

Limits of Submission to Government: 6

Resistance to Tyrants

By Shawn Mathis

sermonaudio.com

Bible Text: Romans 13
Preached on: Sunday, October 27, 2013

Meets at:

Chapel of SDA

2675 S. Downing (Yale & Downing)
Denver, CO 80210

Website: www.denverprovidence.org
Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/denverprovidence

Yeah, I know. Saved to serve is true. That's why I'm preaching in the evening. But Jesus is not an Arian. He wore a cloak but not a cape, there you go.

What is October 31st? Thank you, Bruce. Thank you. The last day of October. Yes, it's Reformation Day. I wrote an opinion piece that turned out, apparently, to be the killer piece for the Rocky Mountain News. Remember the Rocky Mountain News? It was the last year it was in existence when I wrote my piece. They published it. The Rocky Mountain News.

"Lessons from the Reformation."

"What do ghosts and goblins have in common with Luther and Calvin? Both are celebrated on October 31st. Yet only one group had historical significance." Maybe I should rewrite that after 100 years from now. The other group will have some historical significance in America, ghosts and goblins.

"The Reformation of Luther and Calvin changed the West, leading to the creation of America ultimately. That is something to celebrate. But many today cannot celebrate it because so little is known—our children know more about the origins of blood-sucking vampires than the cultural life-force known as the Reformation. Yet many historians acknowledge the predominate influence of the Reformation on the formation of America. George Bancroft, founder of Annapolis Academy and one of the first American historians, asserted, 'He that will not honor the memory, and respect the influence of Calvin, knows but little of the origin of American liberty.'

"Historically, conscience-anguished Martin Luther found peace through faith in the person and work of Christ. Having nailed the 95 Theses to the church door at Wittenberg on October 31st, he blazed a path which John Calvin followed and expanded. Calvin's theological system encompassed all of life, and his worldview was carried to the new world: the French Huguenots of the Southern colonies, the Dutch colonists of Manhattan and the English Puritans of New England. Three key foundation-stones of early

American culture were laid by the ideas of Calvin and others: church liberty, universal education and the right to resistance. Let the historians speak for themselves.

"Yale historian George Fisher wrote: 'How is it, then, that Calvinism is acknowledged, even by foes, to have promoted powerfully the cause of civil liberty? The reason lies in the boundary line which it drew between church and State. Calvinism would not surrender the peculiar notions of the Church to the civil authority. Whether the church, or the Government, should regulate the administration of the Sacrament, and admit or reject the communicants, was the question which Calvin fought out with the authorities at Geneva...'. This idea was institutionalized in the Puritans of the Presbyterian Church and Congregationalist settlers on the shores of America.

"Dedication to education was the hallmark of the Reformers and the settlers in America. A mixture of local schooling initiatives and laissez-faire education formed the basis of American education. Historian Bancroft again asserts," now he said this in the early 1800s so you wouldn't be saying this today, I'm sure. "'We boast of our common schools; Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools.'

"The right to resist unlawful government was furthered by the Reformers. Dave Kopel (of the Independence Institute)," some of you may have heard him in Colorado, wrote in Liberty magazine, October 2008, 'The Reformed, that is, the Congregationalist and Presbyterian ministers played an indispensable role in inciting the American Revolution.' The great statesman John Adams bluntly acknowledged the wide-spread influences of both the 16th century French-Calvinist's work *Vindicus Contra Tyrannus*, a vindication against tyrants, and the English Calvinist work of Ponet, *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Power*," both of which we will go through in Sunday school class. "Both books defended the right of the people to rise against tyrants. Modern historians such as the Professor and Jew, Daniel Elazar of Temple University, have made similar claims, 'In all of the places where Reformed Protestantism was strong, there emerged a Protestant republicanism that opposed tyrants even as it demanded local religious conformity.'

"In fact, most of the early culture was Reformed or tied strongly to it, just read the *New England Primer*. Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, a Roman Catholic intellectual and National Review contributor, asserts, 'If we call the American statesmen of the late 18th century the Founding Fathers of the United States, then the Pilgrims and Puritans were the grandfathers and Calvin the great-grandfather.'

"'So what?' you ask. Well if we are to avoid the errors of the past, are we not also to learn from the victories of history? The least we can do is understand what the Reformation was all about and what elements were so vital to the formation of America. And perhaps, just maybe, God may grant America repentance and her former glory."

So that was a nice little summary statement I put and I'm going to publish it again this week on examiner.com. Hopefully, I won't take out examiner.com like Rocky Mountain News went down that year. That was 2008.

I have a few other things here to go over. That essay I read to you, you don't have it. You can find it online. "Lessons of the Reformation," by Mathis. I just summarized very briefly, it was a little over a page, and I have many more pages. Some of you heard this stuff. I have more new stuff for you to listen to, read to you today, but the old historians, many of the old historians I can get access to and grab ahold of, and newer historians today so it's not just them, are kind of resurgence of the last 15-20 years that I've found in the history books, and I have a number of history books talking about the religious influence of the Reformation, of Calvinism in particular. That's what they specifically list and state because in Colonial America along the East Coast, right, you had about 2 ½ million Americans during the Revolutionary War, and the northern part, as you know, were the Congregationalists. We call them Puritans sometimes but technically they are after the Puritans. They were in New England originally in the 1600s when they came to America. This is the late 1700s.

They had a Confession, the Savoy Confession, which is almost word-for-word the same as the Westminster Confession. Very much like us. And they had all kinds of Catechisms. One of the more popular ones even in New England was the Westminster Shorter Catechism and the Westminster Shorter Catechism was also put into and published along with the New England Primer. Some of you have seen the New England Primer. I have copies. I like to go over that once in a while and show you guys because it's what many Americans were trained on. Whether they believed it or not is not the point, they were in such a culture that that's where it was. Wherever they turned, they were getting not just general Christian doctrine, although that was certainly there and I am sure there were many nominal Christians at the time, but specifically Reformed and Calvinistic doctrine.

Then the middle Colonies and the southern Colonies had a lot of Presbyterians, and we know about them because we're Presbyterian. I've gone over the history of the church, I'll go over that again in a few years from now. Then in the southern Colonies from Virginia down, also had especially the Anglican establishment. They were especially stronger in the south. Of course, the south had less population density compared to the middle and northern Colonies as well.

One of the matter is, the two biggest religious groups were the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians and at that time historically, the word "Presbyterian" could mean not just narrowly the approach to government like we have church government, it could also mean as we use it sometimes to mean Reformed doctrine beyond just church government. It also could even broader could just mean those dissenters from the established Church of England. So that could include Congregationalists of New England, and possibly even Baptists, although the Baptists were a very very small minority at the time.

That's what that word could entail. That's important because I have an article here from the Journal of the American Revolution, September 5, 2013, by Dr. Richard Gardner, "The Presbyterian Rebellion?" That's what he's going to write about. I've heard this stuff. I could never verify this and so it's good to have an historian verify these quotes and he

came up with a lot more quotes than I ever knew existed because that's his job, not mine. This is what I do on the side to edify you and help others.

"Though the events transpired almost a quarter of a millenium ago, the shelves down at the local Barnes & Noble bookstore routinely continue to display freshly researched, written, and published histories of the American Revolution, the founding fathers, and the genesis of the United States. Yet there remains an element of the American founding era that is routinely underrepresented in these volumes—the role of religion. It is a factor of the Revolution that many historians minimize. The revolution, they maintain, was essentially secular in nature."

Who has heard that one? The American Revolution was essentially secular in nature? Come on. You weren't taught that in school, anybody? No. Really? The older people are like, no. The younger people are like, what are you talking about? They didn't even take time to mention it. We don't have to. By omission. You were taught it by omission. Yes, that's... That's exactly right, you can lie a lot through omission.

"But 'No understanding of the eighteenth century is possible' warned Carl Bridenbaugh." He's going to name a number of historians, just nod your head and say, "Yeah, okay." Obviously he's writing to an educated historian audience and not to us. I don't know who these historians are.

"If we unconsciously omit, or consciously jam out, the religious theme just because our own milieu is secular." We shouldn't do that. "Yet, as Kevin Phillips remarked, 'Historians and commentators in the late twentieth-century United States have shrunk from emphasizing religion in their explanations of seventeenth and eighteenth century affairs.'" He continues, "that this is a gross error insofar as 'any serious investigation of the patterns of rebellion and loyalty during the 1775-1783 fighting in the United States leads to religion.'" Any serious study of it will lead you to religion, he says.

"No one recognized this better than the foes of the American revolutionaries. Ambrose Serle, secretary to British General Howe," remember him? Maybe, maybe not, "in New York City," as he sacked New York City, "wrote to the British Secretary of State in 1776 telling him that the American Revolution was ultimately a religious war. The same assessment may be made of Charles Inglis' perspective. He had a front row seat to the entire revolution. He, too, was highly educated and erudite. He had close contacts with a large number of loyalists in the know. If anyone was a principal mouthpiece for the opinions of loyalists, Inglis was. And what did he say? 'It is absolutely certain, that on the part of many, the present is a Religious War.' Another such Tory during the war stated, 'the American controversy is closely connected with Christianity in general, and with Protestantism in particular; and that, of consequence, it is of religious as well as of a civil nature.'" Wow. Yeah. That's some serious omission from the historians that taught you guys in those well-balanced and objective schools.

"The important fact that King George III and his deputies on both sides of the Atlantic alleged that the colonial rebellion was a religious endeavor is no longer widely

publicized. A number of scholars have casually mentioned this phenomenon in passing. Kevin Phillips, in his 1998 study of the American Revolution, twice noted: 'King George III and other highly placed Britons called the colonists' rebellion a "Presbyterian War."' Historians of yesteryear were a bit more attentive to this feature. According to William H. Nelson, the belief that most of the American revolutionaries were 'congregational or presbyterian republicans,' or at least of Calvinistic temperament 'was held by almost all the Tories whose opinions survive.'" That's those in the front lines in America, the Tories. That was their opinion.

"According to the celebrated British historian of the American Revolution, George Trevelyan, in the early days of the revolution, loyalists alleged that 'political agitation against the Royal Government had been deliberately planned by Presbyterians.'" I checked the minute books of the Synod and that's not true. I lost my place.

"'It was fostered and abetted by Presbyterians in every colony.' [John C. Miller observed, 'To the end, the Churchmen believed,'" the Churchmen were those who were the pastors and leaders in the Anglican church, most of whom were Tories. "'The Churchmen believed that the Revolution was a Presbyterian-Congregationalist plot.' These references notwithstanding, historians no longer give much attention to this 'Presbyterian plot' interpretation of the revolution. In light of the abundance of evidence, such is an irresponsible oversight.

"A Hessian captain," Hessians were the Germans hired by the British army to supplement them because they didn't have enough Brits to come over to America, so they were paid mercenaries.

"A Hessian captain fighting on behalf of the British, told a friend in Germany in 1778, 'call this war, dearest friend, by whatsoever name you may, only call it not an American Revolution, it is nothing more nor less than an Irish-Scotch Presbyterian Rebellion.'" The history of the Scot-Irish rebellion against the English, Mike could probably tell you about better than I can. "Who me?" During John Knox in the 1500s and again in the 1600s when they actually went out to the king and had one civil war and then another civil war in the middle of the 1600s, and the Scots and the Irish, Scot-Irish were there, involved in it. So they have a history and their first inclination is to say, "There they go again."

"Andrew Hammond, British commander of the HMS Roebuck, arrived in America just after the Declaration of Independence had been signed by the members of the Continental Congress. At that juncture, Hammond conveyed the perspective of the Anglicans, '[I]t is the Presbyterians that have brought about this revolt, and aim at getting the government of America into their hands.'" I guess we failed at that endeavor, didn't we?

"Isaac Atkinson, a Maryland loyalist, expressed his opinion of the revolution, that 'it was a religious dispute and a Presbyterian scheme.' Thomas Smith, a supporter of the crown in Pennsylvania he held the view 'that the whole was nothing but a scheme of a parcel of hot-headed Presbyterians.'" I don't think they've ever been called hot-headed before.

"King George III was advised by William Jones in 1776, 'this has been a Presbyterian war from the beginning,'" that's what he told King George III, his adviser, "'and accordingly the first firing against the King's troops was from a Massachuset [sic] meeting house.'" So now you see his use of the word "Presbyterian" was broader than how we use it today. It would include Congregationalists. That is, the dissenters, those who don't want to be part of the established Church of England. The Presbyterians and the Congregationalists.

"Did the king agree with Jones? The evidence is overwhelming that he did.

"From the beginning of the conflict, George III was convinced that the leading New England rebels were Presbyterians. This is proven by a remark he made to Massachusetts governor Thomas Hutchinson in 1774. When discussing the nature of the American dissident leadership with his representative from Massachusetts, the king exclaimed, 'are they not Presbyterians?' The king had every reason to suspect so. A letter published in a London newspaper only a month earlier came from a royalist in New York: 'Believe me,'" he wrote in this letter in a London newspaper, "'the Presbyterians have been the chief and principal instruments in all these flaming measures, and they always do and ever will act against Government, from that restless and turbulent anti-monarchical spirit which has always distinguished them every where.'

"The king maintained this sentiment throughout the war. In 1779 Benjamin Franklin, a rather reliable source of diplomatic intelligence, stated that George III hated the American Revolutionaries because the king perceived that they were 'whigs and Presbyterians.'

"Royal sentiments in this regard permeate the documentary record. Jones was not the only source who communicated this opinion to the king. We know that the British Secretary of State, Lord Dartmouth, who certainly had the king's ear, was also urged by an intelligence agent in America to understand that 'Presbyterianism is at the bottom' of the war. The provisional governor of Rhode Island, Nicholas Cooke, was told that the revolution was a Presbyterian war, and the royal governor of Rhode Island believed it.

"Were these Tories who considered the revolution a religious plot entirely sober in these reflections? Clearly not. They, too, were participants, embroiled in the fanaticism of the conflict. Their tendency to suspect that a Presbyterian minister was hiding behind every tree, secretly orchestrating the revolution from beginning to end, is Macarthy-esque indeed. But the other extreme to which historians have gone is just as spurious. Religious and denominational dynamics were vitally central to the revolt. Historians have failed to state this as clearly as it deserves. The allegation that the American Revolution was a Presbyterian Rebellion is an important one to understand if we are to have a truly comprehensive understanding of what happened and why."

Thus wrote this historian, Dr. Richard Gardner and the Journal of the American Revolution, September 5, 2013. You can find that online. They have a website where they go over various things on the early history of the Revolution.

I can, if you remind me. Pardon? Send myself an email. Yeah, the whigs were the political conservatives of the time. They had similar ideas to the Presbyterians.

Yeah, they were Englishman. They were a certain party in the English. Yes, sir? I believe so. Very similar. It's been a while since I've looked into those political parties like that.

Any other questions? Yes, sir. Yes, ma'am. Yeah, there are a couple of books out there like that. The Scot-Irish or the Irish or the Scottish. "How the Scots invented the modern world," is one of the later books, the newest books I've seen. But, you know, they're not the only ones. There is a lot of influence. It wasn't just the Presbyterians broadly conceived as well. I mean, there were Baptist ministers that were in favor of it and they lend their support as well.

But the important point is in that section of the essay I just read and also what I read before, is that there was religious influence. We don't think of it that way today because we have such a secular religious dichotomy in the American scene and we think if it was religious, they must have quoted verse, chapter in the Bible. They didn't. Not necessarily. They believed in a thing called natural revelation where there are things that are complementary to the Bible, that you don't always have to find everything in the Bible. That's never been the position of Christians, they have to find chapter and verse for everything I believe. That's never been the position and that's important to remember because what a lot of the secularist historians today do is they say, "Look, it's the Enlightenment that influenced the American Revolution." They look at it and it's just a small cadre, right? Adams, especially Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin because, of course, they weren't Christians. One's a deist and the other one I'm finding more evidence that maybe he was a little more than a deist. Again, original resources that aren't as well known, and I like to focus on those guys because they reinforce what they already believe about this radical separation between religion and society which is different than separation of church and state. Right? Those are institutional differences, the other one is worldview influence upon each other. Of course, and the church had a tremendous influence in early America and early society in Western civilization, frankly. I mean, that's just what it was. Either that or just if Christianity wasn't there, it would have been really the serious Dark Ages because the Roman Empire fell and you had nothing to hold it up but the church, as the Barbarians were coming.

So anyways, to say all that to encourage us. Part of the reason why I do this, it encourages me to go to the history to see that God works through the church, and it has ramifications on culture. Not always. I'm not post-mill. Some of these post-mills I've run across, they like to use these quotes. They get impatient and they say, "Look, if we just did it right, we could have a great America again." I don't believe that. I think America's last days are coming but I could be wrong. Nations don't last forever. They're judged this side of eternity. Who goes to heaven, a nation or people? People go to heaven. Individuals go to heaven, not nations. There is no giving or taking in marriage and marriage is the foundation of society which itself is a foundation of politics and nations. We're going to be one nation in heaven.

So with that kind of review point, we shouldn't be hung up, "Well, it's not going to help. It's not going to work." It also has an apologetic approach to it. People want their freedom as they define it. They want kind of this mix of heavy government and libertarianism, right? That's kind of weird. Let me have my drugs and sex and the government supply everything else for me. But they don't realize where their liberty came from. They think we undercut their liberty. That's part of the argument. I already went over that in Sunday school class when I pointed out how they're coming after us and harassing us legally now saying, "You guys are a problem. You're undermining us. You're a hindrance." No, historically we're the ones that help significantly found this nation and create the laws therein, only sustained laws that were there for many many centuries.

The faith of our fathers is another way of looking at this, looking here in particular at the culture. The culture of early America. "In 1842, Judge Mellen Chamberlain interviewed 91 year old Levi Preston, a soldier at the Battle of Concord in 1775. He asked the war vet," this is the handout over here, "Faith of our Fathers." It's just a single white sheet. Not the big fancy one.

"He asked the war vet if he had fought because of the Stamp Act or the tea tax. Preston replied, 'No.'

"Then I suppose you had been reading Harrington or Sidney and Lock about the eternal principles of liberty,' Chamberlain finally asked.

"Never heard of 'em. We read only the Bible, the Catechism, Watts's Psalms and Hymns, and the Almanack.'

"Well, then, what was the matter? And what did you mean in going to the fight?'

"Young man, what we meant in going for those red-coats was this: we always had governed ourselves, and we always meant to.'

"It was not the vaulted works of Sidney or Lock that the average early American followed. It was the Bible. Early Americans were in political freedom and self-rule because they learned their Bible."

But it's not enough to say that they believed the Bible, what exactly did they believe? So here I write these as an apologetic to those who are not Reformed, who want to go back to the glory days of early America. Lots of conservatives, right? The Tea Party. What does the Tea Party want? We want to go back to early America. No, they don't. When I finish some of this stuff, you'll find out if they really knew what early America was about, many of them would not want it.

Protestants in the mold of the Puritans. Early American churches were Gospel-centered, affirming grace alone and Christ alone, at least doctrinally. The three largest denominations are the Congregationalists, the Anglicans and the Presbyterians. All three

had similar public confessions about God and man, sin and redemption. And all three, what? Baptized children.

The Anglican 39 Article summarizes part of this common confession. "The condition of Man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith; and calling upon God." Article 10. How many Tea Party people believe that? Because they want political freedom, not spiritual freedom. That's too many of their problems.

God chose "by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour." Article 17. 1808 edition. That's the 39 Articles. How many Tea Party people and conservatives who want to go back to early America want to go back to that kind of theology? If what you believe affects how you act and how you act affects your politics and I'm going back to what you believe or what they believed, at least formally on paper, how many of them really want to go back to early America? They don't. They're ignorant of what early America really believes.

And even the law, I went through the laws, the Sabbath laws. Worship twice on Sunday was commonplace. Pastors were widely honored. Sermons were best-sellers. I have lists of books published in early America in the 1770s, thereabouts. I found them online, Google books, copied them out and go through them. Pastor. Pastor. Pastor. Pastor. Pastor.

Biblical truth doctrine was taught with deep one hour sermons and those were the shorter sermons. Daily schooling and familial, that is home instruction. Theological language was as common as public days of repentance and thanksgiving. They used the word "providence." Do you know what the word "providence" means? Yeah, I hope so after many many years of being in a Presbyterian church and being taught providence. They used the word and they knew what the word meant. It was commonplace.

What was the faith of our fathers? It was belief in the pervasive simpleness of mankind. It was a trust in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. It was confidence in the all-encompassing power of God's providential control of history. As the Congress of 1776 declared, America was "publicly to acknowledge the overruling providence of God, to confess and to deplore our offense against him." This was the faith of our fathers. This is our heritage. It's not a pure heritage, again. I didn't say they all believed it, but it was taught substantially from the pulpits unlike today, and it made a difference. It made a significant difference.

They taught the Reformed faith, especially in the Congregationalist and Presbyterian circles and, as we'll go over in Sunday school class, we'll see that just war is in our Confession. Defensive wars are acceptable. It's part of the sixth commandment in the Larger Catechism. Defending yourself from harm is part of our tradition. I mean, it's there. Just because, what's interesting as well, I read another article. This is important in terms of analyzing the history because you'll hear studies where they go through and find

out all the people, the founding fathers. Again, the word "founding father" for a lot of people is like five people. You know, the big five, right? They were the only ones that did anything in the 13 Colonies, right? There were no, I don't know, governors, local assemblies? You know, you just kind of forget all those lower level people. Again, that's why I read this, "The Faith of our Fathers." This guy interviewed, he said, "I don't know what you're talking about. I just know what the pastor taught me. I read my Bible and I read the Catechism, i.e., the Shorter Catechism and songs and hymns."

One of the ministers in New England in one of the studies I had, he quotes an historian who has it in his private library so I can't get original access to it. I have to trust this historian. He says Otis, James Otis, told one of his friends in his letter. You know, we like to quote Locke and all those other guys. He's apparently, like, the number one quoted guy. So it didn't look like we were going for the real thing, which is right to resistance which the Puritans taught, he said. My summary. In other words, if we would have quoted the Puritans, they would have really gone for the roof over in England. So we quote this kind of semi-secularist. You know, he's not a religious leader or pastor. He wasn't Christian, of a sort, and we quote him and we can get by with it. That's historically significant, isn't it? That's astounding because I've already asserted they quote Locke, but Locke through his evidence was influenced anyways. What he wrote came after people like Milton and Rutherford who wrote almost the same kind of language that he has.

So anyways, let me go ahead and read lastly here, no minister is no fourth of July here in this big fancy... I designed these a couple of years ago for conferences and my idea was this is my specialty, besides the Bible obviously. I thought historicity was a good way to get people to think about doctrine. You can quote a Bible verse and you get an argument and people aren't interested, but you quote some history and go, "Oh, hey, did you know John Adams believed in providence?" "No, what's providence?" "Did you know Noah Webster was a Calvinist?" "Whoa, a Calvinist. Really?" Say who? That's possible too.

Pardon? Ah, there were two of them. They were not related. No, this is the one about Websters... No, that's what I said, Noah Webster. What did I say? Noah Webster. There's another gentleman who was the New England senator. Yeah, I can't remember his... Pardon? Yeah, Daniel Webster. Yeah. Yup, Noah Webster is the one that wrote the Webster's Dictionary. Yes. He was raised Reformed, yes. A long time.

Oh yeah, I went over that in Sunday school class once, because you brought it up and so I read some of his conversion story, that he wrote in a newspaper in 1808 or 1809, about the same time as the anniversary of Calvin, and he said, "You know, my wife and children would go to the worship services and they were excited and they were converted and they're talking about the Gospel and I just thought it was just sentimentalism, emotionalism. I believed in a rational relationship of doing good works." Then he was converted. He found out all that he believed was wrong and it was all good works oriented as opposed to Christ oriented.

The Blue Back Speller, some of you have heard of that and like to promote that. That was his preconversion book and it shows. There is nothing about the Gospel in it. I've looked

through it. I've done a word study online and you can't find the Gospel in that book because he didn't believe in the Gospel. That's why someone like ?? and we're like, "Hey, it's a wonderful Christ-centered book." That's how they describe it. "It's a wonderful Christ-centered." There is no Christ in this book. You're just selling nostalgia and fake history because it seems so wonderful and great. Don't get me down there. Okay.

"Many Christians are aware of the Christian foundations of America. Some of you even know about the many Christian laws throughout the land, yet few know that such a Christian culture roots your ?? in the power of the Bible through the preachers of the Gospel. New England boasted of her yearly election day sermons, Presbyterians taught the right to resist tyrants and the schools taught the Reformed catechisms. Ministers, considered the most trained, godly and intelligent element of society, preached twice on Sunday, lectured during the week, taught schools and catechized children. Their advise was liberally solicited. Their sermons nation-wide sellers. Their influence was tremendous. For generations, they faithfully taught the definition of a godly government and a holy electorate. And they uniformly instructed their listeners about the sovereignty of God and the depravity of man, applying those truths to the politics of their day.

"While the super-minority upper-crust intellectuals, like Jefferson, abstracted and debated amongst themselves, the pastors in the pews laid the path to freedom by popularizing these truths. Unlike today the vast majority of colonists attended church, while many of their children were taught in Christian schools or by ministerial tutors." It was from the pulpit that citizens learned of their God-given rights and they learned their lesson well.

"In fact, on May 20, 1775, the Presbyterian Synod was the first religious body to publicly support the Continental Congress, warning their members to prepare their lives and souls for war. Most of the Continental army were Presbyterian laymen even as most of the New England minutemen were Congregationalists. These ministers--defending the Revolution or even fighting in it--were dubbed the 'Black Regiment.' The churches would turn in the barns damaged or even burned down. Some were hunted by the British. Horace Walpole told Parliament that 'there is no use crying about it. Cousin America has run off with a Presbyterian parson, and that is the end of it.'

"Ministers were at the forefront of political freedom. Many conservative Christians are becoming increasingly alarmed by the rise of American heathenism. They wish to bring back the good ol'e days," think ??, "but without the virtues that nurtured them, without the churches that sustained it. Yet if the church is the pillar and foundation of the truth, then it must be a necessary institution in any Christian society." The church is the pillar and foundational truth, brothers and sisters, 1 Timothy 3:15, Jesus Christ being the chief cornerstone, of course. And it must be a necessary institute in any Christian society.

"And if the churches wish to be leaven in such a corrupt society as today, they must stand firm in the truth without being carried away by every wind of doctrine. The citizens of America must be instructed by strong and faithful men of God, ministers who are called to help perfect the saints with reformational truth."

And that's my stance, not that I believe we can go back to the glory days. It wasn't a glorious day. A lot of things we would disagree with, although in terms of law, in terms of culture, I can live under it and agree with a lot of it compared with what we seem to have today, even without all the prosperity. I'd rather be with a godly and poor than the rich and wicked.

Yes, George? ??

Yes, Bruce? Reprints. I have more originals back there. I made, like, 1,000 of them was it, George? Okay, remind me there is a box back there behind the door.

You know, again, this is to tantalize people to think about what they believe and how doctrine influences politics. If God permits. I mean, right now we're obviously not doing a lot of influence and that's funny. We shouldn't be in despair, "Oh, it's the end of the world! What are we going to do?" We're going to be faithful by God's grace and do what we can. If we're persecuted all the more, praise God. I mean, that's what he said. We count it all joy to be persecuted for Christ's name's sake. We need to start thinking that way, at the same time promote the Gospel truth and his law.

Any other questions? Yes, sir. It's talking about the Tea Party, okay? Yes, that's what most of our social, political and conservative institutions, even. They go after the symptoms, not the root. The root is there is very little Gospel being preached in the churches today, brothers and sisters. People want freedom. The conservatives have a different definition of freedom than the liberals, that's true, but a Christian has a fundamentally different definition than everybody. It's freedom from sin but freedom to obey God. It starts in the churches, brothers. We believe the church is a leaven in society. What does that mean? For a lot of evangelicals, unfortunately, it means, "Me, myself and my Bible." No, God in particular meant not only but of course especially the instituted church, the church as an organization because it's through the preaching of the word especially that God brings many sinners to salvation. And we have a very low view of the church, a low view of pastors, and especially a low view of the Gospel and a high view of man. That's the fundamental problem, I believe.

Yes? Certainly a lot of libertarians want license, yes. I can't say all of them. I know there are Christian libertarians who would argue out of principle, I don't think they would argue, I want to sin. There would be a problem there. But yeah, I think there's a lot of that too. We're a big hodge-podge mess. I'm not trying to give you answers on who to vote for or anything like that. I'm saying we need to sometimes take a big deep breath, back up and look at the deeper substantial issues. We have to be people who know the times and the times have always been sinful and confusing, even, but it always goes back to the Gospel. This world is fleeting. It's going to go away. We can lose all the next 20-30 years of elections. We shouldn't be disheartened and fall apart because of it and be angry. There is so much anger in politics on both sides.

Yes, Bruce? Maybe. That's a maybe.

Let's go ahead and pray.

Glorious God Almighty, you who are the Father of all rights, the Father of freedom, freedom in Jesus Christ. We cannot come to you except for Jesus Christ and that by faith alone and may we be encouraged and renewed in such a truth. May we use this knowledge that we have, Lord, wisely to help those who are perhaps confused about the role of Christianity in society historically and maybe even today, but especially confused about the Gospel, confusing it with the law, even, Lord, as I've heard a number of times in my life as I've done myself. So precious Lord, give us strength, strengthen your church and, Lord, even if you use persecution which seems most likely to be the case, Lord, as we've seen historically that's what you do, to purge your church and strengthen your church, Lord, may we stand firm on the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit within us. Amen.

I. Submission (Days 5-6)

A. Fifth Commandment

B. In General

1. Toward God:

a) James 4:7: Therefore submit to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you.

b) Antithesis: submit vs. resist.

c) Submission to God is no excuse not to submit to others: it is all that God commands, through His Word, through the light of nature, through earthly authorities, such as parents and magistrates.

d) Submission in general but not in every particular:

(1) Resistance to Devil is no excuse not to resist others: it is resist devil ,devil's ploys, devil's minions, devil's temptations--
LCQ99: 6. That under one sin or duty, all of the same kind are forbidden or commanded; together with all the causes, means, occasions, and appearances thereof, and provocations thereunto.
[432]

2. Toward Each Other:

a) Ephesians 5:21: submitting to one another in the fear of God.

b) 1 Peter 5:5: Likewise you younger people, submit yourselves to your elders. Yes, all of you be submissive to one another, and be clothed with humility, for "God resists the proud, But gives grace to the humble."

C. In Particular: Submission toward the World]

1. Romans 12:18 If it is possible, as much as depends on you, live peaceably with all men.

a) What is "possible" ? More than you may think.

2. Matthew 5:39 "But I tell you not to resist an evil person. But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also. "If anyone wants to sue you and take away your tunic, let him have your cloak also. And whoever compels you to go one mile, go with him two.

3. **Matthew 17:24-27: Freedom without Offending:**

a) **24** *When they had come to Capernaum, those who received the temple tax came to Peter and said, "Does your Teacher not pay the temple tax?" 25* He said, "Yes." *And when he had come into the house, Jesus anticipated him, saying, "What do you think, Simon? From whom do the kings of the earth take customs or taxes, from their sons or from strangers?" 26* Peter said to Him, "From strangers." *Jesus said to him, "Then the sons are free. 27* "Nevertheless, lest we offend them, go to the sea, cast in a hook, and take the fish that comes up first. And when you have opened its mouth, you will find a piece of money; take that and give it to them for Me and you."

b) *Freedom is not a cloak for sin*

4. **Matthew 22:14-22: Submission without Offending**

a) **Context: Wedding Garment Parable offended the Pharisees:**
"many are called but few are chosen"

b) **Purpose: v.15:** *Then the Pharisees went and plotted how they might entangle Him in His talk. Political overtones: Jesus' disciples thought in terms of political kingdom; Jews' thought in terms of political kingdom.*

(1) Luke 23:2 And they began to accuse Him, saying, "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to pay taxes to Caesar, saying that He Himself is Christ, a King."

c) **Persons: v.16:** *sent a disciple (man-in-training) and Herodians: disciple to hide true intent; Herodian to bring a witness for rebellious language.*

d) **Method: Preparation: v.16:** *battering up and setting up: "teacher" are and speaks "truth"; indifferent to opinions and positions of men.*

e) **Method: Question: v.17:** *Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?*

(1) If not, then Herodians witness of his rebellion and would turn him in.

(2) If yes, then disciples of Pharisees would have ammunition against him as a "true" teachers: to pay taxes to Caesar is to acknowledge his authority; but his authority is illegitimate.

f) **Response: vs.18-22:** *Jesus knew their "false dilemma" and their intent and their hypocrisy*

(1) Hypocrisy implies that they are claiming one thing but doing another they denounce;

(2) Thus: they violate one of the parts of the dilemma: probably both.

g) Proof: Tax money for Caesar came from the disciples themselves!

(1) Inscription of Caesar is proof of his authority

(2) Inscription and possession of and use thereof proof of Pharisees submission to his authority.

h) Principle: v.21: Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.

(1) From a particular to a general principle: rendering taxes to rendering all relevant things

(2) Relative rendering and not absolute: Caesar cannot claim that which is God's.

i) Question: what is Caesar's and what is God's? Jesus does not answer b/c he assumed OT theology

5. 1 Peter 2:11-20: Submission for Witnessing

a) Purpose of Book: Comfort and Guide Christians during time of physical and legal persecution

b) Historical context: none-approved religion in Rome; no known political leaders to protect them

c) Immediate Context: Live such that your actions glorify God before unbelievers

d) First Reason: v.11: As sojourners and pilgrims in life, resist sin and live upright: temptation is of this world but you are not of this world.

e) Second Reason: v.12: [external relation]: In order that unbelievers see your good works

f) First Conclusion: v.13, 14: Submit

(1) Every [type] of ordinance of man: Give to Caesar what is Caesar's

(2) [Cannot be every particular ordinance b/c some are forbidden by God]

- (3) Every [type] of ruler: kings, governors, others
- (4) Function of rulers: punishment of evildoers; praise of the good
- (5) Author of rulers: "sent by Him"; Friberg: "pempw focuses rather on the sender who is being represented and on the act of sending"

g) Second Reason: v.15: [external relation]: Live such that the unbeliever is silenced

h) Mode: v.16: As freeman from sin, but servants of God's liberty [contra antinomianism, cp. Rom. 6]

i) Second Conclusion: General: v.17: Honor everyone.

- (1) Particular: v.18, 19: Submit to masters [latter verses]
- (2) Servant [oikatas]: domestic servant; household worker [cp. Acts 10:7]
- (3) Master [despot]: esp. a domestic leader
- (4) Good Type of master: good and gentle
- (5) Bad Type of master: [evil] and harsh; opposites: unjust, unfair, overly strict
- (6) Mode [v.19]: suffering/endure injustice for good

j) Third Reason [for second conclusion]: v20: Take wrongful punishment patiently

- (1) kolafi,zw: lit. as beating or striking w. the fist box on the ear, cuff, buffet (MT 26.67); gener. treat roughly, ill-treat (1C 4.11).
- (2) patiently/endure [suffer in v.19]

k) Fourth Reason [vs.21-24]: Obedience and Suffering of Christ as example to follow. Christ turned the other cheek and "committed himself to Him who judges righteously."

l) Principle: First state of conditions for a Christian is submission, even to abusive masters.

6. Romans 13: 1-7: Submission for Wrath and Conscience's sake:

a) Purpose of Book : Teach the Gospel and reinforce Gospel duties

b) Historical Context: A people without political and legal representation

c) Immediate Context: Duty of submission to earthly political authorities; likely to rebuff antinomian tendencies (cp. Rom. 3:8; 6:1, 15)

(1) Buchanan suggests that this was written against antinomians

(2) Internal evidence: 3:8; 6:1, 15.

d) Command: v.1a: Subject yourself to governing authorities

(1) Submit [hypotássō]: submit, obey, subject oneself [same as 1 Peter]

(2) Examples: Disciples called to submit to Pharisees but ignore their hypocrisy [Mat. 23]

e) First Reason: v.1b: All authority is from God; and all [earthly] authority is appointed by God [Lk. 7:1]

f) First Conclusion: v.2a: Therefore do not resist. If all earthly authority is from God and is appointed by God, and God should not be resisted and anyone appointed by God should not be resisted because their appointment presupposes real authority given by God.

(1) Ordinance: Friberg: how a matter has been arranged.

(2) (Eph. 6:5, 7 [obey earthly masters "just as you would obey Christ"])

g) Second Conclusion: v.2b: Resistance brings judgment. Because resistance to an authority of God is sinful. And sin brings punishment.

h) Second Reason [to submit]: 3a: Rulers are a terror to evil, not good works.

(1) For [gar]: continuity and support of the argument

i) First Motivation: 3b: Do you want to live without fear? Do good and receive praise

j) Third Reason: 4a: God's minister to you for [your] good.

(1) Minister [διάκονος]: servant [cp. v.1]

(2) For [the] good: of the community but especially "to you"

(3) Cp: to lead "a tranquil and quiet life in all gravity and godliness" (1 Tim. 2:2).

k) Second Motivation: 4b: Doing evil should bring fear because the magistrate will punish.

(1) Sword: Clearly a metaphor for punishment in general, death in particular [metonymy] (cp. Gen. 9:6)

l) Fourth Reason [sub-reason]: 4c: God's minister's are called to avenge wrath on evil

(1) Avenger of God: to vindicate God's judgment upon evil-doers

m) Third Conclusion: [New addition]: v.5a: Be subject to rulers for conscience's sake

(1) Therefore [dio]: new line of inquiry in this section.

(2) Negative: Not only for fear of punishment [v.3b, 4b]

(3) Conscience sake: One's conscience should be under God's rule; thus, for "conscience's sake" is short-hand for obedience before God. God set the rulers, so I must obey for His sake not their sake as such (cp. Acts 23:1; 1 Tim. 1:5).

(4) Paying taxes: tribute paid to a foreign ruler [Kittle]; this is done for "conscience's sake" not merely out of fear.

n) Fifth Reason: v.5b: Because they are God's servants

(1) Attending continually to their duty, specifically taking taxes

o) Fourth Conclusion: v.6a: Render to all their [just] due:

(1) Paying taxes (a particular case of submission) is a synecdoche (part of the whole): any kind of tribute, hence the short (not exhaustive) list.

p) Overview: Obey the civil magistrate because his duty is to punish evil. You should do good lest you be punished by him.