious practice,’ or to work ‘deterrence of any religious belief.’ Those 40 years suggest that the public visiting the capitol grounds has considered the religious aspect of the tablets’ message as part of what is a broader moral and historical message reflective of a cultural heritage.” 85

Justice Stevens, joined by Justice Ginsburg, dissented. To analyze that dissent from a biblical perspective could be the subject of a book, and not a short one. The author will make only a few observations. Stevens is totally blind to truth. In belittling the obvious endorsement of the “divine code of the ‘Judeo-Christian’ God,” he betrays the fact that he does not even know that the Jewish religion and Christianity worship different Gods. The Jewish religion rejects Jesus Christ, God the Son, thereby rejecting God. He should know this since he “learned to recite the King James version … long before [he] understood the meaning of some of its words.” Many, including this author, find the words of the King James Version much easier to understand than the mumbo-jumbo being penned as law by liberal writers of Supreme Court opinions. He does not understand that the Jewish religion had nothing to do with the founding of this nation, the securing of religious liberty in America, and the blessings that God has bestowed upon America. Justice Stevens states that “[t]he adornment of our public spaces with displays of religious symbols and messages undoubtedly provides comfort, even inspiration to many individuals who subscribe to particular faiths. Unfortunately, the practice also runs the risk of ‘offend[ing] nonmembers of the faith being advertised as well as adherents who consider the particular advertisement disrespectful.” 86 Obviously, he cares nothing for those who are offended by the attempt to remove the monument, for those offended that the Court relegates the monument to an historical monument with a secular purpose, allowed there because being there for 40 years with no complaints has proven that it is not considered by most to be a government endorsement of religion. With his beliefs, he would have been among those who desired to kill and eventually crucified the Savior because they were offended by what he said:
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“Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.”

And, most egregiously, he knows nothing of, much less cares about, what the Sovereign of the universe, the Lord of Lords, the King of Kings, thinks or feels about the monument and this nation’s rejection of the headship of Jesus Christ over nations. Why cannot such a man understand the words of the King James Version of the Bible? Because he is either lost or he is a spiritual baby. He has chosen, as did this author until 1982, to either remain a child of the devil or to remain ignorant of biblical principles, at least as of the writing of his dissent in McCreary.

“Jesus answered them [the Pharisees, a Jewish religious sect], Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham. Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.

And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.”

[Skipping over a lot of the opinion.] Justice Stevens quotes the Fraternal Order of Eagles, the group which donated the monument:

“[I]n searching for a youth guidance program, [we] recognized that there can be no better, no more defined program of Youth Guidance, and adult guidance as well, than the laws handed down by God Himself to Moses more than 3000 years ago, which laws have stood unchanged through the years. They are a fundamental part of our lives, the basis of all our laws for living, the foundation of our relationship with our Creator, with our families and with our fellow men. All the concepts we live by--freedom, democracy, justice, honor--are rooted in the Ten Commandments.

“The erection of these monoliths is to inspire all who pause to view them, with a renewed respect for the law of God, which is our greatest strength against the forces that threaten our way of life.”

Justice Stevens then continues to show his lack of education. Skipping over much other foolishness, one comes to the following:

“The desire to combat juvenile delinquency by providing guidance to youths is both admirable and unquestionably secular. But achieving that goal through biblical teachings injects a religious purpose into an otherwise secular endeavor. By spreading the word of God and converting heathens to Christianity, missionaries expect to enlighten their converts, enhance their satisfaction with life, and improve their behavior. Similarly, by disseminating the ‘law of God’--directing fidelity to God and proscribing murder, theft,
and adultery—the Eagles hope that this divine guidance will help wayward youths conform their behavior and improve their lives. In my judgment, the significant secular byproducts that are intended consequences of religious instruction—and, indeed, of the establishment of most religions—are not the type of ‘secular’ purposes that justify government promulgation of sacred religious messages.

“Though the State of Texas may genuinely wish to combat juvenile delinquency, and may rightly want to honor the Eagles for their efforts, it cannot effectuate these admirable purposes through an explicitly religious medium. See Bowen v. Kendrick, 487 U.S. 589, 639-640, 101 L. Ed. 2d 520, 108 S. Ct. 2562 (1988) (Blackmun, J., dissenting) (“It should be undeniable by now that religious dogma may not be employed by government even to accomplish laudable secular purposes.”). The State may admonish its citizens not to lie, cheat, or steal, to honor their parents, and to respect their neighbors’ property; and it may do so by printed words, in television commercials, or on granite monuments in front of its public buildings. Moreover, the State may provide its schoolchildren and adult citizens with educational materials that explain the important role that our forebears’ faith in God played in their decisions to select America as a refuge from religious persecution, to declare their independence from the British Crown, and to conceive a new Nation. See Edwards, 482 U.S., at 606-608, 96 L. Ed. 2d 510, 107 S. Ct. 2573 (Powell, J., concurring). The message at issue in this case, however, is fundamentally different from either a bland admonition to observe generally accepted rules of behavior or a general history lesson.

“The reason this message stands apart is that the Decalogue is a venerable religious text. As we held 25 years ago, it is beyond dispute that ‘[t]he Ten Commandments are undeniably a sacred text in the Jewish and Christian faiths.’ Stone v. Graham, 449 U.S. 39, 41, 66 L. Ed. 2d 199, 101 S. Ct. 192 (1980) (per curiam). For many followers, the Commandments represent the literal word of God as spoken to Moses and repeated to his followers after descending from Mount Sinai. The message conveyed by the Ten Commandments thus cannot be analogized to an appendage to a common article of commerce (‘In God we Trust’) or an incidental part of a familiar recital (‘God save the United States and this honorable Court’). Thankfully, the plurality does not attempt to minimize the religious significance of the Ten Commandments. Ante, at 690, 162 L. Ed. 2d, at 619 (“Of course, the Ten Commandments are religious—they were so viewed at their inception and so remain’); ante, at 692, 162 L. Ed. 2d, at 620 (Thomas, J., concurring); see also McCreary County v. American Civil Liberties Union of Ky. post, at 909, 162 L. Ed. 2d 729, 125 S. Ct. 2722 (Scalia, J., dissenting). Attempts to secularize what is unquestionably a sacred text defy credibility and disserve people of faith.”

Sadly, Justice Stevens betrays his total lack of understanding of truth and wisdom. He does not understand that combating juvenile delinquency is a spiritual, not a secular battle, meant to be done by parents, operating under the principles of God laid down in the Bible. Juvenile crime should be punished, and some juvenile crime undoubtedly falls under the God-given criminal jurisdiction of the state; but in normal situations, the secular state many times assumes jurisdiction over the juveniles in this nation, a jurisdiction that God gave to parents. God wants parents to bring up the children whom He has placed in their care according to principles in the Word of God.

“Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain. It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows: for so he giveth his beloved sleep. Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward.”

“And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”
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The federal government has taken jurisdiction in many areas against God’s desires. The state has redefined the law, the role of the state, morality, the goals of individuals both male and female, marriage, the family, the roles of parents, and the roles of children. The United States is a society predominantly guided by the principles of the god of this world. Children are indoctrinated in secularism in the public schools, and by the secular media. The state attempts, successfully for the most part, to teach “Christians” to keep their “religion” behind the four walls of their “church,” and that the communication of religious beliefs has no place in the public square. The state tells the corporate 501(c)(3) religious organizations what they can say, and those organizations, even though they contracted with the state and agreed that the state would have jurisdiction over them in certain matters, fight against the state telling them what to do. Intelligent but unwise men tell us that a secular education will better prepare us to “choose our religion.” Most Americans are led by selfishness, greed, and ungodly ambition. We see the results—the ever-deteriorating condition of this nation.

The foolishness of Justice Stevens continues for twenty more pages in the opinion.

Justice Souter, joined by Justice Stevens and Justice Ginsburg, also dissent. Here is just one exemplary statement from that dissent:

“Thus, a pedestrian happening upon the monument at issue here needs no training in religious doctrine to realize that the statement of the Commandments, quoting God himself, proclaims that the will of the divine being is the source of obligation to obey the rules, including the facially secular ones. In this case, moreover, the text is presented to give particular prominence to the Commandments’ first sectarian reference, ‘I am the Lord thy God.’ That proclamation is centered on the stone and written in slightly larger letters than the subsequent recitation. To ensure that the religious nature of the monument is clear to even the most casual passerby, the word ‘Lord’ appears in all capital letters (as does the word ‘am’), so that the most eye-catching segment of the quotation is the declaration ‘I AM the LORD thy God.’ App. to Pet. for Cert. 21. What follows, of course, are the rules against other gods, graven images, vain swearing, and Sabbath breaking. And the full text of the fifth Commandment puts forward filial respect as a condition of long life in the land ‘which the Lord they God giveth thee.’ See ibid. These ‘words ... make [the] ... religious meaning unmistakably clear.’”

Obviously, these justices are in the dark about the sovereignty of the one and only God, His rules for nations, for judges, for other civil government officials, and the consequences of rejecting God as Sovereign.

In McCreary, the other 2005 Ten Commandments case, where is the “establishment of religion”? There is none. There is only an establishment of religion. Again, the Court’s main underlying statement was that these liberal justices choose not to recognize the principles of the true God. Justice Souter, delivered the majority opinion, joined by the three other liberals—Stevens, Ginsburg, and Breyer—and by O’Connor, the “moderate” swing vote.

The majority decided the case based upon the Lemon test, finding that the Ten Commandments monument at issue had no secular purpose. The monument considered was the third monument the counties erected. The counties made changes for the second and third monuments in an attempt to bring the display into accord with Supreme Court jurisprudence. The first monument displayed the Ten Commandments in isolation. The second monument included the statement of the county government’s purpose expressly set out in the county resolutions and juxtaposed the Commandments to other documents whose

---
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references to God were highlighted as their sole common element. The third display placed the Commandments in the company of other documents deemed significant in the historical foundation of the American government. The county cited several new purposes for the display, including a desire to educate County citizens as to the significance of the documents displayed. The attempt failed.

The majority noted that the county placed the monument, which, unlike the monument in the Texas case, displayed an abridged text of the *King James Version* of the Ten Commandments, in a high traffic area of the courthouse. The commandments were hung in a ceremony in which the presiding officer, a judge who was accompanied by the pastor of his church, called them “good rules to live by,” and recounted the story of an astronaut who became convinced “there must be a divine God” after viewing the Earth from the moon. The judge’s pastor called the Commandments “a creed of ethics” and told the press that displaying the Commandments was ‘one of the greatest things the judge could have done to close out the millennium.”

The majority concluded, under *Lemon*, that the alleged secular purpose of the monuments were only a sham, and secondary to a religious objective. The majority noted:

“The touchstone for our analysis is the principle that the ‘First Amendment mandates governmental neutrality between religion and religion, and between religion and nonreligion.’… Manifesting a purpose to favor one faith over another, or adherence to religion generally, clashes with the ‘understanding reached … after decades of religious war, that liberty and social stability demand a religious tolerance that respects the religious views of all citizens…. By showing a purpose to favor religion, the government sends the … message to … nonadherents ‘that they are outsiders, not full members of the political community, and an accompanying message to adherents that they are insiders, favored members….’”

The Court teaches that this nation regards all beliefs to be equal and that a statement that acknowledges a belief in God, at least in this case, will not be tolerated because some people will be offended. Obviously, the Court was, as it had been for some time, manifesting that this is a pluralistic nation where all “religions” and all religious beliefs will be treated equally. The principles of God no longer have a place in the jurisprudence of this nation. The Court does not recognize the sovereign God.

The majority took *Stone* as the initial legal benchmark.

“*Stone* stressed the significance of integrating the Commandments into a secular scheme to forestall the broadcast of an otherwise clearly religious message … and for good reason, the Commandments being a central point of reference in the religious and moral history of Jews and Christians. They proclaim the existence of a monotheistic god (no other gods). They regulate details of religious obligation (no graven images, no sabbath breaking, no vain oath swearing). And they unmistakably rest even the universally accepted prohibitions (as against murder, theft, and the like) on the sanction of the divinity proclaimed at the beginning of the text. Displaying that text is thus different from a symbolic depiction, like tablets with 10 roman numerals, which could be seen as alluding to a general notion of law, not a sectarian conception of faith. Where the text is set out, the insistence of the religious message is hard to avoid in the absence of a context plausibly suggesting a message going beyond an excuse to promote the religious point of view. The display in *Stone* had no context that might have indicated an object beyond the religious character of the text, and the Counties’ solo exhibit here did nothing more to counter the sectarian implication than the postings at issue in *Stone.*"
The majority emphasizes that it must be neutral regarding religion. It attempts to explain “establishment of religion” as follows:

“The prohibition on establishment covers a variety of issues from prayer in widely varying government settings, to financial aid for religious individuals and institutions, to comment on religious questions. In these varied settings, issues of interpreting inexact Establishment Clause language, like difficult interpretative issues generally, arise from the tension of competing values, each constitutionally respectable, but none open to realization to the logical limit.”

Left-wing mumbo-jumbo at its best, but at least letting us know that the Court and the other branches of the federal government can, with enough liberals and “moderates,” reconstruct the Constitution into whatever form it so desires, completely ignoring history and logic and totally discounting God.

The majority then criticizes the dissent, and is somewhat right about the point criticized. The dissent “identifies God as the God of monotheism, all of whose three principal strains (Jewish, Christian, and Muslim) acknowledge the religious importance of the Ten Commandments.” Thus, the dissent would assert that “rigorous espousal of a common element of this common monotheism, is consistent with the establishment ban.” The majority points out that the dissent [like the majority] fails to take into account the “full range of evidence showing what the Framers believed.” The dissent [as does the majority] cites selected historical quotes and facts from the founding era and revises the history of the founding era [as does the majority] to support its position. The majority was as guilty as the dissent when it explained:

“... The dissent is certainly correct in putting forward evidence that some of the Framers thought some endorsement of religion was compatible with the establishment ban; the dissent quotes the first President as stating that ‘[n]ational morality [cannot] prevail in exclusion of religious principle,’ for example, ... and it cites his first Thanksgiving proclamation giving thanks to God.... Surely if expressions like these from Washington and his contemporaries were all we had to go on, there would be a good case that the neutrality principle has the effect of broadening the ban on establishment beyond the Framers' understanding of it (although there would, of course, still be the question of whether the historical case could overcome some 60 years of precedent taking neutrality as its guiding principle).

“But the fact is that we do have more to go on, for there is also evidence supporting the proposition that the Framers intended the Establishment Clause to require governmental neutrality in matters of religion, including neutrality in statements acknowledging religion. The very language of the Establishment Clause represented a significant departure from early drafts that merely prohibited a single national religion, and the final language instead extended [the] prohibition to state support for 'religion' in general.

“The historical record, moreover, is complicated beyond the dissent's account by the writings and practices of figures no less influential than Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. Jefferson, for example, refused to issue Thanksgiving Proclamations because he believed that they violated the Constitution. See Letter to S. Miller (Jan. 23, 1808), in
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5 The Founders’ Constitution, ... at 98. And Madison, whom the dissent claims as supporting its thesis, ... criticized Virginia's general assessment tax not just because it required people to donate ‘three pence’ to religion, but because ‘it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of Citizens all those whose opinions in Religion do not bend to those of the Legislative authority.’ ... (internal quotation marks omitted); see also Letter from J. Madison to E. Livingston (July 10, 1822), in 5 The Founders’ Constitution, ... ([R]eligion & Govt. will both exist in greater purity, the less they are mixed together'); Letter from J. Madison to J. Adams (Sept. 1833), in Religion and Politics in the Early Republic 120 (D. Dresbach ed. 1996) (stating that with respect to religion and government the ‘tendency to a usurpation on one side, or the other, or to a corrupting coalition or alliance between them, will be best guarded against by an entire abstinence of the Government from interference’).

From the above portion of the opinion, one can see that the Founders, or at least a significant number of them, recognized that God was over nations. Too bad they did not memorialize this in the text of the Constitution. Even then liberal government officials, including liberal judges, would have eventually revised the Constitution, but such illegal actions would have been obvious and would have logically left the officials engaging in such conduct open to impeachment.

Since the Constitution did not declare that God and His principles were to be the guiding light for the nation—that is, that this was to be a nation under God whose goal was the glory of God—the majority was able to declare:

“The fair inference is that there was no common understanding about the limits of the establishment prohibition, and the dissent’s conclusion that its narrower view was the original understanding, ... stretches the evidence beyond tensile capacity. What the evidence does show is a group of statesmen, like others before and after them, who proposed a guarantee with contours not wholly worked out, leaving the Establishment Clause with edges still to be determined. And none the worse for that. Indeterminate edges are the kind to have in a constitution meant to endure, and to meet ‘exigencies which, if foreseen at all, must have been seen dimly, and which can be best provided for as they occur.’”

Their conclusion is therefore that one can know nothing for certain. There is no truth. All the Founding Fathers left us was a guarantee with no fixed meaning—the Constitution means what the ruling majority on the Court says it means. This is the ultimate consequence brought by a document that was a blend of enlightenment and biblical principles. Every nation in history, and every nation before the return of Christ, will eventually, if not initially, be ruled by the unregenerate. America experienced a temporary period of time when the majority of Americans honored the Word of God. That time is long gone and will never return.

As Justice Scalia wrote in the minority opinion:

“What distinguishes the rule of law from the dictatorship of a shifting Supreme Court majority is the absolutely indispensable requirement that judicial opinions be grounded in consistently applied principle. That is what prevents judges from ruling now this way, now that—thumbs up or thumbs down—as their personal preferences dictate. Today’s opinion forthrightly (or actually, somewhat less than forthrightly) admits that it does not rest upon consistently applied principle. In a revealing footnote, ... the Court acknowledges that the ‘Establishment Clause doctrine’ it purports to be applying ‘lacks the comfort of categorical absolutes.’ What the Court means by this lovely euphemism is that sometimes the Court chooses to decide cases on the principle that government cannot favor religion, and sometimes it does not. The footnote goes on to say that ‘[i]n special instances we have found good reason’ to dispense with the principle, but ‘[n]o such
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Liberals will not and cannot apply biblical principle. Even conservatives cannot apply biblical principle, as Justice Scalia’s dissent shows.

Justice O’Connor wrote a concurring opinion. She totally misses the point, because she does not have a grasp of history and because she understands neither the sovereignty of God nor biblical principles such as separation of church and state. She said, for example, “the goal of the Clauses is clear: to carry out the Founders’ plan of preserving religious liberty to the fullest extent possible in a pluralistic society.”

What a perversion of truth. As has been shown in Section IV, the Founders lived in a society wherein religious liberty came about as a result of forces which differed on biblical interpretation. The correct interpretation won out as far as freedom of conscience and religious liberty was concerned.

These liberal and “moderate” justices, with their closed secular education, will probably never seek to open their minds and understand the true message that God desires a nation and its leaders to choose to send—that He is the Sovereign of all governments; that the United States choose to be guided by His principles; that He wants a nation to proclaim to the world that it is a “Christian nation” that will be guided by the principles of Christianity; that He as Sovereign gives individual, family, church, and civil governments the choice of whom they will serve. In order to understand that, they would first have to be born again and then continue in God’s Word. The confusion will continue to grow, the state will continue its illogical and God-defying ways, tyranny will continue to increase, and God’s prophecies that He laid out for all who have an open mind to read and study will come about. The lost and the unknowledgeable saved always far outnumber the Christians.

Justice Scalia was joined in the minority opinion by Chief Justice Rehnquist, Justice Thomas, and Justice Kennedy. He writes, “I shall discuss, first, why the Court's oft repeated assertion that the government cannot favor religious practice is false; second, why today’s opinion extends the scope of that falsehood even beyond prior cases; and third, why even on the basis of the Court's false assumptions the judgment here is wrong.”

His first point should have been that the one true God, the God of the Old and New Testaments, desires to be recognized as Sovereign over the nation. This portion of the opinion demonstrates that the Founders leaving this issue unresolved is speeding the nation more quickly toward God’s final judgment. He quotes selected historical facts to support his position—most of those facts would point to the recognition of a sovereign God over the nation and not to the interference with freedom of religion and conscience by the state; that is, not to the conclusion that government can favor religious practice.

Overall, although Justice Scalia makes some valid points which are much closer to the truth by far than the majority, he interjects truth with egregious falsity. At times he is off base, and at other times he dances around the truth, but never quite touches it. He is wrong to seemingly equate Christianity, Judaism, and Islam because they all are “monotheistic” and “believe the Ten Commandments were given by God to Moses,” and are “divine prescriptions for
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a virtuous life.” He does not understand that this nation owes its religious freedom to Christian dissenters, mainly Baptists, and to neither the Jewish religion, whose leaders were responsible for crucifying the giver of liberty even though Christ laid down His life for every sinner,\textsuperscript{104} nor the false theocratic and brutal Islamic religion.

He was close to truth when he wrote:

“Historical practices thus demonstrate that there is a distance between the acknowledgment of a single Creator and the establishment of a religion. The former is, as \textit{Marsh v. Chambers} put it, ‘a tolerable acknowledgment of beliefs widely held among the people of this country.’ ... The three most popular religions in the United States, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam—which combined account for 97.7% of all believers—are monotheistic. See U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2004-2005, p 55 (124th ed. 2004) (Table No. 67). All of them, moreover (Islam included), believe that the Ten Commandments were given by God to Moses, and are divine prescriptions for a virtuous life. See 13 Encyclopedia of Religion 9074 (2d ed. 2005); \textit{The Qur'an} 104 (M. Haleem transl. 2004). Publicly honoring the Ten Commandments is thus indistinguishable, insofar as discriminating against other religions is concerned, from publicly honoring God. Both practices are recognized across such a broad and diverse range of the population—from Christians to Muslims—that they cannot be reasonably understood as a government endorsement of a particular religious viewpoint.”\textsuperscript{105}

Justice Scalia was wrong, according to the Word of God. He was wrong to bring false religions such as Judaism and Islam into the equation. His first sentence immediately above, is correct when applied only to Christianity. Theocracy with persecution (as perverted by Jewish religious leaders) is the rule for Judaism, and counterfeit theocracy of the god of this world with persecution is the rule for Islam. He does not understand that Judaism and Islam, unlike the Baptists in the founding era, reject “the way, the truth, and the life.”\textsuperscript{106} He obviously does not understand that the Jewish religion rejected God the Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, and that the God of Islam is nothing more than an idol. He does not understand the purpose of the Commandments. “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.”\textsuperscript{107} “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.”\textsuperscript{108} “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”\textsuperscript{109} Pursuant to Jesus Christ, the only way to a pious, or godly life and eternal life is through Him. Both Judaism and Islam, contrary to the beliefs of those who were responsible for giving us the First Amendment, deny that He is the only way, the only truth, and the only life.

Justice Scalia relies on official acts and proclamations of civil government and its officials. He writes:

“‘[R]eliance on early religious proclamations and statements made by the Founders is ... problematic,’ Justice Stevens says in his criticism in the \textit{Van Orden} and, ‘because those views were not espoused at the Constitutional Convention in 1787 nor enshrined in the Constitution's text.’ ... But I have not relied upon (as he and the Court in this case do)

\textsuperscript{104} Christ laid down His life for the sins of every individual. Neither the Jewish religious leaders nor the Romans took His life. But, at the same time, the Jewish nation rejected the Messiah and was responsible for His crucifixion, and America, as a nation, should support Israel and oppose her enemies. See Section I.

\textsuperscript{105} McCreary, 545 U.S. at 894.

\textsuperscript{106} See, e.g., John 14.6.

\textsuperscript{107} Galatians 3.24.

\textsuperscript{108} Romans 3.23.

\textsuperscript{109} Romans 6.23.
mere ‘proclamations and statements’ of the Founders. I have relied primarily upon official acts and official proclamations of the United States or of the component branches of its Government, including the First Congress's beginning of the tradition of legislative prayer to God, its appointment of congressional chaplains, its legislative proposal of a Thanksgiving Proclamation, and its reenactment of the Northwest Territory Ordinance; our first President's issuance of a Thanksgiving Proclamation; and invocation of God at the opening of sessions of the Supreme Court. The only mere ‘proclamations and statements’ of the Founders I have relied upon were statements of Founders who occupied federal office, and spoke in at least a quasi-official capacity--Washington's prayer at the opening of his Presidency and his Farewell Address, President John Adams' letter to the Massachusetts Militia, and Jefferson's and Madison's inaugural addresses. The Court and Justice Stevens, by contrast, appeal to no official or even quasi-official action in support of their view of the … --only James Madison's Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, written before the Federal Constitution had even been proposed, two letters written by Madison long after he was President, and the quasi-official inaction of Thomas Jefferson in refusing to issue a Thanksgiving Proclamation…. The Madison Memorial and Remonstrance, dealing as it does with enforced contribution to religion rather than public acknowledgment of God, is irrelevant; one of the letters is utterly ambiguous as to the point at issue here, and should not be read to contradict Madison's statements in his first inaugural address, quoted earlier; even the other letter does not disapprove public acknowledgment of God, unless one posits (what Madison's own actions as President would contradict) that reference to God contradicts ‘the equality of all religious sects.’ See Letter from James Madison to Edward Livingston (July 10, 1822), in 5 The Founders' Constitution 105-106 (P. Kurland & R. Lerner eds. 1987). And as to Jefferson: The notoriously self-contradicting Jefferson did not choose to have his nonauthorship of a Thanksgiving Proclamation inscribed on his tombstone. What he did have inscribed was his authorship of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, a governmental act which begins ‘Whereas, Almighty God hath created the mind free….’ Va. Code Ann. §57-1 (Lexis 2003).”

The Constitution did not require those acts and proclamations, but allowed them. So long as God and His Word were at least respected by the majority, God and His Word were uplifted. God and His Word presently are respected and followed by only a very small minority of the population.

Justice Scalia then analyzes the majority opinion showing how it is logically inconsistent with the facts and the law, how the majority changes the Lemon test in order to arrive at the desired result, how the displays were constitutional “even accepting the Court’s Lemon-based premises,” and how “the Courts conclusion that the Counties exhibited the Foundation’s Displays with the purpose of promoting religion is doubtful.”

Declarations within the Constitution that God and His principles are to be honored by the nation, and that the goal of the nation is to glorify God would have served useful purposes. The document itself would have glorified God and pointed people to truth. But eventually, just as unbelieving men have attacked God, the Bible, and truth, so would they have attacked God and such a Constitution. Inevitably, lost men would have prevailed, albeit not as quickly and easily as they have under the present Constitution, and the nation would have rejected the fact of the sovereignty of God. The nation would someday have been where it is today. God gave man free will to make his own choices. No man can be forced to honor God. Most men and all nations reject God.

---
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America was once the greatest nation that has ever been. This was because America came closer by far than any nation to operating under God. America was so close, but yet so far, from God’s ideal.

The founding fathers incorporated some biblical principles into the body of the Constitution. For example, they recognized the depravity of man, and therefore provided for a balance of powers among executive, legislative, and judicial branches. However, they did not understand that the God-ordained goal of any nation is to glorify God. They did not, in the document, proclaim that the purpose of America was to be “the glory of God” and that America was to be a nation under God.

The founding fathers were also influenced by enlightenment principles and included some of those principles in the Constitution. According to enlightenment thought, the purpose of government is the happiness of man and that principle was incorporated into the Constitution. This can be discerned from a facial reading of the document and from a study of the history surrounding the adoption of the Constitution. Regardless of assertions that “happiness of man” is ultimately tied into a correct relationship with God, most Americans did not make that connection, and as a result set out to achieve material success and prosperity in order to obtain temporal happiness. For the first time, a people of a nation had a government that catered to their happiness.

In spite of this fatal flaw, multitudes were converted to a saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ in revivals which occurred after the Constitution was ratified. As a result, the nation proceeded under God to a large degree for many years even though the civil law under the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, was ever so slowly changing conceptions of marriage, family, church, state, and law itself.

However, as apostasy invaded the churches, the population of America became less and less “Christian” and more secular. Without a solid Christian base, Americans and America, especially in the mid-twentieth century and thereafter, quickly began to adopt satanic principles. America, like all nations before the return of Christ, is doomed to judgment.

After the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Supreme Court gradually intruded more and more into the affairs of the states. The reasoning of the Supreme Court was humanistic, even in the nineteenth century. God was left out. In all the examples in this section, the Court only quoted Scripture once, in Stone v. Graham (see page 329), and there in a God-defying manner. In 1940, the First Amendment was incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment. In 1947, the Supreme Court extended the meaning of “separation of church and state” to also mean “separation of God and state.” Since that time, the Supreme Court has effectively removed almost all vestiges of the sovereign God from public affairs in America, although still upholding the original meaning of the First Amendment to keep the civil government out of the affairs of the church. The task was made much easier for the Court since the Constitution did not proclaim God, and specifically the Lord Jesus Christ, as Sovereign.

“And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all
“Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.”

As will be shown in the Section VI, America, under the god of this world, knew how to tempt even true churches, many which proceeded without knowledge and others which were knowingly disobedient, to place themselves at least partially under another lover. The apostate churches could be expected to do this since they were not churches anyway. But it is vexing to see a Bible believing pastor lead a church into such an unbiblical union; and it is sad to see a good pastor who discovers the truth struggle with whether and/or how to fully please the Lord and separate the church he pastors from the state.

How can born again Christians be so deceived? Most “Christian” lawyers think like Americans, not like Bible-believing Christians. They are American or humanistic in their thinking. The bases for their beliefs are American statute and caselaw, not the Bible. Instead of applying biblical principle, they apply humanistic principles and reasoning they learned in public schools, universities, and law schools. Many of those lawyers believe that by compromising and counseling secular politicians and leaders they will influence a return to God by the civil government. Some of them undoubtedly believe that the church is destined to work hand in hand with the state in preparing the earth for the return of the Lord. Yet, as is apparent to the knowledgeable believer, they have been a party to the march to destruction—the civil government, through its laws and courts, has at an accelerating pace rejected the sovereign God. Many pastors have taught and advocated union of church and state because of an improper understanding of biblical principles concerning church, state, and separation of church and state. Well-meaning Bible believing pastors and churches who love the Lord, in their rallies and meetings to restore God over America, proceed without knowledge, thereby leading the way to destruction. Bible Colleges, seminaries, and “Christian” literature have also succumbed to humanistic principles and taught those principles to multitudes of born again students who have carried those principles into their various ministries. Most Christians are too consumed with the cares of this world to make any independent study of the issues.

The sad fact is that most Christians are more American than they are Christian. America, not God, is the chosen sovereign of most of America’s citizens, including most Christians and churches. Since America is ruled by the principles of the god of this world, those citizens, Christians, and churches are placing themselves, at least partially to one degree or another, under state control and rule.

Some Christians can relate to Habakkuk to whom the holiness of God was more important than that Israel should be delivered. Habakkuk cried out to the Lord:

“O LORD, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear! even cry out unto thee of violence, and thou wilt not save! Why dost thou shew me iniquity, and cause me to behold grievance? for spoiling and violence are before me: and there are that raise up strife and contention. Therefore the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth: for

1 Ephesians 1.19-21.
2 Philippians 2.9.
the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth....

Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity: wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he? And makest men as the fishes of the sea, as the creeping things, that have no ruler over them? They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net, and gather them in their drag: therefore they rejoice and are glad. Therefore they sacrifice unto their net, and burn incense unto their drag; because by them their portion is fat, and their meat plenteous. Shall they therefore empty their net, and not spare continually to slay the nations?"³

But God assured Habakkuk that He was in control and that judgment would follow the iniquities of the people and the nation. God has given us His Word which explains that judgment follows a turning away from God and His principles.

God is already judging America, but “you ain’t seen nothing yet.” Family and marriage have to a large extent been redefined and destroyed by the application of humanist principles. Crime is rampant. People are “lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.” Many “have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof.”⁴ So many “Christians” turn to the state, to false religion, to psychology, or to hedonism instead of to God for answers, for help. When America completely turns against Israel, America will suffer God’s final judgment.

“He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.”⁵

---
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Section VI
God Betrayed: Union of Church and State

“And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”

“Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the LORD. Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart. They also do no iniquity: they walk in his ways. Thou hast commanded us to keep thy precepts diligently.”

---
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Many factors have contributed to the attacks on God’s Word and the apostasy of the church—for example, the enlightenment, the industrial revolution, and Darwinism. Enlightenment thought or humanism was brought into the church as religious modernism. Humanistic principles infiltrated most churches, including fundamental Bible believing churches, which moved from acting and preaching with the goal of glorifying God to acting and preaching with the goal being the happiness of man.

Religious apostasy was followed by moral awfulness which resulted in political anarchy. First, God and His principles were attacked and religious apostasy grew. Then followed moral depravity and then the denial by civil government of God’s authority and any established order under God. As to the first stage in the downfall of America, the states of the new nation invited the churches to an ungodly relationship with civil government through incorporation. Then, in the twentieth century the legislative and executive branches of the federal government, through the Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”), extended another invitation to churches to become more entangled and controlled by government. Most churches eagerly accepted that invitation. In the midst of these unions with civil government, religious modernism and revisions of the Word of God were infiltrating churches and Christian educational institutions to one degree or another.

Jesus Christ is the head of His church in all things. However, God will permit a church to betray Him and take herself from under Christ in one thing, some things, or all things. Placing a church under some person or power in only one thing greatly displeases the Lord because doing so violates biblical precept. God’s Word did not say, “and gave him to be the head over all things to the church except one thing” or “all things except secular or earthly matters,” or “all things except property.” God’s Word says, “all things.”

“If Christ Jesus have left such power with the civil rulers of the world, [kingdoms and counties, or] for the establishing, governing, and reforming his church, what is become of his care and love, wisdom and faithfulness, since in all ages since he left the earth, for the general [beyond all exception] he hath left her destitute of such qualified princes and governors, and in the course of his providence furnished her with such, whom he knew would be [and all men find] as fit as wolves to protect and feed his sheep and people!”

It is impossible for a New Testament Church to remain a New Testament church if that church chooses to do one thing which may result in legal subjection to the civil government. In other words, when a New Testament church does anything contrary to Scripture which gives even partial claim of sovereignty over that church to the state, that church has committed a wicked act which subjects her to another head, thereby greatly displeasing the Lord. That church has betrayed the Lord.

Doing one thing that subjects a church to the state creates a legal entity. “Legal entity” means:

---

Corporations are legal entities. On the other hand, a pastor/trustee may hold legal title to real and/or corporal personal property, which includes movable and tangible things such as furniture, merchandise, etc., for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ through a Declaration of Trust without having created a legal entity. Such a trust relationship cannot sue or be sued.

Furthermore, although there is no precedent in Scripture for a New Testament church, a strictly spiritual entity, to own property, a New Testament church obviously must occupy real property to exist. “Real property” means: “Land, and generally whatever is erected or growing upon or affixed to land.” Hereinafter, the author will use the term “property” in referring to “real property.” In America, a New Testament church may occupy property in a manner consistent with biblical principle in at least three ways. As will be shown in Chapter 7 infra, a church may use property held by a pastor/trustee, under a Declaration of Trust, for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Second, a church may use and occupy property if the owner gives the church permission to do so. Or third, a pastor/trustee, under a Declaration of Trust, may lease property to be used by a church for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ.

A church that holds real and/or other personal property through a corporation has partially placed herself under the control of someone other than the Lord Jesus Christ. Such a church is not under Christ in “all things,” and operates with two heads. A church which further seeks tax exemption under IRC § 501(c)(3) (“501(c)(3)”) has agreed to further limitations and controls by a secular head.

True born again Christians in America have been blessed beyond measure. The First Amendment provided for religious liberty. Christians in America had the opportunity to keep God’s church pure and undefiled and to perform the great commission (“Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.”) without persecution from state or federal governments. What did they do? First, many churches ignored the sound biblical advice of men like Isaac Backus and entered into contracts with the state; that is, they incorporated. Then, when given the opportunity starting in the twentieth century, churches further submitted themselves to another head when they sought 501(c)(3) tax exemption.

To Baptists, passing from persecution to religious liberty without persecution was like God delivering the Israelites from Egyptian bondage and entering the Promised Land. God said to the Israelites in Egypt, “And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and
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2 BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 893-894 (6th ed. 1990), definition of “legal entity.”
3 “Any kind of property, whether real or personal, freehold or leasehold, and any interest therein, whether legal or equitable, may be impressed with a trust. While the question of what property is made subject to a trust is determined by the terms of the trust, as a general proposition a property interest must be transferable to be the subject of an express trust.” 76 AM. JUR. 2D TRUSTS § 247 (2007).
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God did deliver them into that Promised Land. God gave them many instructions and warnings prior to their entry into that land:

“And it shall be, when the LORD thy God shall have brought thee into the land which he sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not, And houses full of all good things, which thou filledst not, and wells digged, which thou diggested not, vineyards and olive trees, which thou plantedst not; when thou shalt have eaten and be full; Then beware lest thou forget the LORD, which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt fear the LORD thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name. Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you; (For the LORD thy God is a jealous God among you) lest the anger of the LORD thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth. Ye shall not tempt the LORD your God, as ye tempted him in Massah. Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of the LORD your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee. And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the LORD: that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest go in and possess the good land which the LORD sware unto thy fathers.[]" 

“Then the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their image with fire. For thou art a holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.”

The children of Israel did not do as the Lord had commanded them.

“And it came to pass, when Israel was strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute, and did not utterly drive them out.”

“They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the LORD commanded them: But were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols: which were a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, And shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan: and the land was polluted with blood. Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions. Therefore was the wrath of the LORD kindled against his people, insomuch that he abhorred his own inheritance. And he gave them into the hand of the heathen; and they that hated them ruled over them.”

As shown in Section IV, Americans owe their religious liberty primarily to the Baptists. But many of those same Baptists who had been persecuted for so long in the fight for religious liberty proved again that man never changes—they never saw or they ignored the fact that incorporation entangled churches with the state contrary to biblical principle. Baptists—like the Israelites who, after God brought them into the Promised Land—did not complete the job God had given them. With religious freedom and material prosperity, many Baptists stopped searching the Bible for God’s truth in all matters and betrayed Christ by
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using their newly acquired freedom to partially subjugate themselves to an earthly power—the state. They practiced pragmatism and introduced a little leaven into many of their churches. They decided that they would proceed according to that which “worked.” God became a means, not an end. Their goal, at least partially, in the beginning became the happiness of man and not the glory of God. They had more important work to do than worrying about contending further for the sovereignty of God over His wife, the church. To remain totally under God and thereby glorify Him would be inconvenient. To incorporate would provide certain earthly benefits and give protection under the contract clause of the United States Constitution.

The results of Israel not obeying God took hundreds of years to play out. At first, the theocracy of Israel was directly under God who ruled through judges.

“The period of the theocracy of Israel under the judges was a time of deep declension of the people as they turned from God, the unseen Leader, and descended to the low level of ‘In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes’ (compare Judges 1.1 with 20.18). This should have been an era of glowing progress, but it was a dark day of repeated failure.

“The ‘hoop’ of Israel’s history [began] with the nation serving God. Then they took certain steps downward. They did evil in the sight of the Lord and served Baalim (see Judges 2.11). They forsook the Lord and they served Baal and Ashtaroth. The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He delivered them into the hands of their enemies. Israel entered a time of servitude. Soon Israel cried out to God in their sad plight and distress. They turned to God and repented. God heard their prayers and raised up judges through whom they were delivered. Then again the nation served God.

“Soon the same old story repeated itself.”

Judges 17 through 21 chronicles events in Israel which represented the state of society at that time. In Judges 17 and 18 God presents the low spiritual state in Israel due to apostasy. In Judges 19 God gives an example of the moral awfulness to which Israel had descended. In Judges 20 and 21 God records the political anarchy of Israel, the final step down by a nation.

After that, the Israelites rejected the headship of God and demanded a king like the other nations. God allowed their request. Even though the nation Israel rejected God’s perfect will, Israel, before the nation split, and Judah, after the division, were blessed by God when ruled by good kings. Israel after the division never had a good king.

As long as the population at least honored the Word of God in most respects, the consequences were not dire. Why? The Bible teaches that God permits deviation from his perfect or directive will.

“It is important to distinguish between the directive and the permissive will of God…. God will take up His people and, so far as possible, bless them, even when they are out of His best. In Israel's choice of a king (1 Sam. 8:7-9); in the turning back from Kadesh (Deut. 1:19-22); in the sending of the spies; in the case of Balaam—illustrations of this principle are seen. It is needless to say that God's permissive will never extend to things morally wrong. The highest blessing is ever found in obedience to His directive will.”

Will a believer and/or a church say to God, “Thy will be done;” or will a believer and/or a church set its goal as the happiness of man and not the glory of God? God allows men to choose. He will say to a particular person and/or church who deviates from His will, “Go ahead and do it your way.” What kind of person are you? What kind of church do you belong to?

13 McGee, Joshua and Judges, pp. 112-113.
The experience of the Israelites in rejecting God and demanding a king is very similar to a church rejecting God as her only Head and seeking incorporation and 501(c)(3) status. When Samuel was judge over Israel, the Israelites demanded a king to rule over them so that they might also, as they put it, “be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.”

“[T]he LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods, so do they also unto thee. Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them.”

Samuel, at God’s direction, told the people the bad consequences of rejecting the theocracy and choosing to be ruled by a king. Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.” Samuel later reminded them that the Lord had always, through His appointed judges, delivered them from their oppressors when they repented of their evil and of their reason for seeking a king: “And when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when the LORD your God was your king.”

Although Israel’s demanding a king was called a “great wickedness,” which they perceived after Samuel foretold and God sent “thunder and rain” on the day of the wheat harvest, the people did not repent of that evil. The people acknowledged their wickedness and asked Samuel to pray to God “that [they] die not,” but they did not repent. Knowing that asking for a king was a great evil, they said to Samuel, “Pray for thy servants unto the LORD thy God, that we die not: for we have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask for a king.”

They were only concerned about their own temporal selves, their own happiness, and not the glory of God. Would not God have been greatly pleased and glorified had they repented, rejected their king, and asked God to rule over them as before? Samuel replied to them:

“Fear not: ye have done all this wickedness: yet turn not aside from following the LORD, but serve the LORD with all your heart; And turn ye not aside: for then should ye go after vain things, which cannot profit nor deliver; for they are vain. For the LORD will not forsake his people for his great name’s sake: because it hath pleased the LORD to make you his people. Moreover as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the LORD in ceasing to pray for you: but I will teach you the good and the right way: Only fear the LORD, and serve him in truth with all your heart: for consider how great things he hath
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done for you. But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your
king.”

The contrast between God as King and a man as king became readily apparent. Samuel said, “Now therefore behold the king whom ye have chosen, and whom ye have desired! and, behold, the LORD hath set a king over you.”

Saul, as king, quickly revealed the contrast. David, and Solomon to a degree, were good kings of Israel before the division; and a few good kings (but mostly bad kings) ruled Judah, and all the kings of Israel after the division were bad. Furthermore, all the administrations under the kings, as the people had been warned, consumed resources and the services of citizens that could have been enjoyed by the people and directed toward the glory of God. Israel separated from Judah because Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, in answer to their request to “make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter and we will serve thee,” replied to them, “And now whereas my father did lade you with a heavy yoke, I will add to your yoke: my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions.”

With time, the people and the kings continued to sink further into evil, the nation divided, and ultimately, after hundreds of years, the nations of Israel and Judah, as God had warned them, were taken into captivity.

Many churches in America have reached the point that Israel eventually reached after rejecting God. After Judah was taken into captivity, some were not taken into captivity, but were permitted to stay in Israel. Jeremiah warned them:

“And now therefore hear the word of the LORD, ye remnant of Judah; Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; If ye wholly set your faces to enter into Egypt, and go to sojourn there; Then it shall come to pass, that the sword, which ye feared, shall overtake you there in the land of Egypt, and the famine, whereof ye were afraid, shall follow close after you there in Egypt; and there ye shall die. So shall it be with all the men that set their faces to go into Egypt to sojourn there; they shall die by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence: and none of them shall remain or escape from the evil that I will bring upon them.”

Against the warnings of God’s prophet, Jeremiah, they decided to go to Egypt. They declared (falsey as to the blessings for worshipping the queen of heaven):

“As for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the LORD, we will not hearken unto thee. But we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem: for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine. And when we burned incense to the queen of heaven, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship her, and pour out drink offerings unto her, without our men?”
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Jeremiah pointed out God’s judgment of Israel for their idolatry which left Israel a land of “desolation, and an astonishment, and a curse, without an inhabitant.”

Like that remnant, some churches in America who know the truth refuse to repent of their evil. Their goal remains the happiness of man, not the glory of God. Many others simply do not know how to proceed to disentangle themselves.

The spiritual apostasy of churches in America has resulted in moral awfulness (which is obvious to any American Christian) and political anarchy. America is experiencing political anarchy because God has been discarded by the federal government. The philosophy of history exemplified by Israel in the Old Testament has played out in America. America is being judged and will be judged more severely, and the fault lies at the door of believers and churches.

As shown in Section I, Christ, the prophets and other men of God, have warned America and every nation of the consequences of failure to submit to Him and His principles. Deviation from God’s directive will always bring bad consequences, sooner or later. To dishonor God on the highest level is soon followed by dishonor in many other ways, and God’s patience and mercy extend only so far. The overall trend after disobedience to God in Israel and in America’s churches and America today was and is always downward, away from God. This principle applies to a corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization in America. With a good pastor (in matters other than the headship issue), as with Judah when she had a good king, an incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organization may still be blessed by God, but not as she would be had she honored her marriage to the Lord Jesus Christ. Even with a good pastor, such an organization does not enjoy the full power of God, since, by her own choice, part of her power and blessings come from the state. Most likely such a church will begin to compromise the Word of God and the principles of God. Sooner or later that church will have a pastor who is not good. As more people are attracted by liberal churches, the number of Bible believing individuals and churches diminishes. The remnant grows smaller by the day. This is demonstrated by the growth of liberal “Bible believing churches,” and the churches of the Faith Movement, the Church Growth Movement, and the Emerging Church Movement as shown in Section II. Many of the churches in those movements are either incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations with God-fearing pastors (who did not understand the importance of keeping the marriage to the Lord pure and undefiled) or religious organizations started by new pastors such as Rick Warren. This state of affairs has been reached in a relatively short time. America, as of 2007, has, since the Constitution, existed only two hundred eighteen years, not nearly as long as Israel had been in the land before the dispersion.

Originally, before and after the ratification of the United States Constitution, the only church involvement with the state was through incorporation. Any incorporation of churches at any time was and is wicked, and modern incorporation significantly subjects churches to the state. Churches rationalized that to incorporate was the pragmatic thing to do. By incorporating, they received protection from the state. They could contract—for example, they could contract with their pastors for his salary. Churches could hold property and receive bequests. As pointed out in Section II, Chapter 5, their goal was the happiness of man, not the glory of God. God became a means to an end, not the
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Churches reasoned, without examining Scripture, that doing certain things “worked” and therefore that doing those things was good or even of God.

In the twentieth century incorporated churches further freely submitted to civil government in both earthly and spiritual matters. The federal government took advantage of the new status of churches in order to control, educate, and define them. Since 1954, 26 United States Code (“U.S.C.”)(IRC) § 501(c)(3), an unconstitutional law which violates the First Amendment religion clause when applied to churches, has lured churches into entanglement with the federal government. As did the Israelites, God’s people in America turned from serving Him fully and entered into unholy alliances with the state and federal governments. Although churches may claim that incorporation only subjects a church to civil government in earthly matters, it is obvious that corporate 501(c)(3) churches submit to the civil government in some spiritual matters. Not only that, churches and church members become entangled in satanic rules and procedures that, if honored (and they should be honored by such a church since a God’s people should always strive to keep their agreements, even anti-biblical contracts they willingly enter into), consume tremendous physical and material resources. The modern American incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organization many times contends with their new sovereign over what she may say and do.

By incorporating, a church creates numerous contracts—a contract between the church and the state, a contract between the members or stockholders of a corporation, and between the corporation and its members or its stockholders—which substantially affect the church and the members. Contract, as opposed to biblical covenant, is a satanic/humanistic/enlightenment principle. A contract is “a binding agreement between two or more persons or parties; esp., one legally enforceable.”

God is not included in a civil contract, whereas biblical covenant always includes God and His principles.

Just as marriage of man and woman is a biblical covenant which includes God, the marriage of Christ and His church is a biblical covenant. The Bible compares not only Christ and His church, as shown in Section III Chapter 7, but also Jehovah and Israel to husband and wife. “For thy maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy one of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.”

Experience and the Word of God teach man how a husband feels when his wife is unfaithful. The Old Testament teaches that God the Father felt the same way when Israel committed spiritual whoredom. Ezekiel 16 speaks of the harlotry of Jerusalem. God said to Jerusalem: “But as a wife that committeth adultery, which taketh strangers instead of her husband! They give gifts to all whores: but thou gavest thy gifts to all thy lovers, and hirest them, that they may come unto thee on every side for thy whoredom.” “Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith the LORD.”

God pleaded with Israel and His people to return unto Him. “… [T]hou has played the harlot, with many lovers; yet return again to me saith the Lord.” “Turn, O Backsliding children saith the LORD; for I am married unto you…”

God’s grief over Jerusalem was displayed by Jesus when He lamented the
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rebellion of Jerusalem: “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!”

God gave some object lessons as to the way He felt about Israel’s spiritual fornication. Ezekiel was made a sign to Israel: God told him not to mourn the death of his wife. Likewise, God used Hosea to communicate His feelings. Hosea was told to marry a woman who, after they had children, left him and became a harlot.

“For their mother hath played the harlot: she that conceived them hath done shamefully: for she said, I will go after my lovers, that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink. Therefore, behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths. And she shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them; and she shall seek them, but shall not find them: then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband: for then was it better with me than now. For she did not know that I gave her corn, and wine, and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold, which they prepared for Baal.”

Like He will restore Israel, God told Hosea to restore his wife.

The Lord Jesus, as Husband of His church, likewise grieves at the unfaithfulness of His church. Christ and His wife, the church, are one flesh. He loves the church as Himself.

“Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church.”

Obviously, God, through Scripture and practical experience, has conveyed to born again believers all they need to know in order to understand Christ’s extreme love for His Church and the grief He suffers when His wife places herself, even partially, under another head.

Most churches in America, in choosing to place themselves under the state through incorporation and 501(c)(3) tax exempt status, made the same choice that the Israelites made—they chose to place themselves under someone besides God so that their new “king” may judge them, go out before them, fight their battles. They entered into an illicit relationship with the state. Good pastors who now understand church-state issues have been called to some of those churches. They are presented with a dilemma.

As could have been predicted from “rightly dividing the Word of Truth,” the civil government is doing the opposite of what the church wished (except for temporal benefits which increase the temporary “happiness of man”); and most incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations and members do not realize what is happening. The civil government has educated many or most “Christians” in anti-biblical principles and used the church to further its satanic purposes. In effect, many churches have become mere arms of the state. Civil government officials, who have absolutely no understanding of Romans 13 point out to
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miseducated or willfully ignorant church pastors and members—many of whom eagerly follow the directions of their illegitimate master—that under Romans 13 it is the duty of the church to serve the state at the whim of the state. In effect, churches have “rendered unto Caesar the things that are God’s.” Many such religious organizations use tithes and offerings, government money, money obtained from begging on street corner, and/or money from advertisements on television, radio, and elsewhere to carry on their ministries, giving donors tax-deduction acknowledgements available because of 501(c)(3) status. In other words, these incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations depend upon the power, authority, reasoning, and techniques of civil government to achieve their goals. Can you imagine our Lord, when Satan offered Him all the kingdoms of the world,\(^{45}\) if the Lord would bow down and worship him—that is, if the Lord would operate under satanic principles—accepting Satan’s offer?\(^{46}\) Instead, the Lord gave us the correct example by quoting Scripture: “Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”\(^{47}\) Can you imagine the Apostle Paul, any other apostle, or persecuted Christians down through the ages when asked “by what authority do you these things,” responding, “by the authority of the state.”

“Churches” which operate even partially by authority of the state get some of their power from the state, not from God. If the power is not of God, it is of Satan. At least a portion of their power is earthly and temporary, not heavenly and eternal. They cannot say as did Peter to the man lame from birth, “Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.”\(^{48}\) In fact, many churches have turned to another gospel, the social gospel, as their sole or primary offer to mankind. They give mankind temporary “help” but either leave out eternal spiritual matters or depend upon their methods, instead of those methods prescribed by God’s Word, to lead men to earthly “salvation.” They “[h]av[e] a form of godliness, but deny[] the power thereof.”\(^{49}\) Paul told Christians to turn away from such.

Without God’s power spearheaded by New Testament churches, there will be no great revivals like those which occurred around the time of the adoption of the Constitution and for years thereafter. Without renewed and more active attention and awakening to the things of God, individuals, families, churches, and the nation will continue down the road to destruction.

Related to this issue of separation of church and state is the issue of the relationship of God and state. How would a nation under God operate? First, the goal of such a nation—the glory of God—would be clearly and emphatically stated in its constitution. According to its stated purpose, a nation under God would totally implement the principle of biblical covenant which includes two or more people or a nation and God in any agreement unleavened in any way by

\(^{45}\) The 1917 Scofield Reference Edition, n. 2 to Matthew 4.8, p. 998: “The Greek word kosmos means ‘order,’ ‘arrangement,’ and so, with the Greeks, ‘beauty’; for order and arrangement in the sense of system are at the bottom of the Greek conception of beauty.

\(^{46}\) See Matthew 4.8-9; Luke 4.5-7.
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\(^{50}\) Ibid.
enlightenment principles such as the principle of contract or any other unbiblical principle. A nation under God would make known that all men have freedom of conscience as proscribed by the Word of God, but that the nation would proceed under the principles of the Word of God, the principles of Christianity, when addressing issues within its God-given jurisdiction in the criminal or civil law. Biblical principle would be used to determine the jurisdiction of civil government and civil government would operate only within the jurisdiction given it by God in His Word. A nation under God would recognize the sovereignty of God and would open up all civil government activities in Jesus name and only in Jesus name. A nation under God, although inherently recognizing the legitimacy of the New Testament church by recognizing the one true God and His principles, would not grant any type material benefits to false religions or to any churches. Such a nation would legitimately proclaim to its citizens and to all nations in the world that it is “one nation under God” whose goal was “the glory of God.”

After God called Israel to be a theocracy directly under Him, the Gentile nations continued under the dispensations of conscience and human government.

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;”\(^51\)

God still desired Gentile nations to choose to be under Him, but sadly both Israel and Gentile nations have governed for self and not God. The Word of God makes clear that Gentile nations, like Israel, are without excuse.

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse;”\(^52\)

Romans 1.21-23 gives the seven stages of Gentile world apostasy, and Romans 1.24-32 gives the results of Gentile world apostasy.

Since America is not a nation under God, America has subverted the biblical concept of the relationship of church and state, God and state, and God and the church. Churches, even most “fundamental Bible believing churches,” have been willing, or willingly ignorant accomplices in this subversion. As will be shown, the states through incorporation and the Federal Government through the IRC have moved into the spiritual arena and invited churches to become established state religious organizations which are to a great degree controlled by the state. Most churches have eagerly accepted the invitations.

Civil government has no authority over a New Testament church, but it does have authority over incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations. Although the IRS recognizes that there is a distinction between churches and other types of religious organizations, a Moslem mosque, a Hindu temple, any type religious organization that meets the test laid down by the Internal Revenue Service is treated exactly as or better than an incorporated 501(c)(3) “church” is
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treated. In the IRC, a 501(c)(3) church is included with a group of “religious organizations.” At the same time, the IRS and civil government have become involved with the exercise of religion, so that there is no “free exercise thereof” for the 501(c)(3) religious organization as intended by those who ratified the First Amendment. Some organizations which are not churches are classified as churches.

Through offering incorporation and later the 501(c)(3) tax exemption to churches, almost all of the states and the federal government opened the door, and most churches promptly entered and became incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations. Incorporation of churches was offered by states and did not violate the First Amendment because originally, as explained in Sections IV and V, the First Amendment applied only to the federal government. However, the federal government was given some authority over the contracts created by incorporation because of the contract clause of Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution. Churches sought incorporation partly to gain federal government protection of the contract with the state. The 501(c)(3) tax exemption tied the church to the federal government. Through those devices, state and federal governments have successfully tempted most churches to entangle themselves with civil government, thereby removing themselves partially or totally from under the Headship of Christ and placing themselves under the jurisdiction of the state of incorporation and the federal government.

Even though the civil government made an offer, churches did not have to accept it. Most did. Since the ratification of the First Amendment, the federal government has never forced a church to incorporate or get 501(c)(3) status. The Supreme Court still understands that the state cannot legally interfere with a church that does not willingly submit itself to the state. Inevitably, the population of America became more and more corrupted; and a time came when most Americans and most civil leaders were lost and without any understanding whatsoever of biblical principles and the nature of God. Furthermore, many or most church members were either lost or were spiritual babies who sought convenience rather than the truths of the Word of God concerning the issue of separation of church and state. As a result, churches have run to the civil government seeking incorporation and 501(c)(3) tax exempt status and put themselves under bondage to civil government.

In effect, as will be shown, the incorporation-501(c)(3) tax exemption is nothing more than an exemption-education-control scheme. The state knows that it cannot control and educate a New Testament church. Civil government cannot tell a New Testament church what to believe, say, or do. The state has no control over such a church. A New Testament church will submit to only one Husband—the Lord Jesus Christ. She gets her spiritual orders from God’s Word, not the civil government. A New Testament church believes and acts upon God’s Words. On the other hand, an incorporated, 501(c)(3) religious organization, in addition to being involved in a wicked act against her Husband, is subject to the teaching and control of civil government.

Saved individuals and churches choose either to be free under God or to be in bondage under Satan. God wants His children and churches to be free.

“Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free…. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.”

53 John 8.31-32, 36.
Anyone who is not saved is in bondage to sin and the devil. “A Christian is free from the guilt of sin, condemnation, the power of darkness, the sting of death, the law of sin and death, the power of indwelling sin, the curse of the law, and pride.”

After salvation, one still has to make choices. A church which incorporates and gets 501(c)(3) status chooses to place herself partially under the civil government and loses part of her freedom.

This does not mean that members of a church are free to commit crimes. As to infractions against another or society, the Bible provides that the state is there “to punish evildoers.” Christians are told not to do evil.

“If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified. But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men’s matters.”

How many times do Christians and churches allow fear to control, paralyze, and enslave them? God desires to deliver those “who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.”

Although the lost man should fear God, the Christian is not to be subject to fear, even the fear of death for practicing his faith.

“And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.”

“For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.”

If death is no cause for fear to the Christian, why should anything else frighten, control, paralyze, and/or enslave him against the will of God?

Since the founding of the nation, Christians in America have suffered little persecution. When persecution for the Lord’s sake comes, the true Christian should rejoice as did persecuted apostles and Christians down through the ages:

“Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.”

---
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Jesus said to the church in Smyrna, the suffering persecuted church, and only one of two churches against which the Lord had nothing bad to say:

“Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.”

Unfortunately, most church members are more American than they are Christian; submission to biblical principles only is impractical and too contrary to the American way of life. The laws passed by the civil government provide that the church which submits to state authority will be able to attract and keep members who are more concerned about their material than their spiritual well-being; who are more concerned with temporary happiness and the absence of fear than with the glory of God. Many church members, including many pastors, either due to biblical ignorance and/or motivated by fear and greed, have misinterpreted or ignored fundamental Bible principles in order to become an arm of the state. Many times good pastors led the move to combine the churches they pastored with the state because they blindly followed their Bible college or seminary education. Also, many good pastors have inherited state-entangled churches and cannot decide what to do about it.

68 Revelation 2.10.
Chapter 2
Incorporation of churches

With just a little knowledge concerning incorporation as relates to a church, a Christian should readily discern that the Lord grieves when a church incorporates. President James Madison understood that incorporation of churches exceeds the authority of civil government and violates the First Amendment. Therefore, on February 21, 1811 he vetoed a bill entitled “An Act incorporating the Protestant Episcopal Church in the town of Alexander, in the District of Columbia” the District of Columbia being under federal jurisdiction. He returned the bill with the following objections:

“Because the bill exceeds the rightful authority to which governments are limited by the essential distinction between civil and religious functions, and violates in particular the article of the Constitution of the United States which declares ‘Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment.

“The bill enacts into and establishes by law sundry rules and proceedings relative purely to the organization and policy of the church incorporated, and comprehending even the election and removal of the minister of the same, so that no change could be made therein by the particular society or by the general church of which it is a member, and whose authority it recognizes.

“This particular church, therefore, would so far be a religious establishment by law, a legal force and sanction being given to certain articles in its constitution and administration. Nor can it be considered that the articles thus established are to be taken as the descriptive criteria only of the corporate identity of the society, inasmuch as this identity must depend on other characteristics, as the regulations established are in general unessential and alterable according to the principles and canons by which churches of the denomination govern themselves, and as the injunctions and prohibitions contained in the regulations would be enforced by the penal consequences applicable to the violation of them according to the local law….”

A New Testament church cannot also be a corporation. This is because a corporation is legal entity created, designed, and organized by statute.

“A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law. As a mere creature of law, it possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it, either expressly or as incidental to its very existence; these are such as are supposed best calculated to effect the object for which they were created. It is essentially the legal identity of a set of contractual obligations and entitlements.

“A corporation is not a natural person but rather an artificial person, that is, a legal fiction or a creature of statute.

“The attributes of a corporation may include the capacity of perpetual succession, the power to sue or be sued in the corporate name, the power to acquire or transfer property and do other acts in the corporate name, the power to purchase and hold real estate, the power to have a common seal, and the power to make bylaws for internal government. The incorporator's choice of a particular statutory framework for incorporation is not dispositive of the corporation's nature and status; the corporation's declared objects and purposes are determinative.”

The sovereign of the corporation is the state.

“No corporation can exist without the consent or grant of the sovereign, since the corporation is a creature of the state and derives its powers by legislative grant. The
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power to create corporations is one of the attributes of sovereignty. There is no inherent right to conduct business as a corporation. The right to act as a corporation does not belong to citizens by common right, but is a special privilege conferred by the sovereign power of the state or nation. Until there is a grant of that right, whether by a special charter or under a general law, there can be no corporation. Any means of incorporation that a state sees fit to adopt are appropriate.

“The right to conduct business as a corporation, being a privilege, may be withheld by the state, or may be made subject to appropriate terms and restrictions. Because the granting of the privilege to be a corporation and to do business in that form rests entirely in the state's discretion, a state is justified in imposing such conditions on that privilege as it deems necessary, so long as those conditions are not imposed in a discriminatory manner.

“Reminder: The law of the jurisdiction in which a corporation is organized governs who may form a corporation, how it is formed, and the powers it will have after it is formed.”

Throughout American corporate law, the state is referred to as sovereign of the corporation. A corporation is therefore a product of civil law.

“The right to act as a corporation is a special privilege conferred by the sovereign power, and until there is a grant of such right, whether by special charter or under general law, there can be no corporation. The existence and legal characteristics of a corporation are matters governed by state law. The commencement of corporate existence depends on the terms of the statute under which the corporation is created. As a general rule, the existence of corporations formed under general laws commences when there has been a substantial compliance with the conditions precedent prescribed by the statutes. Frequently, the filing of the articles of incorporation is specified as the act in the process of incorporation from and after which the corporation exists as a separate legal entity.”


By incorporating, a church becomes a monstrosity with two heads which are at odds with one another. The sovereign state is at least partially over an incorporated church which is an invention of civil government. No principle in the Bible supports church incorporation; instead, biblical principle is contrary to church incorporation and probably to any type incorporation. God is the only Head or Sovereign over a New Testament church.

Since the 1819 Dartmouth College case, which solidified existing principles, the basic principles regarding incorporation of churches have not changed.

A corporation is defined as “An artificial person or legal entity created by or under the authority of the laws of the state. An association of persons created by statute as a legal
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entity. The law treats the corporation itself as a person which can sue and be sued. The corporation is distinct from the individuals who comprise it (shareholders). The corporation survives the death of its investors, as the shares can be transferred. Such entity subsists as a body politic under a special denomination, which is regarded in law as having a personality and existence distinct from that of its several members, and which is, by the same authority, vested with the capacity of continuous succession, irrespective of changes in its membership, either in perpetuity or for a limited term of years, and of acting as a unit or single individual in matters relating to the common purpose of the association, within the scope of the powers and authorities conferred upon such bodies by law. Dartmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 518, 536, 657, 4 L.Ed. 629; U.S. v. Trinidad Coal Co., 137 U.S. 160, 11 S.Ct. 57, 34 L.Ed. 640...

"[Corporations are classified as public and private.] A public corporation is one created by the state for political purposes and to act as an agency in the administration of civil government, generally within a particular territory or subdivision of the state, and usually invested, for that purpose, with subordinate and local powers of legislation; such as a county, city, town, or school district. These are also sometimes called ‘political corporations.’ ...

“Private corporations are those founded by and composed of private individuals, for private purposes, as distinguished from governmental purposes, and having no political or governmental franchises or duties.

“... [T]he fact that the business or operations of a corporation may directly and very extensively affect the general public (as in the case of a railroad company or a bank or an insurance company) is no reason for calling it a public corporation. If organized by private persons for their own advantage,—or even if organized for the benefit of the public generally, as in the case of a free public hospital or other charitable institution,—it is none the less a private corporation if it does not possess governmental powers or functions. The uses may be in a sense be called ‘public,’ but the corporation is ‘private,’ as much as if the franchises were vested in a single person. Dartmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 518, 4 L.Ed. 629.... [Public corporations] are not voluntary associations [as private corporations are] and … there is no contractual relation between government and the individuals who compose [the public corporation as there is with the private corporation and the individuals who compose it.]”

Incorporation excludes God entirely as regards certain matters controlled by the contracts created by incorporation. God and His principles are not part of or included in any of those contracts. Instead of the agreements being between the covenanting entities and the covenanting entities and God, the agreements created are between the contracting entities (the members of the incorporated church), between each contracting entity and the state (each church member and the state), and between the entity thereby created and the state. Incorporation of a church and state marriage of man and woman create a contract which places an incorporated “church” or the state marriage of man and woman under the contract clause of Article I Section 10 of the United States Constitution: “The charter of a private corporation is a contract and entitled to protection under the provision of the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the several states from passing any law impairing the obligation of contract.” The contract clause reads in relevant part: “No State shall … pass any … Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts....”

“A corporate charter frequently is described as a contract of a threefold nature; that is, a contract between the state and the corporation, a contract between the corporation and its stockholders [or members if a private religious corporation], and a contract between the stockholders [or members] inter se. The charter also is spoken of as a contract between the state and the corporators.”
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under the authority of the laws of the state, an association of persons created by statute as a legal entity” which can sue and be sued. God is not included in the contracts created by incorporation, nor does God desire to be included. That contract is outside His perfect will.

Other contracts are created by the bylaws of the corporation: contracts between the members or stockholders of a corporation, and contracts between the corporation and its members or its stockholders.

The multiple contracts created by the articles of incorporation and the bylaws entangle the incorporated church with earthly satanic concerns. Contract is a humanistic or enlightenment principle which has been used to attack and destroy, among other things, the God ordained institutions of marriage, family, church, and state.

“The idea of government remaining neutral over values coincided with the use of contract law as a means of restructuring society. Contract law accords the individuals to any bargain the right to assert their own goals, values, and priorities. The law enforces the bargain, not the values contained in it. Yet implicitly, contract law enforces individualism over communitarianism by its refusal to impose a communitarian ethic upon contracting parties.”

The contract clause has been used by civil government to control and destroy the two basic institutions ordained by God—the family and the church—and the two types of marriages—the marriage of a man and a woman and the marriage of Christ and His church. The contract clause applies satanic principles in dealing with those two institutions and those two marriages. How? To answer succinctly, contract law leaves God and His principles out of the equation. Under contract law, two or more equal persons, alone and without God and His principles, supposedly, but not actually, form a contract of marriage as opposed to a biblical covenant in which God is an active party. Under contract law, a marriage is an agreement between two equal people with equal voices. Violation of the contract allows one or both parties to petition the sovereign for a divorce. Today, no violation of terms is needed—the state has provided for “no-fault” divorce. Thus, a spouse can petition the state for a divorce for no reason at all.

Under contract law, the family is treated as a democracy in which all members of a family, including the children, are to be equal with equal rights and equal voices. Innumerable numbers of good parents get caught up in state programs which teach “child abuse prevention.” These programs mix some truth with a lot of error. The overall effect is satanic. For example, “[in] 1987 in Texas, DHS [Department of Human Services] investigated 63,204 reports of suspected child abuse and neglect. Investigators confirmed physical abuse of 14,177 children.” The author handled two cases in the mid-1990s in which two Christian mothers were not only forced to take part in state indoctrination programs, but also were charged with criminal injury to a child, a third degree felony, for spanking their children with a switch on the behind. Both cases were successfully resolved, by the grace of God, without the children being taken, but both parents suffered extreme stress at the prospect of possibly losing their children. One case went to criminal trial. God gave the victory. The jury found the accused “not guilty,” but the injustice of her having to go through such an ordeal was tragic. In neither of those cases did any abuse occur when judged
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from a biblical perspective. Yet those mothers were forced by the state to go through satanic counseling. Of the approximately 50,000 investigations that resulted in no confirmation of physical abuse in 1987 in Texas, one may safely assume that almost all or all of those parents had to take counseling ordered by the state.

Those forced to take such counseling are taught, among other things:

“In order to deal more effectively with the stresses in your life, you will need to have a plan for replacing physical discipline with more positive behaviors. It hurts to get hit. When someone hits you, you learn that it is OK to hurt other people. Children who are physically disciplined are more aggressive than other children. Violent criminals in prison have a much higher incidence of physical abuse and cruel punishment as children by their parents than the population in general. When children see violence, they believe that violence is a way to resolve differences/problems. CAPP staff believes that any form of violence and especially physical discipline have no place in raising children. They must be eliminated from your life. This may mean a drastic change in the way you think and how you discipline your kids. Hitting children and causing them pain teaches children to be afraid of parents rather than to respect them. Spanking may stop misbehavior for a while, but in time it loses its effect as a way to control behavior. Spanking may relieve a parent’s anger, but most parents feel guilty afterward. Some children learn to use that guilt to get all sorts of privileges after a spanking. As you can see, there are many reasons to stop abuse and physical discipline.”

“Times have definitely changed since we were growing up as children. Most of us accepted our parents’ rules and orders without question. We just did what they told us to do. If we didn’t, we could probably expect a spanking. Why are things different now? Why do our kids challenge us with ‘NO’ and ‘WHY’ so effectively? And why can’t our response simply be ‘because I said so’ or a spanking?

“We may need to look at how society has changed since we’ve grown up to get some answers to our questions.

“When most of us were growing up, society had an order to how it operated. The president ruled the country, men were the heads of the households, whites and people of color were segregated, and fathers were disciplinarians. People did not question the ‘order’ of things. If they did, they were told to stay in line.

“While we called it a democratic society, in many ways the majority of people (people of color, women, and children) were ruled by a minority (mostly white men). This is not really a democracy.

“[Movements mentioned that changed things.] Children also benefited from these movements. For centuries, children had been considered the property of their parents. They were supposed to respect their elders and follow their orders without question. Parents’ wishes were enforced through physical force. Children were often hurt both physically and emotionally by this.

“With the empowerment of other groups came questions about the rights of children. Laws about physical discipline and abuse were made. Children were no longer considered just ‘property’ but members of a democratic family with certain rights.

“How does a democratic family work? First and foremost, both parents and children are considered equal. They are considered equal in terms of individual worth and dignity. Both child and parent are entitled to receive love and respect. Thus, each must treat the other with love and respect.

“Secondly, in a democratic family, each person has a responsibility to make decisions for him/herself (within appropriate limits) and then to be accountable for the decisions that they make.

“Having a democratic family means taking more time to make decisions, encouraging opinions and listening to them, showing appreciation for good things people do, showing respect for personal territory, and showing interest and support for things that are important in people’s lives. It also means sharing power. But the end result is good: people feeling better about themselves and being able to ask for what they want appropriately.”
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Any true Christian knowledgeable in biblical principles can readily discern the satanic principles in the above excerpts. Some truth is injected in a lot of false conclusory statements. Issues having nothing to do with discipline of children and the operation of a family are misconstrued, exaggerated, and inappropriately applied. Behind all this is a total lack of understanding of the nature of man and the applicability of the principles of the Sovereign, which, when properly understood and applied, bring positive consequences. Unfortunately, the human instruments who teach these concepts have been duped by a being whose goal is being realized in America. That goal is the removal of God and His Word from society, destruction of God’s crowning creation, man, both temporally and eternally, and destruction of all of God’s institutions: marriage, family, church, and civil government.

Although God has given civil government no jurisdiction over marriage, civil government has assumed jurisdiction with the willing participation of many pastors. When a man and a woman enter a state ordained marriage, or when the members of a church incorporate the church, they enter into a contract under and with the state and come under the jurisdiction of the civil government. Early on, even the first dictionary published in America gave one definition of “CONTRACT” as “The act by which a man and woman are betrothed, each to the other.”\(^\text{15}\) Compare that with the covenant marriage of a man and woman under God:

> “And [Jesus] answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”\(^\text{16}\)

A civil contract of marriage allegedly includes only a man and a woman; but effectively, God is involved in any marriage, whether man recognizes it or not. Any marriage involves a biblical covenant which includes a man, a woman, and God. All marriages are spiritual unions under God—the problem comes when one forgets or fails to understand this.

God’s rules always apply whether civil government and/or man recognize them or not. Lies, false definitions, and satanic principles do not change truth.

> “O praise the LORD, all ye nations: praise him, all ye people. For his merciful kindness is great toward us: and the truth of the LORD endureth for ever. Praise ye the LORD.”\(^\text{17}\)

God joins a man and woman whether civil government recognizes this fact or not. Neither man nor civil law can destroy that spiritual union although civil law and the man and woman can ignore or be ignorant of that aspect of marriage and physically divide the union. That is, a wife and/or husband can separate and secure a divorce from civil government, but God recognizes no such divorce as destroying the spiritual union which He created. “But I [Jesus] say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.”\(^\text{18}\) “And he [Jesus] saith unto them, Whosoever shall put
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away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.” 19 “And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.” 20 “Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.” 21

In a civil government marriage ceremony, a pastor or other state recognized official proclaims the bride and groom to be husband and wife by the authority given him by the state and maybe also by the authority of God. How could it be that God gave him authority to conduct a marriage under the authority of the state or the state and God when the principles of each are diametrically opposed? God did not tell man (civil government), “you have authority to institute marriage less than, coequal, or above my authority to join man and woman in marriage.” God told man (civil government) not to put asunder “what God [not civil government or civil government and God] hath joined together.” 22

In any event, the state, as well as many pastors, have ignored biblical principle and erroneously declared man and woman to be husband and wife by the authority of the state and God. If the contract of marriage is performed by a pastor who acts by the authority of both the state and God, even should the form of the ceremony and vows be somewhat in line with biblical principle, a marriage based upon a blend of Godly and satanic principles has been initiated. The pastor of that ceremony hands the authority over that marriage to the state and places the marriage and subsequent family under the satanic family law principles of the state.

The ultimate fruition of the application of contract law to marriage is being seen in today’s American society even among “Christians” in high divorce rates, high percentages of people who just “shack up,” and in the ultimate assault by Satan—the effort to redefine marriage to include the union of two of the same sex. Civil government is taking the nation toward an American Sodom and Gomorrah. This ultimate result, which is to be followed by the wrath of God, came about because men “hold the truth in unrighteousness” 22 and was foretold in God’s Word:

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which
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commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."\(^\text{23}\)

Of course, even should civil government define marriage in such a way as to allow the union of two men or two women or any other combination except one man and one woman, such unions are not marriage. God defined marriage in His Word, and that definition cannot be rewritten.

Likewise, the contract clause has been used to attack the marriage of Christ and His churches. Like man and woman as husband and wife, Christ and a church, as Husband and wife, are one flesh:

“For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bone.”\(^\text{24}\)

Many Christians, in seeking incorporation of a church, feel that by so doing the church and/or its members are gaining additional protection from lawsuits and from civil government. The corporate veil can be pierced, and individuals in a corporation can be sued. (Note: A church can renounce its New Testament church status in ways other than incorporation. For example, a church can apply for an Employee or Taxpayer Identification number, enter into a contract, etc. \(^\text{25}\)) Furthermore, the contract of incorporation of the church with the state does not protect the church from all civil governmental interference with matters outside the contract:

“Although a corporate charter is a contract that the Constitution of the United States protects against impairment by subsequent legislation, a legislature can neither bargain away the police power nor in any way withdraw from its successors the power to take appropriate measures to guard the safety, health, and morals of all who may be within their jurisdiction. Thus, the powers or privileges of a private corporation, although not subject to direct impairment, may nevertheless be affected by the operation of certain fundamental governmental powers, such as the police power and power of eminent domain. The legislature may, without impairing the obligations of a contract, by general laws impose new burdens on corporations in addition to those imposed by their charters when such burdens are conducive to the public interest and safety, notwithstanding the power to do so may not have been reserved in the charter. Moreover, the state and those acting under its authority have the right to require a corporation to incur expenses in order properly to exercise its rights and to use its property and franchises with due regard to the public needs. Corporations are subject to legislative control equally with natural persons -- that is, they may be controlled in all matters coming within the general range of legislative authority, subject to the limitation of not impairing the obligation of contracts and provided the essential franchise is not taken without compensation.”\(^\text{26}\)

The corporation is established under a charter from the civil government and conclusively established by filing articles of incorporation:

“A charter is an instrument or authority from the sovereign power bestowing rights or privileges; therefore, with regard to corporations, the term is correctly used in its limited sense only with reference to special incorporation by act of the legislature. The creation of a corporate entity is conclusively established by filing of articles of incorporation. Legislation confers corporate power through general or special statutes.

“Observation: The laws, whether constitutional or statutory, of the state where a corporation is organized, enter into, and become part of, its articles of incorporation or charter so that the charter of a corporation organized under a general law consists of its articles of incorporation and the laws applicable thereto. Only those statutes that in some

\(^{23}\) Romans 1.21-32.

\(^{24}\) Ephesians 5.29-30.

\(^{25}\) See Chapter 6, infra.
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way are intended to grant or restrict the powers of a corporation, however, become a part of the corporate charter.”

“Those who seek and obtain the benefit of a charter of incorporation must take the benefit under the conditions and with the burdens prescribed by the laws, whether in the Constitution, in general laws, or in the charter itself. A corporation accepting a charter consents to be bound by all of its provisions and conditions and cannot complain of the enforcement of any of such provisions and conditions, if, by a fair reading of the language, the enforcement in the particular manner is authorized. A state granting a charter of incorporation may define strictly and limit the uses of the corporate property necessary to the exercise of the powers granted. The state, however, may not enforce any part of a charter that is repugnant to the Federal Constitution.”

“Where there is a conflict between a corporate charter and the constitution and statutes under which it is issued, the charter must yield to the constitution and statutes. With respect to matters to which statutes do not apply, the articles of incorporation of a corporation are its fundamental and organic law.”

“The articles of incorporation establish a corporation's purposes and manner of governance.” “The contents of articles or certificates of incorporation are commonly specified by a state's corporation statutes. Statutory requirements as to the form and content of the articles or certificate must be substantially followed, and the courts have not hesitated to declare an attempted incorporation invalid for failure to do so.”

As sovereign, the state has ultimate authority in interpreting the articles of incorporation.

“Because a corporation's charter embodies a contract between the state and the corporation, the corporation and its shareholders or members, and a contract among the shareholders or members themselves, the courts employ general principles of contract interpretation when construing articles of incorporation or a certificate of incorporation. This means that courts must give effect to the intent of the parties, as evidenced by the language of the certificate and the circumstances surrounding its adoption. The question whether a corporation's articles are ambiguous is one of law, and when determining the meaning of ambiguous provisions, a court will consider the history and surrounding circumstances to determine the parties' intent. The articles should be construed in their entirety. If there is a hopeless ambiguity that could mislead a reasonable investor, the language of articles of incorporation will be construed in favor of the reasonable expectations of the investors and against the drafter.”

The corporate church must also have bylaws. “The bylaws of a corporation are a contract between the members of a corporation, and between the corporation and its members, while the articles of incorporation constitute a contract between the corporation and the state, between the corporation and its owners or members, and between the owners or members themselves.”

“A bylaw is a self-imposed rule, resulting from an agreement or contract between the corporation and its members to conduct the corporate business in a particular way. The bylaws of a corporation are the private ‘statutes’ by which the corporation is regulated and functions. The charter and bylaws are the fundamental documents governing the conduct of corporate affairs; they establish norms of procedure for exercising rights, and they reflect the purposes and intentions of the incorporators.
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“Until repealed, a bylaw is a continuing rule for the government of the corporation and its officers. Bylaws constitute a binding contract as between the corporation and its members and as between the members themselves.”

The conflict of these rules regarding bylaws with biblical principles is obvious to the knowledgeable Christian.

A business or other organization is “incorporated either for the benefit of the public (a public corporation) or for private purposes (a private corporation).” An incorporated “church” is a private corporation.

“A corporation is to be deemed a private corporation, though it was created for the administration of a public charity, where the endowments of the corporation have been received from individuals. A nonprofit corporation organized pursuant to a nonprofit corporation statute is a private corporation, where it is neither controlled nor owned by the state nor supported by public funds. A corporation organized by permission of the legislature, supported largely by voluntary contributions, and managed by officers and directors who are not representatives of the state or any political subdivision, is a ‘private corporation.’ … A corporation may have a double aspect according to the nature of the powers granted and exercised. If they were granted and exercised for public purposes exclusively, they belong to the corporate body in its public, political, or municipal character; however, if the grant was for purposes of private advantage and emolument, though the public may derive a common benefit therefrom, the corporation, quod hoc, is to be regarded as a private company.”

A corporation is a State “franchise. “Franchises are rights or privileges conferred by grant of the sovereign; a corporate franchise arises from a contract between the sovereign power and private citizens or the corporation itself.”

As can be seen, in God’s eyes the incorporated church is somewhat of a two headed monster.

“In determining the threshold question of the applicability of religious corporations law, a court will look to the provisions of the corporation’s certificate of incorporation as well as the actual practices of the organization as revealed in its papers.

“A church society, by incorporating, does not lose its existence or become wholly merged in the corporation. The religious corporation and the church, although one may exist within the pale of the other, are in no respect correlative. The objects and interests of the one are moral and spiritual; the other deals with things temporal and material. Each as a body is entirely independent and free from any direct control or interference by the other.

“Thus, whenever there is an incorporated church, there are two entities—the one, the church as such, not owing its ecclesiastical or spiritual existence to the civil law, and the other, the legal corporation—each separate, although closely allied. The former is purely voluntary and is not a corporation or a quasi corporation. On the other hand, a corporation which is formed for the acquisition and taking care of the property of the church, must be regarded as a legal personality, and is in no sense ecclesiastical in its functions.” [Emphasis mine.]

Of note in the above quote is the inference that a non-incorporated, non-501(c)(3) church which has not in any way submitted to civil government or made herself a legal entity does not subject itself or owe its existence to civil law and its objects and interests are only moral and spiritual. This is in line with biblical principle that a New Testament church is spiritual only and has no temporal attachments.
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Chapter 2: Incorporation of churches

An incorporated 501(c)(3) church gets part of her powers from God and part from the civil government. She is under two heads. Part of the church, as a legal entity, can sue and be sued as to both earthly and spiritual matters. Part of the church must have elected officers who conduct business meetings, meet statutory requirements, etc.

“A church that sees fit to become incorporated under state law is obligated to conduct its business activities in compliance therewith, including governmental regulation of its employment relationships, so long as the employment does not depend on doctrinal matters. Religious corporations are governed by the same rules of law and equity as other corporations.” 38

“Statutory provisions sometimes authorize the membership of a religious society to incorporate as an ecclesiastical body with the power to make bylaws governing the selection of church officials and prescribing their duties.” 39

“A church incorporated for the promotion of a defined fundamental religious faith or doctrine cannot by amendment change its religious creed or faith except by the unanimous vote of its members.” 40

The incorporated church, as has been stated, is an artificial person and a separate legal entity. This has many ramifications.

“The corporate personality is a fiction but is intended to be acted upon as though it were a fact. A corporation is a separate legal entity, distinct from its individual members or stockholders.

“The basic purpose of incorporation is to create a distinct legal entity, with legal rights, obligations, powers, and privileges different from those of the natural individuals who created it, own it, or whom it employs….

“A corporate owner/employee, who is a natural person, is distinct, therefore, from the corporation itself. An employee and the corporation for which the employee works are different persons, even where the employee is the corporation's sole owner…. The corporation also remains unchanged and unaffected in its identity by changes in its individual membership.

“In no legal sense can the business of a corporation be said to be that of its individual stockholders or officers.” 41

“A corporation is a person within the meaning of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and similar provisions of state constitutions and within the meaning of state statutes.” 42 “However, a corporation is not considered as a person under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution (religious liberty clause) or under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.” 43

“[T]here is a clear distinction in this particular between an individual and a corporation, and that the latter has no right to refuse to submit its books and papers for an examination at the suit of the State. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to criminate him. He owes no such duty to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to
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incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.

“Upon the other hand, the corporation is a creature of the State. It is presumed to be incorporated for the benefit of the public. It receives certain special privileges and franchises, and holds them subject to the laws of the State and the limitations of its charter. Its powers are limited by law. It can make no contract not authorized by its charter. Its rights to act as a corporation are only reserved to it so long as it obeys the laws of its creation. There is a reserved right in the legislature to investigate its contracts and find out whether it has exceeded its powers. It would be a strange anomaly to hold that a State, having chartered a corporation to make use of certain franchises, could not in the exercise of its sovereignty inquire how these franchises had been employed, and whether they had been abused, and demand the production of the corporate books and papers for that purpose.”

When a church incorporates or becomes a legal entity, that church contracts with the state gaining certain “protections” but gives up certain constitutional rights. While a corporation must “obey the laws of its creation,” it also has constitutionally protected rights. Only the church which is not satisfied with the freedom and provisions afforded the church by God (which, by the way, are implemented by the First Amendment) seeks incorporation. For the incorporated church, God’s provisions are not adequate. Although perhaps the individual church member seeks incorporation for protection by civil government as opposed to protection by God, that member forgets that God is a far more strong and benevolent protector than the state. Furthermore, when a church is not a legal entity, that church cannot be sued. One can sue a legal entity such as a corporation, but how does one sue a church which is “a spiritual house made up of spiritual beings offering up spiritual sacrifices, and not a physical house made by man?” Individuals, including members of a New Testament church, can be sued for tortious actions or tried for criminal acts, but a New Testament church cannot be sued or tried for criminal acts.

The purpose of the corporation is at odds with the God-given purpose of a church. Ultimately, the purpose of a church is to glorify God by submitting herself to her Husband in all things. The basic purpose of incorporation is to allegedly increase the happiness of man by creating a “distinct legal entity, with legal rights, obligations, powers, and privileges different from those of the natural individuals who created it, own it, or whom it employs.”

A corporation and a church have different creators. Church members, under authority of and in conjunction with the state, create the corporation. God supernaturally creates a church: “And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”

The organization of a church and a corporation are different. The incorporated “church” has “employees.” Even should the incorporated “church” call their “employees” ministers, the state looks at them as “employees,” and the state is the sovereign of the corporation. A New Testament church cannot have employees and remain a New Testament church. Nowhere in the Bible can one conclude that a church is to pay anyone a salary. To do so makes that church a legal entity. Does God want His churches to have “members,” does He want
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them to have “employees,” or does He want His churches to have both members and employees?

Whereas a church is to have pastors, teachers, and so forth, state laws which create corporations require the corporation to have officers such as president, treasurer, secretary, and so forth.

Ownership of a church and a corporation differs. “Members in a nonprofit corporation are the ‘owners’ of the corporation and generally play a role similar to shareholders in for-profit corporations.”50 As has been pointed out, Jesus Christ owns a New Testament church. God ordained that the church would be His. Jesus said to Peter, “That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” 51 [Emphasis mine.] Jesus stated that He would build His church. The incorporated “church” is partly owned, authorized, and built by God and partly owned, authorized, and built by Satan.

The corporation owns the property. “The members of the corporation are not owners of the corporate property; the corporation and its members are distinct parties. The corporation has an existence distinct, separate and apart from its members.”52

An incorporated church must deal with all the government red tape that comes with incorporation. The incorporated church must now elect officers, hold business meetings, notify members of those meetings pursuant to statutory requirements, keep records, etc. All these secular activities take tremendous time, energy, and resources which could be used in pursuing the God-given purposes of a church. The incorporated church which does not comply with statutory requirements is being dishonest and could face further problems from her sovereign state.

Notice that Jesus said that “the gates of hell shall not prevail against [my church].” What about the church that is partly under God and partly under Satan? That church has fallen for Satan’s seduction:

“SEDUCTION, n. ... 2. Appropriately, the act or crime of persuading a female, by flattery or deception, to surrender her chastity. A woman who is above flattery, is least liable to seduction; but the best safeguard is principle, the love and purity of holiness, the fear of God and reverence for his commandments.”53

An incorporated church, having compromised her love for her Husband, will continue to make incremental compromises, and ultimately (perhaps in 1, 5, 10, 50, 100, or 200 years or more) will fall into heresy and apostasy. And from the beginning of that initial compromise, the Lord, even though longsuffering in His love and mercy, is grieving because of His wife’s compromise.

A corporation cannot be the bride of Christ, the wife of Christ. The incorporated part of an incorporated church is not the bride of Christ, the wife of Christ, but rather an extramarital illicit relationship existing alongside the marriage. With the above information it should already be completely obvious to any born again believer who loves the Lord and who has been saved any length of time at all that a church should never incorporate. Scripture contains no principle consistent with church incorporation or incorporation in general. In
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fact, everything about incorporation is anti-biblical. If one who loves the Lord and comes into this understanding is in a church that is already incorporated, he will do all he can to shed the corporate 501(c)(3) status of that church.
Chapter 3
Incorporation of churches
in the colonies and the new nation

“The Constitution did not separate church and state [on the state level], but it did endorse a conception of society that made separation inevitable. The protection of private rights from public action required the delineation of private and public activities. Once law separated public and private realms, churches could not [according to the way the law developed] continue their historic roles of public service. [States that relied on the political process to effectuate separation of church and state, an essentially state matter, encountered tremendous difficulty in doing so.] Politics could not determine the form that educational and welfare institutions would take in the early republic because no political consensus existed. The law could—and when state and federal courts turned to consider this issue, their decisions were informed by the same legal doctrine. Ultimately the Supreme Court did impose a model of privatization on all of the states, but its effect was more to redirect political debate than to resolve political tension.”

Incorporation of churches became an issue for the Baptists in the colonies which carried over to the states in the new nation. In the 1700s, various denominations, including Baptists, in the colony of Rhode Island “took advantage of the absence of religious establishment by incorporating to address a wide range of church goals.”

“Pennsylvania’s laws on religious corporations demonstrate the changing attitudes toward churches and the transformation in the tenets underlying law from the colonial era to the early republic.... In the early republic, churches were redefined, under law, as private organizations serving private and not public goals.” In the colonial era Pennsylvania and New York had a longer history of incorporating churches than did the other colonies. The New York legislature passed a law allowing all Protestant sects to incorporate in the 1760s. The New York Constitution of 1777 provided for “free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference.”

“[T]he developing laws or private property, enforced through contracts, were given early expression to redefine the roles of churches in American society” in a 1784 New York case involving Trinity Church which had received land in a letter from Queen Anne in 1714. The case held that “contracts made with the Crown or its agent were valid, even when made during war when the king’s authority was denied by the colonists in the midst of revolution.” “After the judicial recognition of contract rights as superior to legislative enactment, the legislature had little choice but to limit its disestablishment initiatives to comply with the prevailing contract-law doctrine.” As a result, new law was passed allowing all sects to incorporate and hold property—“the law created a new system of general incorporation for all religious bodies to follow.” All churches in the state incorporated under the new law.

At the same time that laws providing for incorporation of churches were being made, the churches were being redefined as private entities, and care of the poor and needy was passing from the church to the state. Prior to disestablishment, taxes collected by the state were transferred to churches for
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salaries of pastors, building, and charities. With disestablishment, charity went with the money, that is, with the state which could collect taxes, and not with the church. Rather than perceiving churches as helping society address its concerns, churches in the 1790s were recognized as impediments to social progress as public institutions might rationally conceive of it.\(^6\)

In South Carolina, “[d]isestablishment once more followed and conformed to the legal separation of public and private spheres.” The 1790 constitution of South Carolina guaranteed religious liberty and transformed the church into a private institution “when its power as a public institution became too threatening.” After 1790, poor relief, record keeping, and education to a lesser degree passed from church responsibility to government or private citizen responsibility.\(^8\)

In Massachusetts, Isaac Backus and others were against incorporation of churches, but many Baptist churches did not heed their counsel. The issue arose because of the adoption of Article Three to the constitution of Massachusetts in 1780. Isaac Backus and other Baptists vehemently opposed its adoption. Article Three required that compulsory religious taxes be laid in each parish, as they had always been for the “support the public worship of God,” and for the “support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality.” However, new was the requirement that “these taxes were to be laid upon all sects or for all sects.” “Any Protestant minister, of whatever sect, was guaranteed compulsory tax support and the minister of any sect could, if he received the majority of votes of a parish, become legally established.”\(^9\)

After adoption of Article Three, certain Baptists refused to pay the religious tax. One, Elijah Balkcom, was jailed and paid the tax under duress. He then sued the accessors for taxing him illegally and contrary to his constitutional right to freedom of conscience. Although the Baptist position prevailed in that case, another case two years later, Cutter v. Frost, reversed the Balkcom decision. The Superior Court in the Cutter case reconstructed Article Three against the intent of the legislators and said that dissenters had to file a certificate in order to have their taxes paid to their own church and that “only religious societies incorporated by law were under any circumstances entitled to legal recognition.” “To be incorporated, each dissenting congregation would have to petition the legislature to obtain a charter.” Hence the Superior Court closed the door to the liberty which Backus had proclaimed could not be shut after the Balkcom case. The Cutter decision “denied any way for the Baptists to avoid supporting the parish churches except by petitioning the legislature for incorporation.” Petitioning the government for incorporation “was an even more flagrant infringement of conscience than giving in certificates; it acknowledged the power of the State over the Church—the power to incorporate some and not others according to its own standards.”\(^10\)

Another alternative, which was opposed by Backus, was proposed and tried—a taxpayer could file a certificate, pay the tax and, should the parish treasurer fail to pay the taxes to his own pastor, sue to have his taxes returned on the basis that the tax denied his constitutional right to freedom of conscience.
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This method was costly and time consuming and had to be done case by case. However, it was used with some degree of success.

Because of Cutter, many Baptist churches chose to incorporate. Hezekiah Smith led the movement of Baptist churches to incorporate in spite of opposition of Isaac Backus and the Warren Association. Many Baptists supported incorporation to comply with the Cutter case so that the state would return taxes paid by Baptists to their parishes, and to make possible contracts between the members of a church and its pastor, which assured a decent salary. Of course, Backus took the biblical position, seeing the relationship between pastor and other church members as spiritual. He believed that incorporation “acknowledged the right of the state to decide which churches could and could not be chartered,” and “gave all persons in the congregation [whether saved or not, thereby ‘allowing the unconverted members to outvote the converted’] the right to vote on building or repairing a meetinghouse as well as paying the minister’s salary” thereby bringing the same conflicts encountered by Congregational parishes. Other reasons for arguing for incorporation was to allow churches to hold property or endowment funds in the name of the church. Backus “pointed out that the law gave the deacons, or any other suitably appointed persons, the power to ‘receive and hold estates or donations which are given for religious purposes, and to manage the same at the direction and for the good of the church or society.’” Some Baptists incorporated, against Backus’ advice, to avoid distraint or imprisonment. The Religious Liberty Act of 1811 reversed the Cutter Case and applied Article Three to all churches whether incorporated or not.

After the ratification of the Constitution, the United States Supreme Court, headed by Chief Justice John Marshall, relied on the contract clause of Article I Section 10 to delineate public and private actions. “[M]ost c]hurches adapted to the new legal environment after 1790 by reforming themselves as private voluntary associations assuming a corporate form.”12 The primary case in the Marshall Court decisions is the Dartmouth College case in which the Court used the contract clause to prevent New Hampshire’s legislature from breaking its contract of incorporation and restructuring the organization of a private Christian school.13 Prior to Dartmouth College, “state legislatures consistently repudiated school and university charters in order to redesign educational institutions to serve political ends.”14

Britain chartered the institution in Dartmouth College as The Trustees of Dartmouth College in 1769. Under the charter, the Trustees of Dartmouth College was an independent corporation, not requiring any further “grant, license, or conformation.”15 The college was supported by both private and state funds. The college fell under the control of orthodox conservatives who wished to emphasize the God in people’s lives and to modify the curricula appropriately. Restrictions on students were increased in 1809, and “students objecting to increased restrictions rioted, becoming drunk, burning outhouses, vandalizing more orthodox students’ rooms, firing guns into the night air, and spreading garbage over the campus environs of their suspected enemies.”16
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public and political debate ensued pitting republican enlightenment ideals against conservative religious beliefs. The establishment of religion was at the time also being hotly debated. “Republican interests focused on the trustees of the college as dangerous ideologues inhibiting the state’s progress.”

A republican governor and republican majority were elected in the 1816 New Hampshire election. One of the first acts of the new government was to restructure Dartmouth College. Two more followed quickly. The acts amended the charter to allow the state government to restructure the charter, rename the corporation to Trustees of Dartmouth University and the name of the school, and increased the number of trustees by nine, from twelve to twenty-one, and named the governor as the source of all new trustees and of future replacements.

“Even more significant was that the act created a board of overseers, appointed by the governor to govern the university, to undertake most of the responsibilities formerly held by the trustees. The board was authorized to approve or negate any action of the trustees to appoint and remove the president and officers of the university, to set their salaries, to establish professorships, to create new buildings, and to approve all faculty appointments.”

The legislature also expanded religious freedom at Dartmouth.

The trustees fought the new laws. The president of Dartmouth, Reverend Francis Brown, outlined the philosophical divide confronting the Court, New Hampshire, and the country:

“That the labours of the philosopher were so impotent, and the preaching of the apostle attended with such energy is not strange. The mind of Plato, after all his attainments, was involved in spiritual darkness. Paul, on the other hand, was irradiated with a light from heaven, strong and clear; and the same divine spirit, who at first imparted it to his own mind, accompanied it as it was conveyed from him to his fellow man…. If instead of placing Paul in contrast with Plato alone, I had supposed all the philosophers of Greece and Rome arrayed on one side against this single apostle, the general result would have been the same.”

The case went all the way to the Supreme Court which denied the state the right to unilaterally reconstruct the corporation. The main importance of the case is not in the protection of contract rights, or to decide whether a governmental creation was entitled to less protection from the government than other contracts. Those issues had been resolved in prior cases. The main importance of the case is in the reasoning of the Court which “expressed the Court’s perception of distinct realms of public and private action, and the role of the courts in the protection of private action from public action.”

According to Marshall, public institutions are not defined by their purposes, but as being part of the “civil government.” He reasoned that trustees and professors have no authority in or power over civil government, that they are not public officers and have no public duties. Thus, certain corporations are public and others private.

“The Dartmouth College case of 1819 was the crucial national pronouncement that repositioned the churches as private entities distinct from institutions of public governance. The decision expressed a new model of civic organization conceived with
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the Constitution. However, the legal model considered form rather than substance, imposing a private-public distinction and designating separate forums in which the two worldviews would hold sway. In this resolution, law perpetuated the contest between the two worldviews that form the intellectual basis of American culture.”

“Arising out of the disestablishment controversy in New Hampshire, this decision sounded the death knell for New England establishment and confirmed the supremacy of liberal contract-law doctrine in all of the United States. Focusing on the contract clause of the Constitution, the Supreme Court recognized distinct private and public institutions and protected the former from interference by the latter. The old question of religious or church involvement in serving the public good, particularly in public education, was at the heart of the Dartmouth case.”

The case had other ramifications. Marshall wrote: “Charitable, or public spirited individuals, desirous of making permanent appropriations for charitable or other useful purposes, find it impossible to effect their design securely, and certainly, without an incorporation act.” Thus, “unincorporated charitable institutions are too vague to receive bequests of decedents, as their intentions cannot be given definite assurance of fulfillment without a corporate charter and an organization that establishes parameters for the future use of funds.” The same year, Marshall found that a court of equity could not establish “a vague legacy, the object of which is indefinite” even though the intentions of a testator to leave much of his estate to the Philadelphia Baptist Association were obvious, because “a court could not create a legal entity in order to enable it to receive a bequest consistent with a testator’s intent…. Without incorporation, under which the trustees were legally committed to serve the enunciated purposes, the funds left to an association had no assurance of being used for any specific end.”

Also, “After the Dartmouth College decision, government could not rely upon private philanthropic associations to address public perceptions of societal needs. The public-private distinction required states to define their priorities more carefully. No longer could states delegate to private concerns the responsibility for educating young people, caring for the poor, or creating roadways, because states could no longer exercise control over how these private concerns fulfilled their duties. To continue to rely on private concerns after 1819 risked creating educational, welfare, or infrastructure systems significantly at odds with legislative perceptions of the public interest.”

“In the process, civil society was redefined, separating governmental institutions from private charitable corporations. Religiously affiliated private associations pursuing their own goals remained viable on the institutional periphery of society. Marshall’s language in the Dartmouth College case expressed a major change in attitude from an earlier era: ‘These eleemosynary institutions do not fill the place which would otherwise be occupied by government, but that which would otherwise remain vacant.”

Thus, the public and private spheres were divided with private spheres free to pursue their own visions for civil society, and the electorate would determine the public course of action. Protection was provided through the enforcement of contracts, an enlightenment device. The religion of secular humanism, the “religion of the republic,” “reduced Christian doctrine to its lowest common denominator, essentially a code of moral behavior expressed in the golden rule, and positioned God as a benevolent but uninvolved creator of natural laws.”
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Since the Constitution did not recognize God in His exalted position of Supreme Sovereign of the nation and since it created a law modeled after biblical principles, including the biblical principle of separation of church and state, but leavened by some enlightenment principles, the direction of the nation in the long run could only be a much faster downward slide than if the founding documents had been formulated totally upon solid biblical principle under God.

Churches which incorporated under enlightenment principles were no longer truly free since the state created them, was their sovereign as to the earthly matters required by incorporation, and they were bound to comply with the terms of contracts which conflicted with biblical principles.
Chapter 4
Federal government control of churches through 501(c)(3) tax exemption

In the twentieth century, the federal government added more cheese to the trap—26 U.S.C. or IRC § 501(c)(3) tax exemption.

The IRS exerts a certain amount of control over an incorporated 501(c)(3) “church.” Scripture makes clear that God wants no one else—especially the unregenerate—controlling, defining, and restricting his bride in any way. IRC terms set limits on and control the activities of the corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization. Definition of terms used in the IRC by IRS personnel who do not have the expertise to define biblical terms further results in the operation of a corporate 501(c)(3) organization in ways inconsistent with biblical principles.

501(c)(3) invites churches to seek a tax exemption from civil government, even though the First Amendment already has erected a “high and impregnable wall” of separation between church and state which forbids civil government from making any law, including any taxing law, respecting a New Testament church. 501(a),(c)(3),(h) reads in relevant part:

“§ 501. Exemption from tax on corporations, certain trusts, etc.:

“(a) Exemption from taxation. An organization described in subsection (c) ... shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle [26 USCS §§ 1 et seq.] unless such exemption is denied under section 502 or 503 [26 USCS § 502 or 503]....

“(c)(3) Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or international amateur sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection (h)), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office....

“(h) Expenditures by public charities to influence legislation. (1) General rule. In the case of an organization to which this subsection applies, exemption from taxation under subsection (a) shall be denied because a substantial part of the activities of such organization consists of carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation....”

Notice that churches are not mentioned in 501(c)(3). It does mention, among other things, “[c]orporations … organized and operated exclusively for religious … purposes.” Even the federal government thereby recognizes that the basic character of a church that seeks and obtains 501(c)(3) status has changed and that church has become a “religious organization.” That happens when a church incorporates under state law. When a church incorporates, it becomes a corporation organized exclusively for religious purposes.

The state controls, defines, and instructs a corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization to a large degree. Control and definition go hand in hand. The federal government, not God, defines “religious purposes” as to an incorporated church. What if an incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organization considers an

activity to be God-ordained and spiritual, but the civil government disagrees? The civil government with authority over that issue controls.

Under the IRS interpretation of 501(c)(3), to qualify for tax exempt status under 501(c)(3) religious organizations must meet the following requirements, i.e. abide by the following rules:

“1. must be organized and operated exclusively for religious, educational, scientific, or other charitable purposes,
“2. net earnings must not inure to the benefit of any private individual or shareholder,
“3. no substantial part of its activity may be attempting to influence legislation,
“4. the organization may not intervene in political activity,
“5. the organization’s purposes and activities may not be illegal or violate fundamental public policy.”

Notice that the last requirement—“may not violate fundamental public policy”—is not from law; that is, it is not listed as a requirement in § 501(c)(3). This requirement was made law by federal court in the Bob Jones University case:

“On January 12, 1970, a three-judge District Court for the District of Columbia issued a preliminary injunction prohibiting the IRS from according tax-exempt status to private schools in Mississippi that discriminated as to admissions on the basis of race…. Thereafter, in July 1970, the IRS concluded that it could ‘no longer legally justify allowing tax-exempt status [under § 501(c)(3)] to private schools which practice racial discrimination.’ IRS News Release, July 7, 1970, reprinted in App. in No. 81-3, p. A235. At the same time, the IRS announced that it could not ‘treat gifts to such schools as charitable deductions for income tax purposes [under § 170].’ Ibid. By letter dated November 30, 1970, the IRS formally notified private schools, including those involved in this litigation, of this change in policy, ‘applicable to all private schools in the United States at all levels of education.’ … The court permanently enjoined the Commissioner of Internal Revenue from approving tax-exempt status for any school in Mississippi that did not publicly maintain a policy of nondiscrimination…. “Bob Jones University [was] a nonprofit corporation located in Greenville, S. C. Its purpose is ‘to conduct an institution of learning ..., giving special emphasis to the Christian religion and the ethics revealed in the Holy Scriptures.’ Certificate of Incorporation, Bob Jones University, Inc. [Bob Jones University had a policy that] Students who date outside of their own race will be expelled…. After failing to obtain an assurance of tax exemption through administrative means, the University instituted an action in 1971 seeking to enjoin the IRS from revoking the school's tax-exempt status. “The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina held that revocation of the University's tax-exempt status exceeded the delegated powers of the IRS, was improper under the IRS rulings and procedures, and violated the University's rights under the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment…. The District Court found, on the basis of a full evidentiary record, that the challenged practices of petitioner Bob Jones University were based on a genuine belief that the Bible forbids interracial dating and marriage. The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in a divided opinion, reversed…. The Court of Appeals concluded that § 501(c)(3) must be read against the background of charitable trust law. To be eligible for an exemption under that section, an institution must be ‘charitable’ in the common-law sense, and therefore must not be contrary to public policy. In the court's view, Bob Jones University did not meet this requirement, since its ‘racial policies violated the clearly defined public policy, rooted in our Constitution, condemning racial discrimination and, more specifically, the government policy against subsidizing racial discrimination in education, public or private.’ … The court held that the IRS acted within its statutory authority in revoking the University’s

2 IRS Publication 1828 (2007), pp. 3, 5. This and all IRS publications referred to may be accessed at irs.gov. IRS details on proscription #3 are on pp. 5-6 of IRS Pub. 1828. Just mentioning a candidate may violate proscription #4. Detailed guidelines with consequences of violation of proscription #4 are on pp. 7-11 of Pub. 1828. As to proscription #5, public policy is determined by the courts.
tax-exempt status. Finally, the Court of Appeals rejected petitioner's arguments that the revocation of the tax exemption violated the Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses of the First Amendment.

"[Included in the case was Goldsboro Christian Schools, a nonprofit corporation located in Goldsboro, N. C., a private Christian school which prohibited interracial dating based upon sincerely held religious beliefs.]

"[The Supreme Court reasoned in adding the ‘public policy’ requirement to the [IRC]:]

‘The general words used in the clause ..., taken by themselves, and literally construed, without regard to the object in view, would seem to sanction the claim of the plaintiff. But this mode of expounding a statute has never been adopted by any enlightened tribunal -- because it is evident that in many cases it would defeat the object which the Legislature intended to accomplish. And it is well settled that, in interpreting a statute, the court will not look merely to a particular clause in which general words may be used, but will take in connection with it the whole statute... and the objects and policy of the law....’ ... (emphasis added by the Court).

‘Section 501(c)(3) therefore must be analyzed and construed within the framework of the Internal Revenue Code and against the background of the congressional purposes. Such an examination reveals unmistakable evidence that, underlying all relevant parts of the Code, is the intent that entitlement to tax exemption depends on meeting certain common-law standards of charity -- namely, that an institution seeking tax-exempt status must serve a public purpose and not be contrary to established public policy.

‘This ‘charitable’ concept appears explicitly in § 170 of the Code. That section contains a list of organizations virtually identical to that contained in § 501(c)(3). It is apparent that Congress intended that list to have the same meaning in both sections. In § 170, Congress used the list of organizations in defining the term ‘charitable contributions.’ On its face, therefore, § 170 reveals that Congress' intention was to provide tax benefits to organizations serving charitable purposes. The form of § 170 simply makes plain what common sense and history tell us: in enacting both § 170 and § 501(c)(3), Congress sought to provide tax benefits to charitable organizations, to encourage the development of private institutions that serve a useful public purpose or supplement or take the place of public institutions of the same kind.

‘The predecessor of § 170 originally was enacted in 1917, as part of the War Revenue Act of 1917, ch. 63, § 1201(2), 40 Stat. 330, whereas the predecessor of § 501(c)(3) dates back to the income tax law of 1894, Act of Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, 28 Stat. 509, infra. There are minor differences between the lists of organizations in the two sections, see generally Liles & Blum, Development of the Federal Tax Treatment of Charities, 39 Law & Contemp. Prob. 6, 24-25 (No. 4, 1975) (hereinafter Liles & Blum). Nevertheless, the two sections are closely related; both seek to achieve the same basic goal of encouraging the development of certain organizations through the grant of tax benefits. The language of the two sections is in most respects identical, and the Commissioner and the courts consistently have applied many of the same standards in interpreting those sections. See 5 J. Mertens, Law of Federal Income Taxation § 31.12 (1980); 6 id., §§ 34.01-34.13 (1975); B. Bittker & L. Stone, Federal Income Taxation 220-222 (5th ed. 1980). To the extent that § 170 ‘aids in ascertaining the meaning’ of § 501(c)(3), therefore, it is ‘entitled to great weigh.’ ... [the Court analyses ‘charitable trusts’]....

“Act of Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, § 32, 28 Stat. 556-557. The income tax system contained in the 1894 Act was declared unconstitutional, Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 158 U.S. 601 (1895), for reasons unrelated to the charitable exemption provision. The terms of that exemption were in substance included in the corporate income tax contained in the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909, ch. 6, § 38, 36 Stat. 112. A similar exemption has been included in every income tax Act since the adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment, beginning with the Revenue Act of 1913, ch. 16, § II(G), 38 Stat. 172. See generally Reiling, Federal Taxation: What Is a Charitable Organization?, 44 A. B. A. J. 525 (1958); Liles & Blum....

“The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burdens which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from other public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the

"A corollary to the public benefit principle is the requirement, long recognized in the law of trusts, that the purpose of a charitable trust may not be illegal or violate established public policy. In 1861, this Court stated that a public charitable use must be 'consistent with local laws and public policy,' Perin v. Carey, 24 How., at 501. Modern commentators and courts have echoed that view. See, e. g., Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 377, Comment c (1959); 4 Scott § 377, and cases cited therein; Bogert § 378, at 191-192....

"[The Court then explained why racial discrimination now violates clearly defined public policy.] ...

"[The Court concluded:]

'Racially discriminatory educational institutions cannot be viewed as conferring a public benefit within the 'charitable' concept discussed earlier, or within the congressional intent underlying § 170 and § 501(c)(3)....

"This Court has long held the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to be an absolute prohibition against governmental regulation of religious beliefs, Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205, 219 (1972); Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398, 402 (1963); Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296, 303 (1940). As interpreted by this Court, moreover, the Free Exercise Clause provides substantial protection for lawful conduct grounded in religious belief, see Wisconsin v. Yoder, supra, at 220; Thomas v. Review Board of Indiana Employment Security Div., 450 U.S. 707 (1981); Sherbert v. Verner, supra, at 402-403. However, '[not] all burdens on religion are unconstitutional.... The state may justify a limitation on religious liberty by showing that it is essential to accomplish an overriding governmental interest.'

"On occasion this Court has found certain governmental interests so compelling as to allow even regulations prohibiting religiously based conduct. The governmental interest at stake here is compelling.

"[The Court noted:] We deal here only with religious schools -- not with churches or other purely religious institutions; here, the governmental interest is in denying public support to racial discrimination in education.

[The Court also stated:] "The IRS policy at issue here is founded on a 'neutral, secular basis,' Gillette v. United States, 401 U.S. 437, 452 (1971), and does not violate the Establishment Clause."

Although Bob Jones University was limited to religious schools in that a church was not being attacked in that specific case, the same rationale that supported the Court’s conclusions can also be applied to 501(c)(3) religious organizations, although more hurdles will have to be jumped. It is common knowledge that the IRS regularly attacks such organizations for infractions of requirements of IRS regulation. The outcome of such a case against a church hinges upon the liberal-conservative makeup to the Court. Liberal dominated courts have no problem clearing whatever logical, legal, and/or spiritual hurdles they encounter.

God wants members of His body, the church, to decide what is spiritual and what is not. If His body messes up, He will take care of it. The IRS requirements require instruction, definition, and control. The IRS determines, subject to costly and time consuming court challenge, whether a restriction has been breached by a 501(c)(3) religious organization. These restrictions subject a religious organization to suit in the courts for violating a federal government law.

Especially notice the last IRS requirement. Fundamental public policy is above biblical principle if the two conflict. Certain public policies can, do, and

---

will conflict with biblical principles. It is the responsibility of the church, not the state, to determine biblical principle as to the doctrines of the church. A nineteenth century Supreme Court wisely observed:

"The question, what is the public policy of a state, and what is contrary to it, if inquired into beyond these limits, will be found to be one of great vagueness and uncertainty; and to involve discussions which scarcely come within the range of judicial duty and functions, and upon which men may and will complexionally differ; above all, when that topic is connected with religious polity, in a country composed of such a variety of religious sects as our country, it is impossible not to feel that it would be attended with almost insuperable difficulties, and involve differences of opinion almost endless in their variety. We disclaim any right to enter upon such examinations, beyond what the state constitutions, and laws, and decisions necessarily bring before us."

New Testament churches under God are non-taxable. 501(c)(3) religious organizations under civil government are tax exempt. IRC § 508 (the codification of Public Law 91-172 ratified in 1969) provides in relevant part:

"§ 508. Special rules with respect to section 501(c)(3) organizations.

"(a) New organizations must notify secretary that they are applying for recognition of section 501(c)(3) status.

"(c) Exceptions. [Emphasis mine.]

"(1) Mandatory exceptions. Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to—

"(A) churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and conventions or associations of churches." [Emphasis mine.]

Note. A church applies for 501(c)(3) recognition by filling out and filing IRS Form 1023.

§ 508(a),(c) says churches are excepted from obtaining § 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. In other words, churches are non-taxable; and, therefore, churches are an exception to the civil government requirement that certain organizations file for 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. Thus, even the federal government recognizes that a New Testament church is non-taxable.

If a church does not apply for exempt status, and if it is organized as a New Testament church, according to the First Amendment which agrees with the biblical principle of separation of church and state, the church is an exception, and the non-taxable status of that church must be honored.

If a church successfully applies for exempt status, the government is granted some jurisdiction over the church since the civil government now declares and grants an exemption.

"EXEMPT, a. Free from any service, charge, burden, tax, duty, evil or requisition, to which others are subject; not subject; not liable to; as, to be exempt from military duty, or from a poll tax; to be exempt from pain or fear. Peers in G. Britain are exempt from serving on inquests.

"2. Free by privilege; as exempt from the jurisdiction of a lord or of a court.

"3. Free; clear; not included.

"4. Cut off from. [Not used.] Shak.""}

"exempt … 2: free or released from some liability or requirement to which others are subject."
“PRIV'ALEGE, n. …
“1. A particular and peculiar benefit or advantage enjoyed by a person, company or society, beyond the common advantages of other citizens. A privilege may be a particular right granted by law or held by custom, or it may be an exemption from some burden to which others are subject.
“2. Any peculiar benefit or advantage, right or immunity, not common to others of the human race. Thus we speak of national privileges, and civil and religious privileges secured to us by our constitutions of government.…
“3. Advantage, favor, benefit.”

In spite of the fact that biblically sound churches are non-taxable, many, if not most, churches line up to incorporate and to become 501(c)(3) religious organizations. Why do churches apply?

“IRS concurrence that a religious organization is indeed a church is the best protection for a donor that his or her contribution to the church is tax-deductible and will not be challenged in an audit. This knowledge makes a church’s fundraising efforts much easier.”

God had reasons for denying jurisdiction to the state over spiritual matters and restricting state authority to earthly matters. One reason has to do with qualification for determining the meanings of words. The interpretation of laws and regulations requires the defining of words. Employees of civil government are not qualified to determine the meanings of spiritual terms; but, by dealing with spiritual matters, such people are called upon to determine the meanings of spiritual terms. They must determine the meaning of “religion,” “religious,” “church,” and many other words. Since these employees are operating outside their realm of expertise, the outcome of their decisions on these matters will conflict with the biblical meanings of those words. In defining words, therefore, civil government officials intrude upon the jurisdiction of the church—the church is subjected to the state.

For example, what does the word “religion” mean? The word “religion” is used only five times, in the Bible, and only once in a good sense:

“Which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.”

“For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it: And profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.”

“If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man’s religion is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.”

Thus, from a biblical perspective, religion in the good sense may be defined as:

---

8 Ibid.
9 Peter Kershaw, Hushmoney (Branson, Missouri: Heal Our Land Ministries), p. 30, citing Michael Chitwood, Protect Your Contributions (referring to statement of IRS on p. 3 of IRS Publication 1828).
10 Acts 26.5.
11 Galatians 1.13, 14.
12 James 1.26-27.
Since the Bible also teaches that there is only one true God, there can only be one religion in the good and true sense. This means that all other religions are bad and false. All other “gods” are actually no gods at all:

“As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.”

“What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.”

Since there is only one true God, there is only one religion with power from God. Before one can know that one true God, one must know Jesus Christ, God the Son:

“Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him.”

The Bible, as pointed out above, recognized the Jewish religion. Members of the Jewish religion (and any other religion) who do not recognize the Lord Jesus Christ as sovereign God are false religions and have no piety or power from God. “And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” Unconverted Jews deny that Jesus Christ is God the Son. The Jewish religion, like all other religions except true biblical religion, is therefore a false religion. The IRS and the federal government to a great extent, however, have concluded that all religions are equal and have created a pluralistic code and a pluralistic nation.

Civil government officials are required by § 501(c)(3) to define “church.” By providing that churches can become legal entities by incorporating and obtaining 501(c)(3) status, the civil government assured that the IRS and the courts would have to define “church” because, first, a lot of true churches would seek to incorporate and get government declared tax exempt status; and second, many religious organizations would claim to be churches so as to obtain the benefits offered by civil government. As one court noted,

13 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828), definition of “RELIGION.”
14 I Corinthians 8.4-6.
15 I Corinthians 10.19-21.
16 John 14.6-7.
17 Matthew 28.18.
We hasten to emphasize that by its use of the term ‘church,’ Congress must have intended a more narrow classification than that embodied by a term such as ‘religious organization.’ Despite the lack of guidance from Congress, and in the absence of a more explicit regulatory definition of the term ‘church,’ we will continue our efforts to give a distinct meaning to this statutory classification.

In attempting to define “church,” the IRS has “given certain characteristics [14 criteria] which are generally attributed to churches.” The court has recognized that 14-part test in determining whether a religious organization was a church. The 14 criteria are:

“(1) a distinct legal existence;
“(2) a recognized creed and form of worship;
“(3) a definite and distinct ecclesiastical government;
“(4) a formal code of doctrine and discipline;
“(5) a distinct religious history;
“(6) a membership not associated with any other church or denomination;
“(7) an organization of ordained ministers;
“(8) ordained ministers selected after completing prescribed studies;
“(9) a literature of its own;
“(10) established places of worship;
“(11) regular congregations;
“(12) regular religious services;
“(13) Sunday schools for religious instruction of the young;
“(14) schools for the preparation of its ministers.”

“In addition to the 14 criteria enumerated above, the IRS will consider ‘[a]ny other facts and circumstances which may bear upon the organization’s claim for church status.’ Internal Revenue Manual 7(10)69, Exempt Organizations Examination Guidelines Handbook 321.3(3) (Apr. 5, 1982).

The most glaring inaccuracy in the IRS criteria used to decide whether something is a church is the omission of God’s principles from the characteristics. When the natural man defines a church, he leaves God out; or, should he include God, he must have an incorrect conception and definition of God, since he does not know God. That is the most apparent problem with the IRS conception of a church. The natural man, as exemplified by the IRS characteristics of a church, overlooks the fact that Jesus is the one who builds and is the chief cornerstone of the church. If Jesus, and Jesus alone, is not the builder, there can be no church. Paul wrote, speaking to the church:

“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; In whom all the building fitly framed together growth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.”

The results of the attempts of the courts and IRS to define “church” are twofold: First, some of those “religious organizations” which are not “churches,” but have sought to be recognized by the civil government as “churches,” have been declared to be “churches” by the civil government; and

---

21 88 T.C. at 1358.
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second, New Testament churches which have sought and obtained incorporation and/or “tax exemption” have become legal entities and lost their status as New Testament churches solely under God.

The state provisions and actions derived and resulting from those provisions which allow incorporation and declaration of tax exempt status of churches and religious organizations demonstrate:

(1) the wisdom embodied in the First Amendment which recognized that the civil government is not qualified to “make [any] law regarding an establishment of religion, or [to prevent] the free exercise thereof.”

(2) the undesirable consequences of deviation from the biblical principles that the church is a spiritual entity, the only spiritual institution ordained by God; the state is an earthly entity ordained by God to operate only within its God-given earthly jurisdiction; and that neither the church nor state should be over the other, but God should be over both.

(3) that the federal government (and the states since the incorporation of the First Amendment by the Fourteenth Amendment) violates the First Amendment when civil government provides for incorporation and tax-exempt status for churches or any other religious organization.

(4) most importantly, that most churches have abdicated their responsibility to remain pure and chaste so as to honor their husband, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Just one illustration of what can happen when the civil government determines if an organization is a church, when IRS officials determine what constitutes a church within the meaning of IRC § 170(b)(1)(A)(i), follows. The threshold question in determining whether an organization is a church described in § 170(b)(1)(A)(i) is whether the organization qualifies as a religious organization described in § 501(c)(3). Using the 14-part IRS test to determine whether a religious organization was a church, IRS officials held that an organization with the following purpose as stated in its articles of incorporation and bylaws was a church: “[T]o establish an ecumenical church to help people learn to pay attention, wake up, and discover what both Christ and Buddha referred to as one’s true self.”

The ruling stated:

“The organization was established to develop an ecumenical form of religious practice, place greater significance on the modes of religious expression that would unify western and eastern modes of religious practice, place greater significance on the mystical or interior experience of religious truth than that of most western church denominations, and be more spiritually satisfying to members than other existing church organizations.”

In other words, the IRS determined that an organization whose purpose was directly contrary to the principles for a church laid down by the Lord in His Word was a church.

The lost have no clue as to the true meaning of “church,” and America is not a nation under God. The civil governments in the United States, following Satan’s principles, have constructed a code that undermines incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organizations. Yet most American “Christians” are fearful and more concerned with pleasing civil government than they are in pleasing the Lord, more concerned with allowing their members to claim a tax deduction than with pleasing their Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ. The Savior grieves.
Chapter 5
The incorporation-501(c)(3) control scheme

Not only does the civil government know what it is doing when encouraging churches to incorporate and seek 501(C)(3) status; it also blatantly belittles the fact that the IRC provisions exempting churches from taxation and providing for certain controls over corporate 501(c)(3) “churches” are contrary to the First Amendment. The federal government flaunts the lack of knowledge and understanding of the average Christian as to both spiritual and earthly matters. The first words in the body of IRS Publication 1828 are:

“Congress has enacted special tax laws applicable to churches, religious organizations, and ministers in recognition of their unique status in American society and of their rights guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.” [Emphasis mine.]

A comparison of the above statement with the words of the religion clause of the First Amendment reveals the fact that the IRS flaunts the fact that Congress has enacted laws “respecting the establishment of religion and preventing the free exercise thereof.” The First Amendment religion clause says:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” [Emphasis mine.]

Parts of the IRC violate the First Amendment Religion Clause because those parts constitute a law respecting an establishment of religion which invites churches to give up their protection from civil government control and their free exercise of religion. The purposes and effects of that law is the subject of this chapter. The relevant IRC sections constitute an unconstitutional exemption-control scheme that allows the federal government to not only control and define “church,” but also to teach satanic principles to a church.

Churches which incorporate are legal entities. Churches which incorporate and get 501(c)(3) status are legal entities. Such churches have “a form of godliness, but deny[ing] the power thereof.” They are ignorant and unconcerned regarding the biblical issues of the sovereignty of God, state, church, and separation of church and state. That is because “they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.”

Usually a church which is an existing or prospective corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization relies upon “Christian” lawyers who scratch her itching ears. Such a church does not mind or gives little or no thought to the fact that she is breaking the heart of her spiritual Husband, Jesus Christ. Christian lawyers are among the most “educated” of Christians as to secular matters. Many advise churches to incorporate and take a 501(c)(3) status. The problem with those lawyers is that their secular humanistic education has far exceeded their biblical education in the issues of church, state, and separation of church

---
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and state. Some examples of advice given by “Christian” lawyers and other Christians concerning church incorporation and 501(c)(3) tax exemption follow:

Incorporate and get 501(c)(3) status. As long as the preacher preaches “the gospel,” the church can organize any way it wants to organize.⁴

Incorporate [and get 501(c)(3) status]. It is the “path of least resistance.”⁵

Incorporate [and get 501(c)(3) status]. Incorporation is not the same as accepting a license. “License” means permission by competent authority to do an act which, without such permission, would be illegal. Incorporation is just a way to hold property.⁶

On the other hand, a few Christian lawyers give the following biblically sound advice to churches:

Do not incorporate and get 501(c)(3) status. There is no excuse for incorporating or operating as any other type of entity that violates biblical principles regarding separation of church and state. The Lord is grieved when His wife, the church, places herself, even partially, under another’s jurisdiction.⁷

The authority of those attorneys who encourage churches to incorporate and get the 501(c)(3) exemption is either a false theology, human reasoning based upon a humanist philosophy contrary to principles in the Word of God, and/or a combination thereof. The outcome of their efforts has been not only one nation under man’s law (not under God), but also one church under man’s law (not totally under God). It is impossible to back up their position with a correct interpretation of Scripture.

Many of those lawyers and firms that encourage churches to subjugate themselves to the state are there to “help churches, pastors, and members” if they get into trouble. They have seminars all the time in which they go over the constantly changing case law so that churches can continue to modify doctrine, behavior, and speech to comply with man’s ever changing laws, rules, and definitions. They will protect you. Corporate 501(c)(3) religious organizations will need these state lawyers because God will not be there to help no matter how much they pray and no matter the proclamations of such a church and her lawyers that God is blessing their “ministries.” Those lawyers proclaim victories (among mainly obvious defeats) which, in God’s eyes, are no victories at all. Satan is happy to see this continue because he would much prefer that churches voluntarily submit to him. The ultimate results which have been visibly transpiring for many years is the gradual devastating erosion of the law, fewer people being saved due to the demise of New Testament churches and Christianity, moral awfulness, and political anarchy in America.

In return, all that “Christian” lawyers who advise incorporation and 501(c)(3) status for churches need is for thousands of churches and individual church members to send regular contributions to support their law firms and pay their salaries while they hob-nob with high ranking civil government officials

⁴ Untold numbers of preachers, deacons, “Christians” and the vast majority of “Christian” lawyers and law firms.
⁶ Christian Law Association and Attorney David Gibbs. Horrible logic and a lie about what a corporation really is. Both licensing and incorporating along with 501(c)(3) status violate biblical principle. Just because one is wrong doesn’t make the other right.
⁷ Biblical Law Center and Attorney Jerald C. Finney.
including Senators, Representatives, and even Presidents. This would be fine if not for the fact that they are not in line with biblical principles. If they were in line with the Bible, although powerful people would have nothing or very little to do with them, many churches might return to God, and God might begin to move and bring positive changes to the churches of this nation. Instead, most corporate 501(c)(3) churches remain in, at best, a lukewarm state.

“And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God: I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent.”

Because some “Christian” lawyers have relied upon man’s reasoning— their own humanistic philosophies and beliefs as well as the humanistic reasoning found in man-made laws and court cases—America has seen a steady erosion in establishment clause jurisprudence, as well as in true biblical preaching and teaching in churches in all areas of theology, but especially in regards to biblical principles regarding the sovereignty of God, church, civil government, and separation of church and state.

Even though the state still recognizes that a church is different from other religious organizations, it does not know what a church is:

“The term church is found, but not specifically defined, in the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). The term is not used by all faiths[.]”

“Churches and religious organizations may be legally organized in a variety of ways under state law....”

“Unlike churches, religious organizations that wish to be tax exempt generally must apply to the IRS for tax-exempt status unless their gross receipts do not normally exceed $5,000 annually.”

Nonetheless, the state wants to control churches. Some legal scholars know what the civil government is up to with the incorporation-exemption-control scheme. For example, Richard Garnett, assistant professor at Notre Dame Law School, in a well-documented law review article wrote:
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8 Revelation 3.14-19.
9 The word “Christian,” as a noun from a biblical perspective means: “a believer in Christ who is characterized by real piety.” AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828) definition of “CHRISTIAN.” Piety has been defined as follows: “1. Piety in principle, is a compound of veneration or reverence of the Supreme Being and love of his character, or veneration accompanied with love; and piety in practice, is the exercise of these affections in obedience to his will and devotion to his service. Piety is the only proper and adequate relief of decaying man.” AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828) definition of “PIETY.”
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid., p. 3; see also, IRC (26 U.S.C.) § 508, discussed supra at p. 389.
“The imposition of a tax is, after all, an assertion of power and an ‘application of force.’”

13 The same is true of the decision not to tax, or to exempt from taxation. A power is no less real that is exercised selectively or indulged with restraint. The decision to exempt certain associations, persons, activities, or things from taxation presupposes and communicates the ability to do otherwise; definitional lines drawn to mark the boundaries of such exemptions implicitly assert the power to draw them differently…. My claim here is that the decision to exempt religious associations from federal taxation may reasonably be regarded as an assertion of power—the power, perhaps, to ‘destroy’—over these communities, their activities, and their expression....

“In other words, maybe the power to tax churches, to exempt them from taxation, and to attach conditions to such exemptions really does as Chief Justice Marshall quipped, ‘involve the power to destroy’ religion. Neither heavy-handed repression nor even overt hostility toward faith is required, but merely the subtly didactic power of the law. Government need only express and enforce its own view of the nature of religion—i.e., that it is a private matter—and of its proper place—i.e., in the private sphere, not in politics—and religious believers and associations may yield to the temptation to embrace, and to incorporate, this view themselves....

“It is an exemption-and-restriction scheme in which the government extends an invitation to ‘religious organizations’ to receive a tax exemption in return for allowing the government to interpret and categorize the expression and activities of the church. “There is the danger that, having made their own the government’s view of religion’s place, now-humbled and no-longer-prophetic religious associations will retreat with their witness to the ‘private’ sphere where—they now agree—they belong, leaving persons to face the state alone in the hollowed-out remains of the public square....

“Still it strikes me that the Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3)’s exemption-and-restriction scheme is noteworthy in the extent to which it invites government to label as ‘propaganda’ or ‘campaign[ing]’ what are, for religious believers and communities, expressions of their faith and responses to their calling. It is far from clear that this is an appropriate task for the liberal state....

“My concern … is that the premises of the conditional exemption scheme, the labeling it invites, and the monitoring of distinctions it creates will tame religion by saying what it is and identifying what it is not, tempt religion to revise its conception of itself and of its mission, and convince religious consciousness to internalize the state’s own judgment that faith simply does not belong in politics....

“[The tax exemption] is simply the government’s way of paying churches not to talk about certain things, enforce certain beliefs, or engage in certain actions—in other words, it’s the government’s way of privatizing the church....

“By determining for its own purposes the meaning of religious communities’ statements and activities, and by enforcing the distinctions it draws, government subtly reshapes religious consciousness itself. In other words, by telling religion what it may say, really is saying, or will be deemed to have said, and by telling faith where it belongs, government molds religion’s own sense of what it is....

“[Certain pronouncements] led my colleague, Professor Bradley, to suggest in another context that “[T]he Court is now clearly committed to articulating and enforcing a normative scheme of ‘private religion.’ Indeed, he argues powerfully that the Court’s post-Everson v. Board of Education cases ‘are most profitably understood as judicial attempts to move religion into the realm of subjective preference by eliminating religious consciousness.’ … [T]he Court turned to privatization ‘as the ‘final solution’ to the problem of religious faction.’ Its ambition—not merely the unintended effect of its decisions—is not only to confine the potentially subversive messages of religion to a ‘nonpublic ghetto,’ but also to revise and privatize the messages themselves. Having acquiesced to judicial declarations that it is a private matter, and accepted that its authority is entirely subjective, religious consciousness is unable to resist the conclusion that its claims to public truth are ‘implausible nonsense,’ and therefore cannot help but concede the field of public life and morality to government....

“[T]his privatization of religion is not simply its institutional disestablishment or an entirely appropriate respect on government’s part for individual freedom of conscience and autonomy of religion institutions. Nor is the claim only that the exemption privatizes

13 Richard W. Garnett, A Quiet Faith? Taxes, Politics, and the Privatization of Religion, 42 B.C. L. Rev. 771, 772 (2001), citing Stephen L. Carter, The Free Exercise Thereof, 38 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1627, 1639 (1997)(“It is the application of force, not the happenstance that one is able to apply it with legitimate authority, that generates the power that destroys the specialness of religion.”).
religion by deterring political activism and silencing political advocacy by religious believers and communities. It is, instead, that the exemption scheme and its administration subtly re-form religion’s conception of itself. Government evaluates and characterizes what churches say and do, and decides both what it will recognize as religious and what it will label as political. 

“[P]rivatization of the church is its remaking by government and its transformation from a comprehensive and demanding account of the world to a therapeutic ‘cacoen wrapped around the individual.’ It is a state-sponsored change in religious believers’ own notions of what their faith means and what it requires. The government tells faith communities that religion is a private matter, and eventually, they come to believe it.

“And finally, the retreat of religious associations to the private sphere suggests an ill-founded confidence that government will not follow. But it will. The privatization of religion is a one-way ‘ratchet that stems the flow of religious current into the public sphere, but does not slow the incursion of political norms into the private realm.”

How is the 501(c)(3) tax exemption-control scheme implemented? Simply by invitation. In the exemption and restriction scheme, the government extends an invitation to incorporated “religious organizations” to receive a tax exemption in return for allowing the government to interpret and categorize their expression and activities. In effect, this is, as to churches, an invitation which tests (1) the biblical knowledge of churches and church members, especially pastors (as to God’s biblical instructions in the area of church and state); and (2) their love for the Lord. Satan wants God’s children to voluntarily betray God. He probably gets much more enjoyment from this than he would by forcible means. Certainly he knows that he is furthering his cause much more than he would by force and persecution which are always accompanied by many more people being saved, and an increased love for the Lord by His children who glorify God much more when being persecuted.

The IRS doesn’t hide the fact that the exemption-control scheme is implemented by invitation. The IRS openly proclaims:

“Although there is no requirement to do so, many churches seek recognition of tax-exempt status from the IRS because such recognition assures church leaders, members, and contributors that the church is recognized as exempt and qualifies for related tax benefits…. Unlike churches, religious organizations that wish to be tax exempt generally must apply to the IRS for tax-exempt status unless their gross receipts do not normally exceed $5,000 annually.”

Would Christians not believe that churches are not required to obtain 501(c)(3) exemption should their pastor teach them the truth of the matter from the Bible? Sadly, most pastors believe the lie that churches must incorporate and obtain a 501(c)(3) status. Most “Christians” rely on their American education rather than God’s Word. They put their trust in the government, and not in God.

But just imagine how the Lord feels about those few churches who keep His Word and do not deny His name. To the church in Philadelphia, God wrote:

“I know thy works: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name…. Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God,”

14 Ibid., pp. 772, 774-777, 779, 796-800 (citations omitted).
which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name."\textsuperscript{16} [Bold emphasis mine.]

A church is dishonest if she incorporates and seeks 501(c)(3) status thereby becoming a religious organization which has entered into agreements with the state and federal governments, and then fights with the civil government when civil government intervenes in her affairs within the parameters of the civil law.

\textsuperscript{16} Revelation 3.8, 10-12.
Chapter 6
Spurious rational for incorporating: limited liability

Today, the most common reasons given for incorporating and seeking 501(c)(3) status are (1) limited liability; (2) to allow a church to hold property; (3) civil government recognition of tax exempt status assures church leaders, members, and contributors that the church is recognized as exempt and qualifies for related tax benefits (For example, contributors to a church that has been recognized as tax exempt would know that their contributions generally are tax-deductible); and (4) convenience—it is easier to get a tax deduction for tithes and offerings given to an incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organization than for tithes and offerings given to a New Testament church.

This chapter will deal with the first reason. Chapter 7 will cover the second reason, as well as methods for a church to hold property in a manner consistent with biblical principle; and Chapter 8 will cover the last two reasons.

As has already been shown, incorporation is a great evil. A Christian knowledgeable in biblical principles should already realize that incorporation of a church is a wickedness which grieves the Lord. Nonetheless, many will probably still practice human reasoning when attempting to justify incorporation. Whatever arguments they make for incorporation are false, and are inspired by the god of this world.

Nonetheless, a brief examination of the principles involved concerning the alleged benefits of limited liability is in order. Members of “churches” argue that incorporating protects their personal assets (1) from liability for the debts of the corporation, (2) from the torts and criminal acts of the corporation, and (3) from liability on contracts entered into by the corporation. Although such arguments are partially correct, they are misleading. Each of these arguments will be considered in light of biblical principle. Always keep in mind that a New Testament church which incorporates has thereby violated biblical principle, committed a great wickedness by betraying the Lord, grieved the Lord, and subjected herself to inevitable ill consequences.

One may argue first that incorporating a church protects his personal assets from liability for the debts of the corporation.

“One of the major attributes of the corporate form of organization is that it insulates shareholders from personal liability for the debts of the corporation…. As a general rule, and in the absence of a charter, constitutional, or statutory provision to the contrary, stockholders are not liable as such for any of the obligations of a corporation. Because a corporation is an entity, separate and distinct from its officers and stockholders, its debts are not the individual indebtedness of its stockholders.”

Limited liability is not absolute.

“The general rule that shareholders are not liable for corporate obligations or conduct is subject to numerous exceptions. Shareholders may be held individually liable to prevent or redress fraud, to achieve equity, or to prevent the avoidance of a legal obligation or duty.

“If the corporation is a mere instrumentality or alter ego of the shareholder, the corporate entity will be disregarded, and the individuals owning the stock and the corporation treated as identical, with the result that such individuals will be personally

1 18A AM. JUR. 2D Corporations § 724.
liable for the acts and obligations of the purported corporation. The limitation of liability to the corporate assets must give way to imposition of personal liability if the actions of those in control of the corporation denigrate the purpose of limited liability, which is to encourage investment of risk capital. The fact that a corporation is undercapitalized is not sufficient in itself to establish personal liability of the shareholders.

“Corporate creditors may reach unpaid stock subscriptions, and if a corporation is liquidated, the shareholders are liable if, otherwise, they would be unjustly enriched by retaining assets of the corporation free from the debts of the corporation.”

What does the Bible say (in addition to those matters already considered, such as the fact that a New Testament church is a spiritual and not an earthly entity)? First, neither a Christian nor a church should go into debt.

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.”

The Bible does not say “owe no man any thing unless you have to borrow money to build bigger church buildings, gyms, bingo halls, sports fields and facilities, cafeterias, fellowship halls, and/or any other type structures for the church.” Notice that the commandment not to covet is also included. Most importantly, notice the importance placed on love. Will a Christian who loves his neighbor seek to protect himself from debts he owes to others; debts which the Word of God instructed him not to enter into?

“He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

Mammon means: “Riches, wealth; or the god of riches. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Matt. vi.”

Thus, churches which go into debt for buildings or anything else distort themselves. They become servants of the lender, not servants of God. “The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender.” They become servants of money, not servants of God. Pastors of churches which are serving mammon will find that they fear to preach and do not preach everything God has laid on their hearts because they might offend some who might either leave the church and/or cause problems within the church. Pastors in such churches may find it particularly hard to preach any truth that might offend a rich Pharisee in the church. Obviously, failure to preach the whole gospel is displeasing to the Lord.

Christians and churches are to seek godliness, not worldly riches.

“Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself. But godliness with contentment is great

---

2 Ibid., § 728.
3 Romans 13.8-10.
5 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828), definition of “MAMMON.”
6 Proverbs 22.7.
gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses. I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen. Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.”

The above verses speak to the saved person who is the temple of God and, along with other believers, constitute a church body. Nowhere in the New Testament can one find a single verse condoning a church seeking riches and real or personal property. Rather, Christians are to be content with what they have. They are not to go into debt. If they will do the jobs God has given them, lusting after real property and other worldly things will vanish from their hearts and minds.

“Let your conversation be without covetousness; and be content with such things as ye have: for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee. So that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.”

And as long as a church maintains her New Testament status and remains under Christ alone, she can own nothing since she is a spiritual entity.

The apostles, and true Christians in their church body down through the ages, have been careful not to seek worldly riches; and they preached the whole counsel of God no matter who was offended. Nothing was ever mentioned in the Word of God about early church seeking real property or even personal property. Rather than receiving material possessions, they were persecuted. Their goals were spiritual, not earthly.

“And all that believed were together, and had all things common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, Praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”

Thus, a New Testament church should not go into debt. A New Testament church should occupy property in a manner consistent with biblical principles.

As to torts and criminal acts, the member of a New Testament church has the same status as the member of an incorporated church: should a member of either type church be directly connected to tortious or criminal acts, that member is not insulated.

---

7 I Timothy 6.5-19
8 Hebrews 13.5-6.
9 Acts 2.44-47.
“Stockholders are not ordinarily liable for the tortious acts of a corporation unless they participate in or aid the commission of such acts. An individual's liability for the tortious conduct of corporation depends upon that individual's acts, and not upon any theory of vicarious liability based upon the individual's status as an owner. For example, a stockholder is individually liable for constructive fraud committed by a corporation only if he or she had knowledge of and instigated the fraud.

“Caution: The rule shielding shareholders from liability for a corporation's torts do not shield shareholders from personal liability in tort for their own misfeasance or nonfeasance, including liability for negligence; a shareholder may be liable if he or she is the central figure in a corporation's tortious conduct. For example, a shareholder may be held personally liable for negligent acts in managing and supervising the employees of corporation, if those acts are a contributing factor in causing an injury.”

A New Testament church is not liable for the tort or crime of a member or members. How can it be since she is not a legal entity? People in a New Testament church may commit torts or crimes, but the church herself cannot commit a tort or crime since she is a spiritual entity. Anyone who commits or is a party to a tort or crime is responsible. A Christian is not exempt from being falsely accused of a tort and/or a crime; and a Christian can walk in the flesh and commit or participate in a tort and/or a crime if he so chooses.

A New Testament church will not be involved with all the worldly matters with which an incorporated “church” is involved and which give the incorporated church and its members and officers opportunities and temptations for wrongdoing. The member of a church who loves the Lord and has his eyes on spiritual, as opposed to material matters, will be very careful to love his neighbor and to behave in a pious manner. The member of a church should understand that not only the state, but also—and primarily—God, desires him to be liable for and make restitution for damages to another caused by his tort or crime or for any tort or crime with which he knowingly, intentionally, recklessly, or with negligence participates.

A person is not ordinarily liable on contracts entered into by a corporation in which he or she owns stock. However, if a stockholder makes a contract as an individual, he or she is liable. “It has been held that shareholders [or members] are not liable for a corporation's violations of state or local statutes, ordinances, or regulations in the absence of proof of active participation in the management of the corporation or the wrongs. However, it has also been held that the purpose behind incorporating is not to protect those who control a corporation from answering for its criminal actions.”

“A shareholder may expressly guarantee a corporate obligation. A shareholder's contract unconditionally guaranteeing payment of the corporation's debts is not abrogated by negligence of the creditor that results in the debt not being discharged in bankruptcy. Whether a shareholder has guaranteed the credit of the corporation so as to become personally liable on its obligations in a particular case is a question of fact for the jury.”

A New Testament church, being a spiritual entity, will not and cannot enter into any type of contract. Contract, as has been explained supra, is an enlightenment principle which is antithetical to biblical principle.

11 Ibid., § 725.
12 Ibid., § 727.
13 Ibid., § 730.
Spurious rationale for incorporating:
to hold property

To properly understand the relationship between church and state, one must understand the ultimate relationship between the spiritual and the earthly, between a church and the property upon which that church assembles. Since a New Testament church—a spiritual body which cannot own property—is made up of saved human beings, she must occupy earthly space. A church cannot meet in outer space. Thus, a spiritual body must meet together in an earthly space, upon earthly property. God has given no other alternative. “Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.”1

The love of property, not property in and of itself, has contributed mightily to the decline in the number of New Testament churches in America and the advance of heresy and apostasy. Churches have jumped to unbiblical conclusions as to how to possess property upon which to meet. Two considerations are important. First, as shown in Section II, nowhere in the Bible can one infer that a building or property is a church. Nowhere in the New Testament is there any indication that a church owned property. This is because a church, under God, is a spiritual body. By owning property, a church violates biblical principle, becomes a legal entity, entangles herself with earthly matters, and ceases to be a New Testament church. A spiritual body cannot own property.

Nowhere does the Bible mention that the first churches owned property or that the Lord told churches to own property. In fact, the Great Commission says, “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost[.].”2 Christ did not bring people into the temple or synagogue. Evangelism occurs outside the meeting place. Christians meet together for the preaching of the Word of God, for worshipping the Lord, for baptisms and for the Lord’s Supper. There they are uplifted and prepared to go into the World to evangelize. The church which is doing what God desires is in the world where she is a light to those who are lost, not under a bushel where her light is hidden. New churches must go out into the world where they can be a light, so they meet in storefronts or other rented spaces. Maybe new churches grow because they have to go into the world.

Jesus told church members that they would “be witnesses unto [Him] both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”3 He said nothing about them getting big buildings or property. None of the conversions in the New Testament occurred in a church building, nor were the lost or new converts ever invited to a church building. Rather, “the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”4 “[T]here was a great persecution of the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea, and Samaria, except the apostles…. Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the

---
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word.” Everywhere Christians went, they preached the Word publicly. Never was any concern for property, real or personal, expressed. This is because the church is spiritual, not earthly.

Second, the Bible and reality reveal that a church, a spiritual entity, since the spiritual part of the Christian is still housed in an earthly body, must occupy an earthly space and, therefore, property when meeting. Originally churches many times met in a church member’s house. Thus, a church must be concerned with at least one temporal, earthly, secular matter—it has to decide upon what property it will meet and how it will gain the right to possess and assemble on that property. A church must make some type provision for property in order to be able to assemble together and exist. All property is connected with civil government through a title. Someone must hold legal title to the property upon which a church meets. Since the church must possess property to exist, she should endeavor to possess property in a manner consistent with biblical principle. Again, a church cannot own property, since she is a spiritual entity.

Churches who ignore biblical principle can always rationalize incorporation and 501(c)(3) status. However, incorporation is not an option for a church which wishes to remain a New Testament church. In the colonies and early republic, as pointed out supra, Baptist churches ignored Scripture and sought incorporation for several reasons. For a time, one reason for betraying and displeasing God and incorporating in Massachusetts was to comply with the decision in the Cutter v. Frost in 1785, and thus be sure that religious taxes paid by Baptists would be returned to their ministers by parish or town treasurers. That reason disappeared with the passage of the “Religious Liberty Act” of 1811, which reversed the Cutter Case by interpreting Article Three as applying to all churches, incorporated and unincorporated. For some Baptists a more compelling reason was to enable a congregation to make binding contracts between its members and its pastor, thereby guaranteeing regular payment of a decent salary. Those Baptists obviously cared little for the teaching of Scripture concerning contract and the manner in which a church was to provide for her pastor. In addition, incorporation gave all persons in the congregation the right to vote on building or repairing a meetinghouse as well as paying the minister’s salary. Some Baptists argued that incorporation was necessary to hold property or endowment funds in the name of the church. The obsession with property, among other things, has caused churches to jump to unbiblical conclusions and join hands with the state.

If the laws of men allow the church to utilize property openly, the church should do so only in a way that complies with biblical principle. Two biblically acceptable options for a church are the leasing of property by the pastor/trustee under a Declaration of Trust, or, if possible, using someone’s property at no cost. These options would be especially attractive should the pastor/trustee lease from someone who loves God and His church and makes a lease available at a nominal cost or at no cost.

Another means for a church to possess property is available in the United States. A pastor/trustee can hold property for Lord Jesus Christ as beneficiary. A church can execute a Declaration of Trust which proclaims to the world that the church is placing property under the care of a pastor/trustee who will hold the legal, earthly title to the property for the benefit of the true and equitable owner of the property, the Lord Jesus Christ. The Declaration of Trust and necessary

5 Acts 8.1, 4.
associated documents are in line with biblical principle. “Declaration” means: “Publication, manifestation; as the declaration of the greatness of Mordecai. Esth. X.; A public annunciation; proclamation; as the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.”

Declarations of Trust is defined as follows:

“The act by which the person who holds the legal title to property or an estate acknowledges and declares that he holds the same in trust to the use of another person or for certain specified purposes. The name is also used to designate the deed or other writing embodying such a declaration.”

This type of Declaration of Trust does not create a charitable trust; this is important because the IRS recognizes that charitable trusts are creatures of the state, legally organized under state law, along with unincorporated associations, nonprofit corporations, and corporations sole.

“It has been said that trusts are generally divided into two main classes: private trusts and charitable trusts. A ‘charitable trust’ is one in which the beneficiary is a governmental entity or in which the purpose of the trust is to implement public welfare or convenience. The primary differences between a charitable trust and other private trusts are that a charitable trust may be perpetual, the denominated recipients of the trust income may be indefinite, and the intended beneficiary is the community itself. It has also been said that the fundamental distinction between private trusts and charitable trusts is that in a private trust, property is devoted to the use of specified persons who are designated as the beneficiaries of the trust, while a charitable trust has as a beneficiary a definite class and indefinite beneficiaries within a definite class, and has a purpose which is beneficial to the community.”

This manner of holding property, that is by a pastor/trustee for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ, is according to biblical principle and is entirely distinct from the man invented anti-scriptural practice of holding property through incorporation. This manner of holding property does not affect the organization of the church at all and does not place the church under the state in any way.

Incorporation can be distinguished from the holding of property by a pastor/trustee for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ in many ways which emphasize that incorporation is unbiblical and the concept of holding property in trust is found throughout Scripture. First, unlike a corporation which comes into existence with the consent or grant of the state, holding property in trust in this manner does not create a legal entity. The right to act as a corporation is a special privilege conferred by the sovereign power of the state or nation. On the other hand, God left property in trust to mankind to maintain it for His benefit. God Himself initiated the concept of holding property in trust. For a pastor/trustee to hold property in trust for the Lord Jesus Christ is biblical.

The basic purpose of incorporation—to create a distinct legal entity, with legal rights, obligations, powers, and privileges different from those of the natural individuals who created it, own it, or whom it employs—is at odds with the purpose of a church which is to glorify God by submitting herself to her Husband in all things. When a pastor/trustee holds property for the true beneficiary of all property, the Lord Jesus Christ (“For by him were all things 6 MERRIAM WEBSTER’S AMERICAN DICTIONARY OR THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1828) definition of “DECLARATION.”

7 BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 408 (6th ed. 1990) under definition of “Declaration.” This definition is consistent with the definitions in more authoritative legal references such as AM. JUR. and C.J.S.


created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:”

by executing a proper Declaration of Trust and other necessary documents, a church is not placed under the state because no legal entity is thereby created. When a pastor/trustee holds property for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ, God is glorified in that the property is held by the pastor, not the church, in trust for the Lord Jesus, the equitable owner.

Secular law interprets “trust” in a manner consistent with biblical principle:

“A trust is not a legal entity. A trust is not an entity distinct from its trustees and capable of legal action on its own behalf, but merely a fiduciary relationship with respect to property. A trust is not a legal ‘person’ which can own property or enter into contracts, rather, a trust is a relationship having certain characteristics.”

There is a caveat which, if biblical guidelines are followed, is inconsequential to a trust relationship in which a pastor/trustee holds property for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Modern civil law is beginning to treat a trust somewhat like a legal entity, but only so far as the relationship between the trustee(s) and the beneficiary or beneficiaries is concerned. An outside party still cannot sue a trust.

“Observation: The Restatement states that increasingly modern common-law and statutory concepts and terminology tacitly recognize the trust as a legal ‘entity,’ consisting of the trust estate and the associated fiduciary relation between the trustee and the beneficiaries. This is increasingly and appropriately reflected both in language (referring, for example, to the duties or liability of a trustee to ‘the trust’) and in doctrine, especially in distinguishing between the trustee personally or as an individual and the trustee in a fiduciary or representative capacity.”

This caveat should be of little or no consequence unless members of a church violate mandate of Scripture and run to civil government asserting that the pastor/trustee has violated his temporal fiduciary responsibilities.

“Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life? If then ye have

---

10 Colossians 1.16.
11 76 AM. JUR. 2D Trusts § 3 (2007). This concept of trust is not overruled by Black’s Law Dictionary which defines “Entity” as follows: “A real being; existence. An organization or being that possesses separate existence for tax purposes. Examples would be corporations, partnerships, estates, and trusts.... ‘Entity’ includes corporation and foreign corporation, not-for-profit corporation, business trust, estate, partnership, trust....” BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 532 (6th ed. 1990). Black’s Law Dictionary defines numerous kinds of trusts. For example, a business trust is organized for the business purpose of making money.

However, that definition definitely does not apply to the type trust relationship created by a Declaration of Trust by which a pastor/trustee holds property for the beneficiary, the Lord Jesus Christ. Black’s Law Dictionary defines “Legal existence” as “An entity, other than a natural person, who has sufficient existence in legal contemplation that it can function legally, be sued or sue and make decisions through agents as in the case of corporations.” BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 893-894 (6th ed. 1990). The trust contemplated by the author of this book, and as recognized by the law generally, only contemplates holding property by a pastor/trustee for the true beneficiary. No legal entity is thereby created.

Black’s Law Dictionary is not the authoritative law. Sometimes it is wrong, or sometimes, as in regards to trust, it is partially wrong, or when taken in context of all it has to say on a subject, has combined some truth with error as to legal conclusions. Here, Black’s is internally inconsistent and clearly overruled by more authoritative legal sources.

12 Ibid.
judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church. I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren.”

No matter the status of a church—New Testament church or corporate 501(c)(3)—state courts may possibly attempt to assume illegal jurisdiction initiated by a disgruntled member against a pastor or others in the church as regards temporal matters (just as almost all state courts will assume jurisdiction in a divorce petition initiated by a husband or wife married solely under God without state authority and without a state marriage license). This applies no matter how property utilized by a church is held. However, a court will find it impossible to achieve jurisdiction over a New Testament church, a spiritual entity.

Second, the state is sovereign over a corporation which is an invention of man and a legal entity. A trust relationship whereby a pastor/trustee holds property for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ under a Declaration of Trust, implements a principle God laid down in the Garden of Eden and which is seen throughout the Bible, and, as civil law agrees, does not create a legal entity over which the civil government has control. No principle in the Bible supports incorporation; rather, biblical principle is contrary to church incorporation and probably to any type incorporation.

Third, under a corporation, man does not hold property in trust for God. The corporation, a creature of the state, owns property. Under a properly drafted Declaration of Trust in conjunction with other properly worded documents, legal title to property is vested in a pastor/trustee for the benefit of the Lord Jesus.

Who owns all things? The sovereign God owns it all—not only the land, but also everyone and everything. That ownership is implicit in the fact that He created it all. “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Then God created light and divided the light from darkness. Then He created the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from those which were above the firmament. Then He created grass, herb yielding seed, and fruit trees yielding seed. Then He made the sun and moon, then living creatures whom he told to be fruitful and multiply. Then He created male and female in His image.

He clearly stated His ownership of all in His Word.

God said, “Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine.”

God said, “The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.”

“But who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? for all things come of thee [God], and of thine own have we given thee.”

14 Genesis 1.1.
15 Genesis 1.
16 Exodus 19.5.
17 Leviticus 25.23
“The earth is the LORD’S, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.”\textsuperscript{19}

God said, “For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills.”\textsuperscript{20}

“The heavens are thine [God’s], the earth also is thine: as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them.”\textsuperscript{21}

“The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the LORD of hosts.”\textsuperscript{22}

Thus, God owns all people and all things. When a church assembles together, God owns the land upon which they meet. The land is temporarily loaned to man for God’s benefit, but God owns it. Although man has the temporal legal title to the land, God has equitable title. God is the equitable owner. An equitable owner is “[o]ne who is recognized in equity as owner of the property, because real and beneficial use and title belong to him, even though bare legal title is invested in another.”\textsuperscript{23} “In a trust relationship, as distinguished from a ‘contract,’ there is always a divided ownership of property, to which the trustee usually has legal title and cestui [que trust] an equitable title.”\textsuperscript{24}

Mankind holds all property in trust for God. “Trust,” as a noun, has been defined as follows:

“1. Confidence; a reliance or resting of the mind on the integrity, veracity, justice, friendship or other sound principle of another person.
   He that putteth his trust in the Lord shall be saved. Prov. xxix.
   “2. He or that which is the ground of confidence.
   O Lord God, thou art my trust from my youth. Ps. lxxi.
   “3. Charge received in confidence.
   Reward them well, if they observe their trust. Denham.
   “4. That which is committed to one’s care. Never violate a sacred trust.
   “5. Confident opinion of any event.
   His trust was with th’ Eternal to be deem’d Equal in strength. Milton.
   “6. Credit given without examination; as, to take opinions on trust.
   “7. Credit on promise of payment, actual or implied; as, to take or purchase goods on trust.
   “8. Something committed to a person’s care for use or management, and for which an account must be rendered. Every man’s talents and advantages are a trust committed to him by his Maker, and for the use or employment of which he is accountable. [Bold emphasis mine.]
   “9. Confidence; special reliance on supposed honesty.
   “10. State of him to whom something is entrusted.
   I serve him truly, that will put me in trust. Shak.
   “11. Care; management. I Tim. vi.
   “12. In law, an estate, devised or granted in confidence that the devisee or grantee shall convey it, or dispose of the profits, at the will of another; an estate held for the use of another. Blackstone.”\textsuperscript{25}

A more modern dictionary defines “trust” as a noun as follows, in relevant part:

\textsuperscript{19} Psalms 24.1.
\textsuperscript{20} Psalms 50.10.
\textsuperscript{21} Psalms 89.11.
\textsuperscript{22} Haggai 2.8.
\textsuperscript{23} BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 539 (6\textsuperscript{th} ed. 1990).
\textsuperscript{24} 90 C.J.S. Trusts § 1, fn. 13 (2007).
\textsuperscript{25} MERRIAM WEBSTER’S AMERICAN DICTIONARY OR THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1828), definition of “TRUST.”
American Jurisprudence 2d defines trust as follows:

“The fundamental nature of a trust is the division of title, with the trustee being the holder of legal title and the beneficiary that of equitable title. By definition, the creation of a trust must involve a conveyance of property.

“A ‘trust’ exists where the legal title to property is held by one or more persons, under an equitable obligation to convey, apply, or deal with such property for the benefit of other persons. A trust has been defined as a fiduciary relationship with respect to property, subjecting the person by whom the title to the property is held to equitable duties to deal with the property for the benefit of another person, which arises as a result of a manifestation of an intention to create it. The Restatement definition is similar, providing that a trust, when not qualified by the word ‘resulting’ or ‘constructive,’ is a fiduciary relationship with respect to property, arising from a manifestation of intention to create that relationship and subjecting the person who holds title to the property to duties to deal with it for the benefit of charity or for one or more persons, at least one of whom is not the sole trustee.

“Caution: A trust consists not only of property, but also of the trust instrument, the trust's beneficiaries and trustees, and the trust administrator [if any].”

The principle of “trust” runs throughout the Bible. God entrusted mankind with all property, real and personal. He owned all things—even the body, soul and spirit of man—but left all things, including the land, to man to be used for Him. God trusted man with all His earthly creation and left it to him in trust, as trustee or steward. “Trustee” means, in relevant part:

“1 a: one to whom something is entrusted…. 2 a: a natural or legal person to whom property is legally committed to be administered for the benefit of a beneficiary (as a person or a charitable organization).”

For example, Adam and Eve were trustees of the earth and all that was in it. In what some call the Edenic Covenant, God gave responsibilities to mankind.

“The man and woman in Eden were responsible: (1) To replenish the earth with a new order—man; (2) to subdue the earth to human uses; (3) to have dominion over the animal creation; (4) to eat herbs and fruits; (5) to till and keep the garden; (6) to abstain from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; (7) the penalty—death.”

Although entrusted with all things, God gave mankind free will as to whether to carry out their responsibilities as trustees. The principle that nations—Gentile nations and Israel—and individuals were left in trust of land and all things for the benefit of God runs throughout the Old Testament. This principle of trust continues to this day.

The Lord spoke of this concept of trust in at least two parables as recorded in the books of Matthew and Luke. He spoke of an earthly master leaving certain amounts of his goods or money with his servants, according to their abilities. Actually, the more important parallel spiritual meaning was to the Lord and His servants. The master had an absolute right to his own goods, but he distributed to his servants to be used for the benefit of the master, the servants to

26 WEBSTER'S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, 1269 (10th ed. 1995).
27 76 AM. JUR. 2D TRUSTS § 1. (2007).
28 WEBSTER'S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 1269 (10th ed. 1995), definition of “trustee.”
29 Genesis 1:28-31. This was pointed out on page 13 of this book.
be awarded according to their profitable use of the property entrusted to them. Some used the money productively and upon the master’s return presented him with a profit. The property belonged to the master, and the servants were to use it for the master’s benefit, not for their own benefit. Of course, they would be rewarded if they used the property wisely for the benefit of the master. One servant in each example returned only the original amount left in trust with them. The master instructed that the goods which he had left with the unprofitable servants be taken from them, and they were left with nothing. The profitable servants were rewarded by the master. In the story found in Matthew, the Master said, “[C]ast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

Men, as servants of the Master are likewise left in trust of all things for His benefit and will be rewarded or punished according to their use of His goods.

Timothy was a pastor, and a pastor has a special position of trust unlike other members of the body. Timothy was a trustee of a spiritual heritage: “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called.” The Bible proclaims that pastors rule over the body. “Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.”

“Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.”

Biblically, a pastor must meet much more stringent God-given requirements than other members of the body:

“This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre: but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.”

These requirements are strict because the bishop is entrusted by God to “take care of the church of God.” He is a “steward of God.”

31 Matthew 25.30.
32 1 Timothy 6.20.
33 Hebrews 13.7.
34 Hebrews 13.17.
36 “Having completed the treatise of doctrine and of the manner of handling of it, as well also of public prayer, he now in the third place comes to the persons themselves, speaking first of pastors...” Geneva Bible Commentary available on SWORDSEARCHER software. Go to www.swordsearcher.com for information on SWORDSEARCHER software.
37 I Timothy 3.1-7.
38 Titus 1.7.
39 I Timothy 3.5.
Chapter 7: Spurious rationale for incorporating: to hold property

“The elders [pastors⁴⁰] which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.”⁴¹

The pastor is an overseer of the church: “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”⁴² “Overseers” here refers to pastors.⁴³

The pastor then is obviously responsible to act as ruler, trustee, steward, overseer of the church. Therefore, the Declaration of Trust must, to be biblical, name the pastor as trustee acting in trust for the beneficiary, the Lord Jesus Christ.

This does not mean that all men are not trustees. God has appointed every human being who has ever lived as trustee over himself, all that God has given him, his spiritual heritage, and his spiritual destiny. The earth was still God’s, but man was told to care for and possess His earth. Mankind was “trustee” of the earth. The pastor is trustee of the church.

A declaration of the relationship between property held by a person for the benefit of Christ better serves its purpose if the terms “trust” and “trustee” as opposed to “stewardship” and “steward” be used. “Steward” means in relevant part:

“1. A man employed in great families to manage the domestic concerns, superintend the other servants, collect the rents or income, keep the accounts, &c. See Gen. xv. 2—xiii.

“5. In Scripture and theology, a minister of Christ, whose duty is to dispense the provisions of the gospel, to preach its doctrines and administer its ordinances. It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful. 1 Cor. iv.”⁴⁴

⁴⁰ “In this place the term πρεσβυτεροι, elders or presbyters is the name of an office. They were as pastors or shepherds of the flock of God, the Christian people among whom they lived.” Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible available on SWORDSEARCHER software.

⁴¹ That Peter means the officers, not the aged persons, is shown by 1 Peter 5.2.” The People’s New Testament Commentary available on SWORDSEARCHER software.

⁴² 1 Peter 5.1-5.

⁴³ Acts 20.28.

⁴⁴ “Overseers. In Acts 20:17, they are called elders; here, overseers, which is, in the original, the same as the word rendered sometimes bishops.” Abbott New Testament Commentary available on SWORDSEARCHER software.

“Made you overseers - Ἐθέτο επισκοπός , Appointed you bishops; for so we translate the original word in most places where it occurs: but overseers, or inspectors, is much more proper, from επι , over, and σκεπτομαι , I look. The persons who examine into the spiritual state of the flock of God, and take care to lead them in and out, and to find them pasture, are termed episcopoí, or superintendents. The office of a bishop is from God; a true pastor only can fulfill this office: it is an office of most awful responsibility; few there are who can fill it; and, of those who occupy this high and awful place, perhaps we may say there are fewer still who discharge the duties of it. There are, however, through the good providence of God, Christian bishops, who, while they are honored by the calling, do credit to the sacred function. And the annals of our Church can boast of at least as many of this class of men, who have served their God and their generation, as of any other order, in the proportion which this order bears to others in the Church of Christ. That bishop and presbyter, or elder, were at this time of the same order, and that the word was indifferently used of both, see Acts 20.17 (note).” Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible available on SWORDSEARCHER software.

⁴⁴ MERRIAM WEBSTER’S AMERICAN DICTIONARY OR THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1828), definition of “STEWARD.”
The first meaning of “steward” is reflected in several passages of the Bible: Genesis 15.2, 43.19, 44.1, 44.4; I Kings 16.9; Matthew 20.8; Luke 8.3, 12.42, 16.1-8 (parable of the unjust steward). The last meaning is reflected in I Corinthians 4.1, 2 and Titus 1.7. “Stewardship” simply means “The office of a steward.” The terms “stewardship” and “trust,” are distinct. The term “trust” better describes the desired relationship between the Lord and the person who holds all he has for His benefit. Likewise, the meaning of the terms “steward” and “trustee,” are distinct. “Trustee” better describes the position of a person who is to hold property or anything else for the benefit of the Lord. Compare the definitions of “trust” and “stewardship” and “trustee” and “steward.”

Luke 16.1-8 is the parable of the unjust steward. Following that parable, Jesus said,

“He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man’s, who shall give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

Fourth, incorporation creates several contracts. The primary contract created by incorporation of a church is a contract between church and state which places an incorporated “church” under the contract clause of Article I Section 10 of the United States Constitution as already shown. The articles of incorporation constitute a contract between the corporation and its members (owners), and between the members (owners) themselves. Furthermore, the corporate church must also have bylaws which creates contracts between the members (owners) of the corporation, and between the corporation and its members (owners). All these contracts come under Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution. A Declaration of Trust, as described in this chapter, creates no agreement or contract at all with or between anyone. Under such a Declaration, a trustee merely holds legal title to property for the benefit of the beneficiary, the Lord Jesus Christ. “Contract,” is an enlightenment principle. According to enlightenment thinking, man—who is basically good according to this manner of thinking—through his reason can solve all problems. “Trust” is a biblical principle. According to the Bible, God is the Sovereign and only the application of His principles will bring positive consequences.

The members of the church, under the contracts of an incorporated “church,” not only control the church property, they also control the spiritual direction of the church. Corporate trustees become the de facto rulers and overseers of the church. Members are beginning to realize and understand and exercise the power given them in the contracts entered into between themselves and the sovereign state, between themselves and the corporation, and between themselves. Dr. Greg Dixon explains:

“Fundamental Baptists have operated through a strong pastor/leader who has been able to control his board, but as David Gibbs, Jr. told me [Dr. Dixon] 20 years ago, ‘We have a new breed of trustees now who are educated and understand their fiduciary responsibility.’ Even after the Baptists gained liberty through the First Amendment, they

45 Ibid., definition of “STEWARDSHIP.”
held property by the Protestant method through lay trustees. In reality they had a church board contrary to biblical and Baptist polity which lasts till this day. These trustees are now firing preachers for cause. One old preacher in Ohio testified at a fellowship meeting and said that the trustees fired him on Saturday night and changed the locks, and he couldn’t even get in on Sunday a.m. Another preacher in Colorado said that they fired him on Sunday p.m. and told him not to come back on Sunday night. They have power to call the police. They can violate the constitution and by laws, how can the preacher sue?

“Catholic clergy understand the effect of lay control of a ‘church.’ The Catholic laymen came to America without priests to begin with and started ‘churches’ including buying ‘church’ property and holding the property through the Protestant system with lay trustees. When the priests came they tried to take the property over through the corporation sole method as in Europe where the Bishop of the Diocese holds the property in his own name. The lay trustees didn’t want to give up their power, but finally did; and the Catholic polity of corporation sole prevails to this day.”

Fifth, a corporation is established under a charter from the civil government and conclusively established by filing articles of incorporation with a state agency, the contents of which are commonly specified by a state's corporation statutes. Statutory requirements as to the form and content of the articles or certificate must be substantially followed. No such requirements exist for the drafting or filing of a Declaration or Trust. A Declaration of Trust can be drafted in any logical manner and need not be filed to establish the trust relationship. A Declaration of Trust in no way either subjugates a church to the state or creates any contract of any kind between anyone.

Sixth, whereas incorporation of a church creates a monstrosity, a pastor/trustee holding property for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ implements biblical principle. An incorporated church gets part of its powers from God and part from the civil government. It is under two heads. It operates partly under Satan and partly under God. A church that sees fit to become incorporated under state law is obligated to conduct its business activities in compliance therewith, including governmental regulation of its employment relationships, so long as the employment does not depend on doctrinal matters.

A church which meets on property held by a pastor/trustee for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ and does not connect herself to the state in any other way is totally under God. No “business” practices or requirements in the operation of the church are initiated. By utilizing property held in trust by a pastor/trustee for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ, no entanglement of church and state results, no elections, board of directors, no officers, no employees, no business meetings, etc. are required since the civil government has absolutely no control over the secular or spiritual affairs of that church.

Holding property in the recommended manner has additional benefits. Not only does holding property in this manner comport with biblical principles, holding the property in this manner lessens the chances that the property, and especially the buildings, will become idols. “Their idols are ... the work of men’s hands. ... They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them.”

Finally, holding property in this way does not require that the church be structured as a business. A church that loves the Lord and desires to please the Lord will leave no stone unturned in her quest to structure herself as a New Testament church.

47 Dr. Greg Dixon is pastor emeritus of Indianapolis Baptist Temple. The information concerning the Catholic “church” is from John Cogley, Catholic America (Garden City, NY: Image Books, A Division of Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1960), pp. 200-203.
48 Psalm 115.4-8.
Thus, God instituted the concept of trust in the beginning, in the Garden of Eden. It is a biblical concept which is utilized in America today. Just because the law uses the concept and uses some of the same terms, does not mean that Christians can no longer use the concept and the term(s). For example, if adoption of biblical terms by the state means that thereafter use of those terms are prohibited by Christians, then Christians can no longer use the term “justification.” A Christian who objects to the use of the terms “trust,” “trustee,” and “beneficiary” should never again use the term “justification” since that is a term utilized by the state.

Simply put, justification means “a reason to be found not guilty even though you are guilty.” Biblically, all men are guilty before God. The only reason for a finding of “not guilty” before God will be salvation through the blood of Christ. Temporally, the criminal law provides justifications which allow guilty men to be found “not guilty.” The Texas Penal Code provides: “It is a defense to the prosecution that the conduct in question is justified under this chapter.” 49 Self-defense is a justification for murder. Texas criminal law further provides for self-defense: “… [A] person is justified in using force against another when and to the degree he reasonably believes the force is immediately necessary to protect himself against the other’s use or attempted use of unlawful force.” 50 “Justification” in Texas law is a reason for your crime that provides a defense. If the issue of a defense is raised by the evidence, “a reasonable doubt on the issue requires that the defendant be acquitted.” 51

The Supreme Court of Texas recently addressed the use of certain secular terms by Tyndale Theological Seminary and Bible Institute, a ministry of HEB Ministries, Inc., a church in Fort Worth, Texas. 52 In that case, a law in the State of Texas required a private post-secondary school to meet prescribed standards before it may call itself a “seminary” or use words like “degree”, “associate”, “bachelor”, “master”, and “doctor” — or their equivalents — to recognize attainment in religious education and training. Violation of the law was a Class A misdemeanor and was also punishable by a civil penalty of $1,000 per day. The issue was whether this requirement impermissibly intrudes upon religious freedom protected by the United States and Texas Constitutions.

HEB ministries was fined $173,000 for violating the law. The Texas Supreme Court ruled in favor of HEB ministries. HEB contended that “the State cannot deny the use of such higher education terminology to religious schools that do not meet its standards.” The court stated, among other important pronouncements, that

“[T]he government cannot set standards for religious education or training.” … “Neutrality is what is required. The State must confine itself to secular objectives, and neither advance nor impede religious activity.” … [S]etting standards for a religious education is a religious exercise for which the State lacks not only authority but competence.” … “By restricting the terminology a religious institution can use, the State signals its approval or disapproval of the institution’s operation and curriculum as vividly as if it hung the state seal on the institution’s front door.” 53

The pastor/trustee who holds property for the benefit of the Lord, since he holds that property in sacred trust for the Lord, is not to utilize the property as a

50 Ibid., § 9.31 (2007).
51 Ibid., § 2.03(d) (2007).
52 HEB Ministries, Inc. v. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, __S.W.3d__ (Tex. 2007).
53 Ibid.
profit-making venture in any way. The purpose of holding the property is to glorify God by allowing the church to assemble together to worship and glorify God. This does not mean that the pastor/trustee cannot sell the property at an appreciated price. All proceeds from a sale of such property, no matter the sales price, should be used for the glory of God. Since the pastor must meet the highest of biblical standards, he is least likely, of all church members, to deal carelessly or in a sinful manner in carrying out his responsibilities.
Chapter 8
Spurious rationale for corporate-501(c)(3) status: tax exemption and tax deduction for contributions

As pointed out in Chapter 4 on pages 389-390 of this section, according to IRS Code § 508, churches are an exception to the 501(c)(3) filing requirement. Churches which do not file for exempt status under 501(c)(3) are non-taxable. Other types of religious organizations are not so:

“Unlike churches, religious organizations that wish to be tax exempt generally must apply to the IRS for tax-exempt status unless their gross receipts do not normally exceed $5,000 annually.”

Why then do churches seek 501(c)(3) tax exemption? The IRS gives the answer:

“Although there is no requirement to do so, many churches seek recognition of tax-exempt status from the IRS because such recognition assures church leaders, members, and contributors that the church is recognized as exempt and qualifies for related tax benefits. For example, contributors to a church that has been recognized as tax exempt would know that their contributions generally are tax-deductible.”

Will the IRS disallow a tax deduction for gifts to a New Testament Church? The IRS Code provides:

“§ 170. Charitable, etc., contributions and gifts....
(a) Allowance of deduction.
  “(1) General rule. There shall be allowed as a deduction any charitable contribution (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made within the taxable year. A charitable contribution shall be allowable as a deduction only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. [Emphasis mine.]
  “(c) Charitable contribution defined. For purposes of this section, the term ‘charitable contribution’ means a contribution or gift to or for the use of—
   ‘(2) A corporation, trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation—
    ‘(A) created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States;
    ‘(B) organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or international amateur sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals;
    ‘(C) no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and
   “(D) which is not disqualified for tax exemption under section 501(c)(3) [26 USCS § 501(c)(3)] by reason of attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.”

The author has found only one case, a case from a federal district court in 1962, which addresses the issue of deductions for members of a New Testament church. That case held that § 170 applies to what appears from the record to
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1 IRS Publication 1828 (2007), p. 3. The publication is not the law, but just a comment on the law.
2 Ibid.
have been, at least for the most part, a New Testament church. The government argued that contributions did not qualify as deductions. The Court held for the church on all points. The government’s arguments and the court’s holdings follow:

“(1) The government argued that the church was not in fact an ‘organized association as contemplated by the statute (no distinctive identifying name, no written charter, constitution, bylaws, or operational guide other than the Holy Bible; it had no permanent headquarters, it did not maintain comprehensive records, and its funds were not held in a bank account designated as a church account.)

“Held. The members of the church regard themselves simply as members of the body of Christ (as following the teachings of Christ in the NT). They have no denominational name, no written organizational guide supplementary to the NT because they believe to do so would be to add an arbitrary gloss to biblical precepts, thus obscuring the word of God. Yet, in adherence to this philosophy, they have bound themselves together in an organized association. Many of them have worshipped together for years in furtherance of the purposes of the church. They hold regular public meetings in homes and rented quarters for Bible study, worship and evangelism. They assemble together in ‘camp meetings’. An association, they sponsor radio broadcasts and print and distribute Bible literature. They recognize specific individuals as ministers and as church officers, from whom they accept guidance. Through the years their ministers have regularly performed marriage ceremonies accepted as valid by civil authorities. Thus, while the church lacks some of the common indicia of organization, it plainly is an organized association of persons dedicated to religious purposes.

“(2) The government argued that the church was not organized in the U.S. as required by statute.

“Held. The basis for this contention is certain testimony that the church had its beginnings in Jerusalem in 33 A.D. It is perfectly obvious that what was meant by this testimony was that the Christian Church in the all-inclusive sense began in Jerusalem in 33 A.D. There is no doubt that the association constituting the church for whose use the contributions were made was organized in the United States.

“(3) The government argued that the church does not qualify as a beneficiary for deductible contributions because no showing has been made that in the event of its dissolution its assets would by operation of law be distributed solely for religious purposes.

“Held. This suggestion is prompted by [certain sections of the Income Tax Regulations and the C.F.R. that establish] that upon dissolution its assets must be distributable solely for an exempt purpose, either by terms of its articles of by operation of law. This regulation has no governing force in respect to the determination of the deductibility of plaintiffs’ contributions for two reasons. It had not yet been promulgated at the time the contributions were made and tax returns filed.... The regulation ... is obviously intended as a safeguard against the possibility that funds accumulated by an organization by reason of its tax-exempt status might, in the event of its dissolution, be used for purposes other that those to which it was dedicated.... [See case for important part of the analysis.] It is evident that the contributions made by plaintiffs have long since been spent in furtherance of the religious purposes of the church, and that there is no possibility of their application to other uses.

“(4) The government argued that the contributions were made by checks payable to the order of four of the church’s ministers.

“Held. The government cites several cases in which bequests inured to the benefit of the order. These cases are factually distinguishable because in each case the Court found that the testator intended to make the bequest to the named individual. In the present case, it is clear from the evidence that plaintiffs did not intend to make contributions to ministers, individually, but placed the funds in their hands, as agents, for the use of the church.

“(5) The government argued that the plaintiff’s contributions were not deductible because they inured to the benefit of individuals (the church’s ministers).

“Held. The individuals benefited were the church’s recognized ministers, who employed a portion of the contributions given for the use of the church to pay their living expenses. Such use of the contributions does not constitute a departure from the statutory requirement that no part of the net profits of the organization shall inure to the benefit of any individual, for the sums expended to meet the living expenses of the ministers were
no part of the net profits of the church. They were monies expended to meet legitimate expenses of the church in implementing its religious purposes. These expenses were of the same character as the salaries paid by any religious or charitable organization to its staff. The evidence was clear that the ministers devoted the major portion of their time to work of the church and that the amount of church funds used to pay their modest living expenses was small in comparison to the extent of their services.  

The IRS agrees that contributions to a non-incorporated, non-501(c)(3) church are deductible.

“You can deduct contributions only if you make them to a qualified organization. To become a qualified organization, most organizations, other than churches and governments, as described below, must apply to the IRS.... You can ask any organization whether it is a qualified organization, and most will be able to tell you. Or you can check IRS Publication 78 which lists most qualified organizations. You may find Publication 78 in your local library’s reference section. Or you can find it on the internet at www.irs.gov. You can also call the IRS to find out if an organization is qualified. Call 1-877-829-5500....” [Bold emphasis mine.]

However, the above does not tell the whole story. Other regulations come into play and definitely affect the ability and desirability of seeking tax deductions for contributions by a member of a New Testament church. Another reason some churches seek 501(c)(3) status is that IRS regulations make it more difficult for members to receive tax deductions for tithes and offerings to a New Testament church than to an incorporated 501(c)(3) religious organization.

“A donor cannot claim a tax deduction for any single contribution of $250 or more unless the donor obtains a contemporaneous, written acknowledgment of the contribution from the recipient church or religious organization. A church or religious organization that does not acknowledge a contribution incurs no penalty; but without a written acknowledgment, the donor cannot claim a tax deduction.”

To receive a deduction, one must have records to prove his contributions. For cash contributions less than $250, he must keep one of the following:

“1. A cancelled check, or a legible and readable account statement that shows:
   “a. If payment was by check—the check number, amount, date posted, and to whom paid,
   “b. if payment was by electronic funds transfer—the amount, date posted, and to whom paid, or
   “c. if payment was charged to a credit card—the amount, transaction date, and to whom paid.

   “2. A receipt (or a letter or other written communication) from the charitable organization showing the name of the organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution.

   “3. Other reliable written records that include the information described in (2). Records may be considered reliable if they were made at or near the time of the contribution, were regularly kept by you, or if, in the case of small donations, you have buttons, emblems, or other tokens, that are regularly given to persons making small cash contributions.

   “[Provisions are made for car expenses].”

   “Beginning in 2007, you cannot deduct a cash contribution, regardless of the amount, unless you keep a bank record (such as a cancelled check, a bank copy of a canceled
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5 Ibid. All matters concerning tax deductions for contributions to churches are not covered. For a complete overview, see the cited publications.
check, or a bank statement containing the name of the charity, the date, and the amount) or a written communication from the qualified organization. The written communication must include the name of the organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution.”

For contributions of more than $250, one must keep one of the following:

“You can claim a deduction for a contribution of $250 or more only if you have an acknowledgement of your contribution from the qualified organization or certain payroll deduction records.

“If you claim more than one contribution of $250 or more, you must have either a separate acknowledgement for each or one acknowledgement that shows your total contributions.”

“Acknowledgement. The acknowledgement must meet these tests.

"1. It must be written.
"2. It must include:
"a. The amount of cash you contributed.
"b. Whether the qualified organization gave you any goods or services as a result of your contribution (other than certain taken items and membership benefits), and
"c. A description and good faith estimate of the value of any goods or services described in (b). If the only benefit you received was an intangible religious benefit (such as admission to a religious ceremony) that generally is not sold in a commercial transaction outside the donative context, the acknowledgement must say so and does not need to describe or estimate the value of the benefit.

"3. You must get it on or before the earlier of:
"a. The date you file your return for the year you make the contribution, or
"b. The due date, including extensions, for filing the return.”

“Payroll deductions. If you make a contribution by payroll deduction, you do not need an acknowledgement from the qualified organization. But if your employer deducted $250 or more from a single paycheck, you must keep:

"1. A pay stub, Form W-2, or other document furnished by your employer that proves the amount withheld, and
"2. A pledge card or other document from the qualified organization that states the organization does not provide goods or services in return for any contribution made to it by payroll deduction.

“Beginning in 2007, you must keep the records just described for any contribution by payroll deduction, regardless of amount. However, the pledge card or other document must include the statement described in (2) regarding goods and services only if your employer withheld $250 or more from a single paycheck.”

“Out of pocket expenses....
"Noncash contributions (rules given for noncash contributions depend on the value of the contributions.) ”

Also, according to the IRS, a church may assist the IRS and issue written statements for gifts of $250 or more given the church, which will be honored by the IRS if such receipts contain the following information:

“the name of the church or religious organization; date of contribution; amount of any cash contribution, and description (but not the value) of non-cash contributions; statement that no goods or services were provided by the church religious organization in return for the contribution; statement that goods or services that a church or religious organization provided in return for the contribution consisted entirely of intangible religious benefits,
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or description and good faith estimate of the value of goods or services other than intangible religious benefits that the church or religious organization provided in return for the contribution.

“The church or religious organization may either provide separate acknowledgments for each single contribution of $250 or more or one acknowledgment to substantiate several single contributions of $250 or more. Separate contributions are not aggregated for purposes of measuring the $250 threshold.”

To provide such records to the state would, in the opinion of the author, entangle the church with the state, which, as has been shown, is contrary to both the biblical and the First Amendment principle of separation of church and state.

In the opinion of the author, a New Testament church cannot herself issue receipts since she is a spiritual entity which holds no property—a pastor/trustee, not a church, can hold property for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ. First, a New Testament church cannot keep records of any kind since she is not an earthly entity. As to membership records, only those who have been born again are members of a church and only God knows who has been saved and adds to the church. Keeping financial records focuses attention on worldly matters and concerns. Christians are to live by faith, and are not to be concerned with treasures on earth. The Bible contains no example of our Lord or the church keeping financial records. Judas stole from the money bag he carried. No apostle made an issue of it. Christ knew about it, but did not rebuke him in any way or turn Judas in to the civil authority. No instructions for a church to keep financial records can be found in the New Testament. IRS regulations require that:

“All tax-exempt organizations, including churches and religious organizations (regardless of whether tax-exempt status has been officially recognized by the IRS), are required to maintain books of accounting and other records necessary to justify their claim for exemption in the event of an audit.”

Keeping records would require a church to behave somewhat like a business and keep records of all donations received, thereby destroying her status as a spiritual entity.

Second, “charitable contribution” under IRC § 170 quoted supra at page 419, means “a contribution or gift to or for the use of … a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation … organized and operated exclusively for religious [or] charitable … purposes … which is not disqualified for tax exemption under section 501(c)(3) [26 USCS § 501(c)(3)] by reason of attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.” A New Testament church may find that the Lord has directed the church to attempt to influence legislation or support or oppose a political candidate in violation of § 170. A New Testament church cannot accept such limitations on her spiritual responsibilities.

The author believes that a New Testament church cannot have employees. First, he believes that to do so is unbiblical. Secondly, to do so subjects the

---

15 See John 12.6.
church to Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) taxes which consist of Social Security and Medicare taxes.\textsuperscript{17}

Wages paid to employees of churches or religious organizations are subject to FICA taxes unless: (1) wages are paid for services performed by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his or her ministry, or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order, (2) the church or religious organization pays the employee wages of less than $108.28 in a calendar year, or (3) a church that is opposed to the payment of social security and Medicare taxes for religious reasons [files Form 8274]…. If such an election is made, affected employees must pay Self-Employment Contributions Act (SECA) tax….\textsuperscript{18}

Unlike exempt organizations or businesses, civil law provides that a church is not required to withhold income tax from the compensation that it pays to its duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed ministers for performing services in the exercise of their ministry.”\textsuperscript{19} In fact, a New Testament church cannot “compensate” anyone since she is a spiritual entity, and therefore can hold no property of any kind, including money—members as individuals can give to others—including a pastor/trustee who is to hold property for the benefit of the Lord Jesus Christ—but not to the church. Other IRS rules apply to taxes on compensation of ministers. A New Testament church cannot pay wages or any type of compensation to her pastor or anyone else. According to the Bible members of such a church can give love gifts to take care of a pastor or to anyone, but those gifts are not wages and are not required by contract or any other earthly rule.

“Nearly 30 years ago, an eminent minister insisted before Congress that: [T]he first amendment … should not permit the state to tell the church when it is being ‘religious’ and when it is not. The church must be permitted to define its own goals in society in terms of the imperatives of its religious faith. Is the Christian church somehow not being religious when it works on behalf of healing the sick, or for the rights of minorities, or as peacemaker on the international scene? No, the church itself must define the perimeters of its outreach on public policy questions.”\textsuperscript{20}

A New Testament church is forever protected by God and presently by the First Amendment. On the other hand, a state incorporated church enters into a contract with the state, the sovereign of the corporation. By so doing, the incorporated church assumes a second personality—that of an artificial person, a legal entity, capable of suing and being sued. Incorporation provides for civil governmental regulation in many areas, and it does not protect the church from all governmental interference with matters outside the contract. When a church seeks and acquires 501(c)(3) status, she thereby has agreed to certain restrictions and that she will abide by public policy. She also submits herself to anti-biblical teaching from civil government through the IRS. Most egregious of all, she, like Israel who asked for a king, has committed a great wickedness against God which will be followed by undesirable consequences.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 14.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 15.
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The results of ignoring the biblical principle of separation of church and state

As a result of earthly concerns for property, tax deductions, and the receipt of benefits from the state, most American churches have betrayed God and placed themselves under the jurisdiction of the state. Furthermore, corporate 501(c)(3) churches are to some extent controlled by the state and are run as businesses to one degree or another: Trustees and corporate officers or officers or employees many times control everything about the church, including the preaching, and, yes, the pastor. However far the effects of becoming a corporate 501(c)(3) religious organization extend, such a church, like the Israelites who demanded a king, has committed a great wickedness by submitting to another head. Very few churches are New Testament churches. This wickedness grieves the Lord. Very few churches seek to remain pure. God said in His Word:

“As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance; But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Because it is written, Be ye holy, as I am holy. Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot;”

The result of this betrayal is far reaching. The most obvious and damaging consequence is that the whole Word is not preached. Churches have gotten in such debt that pastors cannot preach the whole Word because they would offend some visible church members, especially some of the visible rich members. Incremental compromise after incremental compromise in preaching eventually adds up to outright heresy and apostasy.

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out or season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.”

Many of God’s children have been deceived. Peter wrote to believers, “Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.”

I believe that when we say, “Bless God, by submitting myself to civil government, I can be more effective in winning souls and doing God’s work,” God says, “OK, let’s see how well you do—how many souls are saved in the
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1 I Peter 1:14-16, 18-19.
2 II Peter 2:1-3, 18: “[False prophets and teachers] shall bring in damnable heresies and [apostasy]. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they .... with feigned words make merchandise of you.... For when [these false teachers] speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error.” See the whole second chapter of II Peter.
3 AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, NOAH WEBSTER (1828) definition of “FABLE”: A feigned story or tale, intended to instruct or amuse; a softer term for a lie.
4 II Peter 3:17
long-run, and what is the fate of the church—when you do it your way in the flesh.”

The sincere but misguided Christian who asks, “What about all those souls that are being saved under the ministry of a particular incorporated 501(c)(3) church?” is promoting a practical religion that, in the long run, produces disastrous results. What are the results of God’s church submitting itself to the government? A few of a multitude of examples follow:

(1) Barna Research reports that just 4% of Americans have a biblical Worldview.5
(2) Marketers of evil have convinced church leaders that they are not to be leaders in society but to be content to hide behind the four walls of their church.6
(3) We, yes even we in the church, have traded Western civilization for vain delusion, cheap thrills, and illogical doctrines.7
(4) Marketing has changed our most basic beliefs—within our lifetime, much of what Americans universally abhorred has been packaged and sold to us as “enlightened” even “noble”, when previous generations regarded evil as self-destructive.8
(5) The percentage of “Protestant” churches (included in the survey were the Mormons, other non-christian groups, and some New Age devotees which were classified as “Protestant”) dropped from 63% to 52% from 1993 through 2002 and is probably now less than 50%.9
(6) Among mainstream Protestant denominations [as well as among the Baptists and Independent Baptists, I might add], theological liberalism has eroded the entire system of Christian doctrine, leading to the evaporation of faith and the secularization of those churches. Once the churches have been thoroughly secularized, what value remains in church membership and denominational identification?10
(7) The Laodicean Christian is oblivious to those First Amendment prerequisites pioneered by his Philadelphia Forefathers—“Thou has a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name.” (Rev. 3.8c)11
(8) Pleasure has replaced persecution, revision has undermined the Word, and Ecumenical evangelism has denied the Name.12

Foremost, God is not pleased with a church that prostitutes itself. The church that refuses to return to her first love will suffer the consequences.

Churches, because of the subjugation to civil government, have been confined to their four walls, preach what the state says they can preach, and do what the state tells them to do. Churches and pastors that submit to civil government are taught, controlled, and defined, at least to some degree, by civil government. Such churches are anemic (lacking force, vitality, or spirit) to a greater or lesser degree. They are no longer a spiritual body, but a “religious organization” which is a legal entity. Being dead spiritually, eventually their doors will close and they will either disappear or continue to exist as an arm of the state with little spiritual effect in the world. The dead will minister to the dead, and ultimately, the dead will have no one to minister to.

---

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
Chapter 10
Conclusion

God left all things, including the mind, body, and soul of man himself, in trust with man. God’s desire is for man to include God in every covenant, not for man to contract with man or with any other entity. A covenant which includes God is spiritual. Contract, a device conceived by man, leaves God and His principles out of the equation and therefore is not pleasing to God.

The Constitution, the product of a blend of enlightenment and biblical thinking, created a partly humanistic atmosphere by implementing some enlightenment principles. On the other hand, thank God for some biblical principles such as separation of church and state which are included in the Constitution. As a result of the spiritual fight of God’s persecuted people the principle of separation of church and state/religious liberty/freedom of conscience was implemented in the First Amendment.

Satan inspired men, brilliant men, to include certain humanistic principles in the Constitution. The two most devastating of these were the goal of the nation under the Constitution—the happiness of man—and the contract principle as implemented in Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution. These principles seem good according to man’s reasoning “under the sun.” After all, humanism says that man, who is basically good, has the reasoning ability without God’s guidance and principles to solve all problems and bring about happiness for all. To God, such reasoning is foolish and vain and speeds the occurrence of ill-consequences.

The contract principle has been used by the legal system to construct a humanistic environment and has successfully destroyed, among other things, knowledge of the real meaning of the two types of marriage in existence in this nation—the marriage of man and woman, and the marriage of Christ and His church. The ultimate consequence of treating the marriage as a contract is occurring before our eyes. Marriage is disdained by many. People “shack up” to see if it will work before “tying the knot.” Some just “shack up” without having any thought of marrying. The state effort to define marriage as a contract between any two or more persons, whether they be men, women, or any combination thereof is well under way. This destruction of the knowledge of what marriage is has resulted in the destruction of family.

Likewise, the contract principle has been used to destroy knowledge or encourage willful ignorance concerning the marriage of Christ and His church. Provisions for incorporation seduced spiritual entities, churches, and persuaded them to place themselves under an earthly head, the state. Incorporation requires churches to comply with satanic earthly principles and procedures in some matters rather than God’s spiritual biblical principles and procedures in all matters. Corporate trustees of incorporated churches conduct church matters according to contract principles. They walk in the flesh and not in the spirit. The corporation, not God, according to state law but contrary to God’s Word, owns the property utilized by the church. The members own the corporation. The members/owners of the church, not the pastor, are the overseers, rulers, and trustees of the church. The members/owners many times exercise their contractual powers given them by their sovereign state to control the pastor, even hiring or firing pastors at will.
In addition to incorporation, civil government has also enticed incorporated churches to become religious organizations under federal law, the IRC. The IRC presents an exemption-education-control scheme which most churches, motivated by fear and greed, have not been able to resist. Some corporate 501(c)(3) churches ease their consciences by claiming that they can do more for God with state help and by using state methods, which are designed to keep the gospel within the four walls of a building. Some corporate 501(c)(3) churches have not studied the issue. In effect, corporate 501(c)(3) churches lose the power of God; and more seriously, grieve our Lord by placing themselves under an additional head. The result has been disastrous consequences for individuals, families, churches, and the nation.

The principle of separation runs throughout God’s Word. Christians in America have therefore betrayed the trust God placed in them as his children and His church. They have mixed the spiritual with the earthly, including combining the church with the state.

“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,”

Like Balaam who, working for the civil authority, was able, for reward, to conceive of a plan to corrupt the children of Israel, so have leaders conceived of plans to successfully corrupt God’s churches in America. “It is that union of the world and the church which is spiritual unchastity (James 4.4).”

“Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.”

Isaac Backus wisely observed:

“When God took the nation of Israel to be his church, he was an husband unto them. Jer. xxxxi. 32. And Moses said unto him, If thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence. For wherein shall it be known here, that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth. Exod. xxxiii. 15, 16. But Balaam, for an earthly reward, taught Balak how to destroy that separation. And it was done by the Midianites, among whom Balaam dwelt, who enticed Israel into adultery and idolatry; and those Midianites were of the posterity of Abraham. Numb. xxv. 6; xxxi. 8, 16; Gen. xxv. 4. And how many children of believers are now guilty of this iniquity! for covetousness is idolatry. Col. iii. 5. And many make a god of their belly. Phil. iii. 19. And idolatry is also adultery in the sight of God, who said of the church of Israel, Their mother hath played the harlot; she that conceived them hath done shamefully; for she said, I will go after my lovers, that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink. Hosea ii. 5. All lawful things, but they were sought in an unlawful way. So one apostle says of many teachers and professors, An heart they have exercised with covetous practices; cursed children; who have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness; but was rebuked for his iniquity; the dumb ass, speaking with man’s voice, forbad the madness of the prophet. II Peter ii. 14, 15, 16. Another says, Woe unto them; for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. Jude 11. And Christ says by a third, I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who

1 II Corinthians 6.14-17.
3 James 4.4.
taught Balak to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. Rev. ii. 14. Now, since covetousness and luxury are idolatry in the sight of God, and idolatry is also adultery, how many are there in the world who entice Christians into these evils, in order to grasp the honors and profits of religion to themselves! Yea, and who go out from the ways of God to gratify their love of the world! I John ii. 15, 19. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit. Jude 19. Mystery Babylon is the mother of harlots, and abomina tions of the earth. Rev. xvii. 5.

Of course, this betrayal extends far beyond the issue of church and state. Many of God’s children, marriages, and families have operated according to man’s rules instead of honoring the relationships between God and each individual son of God, between the parties to a marriage and God, and between families and God. They are more American than they are Christian. Men have sought material wealth, not spiritual wealth. Even should men look to God’s rules, they have not understood that the key is the relationship, not the rules. If one truly loves God, obedience to His principles will follow. Many of today’s “Christians” dress, act, look like, and bow down to the world. In America today, a church may look historically sound on the outside, while on the inside the foundations are being destroyed. Inside the facade are rotten timbers.

“And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is like: He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock. But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great.”

A church which subjects herself in any way to any head other than the Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Word of God, has some termites eating away at the structure of that church. Those termites have been in many of America’s churches since the nation was constituted and before. They kept eating away to the point that the door has been left open for a proliferation of religious liberalism through the Church Growth Movement and now the Emerging Church Movement. Many of the megachurches as well as some “Bible believing churches” are churches by declaration only, are rotten to the core, and are perverting truth and misleading millions. They are the dead ministering to the dead. Other fundamental churches blend the world with the Word of God.

Bible believing churches, especially some fundamental Bible believing churches—not the liberal churches and the churches of the Church Growth Movement—led the way to heresy. They took the first step towards heresy and apostasy when they betrayed their Lord and Savior and Husband and placed themselves under a worldly head. They did not heed the warnings, and they did not seek biblical truth about the issue. They became pragmatic and supplemented or replaced the goal of “the glory of God” with the goal of “the happiness of man.”

The author, until he began a serious study of this subject three years ago, preached and taught that Christians must apply the principles in II Chronicles 7.14 to church and America in order to bring America back under God. That verse says, “If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then

---

will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.” The author emphasized that if “good Christians” pray for America, America will seek God’s face and turn from her wicked ways.

The author incorrectly interpreted II Chronicles 7.14. In context, that verse was written to an earthly nation, God’s chosen people, and called for a national repentance by the Jews. Israel’s main sin was that she “laid hold on other gods, and worshipped them, and served them.” Today, Christians, not Israel or America in general, are God’s chosen people with whom He is working. A New Testament church is a spiritual, not an earthly, entity. Churches in America—just as did the nation Israel which, in asking for a king, rejected God as head—placed themselves under another head, the state. That led to heresy in other areas. Finally, apostasy overran many American churches, first churches which succumbed to modernism starting in the late nineteenth century. America is now seeing the inevitable result of deviation from God’s plan in Faith Movement churches, many churches which still call themselves fundamental Bible believing, many of the megachurches, and emerging churches.

II Chronicles 7.14 can only be applied today, if at all, to the church and not to the nation in general. As has been pointed out, Gentile nations continue under the dispensations of conscience and human government, still accountable to God. God’s rules and admonitions toward Israel do not apply to Gentile nations and therefore to America. Of course, God would bless America if America chose to proceed under God and His principles, the chief of which is God’s promise to bless those who bless Israel. But the nation is not part of the church and vice-versa. In other words, the verse cannot be applied in such a way that if the church meets all the requirements of the verse, the nation will be healed. Rather, if the church meets all the requirements, the church will be healed. Churches, in order to satisfy requirements in the verse, must seek God’s face and turn from their wicked ways, one of which is the union of church and state in any way, but primarily union through incorporation and 501(c)(3) status. If pastors and Christians cannot seek God’s face, establish the proper goal by, for one thing, choosing to place God in His desired place over His churches, how can they hope to see God over a nation which has rejected God?

Every born again believer should attempt to make sure that he and the church he attends honors the Lord Jesus in all things. Thank God that churches in America can still choose to be “under God” without going underground. This may not be true much longer. But in persecution much more than in compromise and union with the world, the believer, unlike the lost person, is free and can praise and glorify the Lord.

"Praise ye the LORD. Praise ye the LORD from the heavens: praise him in the heights. Praise ye him, all his angels: praise ye him, all his hosts. Praise ye him, sun and moon: praise him, all ye stars of light. Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the LORD: for he commanded, and they were created. He hath also established them for ever and ever: he hath made a decree which shall not pass. Praise the LORD from the earth, ye dragons, and all deeps: Fire, and hail; snow, and vapour; stormy wind fulfilling his word: Mountains, and all hills; fruitful trees, and all cedars: Beasts, and all cattle; creeping things, and flying fowl: Kings of the earth, and all people; princes, and all judges of the earth: Both young men, and maidens; old men, and children: Let them praise the name of the LORD: for his name alone is excellent; his glory is above the earth and heaven." [Emphasis mine.]
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McArthur, General Douglas, 222

McArthur, John, 114

McCready County, Kentucky, v. ACLU, 545 U.S. 844 (2005), 325, 332, 334, 337, 338-344

McCurry, Bob, iii

McDowell, Josh, 102

McGarvie, 24

McGavran, Donald, 103

McGee, J. Vernon, 83

McGowan v. Maryland, 366 U.S. 420 (1961), 325

McLaren, Brian, 116

Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, 255 (deistic arguments), 277, 278-279 (quoted), 319, 344

Merrill, Benjamin, 264

Meshach, 1, 75

Messiah, 15, 34, 41, 49, 170, 176

Methodist(s), xi, xiii, 96 (effect of liberalism), 97, 306, 351, 430

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923), 308-309, 316

Micah, 12

Middleborough, Massachusetts, 254 (Baptist church instituted by Isaac Backus and others)

Mill Creek Baptist Church, 261

Miller, Perry, 235 (historian)

Milton, Milton, John, 59, 153, 238, 242, 410

Minnersville School District v. Gobitis, 310 U.S. 586, (1940), 311 (flag-salute case)

Modernism, 69, 106, 351, 430

Monotheism, 340

Moravians, 212, 262

Mordecai, 175

Moore v. Riddell, 205 F. Supp. 918 (S.D. Cal. 1962), 419-421

Morison, Samuel Eliot, 219

Mormons, Mormon religion, Mormon church, 103, 105, 300, 303, 426

Morris, Samuel F. B., 200

Mosaic Covenant, 32, 41, 143, 146, 147, 150, 161

Mosaic Law, 32, 36, 161 (contrasted with the new law of Christ), 198


Mount Enterprise, Texas, viii

Mount Sinai, 113, 337

Mulkey, Philip, 268

Murray, Father John Courtney, 201

Murray, Madalyn, 327

Murray, William J., 327


Muslim(s), Moslem, 57, 106, 145 and 326 (Mohammedans), 340, 343, 361

Nahash, 355

Nehum, 52

Names of God, 4

Nation under God, see “One Nation under God”
Nebuchadnezzar, 3, 51, 54, 55
Negroes, 268, 307
New Amsterdam, 210, 211
New Covenant, 37, 45, 46, 143 (according to Covenant Theology), 145, 146, 147 (Summary of the New Covenant), 148, 150, 161, 220, 221
New Deal, 318
Newdow, 331
New England Company, 218
New Hampshire, 194, 199, 209, 210, 213, 216, 239, 285, 381, 382, 383
New Haven Consociation, 251
New Jersey, 211, 212, 253, 257, 272, 283, 320
New Light(s), 249, 250, 251, 261, 269
Newport, Rhode Island, 239, 242, 243, 247, 249
Newton, Isaac, 238
New York, 83, 211, 212, 261, 283, 285, 296, 303, 309, 328, 313, 323-324, 326, 327, 379
Niebuhr, Richard, 107
Nin, Anais, 112
Ninevah, 51, 52
Noah, 5, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 86 (fn. 3), 113, 175
Noahic Covenant, 21, 22, 24, 25, 31, 33, 34
non-taxable, 186, 389, 390, 419
Nordin, Robert, 268 (established 1st Baptist church in Virginia)
North Carolina, 210, 211, 262, 263, 264, 266, 268, 283, 285, 325
Northwest Territory Ordinance, 344
Norwich, Connecticut, 250
O’Connor, Justice, 331, 338, 342
Old Covenant, 143
Old Lights, 249, 251
O’Neill, James M., 201
One Nation under God (selected references), 17, 24 (the teaching function of civil government and what a civil government should teach), 25, 51-52 (God desires nations to glorify Him), 135, 148-149 (versus one nation under church), 194-195, 295 (the Constitution—a blend of humanistic and biblical principles), 208, [295-297, 344 (The populace initially honored God, but that has changed)], 295, 298, 324 (difference between nation under God and nation under church), 360-361
Onnaquaggy, 261
Opekon, Virginia, 261
Orange County, Virginia, 269, 285
ordinance, 3 (definition)
Osborne, Thomas, 228 (Baptist imprisoned)
Otwell Home, i, ii, iii, iv, vi
Otwell, W. N., i, iii
ownership, 410 (beneficiary of a trust relationship has equitable title and is the real and beneficial owner)
Palestinian Covenant, 33, 41, 42, 46, 55 (fn. 39), 166
Panthe(ism)(istic), 112, 115
Parks, W. A., iii
Partridge, Richard, 230
pastor, 412-413 (ruler/trustee/steward/overseer)
pastor/trustee, 352, 406, 407, 408, 409, 415, 416, 417
patriarchs, 32
Paul, xi, xii, xvii, xviii, 9, 15, 24, 28, 50, 65, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 79, 83, 85, 86, 88, 90, 98, 102, 127 (martyred), 133, 139, 145, 151, 154, 155, 156, 161, 164, 165, 167, 175, 177, 182, 183, 184, 191, 253, 325, 261-360, 382, 392
Payson, Reverend Philips, 231
PBS, 104
Peale, Norman Vincent, 97, 102, 104
Pennsylvania, 189, 210, 211, 212, 261, 262, 267, 283, 303, 327, 379
Penn, William, 7, 211, 212
Pentecostals, 98
persecut(e)(ion)(ions)(ed), x, xii, xv, 9, 28, 40, 41, 54, 55, 72, 113, 127 (Jesus’ warnings; first persecution of Christians was by the religious Jews), 128 (Christians persecute Christians), 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 141, 148 (as a result of Covenant Theology), 149, 150, 151, 152 (persecutors think they do God service), 155, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 174, 175, 178, 183, 177, 178, 182 (the 1st persecution at Jerusalem and its purpose), 183, 191, 192, 193, 199, 202, 203, 205, 209, 210, 211, 212, 216, 217, 218, 219 (Puritans seek refuge from persecution), 224, 225-230, 234, and 236 (by Puritans early in the colony of Massachusetts), 237, 238, 239, 243-244 (beating of Obadiah Holmes), 245, 247, 248, 251, 253, 255, 256, 261, 262, 264, 266, 269-271 (persecution of Baptists in Virginia, 1768-1774), 277 (Madison comments of), 278-279 (Memorial and Remonstrance), 286, 318, 319, 326, 327, 337, 341, 343, 352, 353, 360, 363, 390, 399, 403, 405, 426, 427, 430
persecutor(s), x, 132, 151, 163, 193, 236, 238, 269
personal property, 352 (defined), 403
Peter, 49, 63, 67, 68, 72, 74, 76, 88, 90, 116, 127 (martyred), 169, 175, 177, 179, 180, 182, 360, 377, 425
Peterson, Eugene, 111
Pfeffer, Leo, 192, 277 (on the proposed Virginia Bill for Religious Freedom), 295, 325
Pharisees, xiii, 93, 150, 154, 170, 171, 202, 336
Philadelphia Baptist Association, 383
Philadelphia, church in, 73, 256, 399, 426
Philip, 127 (martyred)
pietist, piety, pietistic, pietism, 129, 131, 155, 194, 242, 246, 249, 255-256 (Backus’ pietistic arguments versus Madison and Jefferson’s deistic arguments for separation; see also, p. 278), 257, 258, 278, 321, 380, 391, 397 (definition of “piety” in fn. 9)
Pilgrim(s), 217, 218, 234, 236
Plainfield, Connecticut, 251
Plato, 382
Pledge of Allegiance, 315, 331, 334
Plymouth, England, 217
Plymouth, Massachusetts, 210, 217, 218 (a church-state), 237, 254
polygamy, 300, 301, 303
Pontius Pilate, 181, 403
Pope, Popery, Papacy, Papists, 120, 130, 131, 148, 194, 242, 246, 249, 255-256 (Backus’ pietistic arguments versus Madison and Jefferson’s deistic arguments for separation; see also, p. 278), 257, 258, 278, 321, 380, 391, 397 (definition of “piety” in fn. 9)
Puritan(s), Puritanism, x, 141 (introduced Covenant Theology to America), 142, 152, 191, 194, 197, 203, 209, 210, 211, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220 (goal—to build the Kingdom of God on earth pursuant to false Covenant Theology), 221, 222, 223, 224, 229, 233-236 (the clash with Roger Williams), 243, 244, 245, 251, 253, 254, 255, 266
Rhode Island, 189, 193, 210, 211, 216, 233, 236, 237 (Roger Williams goes to Rhode Island), 238, 239, (John Clarke goes to Rhode Island), 240, 244, 245, 246, 247-
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248 (refuses to enact penal legislation against Quakers), 250, 272, 277, 278, 379
Rhode Island Charter of 1644, 241
Rhode Island Charter of 1663, 246 (partially quoted)
Richmond County, New York, 328
Richmond, County, Virginia, 267
Robinson, John, 159, 160
Robinson, Reverend E. G., 273, 277
Rolling Stones, 109
Roloff Home, iii, iv, v, vi
Roloff, Lester, iii, iv
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 318
Rushdoony, Rousas John, 198, 206, 207
Russia(n), 57, 311
Russell, Bertrand, 112
Ruth, 80
Rutherford Institute, vii, 198
Rutledge, Justice of Supreme Court, 318, 321, 328
Sabbath, 53, 74, 237, 266, 304, 325, 326 (secularized by the Court), 329, 338, 339
Sadducees, 93, 180
Salem, Massachusetts, 219, 237
Saltonstall, Richard, 244 (letter condemning persecution)
Samson, 175
Samuel, 35, 355, 356
Sandlin, Andrew, 198
Sandy Creek Association, 263
Sandy Creek Church, 262, 264
Sandy Creek, North Carolina, 262
Sarah (Sara), 15, 175
Satan, Satan’s god of this world, the devil, xi, xviii, xix, xx, xxi, 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 28, 45, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 71, 85, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 106, 107, 113, 117, 120, 123, 139, 140, 149, 164, 176, 179, 183, 184, 202, 222, 229, 264, 295, 297, 298, 313, 315, 318, 325, 326, 329, 331, 338, 343, 346, 360, 362, 363, 371 (result of application of Satan’s principles concerning marriage), 377, 393, 395, 396, 399, 401, 415, 427; [49, 60, 157 (prince of the power of the air)]; [59, 60 (prince of the present world (system))]
Saul (King), 34, 35, 42, 149, 156, 175, 221, 235, 356
Saybrook Platform, 250, 251
Scalia, Justice Anthony, 332, 334, 337, 341-344
Scheppep, Edward and Sidney, 327
Schuller, Robert, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113
Scofield, C. L., 137
Scopes Trial, 315
self-defense, 416 (defined)
Separate Baptists, 263, 264, 268, 269
Separate(s), 250 (“Separates” defined), 251, 252 (consequences of separatist movement), 253, 254, 261, 262, 267 (the main force in Virginia for separation) Separation of God and State, 324-325 (explained and distinguished from separation of church and state) Separatist(s), 159, 217, 223, 235, 236, 249, 252, 254, 278, (deistic separatists)
Seth, 14
Shadrach, 175
Shaw, George Bernard, 112
Shem, 14, 22
Siegel, Bernie, 104, 112
Silas, 183
Smith, Hezekiah, 381
Smith, Joseph, 97
Smith, Warren, xiii, 107, 110, 111, 112
Smyrna, church at, 73, 363
Sodom and Gomorrah, 371 (in America)
Solomon, 35, 51, 166, 221, 235, 356
Song of Solomon, 82
Souter, Justice, 338
South Carolina, 210, 211, 263, 264, 283, 380
sovereign of a corporation, 365-366 (“sovereign” defined)
Soviet Union, 174, 175
spiritual, 153 (definition)
Spotylvania, Virginia, 269
Spurgeon, Charles, 106
Stalin, 174
Stanley, Charles, 102
State v. Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, Inc., No. 10-83-128-CV (Tex. App.—Waco, April 26, 1984)(unpublished opinion), iii
State v. Corpus Christi People’s Baptist Church, Inc. et. al, 683 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1984), iv
Stearns, Shubal, xvi, 208, 261, 262, 263, 264 (the guiding light and genius behind the Separate Baptist movement)

Stephen, 127 (martyred)

Stevens, Justice, 331, 335-338, 343, 344

Steward, viii, 139, 140, 160, 163, 411, 412, 413 (defined), 414

Stewardship, 20, 24, 139, 413 (defined), 414 (as distinguished from "trust")

Stokes, Anson Phelps, 206


suffer(s)(ed)(ings), long-suffering, x, xiv, 34, 54, 59, 63, 90, 121, 153, 166, 177 (for Christ's sake, those who live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution, shall reign with the Lord, shall be rewarded, etc.), 75, 94, 95 (believers are a reward to Christ for His suffering), 106, 125, 145, 149, 156, 157, 158 (identified with Christ through suffering), 164, 175 (Moses chose suffering, etc.), 176 (abortion and emotional suffering), 181, 182, 191, 2116, 218, 219, 224 (Puritans), 226 (dissenters; through the pages following the suffering and persecution of dissenters is discussed), 235, 254, 281, 347, 359, 363 (church at Smyrna, etc.), 368, 377, 413, 425, 426

Swindoll, Chuck, 102

Tabitha, 182

Taoism, 326

Taylor, Dr. George B., 277

Taylor, Jeremy, 238, 242, 272


Tennessee, 264, 315

Terry v. Taylor, 13 U.S. 43 (1815), 382

Texas Child Care Licensing Act (1975), ii

Texas Penal Code, 416

Texas Youth Commission, v

Thanksgiving Day, [297, 340, 344 (Washington's Proclamation)], 324

The Message, 110, 111

Theocracy, theocra(cy)(ies)(tis), 5, 25, 33, 34 (defined), 35, 42, 131, 133, 148, 149, 150, 206, 208, 217, 219-220 (established in Massachusetts), 221, 234, 253, 354, 355, 361

Theonomy, 198

Thomas, 127 (martyred)

Thomas, Clarence, Justice, 331, 332, 334-335, 342

Thomas Road Baptist Church, 282

Thompson, Hank, iii, 149

Thyatira, 73, 119

Timothy, 24, 90, 412

Titicut, Connecticut, 252

Titicut Separatist Church, 254

Titus, 164, 165

tolerance, religious, 272 (distinguished from religious liberty by James Madison)

Tolland, Connecticut, 261


tower of Babel, 23

Tozer, A. W., 112

Trismegistus, Hermes, 111

trust (as means to hold property), 352, 407 (private versus charitable trusts), 408 (a trust is not a legal entity), 408-416, 410-411 (defined), 427

trust (important uses of the term), 252 (used by James Madison in his "Memorial and Remonstrance"), 280 (used in "Virginia Act for Religious Liberty"), 413-414 (as distinguished from "stewardship"

trustee, 406-416, 411 (defined)


Tryon, William, 263, 264

Turner, William, 228 (Baptist imprisoned)

Tyndal Theological Seminary and Bible Institute, 416

tyranny, tyrants, tyrant, tyrannical, vi, 7 (defined; humanists and tyranny), 23, 130, 177, 178, 191 (Puritans fled tyranny), 223, 231, 236, 244, 256, 274, 278-279 ("tyranny" used in "Memorial and Remonstrance"), 280 ("tyranny" used in "Virginia Act for Religious Liberty"), 286 ("tyranny" used in an Isaac Backus speech), 299 (Supreme Court tyranny), 313, 314, 342

Unitarians, Unitarianism, 192, 316


United States of America, America, i, iv, ix, x, xi, xii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvi, 6, 69, 71, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102, 103, 106, 112, 115, 117, 132, 133, 135, 141, 152, 160, 168, 170, 176, 177, 180, 181, 193, 194, 195, 199, 200 (Catholic political conspiracy against), 201, 205, 208, 209, 210, 211, 215, 217, 219, 232, 233, 234,
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United States Supreme Court, vi, xii, xxi, 197, 199, 201, 232, 277, 291-347 (Supreme Court Religion Clause jurisprudence), 362, 379, 381, 382, 383, 387, 389
Unity School of Christianity, 100
University of Texas School of Law, vii
Unregistered Baptist Fellowship, ix
Utah, 283
Vane, Sir Henry, 229 (opposed persecution of dissenters), 241
Van Orden v. Perry, 545 U.S. 677 (2005), 332-338, 343
Vatican, 200
Vaughan, Aubrey, iii
Vermont, 283
Vernon’s Ann.Civ.St. art. 695a—3, §§ 1 to 27; TEX. HUM. RES. CODE. ANN. § 42.001; (1975), ii, iii
Vidal v. Gerard’s Executors, 43 U.S. 127 (1844), 389
Virginia, 28, 135, 191, 192, 206, 210, 211, 216, 217, 219, 257-258 (the enlightenment view of the Virginia separationists), 262, 265-283 (toward the First Amendment in Virginia), 272 (first state other than Rhode Island to recognize religious liberty), 283, 285, 286, 319, 341
Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, [aka/Virginia Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom], 273 (written by Jefferson), 274-282 (quoted on 280; Act passed in 1786; ways the Bill was right and wrong on 282), 319, 344 (Justice Scalia comments upon the “notoriously self-contradicting Jefferson”)
Waldenses, 131
Waller, John, 269 (persecuted in Virginia)
War of the Regulation in North Carolina, 263
Warren Association, 220 (covenant upon which America founded), 255, 256, 258 (published a remonstrance written by Isaac Backus), 381
Warren, Rick, 102-115, 357
Washington, George, 276, 286, [297, 340, 344 (Thanksgiving Day Proclamation)], 344
Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 679 (1871), 308
Wellhausen, Julius, xviii, 95
Weninger, F. X., 201 (Jesuit author)
West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943), 311-312 (flag-salute case), 321
Weston, Thomas, 217
Whitefield, George, xv, xvi, 245, 249, 261, 268
Whitehead, John, 198
wife, xi, xiv, xviii, 13, 14, 19, 34, 44, 47 (Israel, wife of Jehovah), 69, 72, 75, 78, 79, 80, 82, 101, 105, 110, 114, 115, 134, 152, 155, 156, 160, 164, 166, 167, 176, 188, 237, 252, 261, 327, 354, [185-186, 358-359 (Jehovah and Israel compared to husband and wife)], 359, 370-371 (covenant versus contract marriage), 372 (one flesh), 377, 396, 409, 412
Wilkinson, Bruce, 107, 112, 113
Williams, Roger, xii, xv, 148, 149, 150, 151, 155, 163-164 (Williams gives the boundaries of civil and church jurisdictions), 188, 193, 208, 228, 233-242 (banished and founded Rhode Island)(242—writes Bloody Tenent of Persecution... and The Bloody Tenent yet more Bloody), 244, 246, 247, 248, 255, 277, 278, 281, 289
Wilson, James, 286 (against Bill of Rights)
Windham Consociation, 251
Windsor, Connecticut, 261
Winfrey, Oprah, 104
Winthrop, John, 229, 234, 235
Wisdom (defined), 155
Witherspoon, John, 272
Witter, William, 243
Worship, 77 (defined)
Yale, xvi
Yates, Robert, 313
Zedekiah, 55
Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306 (1952), 323-325
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<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3, 7</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.12-31.18</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.15, 16</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.3, 4</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.18-35.3</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>175, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22-25</td>
<td>175, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4-16</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.14-15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15-26</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17-22</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.24-16.30</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-21</td>
<td>222, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Samuel</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.8-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.8 through chapter 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Samuel</td>
<td>7.5-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.16-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Kings</td>
<td>5-6, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.17-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Kings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1-25.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Chronicles</td>
<td>17.7-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Chronicles</td>
<td>7.12-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.1-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1.6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.1-2, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.1-3, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.6a</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.6, 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.6, 7, 16-18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.3-4, 28-29, 34-37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.11</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.20-37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.30-37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.9-12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.7-10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.1-6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.1-3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.34-41</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.4-5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.1-3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.4-8</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.10</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.1-2</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.1-4</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.163</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.1-3</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.6, 10-11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.17-21</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.10-13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.1-13</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proverbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1, 2, 10, 11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.16-19</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecclesiastes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9a</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>16, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Song of Solomon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isaiah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2-7, 24, 25</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5, 6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2, 4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.3, 7</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.8, 9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>5, 44, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>34, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34, 185, 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.9-10</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.18-19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.1-3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>xxi, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3, 5, 11-16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3-11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3-62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.6, 9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.1-16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.17-25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.17-66.24</td>
<td>5, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.12, 18, 19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14, 20</td>
<td>34, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.14-16</td>
<td>5, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.15c</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.9, 23</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7-10</td>
<td>28, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1-40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3, 5-6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3-8</td>
<td>5, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.5-8</td>
<td>40, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>5, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.9-10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11, 12</td>
<td>40, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11-14, 15-38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.18-38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.8-11, 16-24</td>
<td>5, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.10-11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8, 31-33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17-21</td>
<td>5, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.26-59</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.32-33</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.60-63</td>
<td>5, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.15-27</td>
<td>34, 359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.16-18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.4, 25</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.11-31</td>
<td>5, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.12-14, 23-24</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.18, 25</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.22-23, 32</td>
<td>5, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.1-14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.21-25</td>
<td>33, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.21-28</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.26-28</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.6, 7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.17-21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.25-29</td>
<td>5, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.28</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.1-48.35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.7-12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.19-27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td><strong>Daniel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34, 35</td>
<td>xxii, 49, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34-36, 44</td>
<td>6, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34, 35, 45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.37-40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.32b</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.35</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-8</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14-16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14-23</td>
<td>5, 47, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16-23</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>47, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6-11</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9-16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joel</strong></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12-17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18-27</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28, 29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30-32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-3, 20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-8</td>
<td>33, 40, 54, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2-8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9, 10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17-21</td>
<td>47, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse Range</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>xxii, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1-3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1-9</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.16-21</td>
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</tr>
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<td>34</td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 20-23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2-3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11-15</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-11</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5, 6</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8, 9</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>5.14-16</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
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<td>5.17-18</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.32</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>402</td>
</tr>
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<td>187</td>
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<tr>
<td>6.28</td>
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</tr>
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<td>7.9-11</td>
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<td>10.28</td>
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<td>11.20-24</td>
<td>67</td>
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<td>11.28-30</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.49-50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1-30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.24-30, 37-43</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.36-43</td>
<td>71, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45-46</td>
<td>75, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.13-14</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.14-15</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15.16-17    | 67
| Matthew     |           |
| 1.1, 20-23  | 14        |
| 1.23        | 42        |
| 2.1-2       | 80        |
| 2.2         | 80        |
| 3.2         | 67        |
| 3.2-3       | 67        |
| 3.11        | 156       |
| 3.11-15     | 63        |
| 4.1-11      | xix       |
| 4.3         | xix       |
| 4.4         | xix       |
| 4.5, 6      | xix       |
| 4.7         | xix       |
| 4.8         | 360       |
| 4.8, 9      | xix, 59, 60, 360 |
| 4.10        | xix, 360  |
| 5.10-12     | 127       |
| 5.11-12     | 363       |
| 5.13-16     | 187, 198  |
| 5.14-16     | 202       |
| 5.17-18     | 146       |
| 5.32        | 371       |
| 6           | 402       |
| 6.19-24     | 187       |
| 6.28        | 109       |
| 7.9-11      | 19        |
| 7.15        | xvii, 87  |
| 7.21-23     | 87, 100   |
| 7.22        | 59        |
| 10.16-18    | 151       |
| 10.28       | 363       |
| 11.11       | 73        |
| 11.20-24    | 67        |
| 11.28-30    | 67        |
| 12.18       | 67        |
| 12.49-50    | 74        |
| 13          | 68        |
| 13.1-30     | 75        |
| 13.24-30, 37-43 | 150 |
| 13.36-43    | 71, 120   |
| 13.44       | 93        |
| 13.45       | 75        |
| 13.45-46    | 75, 81    |
| 15.9        | 88        |
| 15.13-14    | 150       |
| Mark          | 1.2-3 | 67   | 16.10-13 | 402, 414 |
|              | 1.8   | 156  | 16.18    | 176, 371 |
|              | 1.12, 13 | xix | 17.24    | xxi, 48  |
|              | 3.6   | 93   | 18.8     | 71, 83, 86 |
|              | 4.20-21 | 187 | 18.8b    | 86 |
|              | 4.21-23 | 203 | 19.12-27 | 411 |
|              | 8.15  | 93   | 20.19    | 170 |
|              | 8.29  | 67   | 20.19-26 | 133 |
|              | 9.38  | 151  | 20.20-22 | 170 |
|              | 10.1-12 | 176 | 20.23    | 171 |
|              | 10.11 | 371  | 20.24    | 171 |
|              | 10.12 | 371  | 20.25    | 170 |
|              | 12.13 | 170  | 20.26    | 171 |
|              | 12.13-17 | 133 | 21.8-19  | 113 |
|              | 12.15 | 171  | 21.24    | 43, 50, 55 |
|              | 12.15-16 | 171 | 22.31-32 | 59 |
|              | 12.16 | 171  | 24.46, 47 | 67 |
|              | 12.17 | 171  | 24.46-49 | 182 |
|              | 12.17 | 170  |
|              | 12.28-34 | 101, 158, 159 | 1.17 | 139 |
|              | 12.30 | 82   | 1.23     | 67 |
|              | 13.5-13 | 113 | 2.20, 27 | 74 |
|              | 13.22 | 87   | 3.3      | 74, 156 |
|              | 14.62 | xxi, 48 | 3.3, 6    | 74 |
|              | 16.15 | 77, 181, 191, 352 | 3.5 | 156 |
| John         | 1.26-38 | 48   | 3.6     | 156 |
|              | 1.30-33 | 40   | 3.9      | 167 |
|              | 1.31-33 | xxi, 42, 49 | 3.12 | 157 |
|              | 1.32  | 48   | 3.14, 15 | 14 |
|              | 1.32, 33 | 49, 67 | 3.16    | 10, 81 |
|              | 1.67-80 | 48   | 3.16, 18 | 17 |
|              | 1.69-75 | 48   | 3.16-19  | 123 |
|              | 2.27  | 74   | John 3.18 | 363 |
|              | 3.4   | 67   | 3.17-21  | 187 |
|              | 3.16  | 156  | 3.18, 19, 36 | 34 |
|              | 4.1   | 74   | 3.28, 29 | 79 |
|              | 4.1-13 | xix | 3.29     | 80, 167 |
|              | 4.5-7 | 360  | 3.31     | 3 |
|              | 4.8   | 360  | 4.10, 13-14 | 156 |
|              | 6.35-36 | 77  | 4.21, 23 | 168 |
|              | 6.46-49 | 429 | 4.23-24  | 77 |
|              | 8.3   | 414  | 4.35     | 75 |
|              | 8.8   | 83   | 5.24     | 363 |
|              | 9.20  | 67   | 6.39, 40, 44, 54 | 49 |
|              | 9.49-50 | 151 | 6.40     | 5, 100 |
|              | 9.54  | 166  | 6.44     | 16 |
|              | 9.55-56 | 151 | 6.63     | 157 |
|              | 10.18 | 59   | 7.7      | 360 |
|              | 10.25-28 | 101, 158, 159 | 8.31-32 | 61, 209 |
|              | 10.27 | 82, 161 | 8.31-32, 36 | 362 |
|              | 11.33 | 187  | 8.34-47  | 336 |
|              | 11.33-36 | 202 | 8.37     | 40 |
|              | 11.34-36 | 187 | 8.39     | 40 |
|              | 12.42 | 414  | 8.44-47  | 203 |
|              | 12.42 | 414  | 8.56     | 40 |
|              | 13.34 | 359  | 8.56-58  | 40 |
|              | 14.23 | 128  | 10.10-11 | 151 |
|              | 14.26-27 | 101 | 10.31-33 | 336 |
|              | 14.33 | 101  | 10.31-38 | 179 |
|              | 16.1-8 | 414  | 10.32-33 | 171 |
|              |       |      | 11.24    | 49 |
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18-23</td>
<td>71, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7, 8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17-18, 21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1-2, 26-27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I Corinthians**

1.1-2 | 72 |
1.11-13 | 77 |
1.25 | 298 |
2 | 155 |
2.1-16 | 155 |
2.4 | 74 |
2.14 | 298 |
3.6-9 | 75 |
3.9 | 75 |
3.16 | 75 |
3.16, 17 | 74, 78, 167 |
3.18-21 | 324 |
3.19 | 207 |
3.19-20 | 298 |
3.20 | 207 |
4 | 413 |
4.1, 2 | 414 |
5 | 72 |
5.1 | 176 |
5.4, 5 | 78 |
5.5 | 59 |
5.6 | 94 |
5.6, 7 | 165 |
5.6-8 | 93 |
5.13 | 164, 165 |
5.17 | 156 |
6.1-5 | 164 |
6.1-8 | 164, 409 |
6.2-3 | 121 |
6.7-11 | 164 |
6.9 | 151 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9-10, 13, 18</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15-20</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>74, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19-20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>19, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10-15</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22-23</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4-6</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19-21</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>12, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1-2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7-9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7-11, 27, 30</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12, 13</td>
<td>74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12-27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12-31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12-34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>82, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1-3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.22, 45</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>xxi, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>44-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.51, 52</td>
<td>xxi, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.54-57</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II Corinthians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 155</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3-11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6, 17</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7-9</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-4</td>
<td>60, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>59, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-9</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14-20</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.14-17</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.14-18</td>
<td>150, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8-11</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3-4</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Galatians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6-8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10-24</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13, 14</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19, 20</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3-25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6, 7, 29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8-14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-14, 16-18, 24-26</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10-18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13, 14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15-22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>40, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19, 23-25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23-25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>24, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26-29</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>15, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21-31</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2-4</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7-9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.16-25</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22-24</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ephesians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>157, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5-6, 12, 14, 18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>74, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19-21</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19-22</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>80, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22-23</td>
<td>75, 78, 80, 154, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-6</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4-5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19-21</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19-22</td>
<td>167, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>75, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21-22</td>
<td>76, 78, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3, 9-11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20-21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4-6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12-13</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-16</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>74, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-17</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.19-20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22-25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22-26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.23, 25-27, 29-33</td>
<td>79, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>68, 72, 132, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25-27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25-29</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.29-30</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30, 31</td>
<td>78, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1, 4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10-18</td>
<td>162, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10-20</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13-14a</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12-31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>158, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6-8</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>158, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>xxi, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20, 21</td>
<td>xxi, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14-18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19-20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15-18</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>111, 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>72, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-4, 6-8</td>
<td>xvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6-8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8, 16-19</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-6</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>xxi, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7-8</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14-17</td>
<td>xxi, 48, 49, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14-16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16-17</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2-3</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7-8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3-4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10-12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6, 14-15</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9-11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>11, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-6</td>
<td>24, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11-14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>71, 73, 75, 78, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-2</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-16</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16-17</td>
<td>71, 73, 75, 78, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>86, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20, 21</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-4</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14-18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19-20</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>xxi, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**II Timothy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6-7</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4, 20-21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11-12</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13, 19</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24-26</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25, 26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>49, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2-5</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>85, 180, 360, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>63, 152, 166, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15-17</td>
<td>76, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2-5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-4</td>
<td>85, 91, 98, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6-8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-8</td>
<td>90, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4-8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13-15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1-5</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>147, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7-13</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>148, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8-11</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8-12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9-10</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10, 12-13</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>147, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1-2, 11</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6-9</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11, 12, 18-23</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>145, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11-17</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>78, 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25a</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.26-31</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.24-26</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>175, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25-27</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5-6</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15-16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Titus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>412, 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10-11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>xx1, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Philemon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hebrews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>157, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>75, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15-16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**James**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.14, 15</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I Peter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4, 5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14-16, 18-19</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23-25</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>153, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4-9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>75, 76, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>157, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13-14</td>
<td>173-183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1, 5-7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14-15</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-5</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II Peter**

| 1.1 | 68 |
| 1.3-4 | 63 |
| 1.3-9 | 208 |
| 1.3-10 | xx |
| 1.3-13 | 63 |
| 1.4 | 157 |
| 1.10-12, 20-21 | 169 |
| 1.14 | 90 |
| 2 | 89 |
| 2.1 | 85, 89 |
| 2.1-3, 15-19 | 89 |
| 2.1-3, 18 | 425 |
| 2.1-19 | 85 |
| 2.14 | 94 |
| 2.14, 15, 16 | 428 |
| 2.17, 21 | 86 |
| 2.18, 19 | 178 |
| 3.1-9 | 49 |
| 3.3-4 | 89 |
| 3.17 | 105, 425 |

**Revelation**

| 1.6 | 121, 158 |
| 1.18 | 68 |
| 1.20 | 187 |
| 2.1 | 73 |
| 2.2-5 | 83 |
| 2.8 | 73 |
| 2.10 | 364 |
| 2.12 | 73 |
| 2.14 | 429 |
| 2.18 | 73 |
| 2.18-19 | 119 |
| 3.1 | 73 |
| 3.7 | 68, 73 |
| 3.8, 10-12 | 399 |
| 3.14 | 73 |
| 3.14-16 | 86 |
| 3.14-19 | 397 |
| 3.15-19 | 119 |
| 3.17 | 123 |
| 3.20 | 119 |
| 3.21 | 121 |
| 4.11 | 12 |
| 5.10 | 121, 158 |
| 5.13 | 11, 12 |
| 7.10-12 | 12 |
| 8.4-13 | 145 |
| 11.7 | 171 |
| 11.13 | 12 |
| 12.5 | 23 |
| 12.7-12 | 59 |
| 12.10 | 59 |
| 13.1 | 360 |
| 13.1, 12 | 171 |
| 13.8 | 132 |
| 13.8, 59, 60, 145 | 57 |
| 16.13-16 | 57 |
| 17.5 | 429 |
| 17.8 | 119 |
| 17.18 | 119 |
| 17.18-21 | 120 |
| 18.4-13 | 145 |
| 19.1-2 | 12 |
| 19.6-8 | 79, 167 |
| 19.7 | 167 |
| 19.7-9 | 80 |
| 19.7-10 | 72 |

**I John**

| 1.5-7 | 188 |
| 2.1 | 59 |
| 2.1, 2 | 166 |
| 2.15-17 | xix, 60, 168 |
| 2.15, 19 | 429 |
| 2.18, 19 | 49 |
| 2.18-28 | 90 |
| 2.27 | 74 |
| 3.8 | 14 |
| 3.17 | 78 |
| 4.1-3 | 85 |
| 4.1-5 | 90 |
| 4.4 | vii |
| 4.5-14, 18-21 | 159 |
| 4.7, 19, 20 | 161 |
| 5.1 | 74 |
| 5.5-14, 18-21 | 159 |
| 5.9-12 | 34 |
| 5.12 | 157 |

**II John**

| 5 | 161 |

**Jude**

| 3 | 86 |
| 4 | 86, 89 |
| 4, 8, 11-13, 16 | 86 |
| 10 | 144 |
| 11 | 428 |
| 11-15 | 86 |
| 14, 15 | 86 |
| 17-19 | 49 |
| 19 | 429 |
| 25 | 11 |

**Revelation**

<p>| 1.6 | 121, 158 |
| 1.18 | 68 |
| 1.20 | 187 |
| 2.1 | 73 |
| 2.2-5 | 83 |
| 2.8 | 73 |
| 2.10 | 364 |
| 2.12 | 73 |
| 2.14 | 429 |
| 2.18 | 73 |
| 2.18-19 | 119 |
| 3.1 | 73 |
| 3.7 | 68, 73 |
| 3.8, 10-12 | 399 |
| 3.14 | 73 |
| 3.14-16 | 86 |
| 3.14-19 | 397 |
| 3.15-19 | 119 |
| 3.17 | 123 |
| 3.20 | 119 |
| 3.21 | 121 |
| 4.11 | 12 |
| 5.10 | 121, 158 |
| 5.13 | 11, 12 |
| 7.10-12 | 12 |
| 8.4-13 | 145 |
| 11.7 | 171 |
| 11.13 | 12 |
| 12.5 | 23 |
| 12.7-12 | 59 |
| 12.10 | 59 |
| 13.1 | 360 |
| 13.1, 12 | 171 |
| 13.8 | 132 |
| 13.8, 59, 60, 145 | 57 |
| 16.13-16 | 57 |
| 17.5 | 429 |
| 17.8 | 119 |
| 17.18 | 119 |
| 17.18-21 | 120 |
| 18.4-13 | 145 |
| 19.1-2 | 12 |
| 19.6-8 | 79, 167 |
| 19.7 | 167 |
| 19.7-9 | 80 |
| 19.7-10 | 72 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Range</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.11-21</td>
<td>55, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.19-20.6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1-3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3, 7-8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3, 8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7-14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.9-10</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.9-22.17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.24, 26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>76, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.18, 19</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>xxi, 49, 347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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