

Roger Williams: Quotes and other selected information from *God Betrayed*

The following are quotes of Roger Williams in *God Betrayed*. There is also much more information on Williams from other sources in the book.

Pages xii-xiii of *god Betrayed*: 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 Williams¹ 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?

“*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.”²

Page xv of *God Betrayed*: 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.

Page 148 of *God Betrayed*: 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.’”³ Only one side can be

¹ 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.

² Roger Williams and Edward Bean Underhill, *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed and Mr. Cotton’s Letter Examined and Answered* (London: Printed for the Society, by J. Haddon, Castle Street, Finsbury, 1848), pp. 32-33.

³ Williams and Underhill, p. 33.

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.”⁴

Pages 150-151 of *God Betrayed*: 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 at present, and hereafter to all eternity. Such a sentence no civil judge can pass, such a death no civil sword can inflict.”⁵

Pages 151-152 of *God Betrayed*: 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.

“Some come not till the eleventh hour, Matt. xx. 6: if those that come not till the last hour should be destroyed, because they come not at the first, then should they never come, but be prevented.”⁶

Pages 155-156 of *God Betrayed*: 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

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁵ Williams and Underhill, p. 97.

⁶ Williams and Underhill, pp. 11-12.

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 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....”⁷

“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....”⁸

“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

⁷ Williams, *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution*, pp. 204-205.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

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.”⁹

Pages 163-164 of *God Betrayed: 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:

“[T]o 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.”¹⁰

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

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

¹⁰ Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution*, pp. 119-120.

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.”¹¹

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.

“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

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213. See pp. 219-223 concerning the power of the magistrate in making laws.

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.”¹²

Page 164 of *God Betrayed*: 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.*”¹³

Pages 164-165 of *God Betrayed*: Roger Williams’ insights into this verse are instructive:

“[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[.]”¹⁴

“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 heading, 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—

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 213-214.

¹³ Williams and Underhill, p. 62.

¹⁴ Williams and Underhill, p. 20.

“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.”¹⁵

Pages 155-156 of *God Betrayed*: 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.

“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.”¹⁶

Page 174 of *God Betrayed*: 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.”¹⁷

Page 188 of *God Betrayed*: 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.”¹⁸

Page 208 of *God Betrayed*: 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

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-63.

¹⁶ Williams and Underhill, p. 86.

¹⁷ Williams and Underhill, p. 133.

¹⁸ Williams and Underhill, p. 38.

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.

Page 219 of *God Betrayed*: 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.¹⁹ 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.”²⁰ 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.”²¹ 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.”²²

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.”²³

John Cotton was called upon to arrange the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the colony.²⁴ They set up a ecclesiocracy in which no one could hold office who was not a member of an approved church.²⁵ “The civil laws were adjusted to the polity of the church, and while nominally distinct, they supported and assisted each other.”²⁶

Page 228 of *God Betrayed*: “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

¹⁹ Williams and Underhill, p. v.

²⁰ Marnell, p. 48.

²¹ Williams and Underhill, p. 244.

²² *Ibid.*, p. vii.

²³ Backus, *A History of New England, Volume 1*, pp. 34-35.

²⁴ Williams and Underhill, p. xii.

²⁵ Backus, *A History of New England... Volume 1*, p. 35; Williams and Underhill, pp. x-xi.

²⁶ Williams and Underhill, pp. xii-xiii.

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!*’”²⁷

Page 233 of *God Betrayed*: “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.”²⁸ “Roger Williams was the first person in modern Christendom to maintain the doctrine of religious liberty and unlimited toleration.”²⁹ 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.”³⁰

Section IV, Chapter 6 of *God Betrayed*, pp. 233-249, addresses the efforts against the establishment by Roger Williams and Dr. John Clarke to some extent. Only some quotes and other information is included here.

Page 233-235 of *God Betrayed*: 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.

²⁷ Backus, *A History of New England...*, Volume 1,, fn. 1, p. 252; pp. 258, 262-263, 265.

²⁸ Callender, p. 70.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Appendix IV, p. 190.

³⁰ Marshall and Manuel, *The Light and the Glory*, p. 146.

“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. 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....’”³¹

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 the first four of the Ten Commandments which deal with man’s relationship to God.

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.”³² 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

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

³² *Ibid.*

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.)”³³

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:

“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.”³⁴

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.”³⁵ 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.”³⁶ 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

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

³⁴ Williams and Underhill, pp. 100-101. In this book, *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed and Mr. Cotton’s Letter Examined and Answered*, Williams addresses the arguments presented by Covenant Theology.

³⁵ Marshall and Manuel, *The Light and the Glory*, p.194.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-195.

truth.’ Trying to relate to him on a personal level was like trying to relate to cold steel—highly polished and refined.”³⁷

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: [See *God Betrayed* through 239]

Page 237 of *God Betrayed*: He also, contrary to the practice of the church at Boston, hesitated to hold communion with any church who 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.”³⁸

Page 237-8 of *God Betrayed*: 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,”³⁹ 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;⁴⁰ “and for terming the churches of England antichristian.”⁴¹ 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.”⁴²

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.’”⁴³ The “grand difficulty

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

³⁸ Williams and Underhill, p. x.

³⁹ Callender, p. 72.

⁴⁰ Backus, *A History of New England... Volume 1*, pp. 44-46. Williams and Underhill, p. xiii. (The colonies held their land under the royal patent. Under the royal right of patent, Christian kings (so called) were given the right to take and give away the lands and countries of other men); Armitage, *The History of the Baptists, Volume 2* pp. 638-639..

⁴¹ Williams and Underhill, pp. xiii-xiv.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. xiv; Callender, p. 72; Backus, *A History of New England... Volume 1*, p. 53 (Backus adds item 2, as, according to footnote 1, p. 53, his is from Governor Winthrop’s Journal, Vol. 1, pp. [162, 163]).

⁴³ Williams and Underhill, pp. xv, 387-389.

they had with Mr. Williams was, his denying the civil magistrate's right to govern in ecclesiastical affairs."⁴⁴

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.⁴⁵ He bought land from the Indians and founded the town of Providence where persecution has never "sullied its annals."⁴⁶ "[T]he 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."⁴⁷

Page 238 of *God Betrayed*: 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."⁴⁸

Page 240 of *God Betrayed*: 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."⁴⁹ ... Thus, liberty of conscience was the basis for legislation in Rhode Island, and its annals have remained to this day [when Underhill wrote this] unsullied by the blot of persecution.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Backus, *A History of New England...*, Volume 1, p. 53; Armitage, *The History of the Baptists*, Volume 2, pp. 627-640.

⁴⁵ Williams and Underhill., p. xxiii.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Backus, *A History of New England...*, Volume 1, p. 59.

⁴⁸ Williams and Underhill, p. xxv, citing in fn. 5: Letter to Mason. Knowles, p. 398.

⁴⁹ Williams and Underhill, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

⁵⁰ Williams and Underhill, p. xxviii.