

## Resistance to Government 8

*Life in Post-Christian America*

By Shawn Mathis

sermonaudio.com

**Bible Text:** Romans 13  
**Preached on:** Sunday, December 17, 2017

Meets at:

**Chapel of SDA**

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

**Website:** [www.denverprovidence.org](http://www.denverprovidence.org)  
**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/denverprovidence](http://www.sermonaudio.com/denverprovidence)

Again, the title is chosen to express both how far we can go and should go as Christians to submit to even things we consider unjust and wicked, to some extent, and then when that line is crossed, then what we should do against such wicked government if it gets bad enough. Of course, it's theoretical at this point. I'm not suggesting that we're there or even half-way there, although we are slowly moving in that direction. It's been accelerated the last 50 years or so with the overt reduction of America.

I had 17, I just kind of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Okay, sorry. Yeah, there are a couple of single people that are part of a family. I keep thinking...sorry. Well, yeah, I'll try, but then I do 25 and 15 or 12 show up, which has happened before and I have all these extras. I'll try. Just part of me hates making all that paper and throwing it away or having it build up in my room. Scrap paper? Okay, I'll send it to your house. Yeah, I print both sides. That's why I got a duplex so I can be efficient with my paper. Paper mache. Okay.

The first one, we have three we're covering today or four. I'm going to summarize the fourth one, a very popular one you can have access to on the internet. You can even buy the book. These are harder to find. Buchanan's "De Jure Regni Apud Scotus," I'm not even going to try to pronounce the Latin. It means "The Powers of the Crown in Scotland." Published in 1579. Written in 1568. This is on the first page. Form of a dialog between two friends. Written for Prince James, as in King James before he became king. So this is Buchanan, a Calvinist minister in the Church of England. He wrote this out to teach the king how to be a king. He was his tutor. He was the prince's tutor.

This is the background. The Murder of Darnley and abduction of Mary, Queen of Scots at the time. The imaginary person, Maitland, is concerned to maintain some authority of the king during this time of turmoil and people being upset and saying, "We need to stop this and go after the government."

This book, this booklet or pamphlet, was condemned by Parliament. They considered it a dangerous talk. In 1584, 1664, some of you recognize that's around the time of King Charles I and the like and the first and second civil war of England, and then 1688, the

glorious revolution. So these map the times of discontent and the government's concern that we don't pass on information like this that can encourage people to rise up against us.

The thesis in general, "trace, from the beginnings, the rights and respective powers of the king and of citizens." In particular, chapter 2, he says, "Rulers may properly be held accountable for their acts." He says, "It follows," first point, "therefore, that he who explains the origin and the cause of creation of legitimate government, and shows what are the duties of rulers with respect to their people and of people with respect to their rulers, will, in the same explanation, make clear, by contraries, the nature of tyranny." So if you can determine the origin of government, then therefore its limits and its nature, the nature of government, then you determine the nature of tyranny, which makes logical sense. We have a similar thing when we argue against evolutionists. You can determine the nature of man by his origin and who makes him, then we determine who man is and what society is and the limits thereof and, of course, they say, "No, he's made by creation not by God so he's determined by creation either by nurture or nature or something inside of creation determines what we think is right or wrong about man." Hence, progressive liberalism has run amok with evolutionary theory in their view of the origin of man or views, plural.

The next point here is he argues that there is such a thing called the law of nature. The Confession talks about the light of nature in chapter 1 and elsewhere, that is, things that are true that man knows intuitively because he's made in the image of God, he doesn't have to read the Bible to know that murder is wrong, for instance, or thievery is wrong. All kinds of societies who never had contact with Jews had laws against thievery and murder, etc. Of course, they weren't perfect laws, they made exceptions at times kind of like today, people make themselves exceptions and put loopholes in the laws for the rich or the powerful or the famous. That's always been the problem on history not only for unbelieving societies or pagan societies, is the word he would use, pagans, but even a Christian society.

As he says and he quotes one jurist and he quotes another jurist later, John of Salisbury, a Christian writer in the late medieval ages, "Nature never says one thing and reason the contrary." And he'll even say nature is not contrary to the word of God.

Then he concludes down here, then, Maitland says so, "This is to say you think that God not some orator or lawyer who brought man together, is the author of human association, the author of society, the author of politics." Well, of course that's what he's saying. He's saying it's God, it's not merely a lawyer or a man or a constitutional lawyer like we have in the progressives at times, as our President was a Constitutional instructor of law, and we already know his view of the Constitution, it's malleable. He even says so in his book and I've given you that quote at the beginning of this class, hence, further evidence of our society going towards the direction of relativism and the like.

He argues a little later, of course, that, "I'm not interested in defining what is the right government and what is a just government. As long as the government is put in place that

tries to maintain justice, I'm happy with that." And that's a common theme in a lot of these writers, early on anyway.

He says in the second page in a summary fashion of what he's going to say and what he will say and this is important to remember as you go through this. You might see a pattern. I'm curious if anybody sees this at the end of Buchanan when we finish this section. You can probably see it here.

Buchanan: "First, it was agreed between us," him and the imaginary speaker, Maitland, from across in the continent, "It was agreed between us that men were by nature, created for society, and for the sharing of life." And Buchanan said, "And that, as guardian of this society, a king, a man, eminent for his high character, is chosen. And, just as strife between men has led to the necessity of creation kings, so the injuries inflicted by king on their subjects were the occasion of our wishing to have laws... And we regard the laws as a pattern for the art of government, just as the principles of medicine are for the physician's art." So he's saying you have man by nature and, of course, man fell and man fell so you have all these problems, you have government. One of the things that happened historically is you had kings. It was the easiest thing to grab a man with wisdom and he would typically gather around himself administrators and those who would assist him in his rule and the like, and he would stop the grievances between people. But even then, that king, a lot of times they were tyrants in the pagan world, the Oriental world, as you know, Nebuchadnezzar and the like and Pharaoh. If they didn't like you, off with your head. They started making not just the Jews, by the way, other societies had some laws restricting the kings. He says this is commonplace, this is an historical fact. I'm explaining this to you because I'm a student of history and I know these things. He does go through the details of history to some extent, a larger extent later on in his book. So therefore we make these laws to limit the rule of the kings and we regard the law as a pattern for the art of government.

He's arguing against, and you'll see this as a common pattern in a lot of these, against absolute authority of the king which was on the rise during this time in the 1500s and 1400-1500s. Henry VIII, and the like, that's kind of what they were pushing for. James I did that a lot. He said, "Hey, I'm king. What I say goes." That was not the common understanding. It was actually increasing. They were pushing and pressuring during the time of the Reformation, "We want more authority as kings," and the people said, "No," that is, the lesser magistrates fought against that. Then they sense, you already had a layer of authority, those with land, had money and influence and they had judges in the land, as we know. King John was restricted by the rich landowners which became rulers of some sort. The Magna Carta saying, "Hey, look what you did. We're tired of this. We're going to hold you back." It's always been a struggle but it was really pushed. Again, it was interesting historically during this time of their writing, absolute authority of the king contrary to Christian understanding, and that is the history of Christianity in medieval ages onward. It was culminated, of course, with King Louis XVI in the 1600s. He was just, "I'm the head of everybody. I'm the greatest. Listen to me."

He continues here quoting, you'll again find this in their writings. These are learned men and learned men back then didn't just read the Bible. There's an interesting in some Christian conservative circles, this naive view that, "Hey, if we just had the Bible and we're on a desert island, everything would be okay." No, you have the law of nature. The Bible doesn't talk about a lot of things that we do in life, a lot of laws and particular applications of the law you can't find or trace explicitly to the Bible, and activities and customs that we do because that's not the design of the Bible. It's not a law book in the sense of the IRS code or the federal codes that take up rows and rows and storage houses because they try to cover every conceivable thing. No, it's mostly a story of redemption, isn't it?

So he quotes Cicero, the great Roman Orator, "The public welfare is the supreme law," that is, in terms of politics and society, and we have that today. Now, the first thing you may realize, of course, is what does that mean in particular? It sounds kind of good but what does that mean in particular? That's the debate. The Christians will have a different definition of welfare than, I don't know, say, the modern liberal progressives. They'll argue the same thing. This is good for society. So we're following the general principle that comes that was strengthened, and Cicero said it without reading the Bible, that will strengthen the Christian tradition. They said, "Yes, that's true. We're going to follow that principle."

He adds a little section here in E, he says, "A little while ago we agreed that no law can take every contingency so clearly into account that evil minds can make no opening for trickery." Did you catch that? You can't make enough laws to stop wickedness. Conservatives need to learn that lesson as well as liberals. Big Gulp liberals of New York or other conservatives who think they can try to, I don't know, outlaw obesity or something. Well, alcohol, right, during prohibition, they were trying to stop wickedness with more law.

He continues on in the next section, Maitland in G asks, "What if the people were defrauded by trickery or compelled by fear and put themselves into slavery with this king and with these leaders?" And he argues in classical law, no covenant is absolute. If you were brought into an agreement by fraud, it's not an agreement anymore. We have that in our society. If someone lied to you, we don't care if it's a contract, it's a contract written as a fraud under lying conditions. We have similar laws today, Lemon Laws for cars. The assumption is that the car is good enough under normal inspection, we don't just sell broken cars that are going to fall apart in 24 hours. That kind of thing. That's based upon this general idea, even an unbelieving society, is that a contract is only as good as the intent behind it. If your intent was to deceive and lie and to give a false product, you've been lied to, deceived, and that covenant or contract is broken. He makes the same analogy and says if that's what happened to the people, if that's what happens to the state with the governor, with their judges, with their sheriffs, then they're no longer bound to follow him because he's broken the contract, the covenant. He's lied.

So this is interesting here, he makes a lot of arguments by analogy as other ones do. Arguments by analogy work if the person you're talking to already has some

commonality with you and what you're talking about. When we talk to progressive liberals, you don't think they believe that if you lie and give a false promise and a contract or your product that you sell, that you shouldn't be able to get your money back? Of course they do, unless it's the President, apparently. But yeah, they believe it if it happens to them. You don't think if the President was lied to like that, he wouldn't be a little upset? Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Even pagans know that. Of course, they always make exceptions to themselves but make sure other people follow God's law.

So being defrauded by trickery and the like, the example he uses, orphans, and this they allow most liberally to orphans and to other persons who they think ought to be protected by God's law. There was a problem back then, he said, and we know the law says you shouldn't do that and try to trick, confuse weak-minded people, orphans who are scared. "What am I going to do? Where am I going to go?" That's wrong. That's wicked.

He continues in section H, my H, "For as Chrysostom says," a golden tongue in the epistle to the Romans, he says, "Paul is not writing of tyrants but of true and lawfully appointed rulers who are God's true vice-regents on earth. Anyone who resists them does indeed resist God's ordinances." So he's arguing it's not just me who interprets Romans 13 in the sense of God describing upright rulers and not tyrants, even a church father way back, I think he was 400-500s, even he agrees with my interpretations. So it's part of Christian history in that sense, which is a strong argument for conservatives. Conservatives are those who wish to conserve tradition or at the very least by default the tradition is true unless you can prove it wrong.

He talks some about Romans 13 and 1 Peter and the like and I'm going to go over in detail those in the third day. This is our first day, and the next day I'm going to cover other writers and their arguments as well, and then we'll go over counter arguments.

He explains Romans 13 and Jeremiah, for instance, when they are in captivity in Babylon and God says pray for the peace of Babylon. Don't fight against them. He says, of course, that's a good godly device because, 1: they're captive. 2. They're surrounded. 3. They're out-manned. 4. They're out-gunned. I mean, what other advice would be given unless God promises them and God has promised Israel at times, didn't he? I don't care if you're outnumber 10 to 1, rise up and fight against them and you're going to win. In this case, a prophet comes to them and says, "Don't fight. Submit to the punishment of God." That's an argument later, I think it was by him or someone else that, "Hey, if we had special revelation from God telling us to do that, we ought to obey too." But short of that, common sense, if you're out-gunned and the like, of course, you should submit and if God tells you one thing or another, then you ought to obey it if you have a prophet, but we have neither and the circumstances if they are alike, we're out-gunned, we've been invaded, we're out-manned, then you're not going to fight. That's silly. Live under some peace if you can. They had a lot of peace in Babylon to a large extent. So that's an interesting take on parallels and circumstances of the culture, not just reading a text in the bold face but realizing it's written in a situation of time and space.

He points out, of course again, the Bible is not a law book like the federal government and so that you can't go to the Bible and say, "If I don't find precedent for this in the Bible, I can't do this." And he admits freely, "I cannot find precedent explicitly in Holy Scripture that commands us explicitly and directly of a king punished by his subjects the way I'm talking about, but then the Bible doesn't say about a lot of things in particular." It's just the nature of the Bible. It's not there to say a lot of things particular. God's given you a brain and common revelation or natural law.

He continues and I'll read this section K, page 3, K, "There is, then, a mutual compact," he argues, "between king and citizens and if this is the case, does not he who first withdraws from the covenant or does something contrary to the agreement break the covenant and the agreement?" He's arguing thus the king, if he breaks his contract with the people, does something wicked contrary to what they agreed to, then it's sufficiently broken and we can ignore him, take him, arrest him, as the case may be. So he's arguing, again, from contract law like he did with the orphans and the like, what if we come under a false understanding of our agreement, and he says it's broken. That's what happens in marriages. That's what happens in contracts and the like. They allowed in Geneva, for instance, that if they were married under false premises, you can divorce. Did you know that? Which makes sense if you understand the background of Roman Catholicism which looks at marriage as a sacrament. You don't want to have a divorce if it's a sacrament. That's a terrible thing in that context, but it's not a sacrament. It's part of nature.

L, "But once a just war is undertaken with an enemy," so he's arguing by analogy again, "it is not only right for the whole people to destroy an enemy, but for the individual to do so." You don't sit there and say, "Hey, we're at war with Canada," God forbid, they invade us and you sit there and go, "Oh, I can't fight you. I have to wait for the army to come over here." No, we're all at war. And I thought that was quite interesting there as well. Of course, if a tyrant is at war with his people and takes armies and goes after them, they too can defend themselves even as individuals.

He points out that de facto rulers aren't inherently wrong. I would mention de facto means by fact. We grow up in a society, for instance, that has a king who came in by cunning and lying, well, that may be the case but if he's ruling well. He gives historical examples of those who were excellent and right in their government but they came to the government wrong. That's not the end of the world. This is where you are now, accept it.

Then lastly he points out in N that it takes a lot of wisdom to know when to resist and fight the government and it shouldn't be done carelessly.

That's Buchanan in summary fashion highlighting some of the arguments for you to consider and think. You can read those later and we can go over those. Again, I have the last two days with questions and answers and the like.

Ponet, Bishop Ponet, Bishop of Rochester. Written in 1556. A historico-theoretical grounding of political power. He uses biblical, logical, historical and rhetorical arguments, of course.

He starts out with a more logically orderly fashion on page 4. He talks about the law of nature. We saw that in Buchanan as well. This is an important theme for all of them, that there was a law of nature and then it was plain unto man, sometimes we call it common sense. I like to use the word sanctified common sense when a Christian uses it. But of course, man fell. His mind was defiled by sin, filled with darkness and encumbered with many doubts and then God set this rule forth, that is the rule of natural law, in the 10 Commandments because they're not different. God doesn't have two different laws. It's now explicit and clear because man has fallen.

He needs that so, of course, God gave it to Israel and the church and he says this is summarized, the 10 Commandments are summarized by Christ himself, of course, "Whatever you would have done unto yourself, do that unto others." And this is a common rule and a touchstone for all laws, he says. And I used the example of Obama's lie about Obamacare. It's convenient and okay for him because he's exempted from the law anyways, right? The House and the Congress are. But of course, you just use the principle whatsoever you would have done unto you, do unto others, he would not want people lying to him and giving him a false product, thus what he did was wrong even without going to the 10 Commandments and quoting verse, chapter and book.

He grounds government and law in the Noahic covenant. By this ordinance and law, he instituted political power and gave authority to men to make more laws, or he instituted political power and gave authority to men to make more laws because if you can make laws to kill a man, that is execute them, then you can make lesser laws with lesser punishment. So it's an argument from the greater to the lesser packed very tightly here.

He says, again like Buchanan, not interested in the types of government, whether they be a democracy, aristocracy or mixed government, is the phrase that he used. Calvin uses that phrase as well. Many rulers, a little bit of rulers, one ruler. Monarchy, that's the third one.

But tyrants, anyways, he continues on here in D, an example of tyrants and how God punishes people, that whole section D there you can read, God punishes people with tyrants. When the people are wicked, people forsake God, in other words, they start acting evilly or wickedly, God says, "Fine. You're going to have a tyrant." And that makes sense if you step back and realize, oh, there is a cause and effect, although not always 1 to 1. We have to remember that and God's mercy is great and everlasting.

There is a general cause and effect and when people are wicked what are they going to do? They're going to vote for wicked people to reinforce their own wickedness. We've seen that. We've seen that the last 50 years, especially in America. You're like, "Why are all these politicians lying?" Because people themselves lie. It doesn't bother them. Why are they voting for these people who want homosexuals? Because they, themselves, live in adultery for generations now, which is just one step... I mean, homosexuality is a form of adultery in one sense or fornication, depending if they're married or not. And they're already doing it in one sex, they just want to do it with another. It's a way of justifying

themselves. Man isn't created that way. That's why I highlighted that in Romans 1:18 and following at the end there in verse 32, I think it was, and they make excuses for one another, excusing one another, it says, for all these sins, and one way you can excuse yourself is by voting a ruler in and saying, "Hey, look, I'm good now. He justifies my position." That's human psychology according to Romans 1, don't forget that.

Here, E, top of page 5, "For the whole Decalogue and every part thereof is written as well to kings, princes, and other public persons, as it is to private persons." That's an important point. The 10 Commandments are written to everybody. "A king may no more commit idolatry than a private man: he may not take the name of God in vain, he may not break the Sabbath, no more than any private man." Or what else shall we add? He cannot murder. He cannot lie. "No, he is bound and charged under great pains to keep them more than any other," actually, "because he is both a private man in respect of his own person, and a public figure in respect to his office." That's why we do the same thing in the church, we don't just pick anybody to be a ruler in the church. He has to have such a reputation that even the unbelievers don't speak badly of him, as it were, and the same with any public office. As a reminder, of course, he's writing in a Christian context. He's writing in a world. In a Western civilization, you're a particular that was ostensibly Christian.

So a lot of his arguments make sense in a Christian context but where are we today? We are in a post-Christian context, a post-Christian America in a very real sense, at least more and more so socially, culturally, politically and legally with the increasing legal harassments of Christians today in America. They don't think that way. They have different assumptions and approaches to things. They use some of our language, to be sure, but it's going to take other ways to convince them if they have legal arguments.

He points out Romans 13, section G, "the ordinance being godly," that is the magistrate, "the man may be evil and not of God, nor come there by God, as the prophet Hosea says, 'They have made themselves a king and not through me, a prince and not through my counsel or will.'" In other words he's saying Romans 13 is talking about the office, not the person and if the person is wicked, then he's wicked. Just because he has the office doesn't make him inherently good. As you recall, we looked a little bit at Romans 13 in terms of submission, it calls us to be submissive, that's the default position, social default position and, in fact, it's the social moral position for everybody, and Christians in particular, because you're born under submission to your parents, under submission to your church, under submission to society and its laws.

But what's there, he says in particular Romans 13, is what? God has made the magistrate to punish evil and to reward the good and he's pointing out what happens if you have a wicked man who is not rewarding the good, does that nullify his office? It doesn't nullify his office, it nullifies him and you'll have an argument later on from some of these men that, therefore, now he's a private citizen and no longer a public figure and, thus, he can be removed easily.



He argues in H, I don't read all these as you know, that it's not unlimited power and authority given to them by God, again as some of the people were trying to claim for their kings at the time. Sometimes we kind of get that today. We don't have kings, it doesn't mean the government or parts of the government can't say, "Hey, I can do more than what's normally allowed because I'm the government. It's me. Trust me." All it takes is one public lie without proper repentance and they're not trustworthy anymore and unfortunately, I dare say, since we put up with a lot of it in churches, why wouldn't we put up with it in politics? We had Haggard. He got caught and five years later he becomes a pastor again. It was that quick, he's no longer a homosexual, he's no longer doing drugs and he's an upright leader. Of course, now his church, it turned out, was a little more liberal than last time. Still down in the Springs, the new church. But that is a society issue. I mean, this of course, could go on longer. You know, what kind of influence has the church had on society, how sinful has the church and how weak, how lackadaisical? What do they put up with in their own church? Are they going to put up with leaders saying all kinds of things to them, spiritually abusing them, binding them with their own laws instead of God's laws, i.e. legalism? What are they going to put up with in politics? And they do, a lot of people do, unfortunately. Of course, a lot of people are consistent, praise God. They'll put up with less in politics than they will in the church. It's really kind of strange. The church deals a lot more with your soul than politics the last I checked.

J, don't do evil even if commanded. Again, he was talking to an audience, apparently these sycophants or whatever around the king were saying, "Hey, even if a king tells you to go over here and capture your Christians and throw them in jail because they are Protestants, do it!" He says, "No, if it's a wrong or wicked thing, don't obey." And do you know what? We did that in WWII, right? These Nazis were saying, "I'm just following orders," and they said, "And your point being what? It's not relevant." But I wonder how much that law is going to be changing shortly. When you go after whistleblowers until they've proven their case in court, they should be able to prove their case in court as they're trying to do the right thing and we won't know until, of course, the courts. You shouldn't go after them ahead of time.

But be that as it may, he's arguing here simply that if you're commanded to commit adultery, to kill an innocent person, to fight against your country or family, don't do it. Police officers, don't do it. Sheriffs, don't do it. Military men, don't do it. It's that simple. If you believe God is in charge of morality, if you believe man's origin and man's society is rooted in how God defines it and how God makes him, these arguments flow, but if you have a military increasingly more and more or police departments more and more with people who have been run through the mills through public schools, through terrible churches and the like, and of course the social media and everything else, and being told you're nothing but an advanced ape or monkey and laws are defined by who's making them or who is the strongest as opposed to ultimately by God, then you don't know what you're going to get. You don't know how trustworthy they're going to be at the end of the day. I don't think we're there yet, there's still a lot of insipid patriotism, overt patriotism in military circles, how much I don't know. Police circles, how much I don't know. So a lot of this is, again, what the people's dispositions are. Even if they're not Christians, they still want to fight for their country and that can be a good thing if we can use it aright.

Here, L, page 6, "If he that is persecuted feels in his conscience that he may do God greater service and glorify by suffering than by fleeing, he ought rather to suffer a thousand deaths than to flee one foot. But if his conscience witnesses with him that he may do God greater glory by fleeing than by tarrying but is bound by the commandment to depart." And he quotes Christ and uses Christ as an example who fled at times. He didn't stand his guard to die, he said it wasn't time yet. He knew his purpose in life. It wasn't time yet. Remember that? And he's saying by analogy it depends on our purpose. It depends where we are. We have to determine between ourselves and God and our conscience whether we should flee or stand and die. So he's not going to make it a commandment and he shouldn't make it a commandment anymore than you can also make a commandment to stand and fight. That's between you and God and the conscience and what you've determined and that's important. You shouldn't run around binding other people's consciences and saying, "We think now is the time. Now is the time." You might be strong and urgent, obviously, if people are on your door slaughtering people. Then you're going to say it. We have to be careful before that time that we try not to bind people's consciences on this issue that we're going over.

He defines a tyrant in number N, the letter N. "An evil person coming to the government of any state, either by usurpation, or by election or by succession, utterly neglecting the cause why kings, princes, and other governors in commonwealths be made, that is, the wealth of the people, seeks only or chiefly his own profit and pleasure." Then he gives a long description there in that section I cut out of how he defines a tyrant.

Then he goes in the next section and argues that you can kill a tyrant. One of his arguments is the arguments from the Greeks and the Romans, the ethnics he called them, the ethicist philosophers, that like a body member, your hand has gangrene or something and your legs have got a disease, what do you do? You cut it off before it destroys the rest of the body and, therefore, you can cut off the magistrate. And of course, he argues elsewhere the magistrate and the leaders aren't so intrinsic to the commonwealth, that's the phrase they use, we'd say society today, but the commonwealth that if you get rid of them, the commonwealth just withers away and dies. Oh no, what are we going to do? We kind of get that feeling from some progressives, don't you? "Oh no, these programs are closed! What is society going to do about the government?" Societies have survived millennia without government, with different forms of government. People lived and bought and sold and married with minimal government, all kinds of different government, so it's not. The commonwealth precedes the government, society precedes government because what precedes society is man, man and the state of nature, man married as well. Man and community or society, not just individual in a radical sense.

So he argues by analogy, argues by Old Testament examples. He does go through some details as a number of the authors do and writers. You see here it is plain by P, by the Chronicles, the book of Chronicles and experience of all ages. In the book of Judges you see this happening as well, that the tyrants are taken down. There are examples, of course, of others as well.

Then he argues in Q, page 7, that private citizens shouldn't uprising. There's kind of a question, is it only a magistrate or what Calvin calls the lesser magistrate, someone short of the king that can fight against the king, using historical examples? What about individuals who aren't magistrates, who aren't judges, who aren't sheriffs or something like that, someone in a place of social authority, can they rise up? And he says in general, no. Well, except where the execution of just punishment upon tyrants is either by the whole state utterly neglected or the prince with the nobility and counsel conspire to subvert the country and the people. So he does leave a back door. And the fear, of course, for all of them is you leave too big of a back door, you could end up with anarchy and chaos whenever people are just discontent and you all get together and go after whatever social leader you're upset about.

How superiors ought to be obeyed. Goodman. This is 1558 during the reign of Bloody Mary. Goodman wrote, How superiors ought to be obeyed." The thesis, he says, is the extended title itself, "And wherein they may lawfully by God's word be disobeyed and resisted," even.

He goes through the argument here, the first one which is interesting, in Acts 5, we ought to obey God rather than man. When the Sanhedrin said, "Stop preaching the Gospel." "No, we don't care if you're the magistrate. You don't have unlimited power. God tells us otherwise and we will disobey you." Tyrants don't like to hear that, do they? So they're not going to like to hear this series, are they?

He's essentially arguing a major and a minor premise. The major premise being obey God rather than man. The minor premise being to obey God is to preach the Gospel. Therefore to preach the Gospel is better than to obey man, or rather than obey man. That talk goes A, B, B, C, C to A.

It continues on. If there are no limits upon rulers, C., then you have a *reductio ad absurdum* in which he says at the end there, letter C, bottom of 7, "And the soldiers also of cruel Herod should be blameless in murdering and shedding the blood of so many infants in Bethlehem at Herod's commandment," if authorities have unlimited authority and they're not wrong in whatever they do. You can't resist them and the like. It's *reductio ad absurdum*. People don't usually argue that far but apparently someone did back then.

He has an interesting thing here. I already drew this conclusion in my own studies before I read Buchanan. Page 8, D, "Besides this we learn by the commandments of God, that so often as he forbids anything which he would will not to be done, in the same, he commands us the contrary." Does that sound familiar to anybody? Good. Pardon? Yeah, Larger Catechism Question 99, where something is commanded, something is also forbidden. Whatever is forbidden implies that which is commanded. Reciprocal. The binary morality.

He commands us to the contrary. "For example, you shall not murder," means, class? You should preserve life. That's embedded in that commandment. You should not steal means? You should work honestly with your hands. You shouldn't commit adultery

means you should love your family and support the family because the commandments are a summary of God's law. It handles it, we can grab, they're easy to memorize but they have a lot of depth to them when you go through the rest of the Bible. There is no passage that says you shall not cheat. There is not the 11<sup>th</sup> commandment, you shall not cheat. It's a combination of two commandments, isn't it? Lying and stealing. And that's why we get the Larger Catechism Question 99 which I strongly recommend people to know.

"For as God," number E, "has not created us for ourselves," this is a very strong and powerful argument. For as God has not created us for ourselves, right? No man is an island. We don't follow the view of individualism where man as an individual is created in the state of nature. No, man as a social unit with his wife, Eve, and then ultimately their children, as we know but then they fell.

"For as God has not created us for ourselves but to seek his honor and glory and the profit of our neighbor." The first greatest commandment, the second greatest commandment, right? "Especially of such as be of the household of faith, and stand in need of our aid and support." We're supposed to help them and support them. "Otherwise we show ourselves to have more comparison upon brute beasts, as our neighbor's ox, which God's law does charge us to help." He's arguing this and he expands upon it later in the section there. It's not as crisp as I would like it. There are interesting writers, they don't write the way we do today. Apparently it was clear in their heads when they wrote it. We are commanded to help one another, even animals. The Deuteronomic code says that, right? If your neighbor's ox is in a ditch, even your enemy's ox is in a ditch. Is it just the ox in the ditch or is it maybe their ox is being gored by another ox? Or their ox is being stolen by a neighbor? I mean, it's all kinds of bad scenarios it's saying, not just, "Oh, I followed the letter of the law. Look at me." Again, Larger Catechism Question 99. Cause, means, occasions and provocations thereunto. Everything else is wrapped up into that and I went over that when I preached on that. How much more if your neighbor is being attacked by a thief and a robber? Well, he's not an animal, he's a human. I don't see a passage of the Bible that says we're supposed to protect them.

So you don't know how to reason morally, do you? If it's true for an animal, what does Paul argue in Romans? Does God care about the ox? Excuse me, Corinthians 9. Does God care about the ox, muzzling the ox? In one sense it's part of his creation and he's saying, "Well, it doesn't say humans. He doesn't care." It's the human he cares about. It's an argument from the lesser to the greater. If you care about animals, how much more should you care about humans unless you're an animal lover in the worst sense of the word? That's how twisted our society is. There are people like that. And if a tyrant comes and takes out whole swaths of communities and peoples and towns, shouldn't you rise up against him as well if you're able? It's a very strong argument.

"And in disobeying or resisting such tyrants, we do not resist God's ordinance," he argues in G, "but Satan's." Well, that's interesting. "And in disobeying or resisting such, we do not resist God's ordinance but Satan's." I mentioned this at the beginning of submission in general a couple of weeks ago. Where does he get that? To resist a tyrant is not to resist God's ordinance but Satan's. St. James gives us contrary commandments saying resist the

devil and he will flee from you, and you don't just resist the devil as though the devil comes up to you in a coat, "Hi, it's me the devil." What's he saying? He's saying the works of the devil. That's what we know and no one meets the devil. We see the works of the devil, that's what you see. Tyranny is a work of the devil, therefore, it's acceptable to resist it.

Then he goes through H and I through some verses there I compacted and gave you to read on your own on what to do in Jeremiah 29:7, pray for the peace of Babylon. What to do with Deuteronomy 13, if even your closest family member, your wife or your children are supposed to be thrown up to the law if they are idolaters or false prophets trying to tear down society, how much more a foreign, strange monarch in your own kingdom who is not your own member of your flesh and blood.

1 Samuel 22:16 is an example of Saul's servants disobeying him. We see also, of course if you recall, I don't know if this is another passage later on, there are a number of Old Testament passages you can go through to show both tyrants doing wicked things and getting away with them, tyrants doing bad things and not getting away with it. God is rising up a judge or even sometimes the people resisting Saul when Jonathan ate some honey. Remember that? "You cannot eat until we destroy our enemy." What a foolish command Saul made. He was so angry, he had such a temper. Then his son Jonathan was ignorant of the law, he had some honey and said, "Oh, this is great stuff." They cast a lot and found out it was Jonathan and the people came before between him, interposed between Saul and Jonathan and said, "You will not touch him." Now it's an example, the question is is that a divine good example or an example we're not supposed to emulate? Of course, I think you know where I would go with that and we could talk about that later on in the future.

So there are a number of passages you can go to in the Old Testament to cover these things. I'll stop right there. Again, I encourage you if you have questions, you can read over this through the week. I will email this to you. I'm sorry, there should have been 17 copies. One of the interesting things that happened was it was my fault for my planning but also my computer did something weird and I lost a lot of my editing work. It was quite annoying. But write it down, we'll go over the questions the last two weeks. So that's the first two weeks of December so I'm taking the last two weeks of December off. Send them to me ahead of time, please, so I'm not caught off guard.

## A. De Jure Regni Apud Scotus, Buchanan

1. Context: [The Powers of the Crown in Scotland]. published 1579, written 1567/8. Form of a dialogue between two friends. Written for prince James, of King James fame. Background: Murder of [Darnley](#) and abduction of Mary, Queen of Scots. Maitland is concerned to maintain some authority of the king. Condemned by parliament 1584, 1664, 1688.

2. Thesis: General: "trace, from their beginnings, the rights and the respective powers of the king and of citizens." Particular: Chapter 2 description: "Rulers May Properly be Held Accountable for Their Acts"

a) *B: It follows, therefore, that he who explains the origin and the cause of creation of legitimate government, and shows what are the duties of rulers with respect to their people and of people with respect to their rulers, will, in the same explanation, make clear, by contraries, the nature of tyranny.*

b) *B: He not only gave him the physical senses, by the use of which he can avoid all that endangers him and can maintain situations favorable to his well-being; but he also created in his spirit a light by which he distinguishes between good and evil. Some call this ability Nature, and others the Law of Nature. I regard it as truly divine, and am convinced that 'Nature never says the one thing, and reason the contrary'. [Juvenal, xiv. 321.] Furthermore, God has given us a summary, which comprises the whole law in a few words: We should love Him with our souls, and our neighbors as ourselves. Herein are contained all the rules of the Holy Scriptures, which deal with moral conduct - other than this is merely elaboration. [Lev. 19: 18; Matt. 5:43, 19:19, 22:37-39; Mark 12:31-33; Gal.14; James 2:8] Maitland: That is to say, you think that God - not some orator or lawyer who brought man together - is the author of human association. Buchanan: Precisely*

c) *Buchanan: I do not believe that it is any great matter whether the chief magistrate is called King, Duke, Emperor, or Consul, so long as it is understood that he is placed in office to maintain justice. So long as government be just, we ought not contend over names. For him whom we call the Duke of Venice is nothing more nor less than a king under a constitutional government*

d) **SUMMARY: Buchanan: First, it was agreed between us that men were by nature, created for society, and for the sharing of life.**

**Buchanan: And that, as guardian of this society, a king, a man, eminent for his high character, is chosen... And, just as strife between men has led to the necessity of creating kings; so the injuries inflicted by king on their subjects were the occasion of our wishing to have laws...And we regard the laws as a pattern for the art of government, just as the principles of medicine are for the physician's art.**

e) **B: I have been striving exclusively for this one thing-that the Ciceronian principle, "The public welfare is the supreme law," [Cicero, De Leg. iii. 8.] might be held in reverence and perfectly observed....A little while ago we agreed that no law can take every contingency so clearly into account that evil minds can make no opening for trickery**

f) **But it may be best to endure a tyranny of this sort [i.e., benevolent despotism] if it is not possible to get rid of it without a public calamity;**

g) **Maitland: What if the people, having been defrauded by trickery or compelled by fear, gave themselves into slavery? Buchanan: ...First among these reasons is an established principle, derived from nature, that agreements made under compulsion are not binding. The laws allow full restitution to be made to those who have been defrauded by trickery, and this they allow most liberally to orphans and to those other persons who they think ought to be protected...**

h) **In the Epistle to the Romans, he defines a ruler with a precision almost equal to that of formal logic. [Romans 13:1-7.] For as Chrysostom says: "Paul was not writing of tyrants, but of true and lawfully appointed rulers, who are God's true vice-regents on earth: Anyone who resists them does indeed resist God's ordinances."**

i) **Rom. 13: for Paul is speaking of the authority of public officials, not of those evil men who exercise that authority wickedly, Nor, if we apply Paul's rule, will all tyrants of this sort prove to be public officials. But should anyone argue that bad princes are likewise appointed by God, beware of the fallacy of this argument...but no man of sound mind would dare to affirm that God is the author of human wickedness; and, likewise, no one is ignorant that he is the author of condemnation of sin... How, I ask, could this hypothetical scholar advise them differently from the advice which Paul gave to the church at Rome, or which Jeremiah gave to the Hebrew exiles living in Assyria?**

j) *B: But someone else may rise to demand to be shown an instance in the Holy Scriptures of a king punished by his subjects. This I cannot produce, but it does not necessarily follow that because we do not read of this act, that such an act is at once to be regarded as infamous and criminal... For, if no course of action is permissible save that for which there is a precedent, what part of our governmental institutions would remain to us? What part of the laws?*

k) *Buchanan: There is, then, a mutual compact between king and citizens....Does not he who first withdraws from the covenant or does something contrary to the agreement break the covenant and the agreement?...I think moreover that in case the king has broken the bond which holds him and his people together, he who first breaks the agreement forfeits whatever rights belong to him under it...But the other party to the covenant would be in the same state as he was before the agreement, free.*

l) *B: But once a just war is undertaken with an enemy, it is not only right for the whole people to destroy an enemy, but for the individual to do so. Maitland: I grant that. Buchanan: What of that public enemy the tyrant, with whom every good man is eternally at war? May not every member of the human race justly demand that all force of arms be employed against him?*

m) *B: These men took over governments unjustly by the use of force and of arms, but on the score of the excellence and rightness of their governments they deserve to be placed in the number of true kings.*

n) *For success or failure in overt undertakings of this sort depend upon the times, persons, places, and other matters involved in their execution; so, if anyone were to rashly undertake the overthrow of a government, no more blame would attach to me for having defended the right of citizens to resist tyrants than there would attach to a physician who has diagnosed a disease adequately. The man who administers the remedy improperly is the person who should be held accountable.*

## **B. A Short Treatise on Political Power, Ponet**

1. Context: 1556, Dr. John Ponet, Bishop of Rochester
2. Thesis: a historico-theoretical grounding of political power
3. Arguments: Biblical, logical, historical, rhetorical



a) *yet because through the fall of the first man, his reason is radically corrupt, and sensuality has gotten the upper hand, he is not able by himself to rule himself, but must have a more excellent governor...This rule is the law of nature, first planted and grafted only in the mind of man, then after that his mind was defiled by sin, filled with darkness, and encumbered with many doubts. God set this rule forth in writing in the Decalogue, or the Ten Commandments: and after that, reduced by Christ our Savior to just two commands: You will love the Lord your God above all things, and your neighbor as yourself. The latter part He also expounded on: Whatever you would want done unto yourself, do that unto others. In this law is compiled all justice, the perfect way to serve and glorify God, and the right means to rule each and every man: and the only stay to maintain every commonwealth. This is the touchstone to try every man's works, whether he is king or beggar, whether he be good or evil.*

b) *which He declared to Noah: He that sheds the blood of man, his blood shall also be shed by man. For man is made in the image of God. By this ordinance and law His instituted political power and gave authority to men to make more laws.*

c) *But whether this authority to make laws, or the power to execute the same, shall be and remain in one person alone, or in many, it is not expressed, but left to the discretion of the people to make so many and so few, as they think necessary for the maintenance of the state.*

d) *But where the people have forsaken God, and contend with His word, there has the devil by his ministers, occupied the whole country, and subverted the good orders, justice and equality, that was in the commonwealth, and planted his unreasonable lust for good laws, as every man may see by the realm of Hungary which the Turks in our time have occupied. And there the people have not utterly forsaken God and His word, but have begun to be weary of it: has not there God suffered Tyrannies by and by to rush in, and to occupy the whole, and to suppress the good orders of the commonwealth, but little by little has suffered them to creep in, first with the head, then with an arm, and so after with a leg, and at length (were not the people penitent, and in time converted to God) to bring in the whole body, and to work the feats of tyrannies, as hereafter it shall be described.*

*e) For the whole Decalogue and every part thereof is written as well to kings, princes, and other public persons, as it is to private persons. A king may no more commit idolatry than a private man: he may not take the name of God in vain, he may not break the Sabbath, no more than any private man...No, he is bound and charged under great pains to keep them more than any other, because he is both a private man in respect of his own person, and a public figure in respect to his office*

*f) Examples of God's punishment: "Rehoboam, because he would reign as a tyrant and not be subject to law or counsel, had ten tribes of his kingdom taken away from him, and given to Jeroboam...The end of Ahab and Jezebel is understood well enough.*

*g) Romans 13: "so the ordinance itself is one thing, and the persons, that is, the man and woman, another: even so is the political power or authority being the ordinance and good gift of God, one thing, and the person that executes the same (be he king or caesar) another thing. The ordinance being godly, the man may be evil and not of God, nor come there by God, as the Prophet Hosea says: "They have make them a king, and not through me: a prince, and not through my counsel or will."*

*h) And if they were exempt from the laws, and so it were lawful for them to do what they lusted for, their authority being of God, it might be said that God allowed their tyranny and robbery of their subjects, killing them without law, and making God the author of evil: which is a great blasphemy.*

*i) He may not rob Peter to clothe Paul, not take from God his due to give it unto civil power: neither may he make confusion of the powers, but yield unto everyone that is his due, not in obeying the inferior commandment, leave the commandment of the highest undone*

*j) But if the ministers of the civil power command you to dishonor God, to commit idolatry, to kill an innocent, to fight against your country, to give or lend what you have, to the mind of subversion and destruction of your country, or to maintain them in their wickedness, you ought not to do it, but to leave it undone: for it is evil...When Pharaoh, the tyrant, commanded the midwives of the Egyptians to kill all the male children that should be born to the Israelite wives*

*k) and commonwealths may withstand well enough and flourish, albeit there be no kings, but to the contrary, without a commonwealth there can be no king.*

*l) If he that is persecuted, feels in his conscience, that he may do God greater service and glorify by suffering than by fleeing, he ought rather to suffer a thousand deaths, than to flee one foot. But if his conscience witnesses with him that he may do God greater glory by fleeing than by tarrying, but is bound by the commandment to depart. "If they persecute you in one city", says Christ, "flee to another". And he did not only teach it, but did it himself, forsaking Jewry, and going into Galilee...because the time was not yet come, wherein he was appointed to glorify God.*

*m) OT kings no proof of ownership of all things: 1 Kings 21:1: Ahab and Naboth; Samuel who would pay back anything taken (a fortiori)*

*n) Tyrant: And evil person coming to the government of any state, either by usurpation, or by election or by succession, utterly neglecting the cause why kings, princes, and other governors in commonwealths be made (that is, the wealth of the people) seeks only or chiefly his own profit and pleasure. And as a sow coming into a fair garden, roots up all the fair and sweet flowers and wholesome simples, leaving nothing behind, but her own filthy dirt: so does an evil governor subvert the laws and orders, or makes them to be wrenched or racked to serve his affections, that they can no longer do their office....Such an evil governor men properly call a tyrant. Now for as much as there is no express positive law for punishment of a tyrant among Christian men, the question is, whether it is lawful to kill such a monster and cruel beast covered with the shape of a man.*

*o) Natural to kill a tyrant: But now to prove the later part of this question affirmatively, that it is lawful to kill a tyrant: there is no man that can deny, but that the ethnics (although they had not the right and perfect knowledge of God) were endued with the knowledge of the law of nature....This law testifies to every man's conscience, that it is natural to cut away an incurable member, which (being suffered) would destroy the whole body. Kings, princes, and other governors, although they are the heads of a political body, yet they are not the whole body. ...*

*p) So that this principle that evil and evil doers ought to be punished, and rotten members to be cut away, was no peculiar law of the ethnics, but it proceeds of nature, and therefore common to all men, as it is plain by the Chronicles and experience of all ages, and purposely exemplifies for our sure stay and learning as well as the Book of Judges, as in many other histories of Holy Scriptures, according to the express word and commandment (applied to this sense and meaning) which says: "Let evil be taken out of the midst of the congregation; that the rest which hear of it, may be afraid, and not enterprise to do the like*

q) *Private citizens uprising? ... I think it cannot be maintained by God's word, that nay private man may kill, except (where execution of just punishment upon tyrants, idolaters, and traitorous governors is either by the whole state utterly neglected, or the prince with the nobility and counsel conspire the subversion or alteration of their country and people)*

r) *Ehud commended by HS (Jdg. 3:15); Jael, Jdg. 4:17ff.*

s) *If no remedy, then: But if neither the whole state not the minister of God's word would do their common duty, not any other lawful shift before mentioned can be had, not dare be attempted: yet are not the poor people destitute all together of remedy: but God has left unto them two weapons, able to conquer and destroy the greatest tyrant that ever was: that is, Penance and Prayer.*

### C. **How Superior Powers Ought to be Obeyed, Goodman**

1. **Context: 1558, during the reign of Bloody Mary**

2. **Thesis: How Superior Powers Ought To Be Obeyed By Their Subjects; And Wherein They May Lawfully By God's Word Be Disobeyed And Resisted.**

3. **Arguments**

a) *You judge whether it be right or just in God's sight to obey you rather than God [taken as a major premise. Gospel as minor premise]... For what is king, queen, or emperor compared to God [Isaiah 2:10-18]*

b) *Seeing also, that kings are instituted to rule in God's fear and Laws, as subjects and sergeants to God, and not against His Laws, and above Him: it must follow (as we first said) that all obedience given to such, wicked princes against God, and disobey man, is true obedience, how so ever the world judges*

c) *If no limits upon rulers: reducio ad absurdum: "Then should that cruel butcher Doeg, in killing Abimalech with eighty-five priests or Levites, and the whole town of Nob, at the commandment of ungodly King Saul, have been preferred to the rest of all his servants and soldiers. [1 Samuel 22.] And the soldiers also of cruel Herod should be blameless in murdering and shedding the blood of so many infants in Bethlehem at Herod's commandment.*

d) *Besides this we learn by the commandments of God, that so often as He forbids anything which He would will not to be done, in the same, He commands us the contrary, for example: You shall not murder, steal, commit adultery... It is not enough to abstain from these things...except we do the contrary... that is, to save, preserve, and defend, as well the goods as the persons of our brethren and neighbors.*

e) *For as God has not created us for ourselves, but to seek His honor and glory, and the profit of our neighbor, especially of such as be of the household of faith..and stand in need of our aid and support. Otherwise we show ourselves to have more comparison upon brute beasts, as our neighbor's ox... which God's Law does charge us to help, save, or draw forth from the ditch, although it were the beast of our enemy.*

f) *You have despised and abused the word of His dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, the Author of salvation, in the days of our godly King Edward (which is the cause why God has thus plagued us with a tyrant)*

g) *Roman 13: There is no power but of God: yet does he here mean any other powers, but such as are orderly and lawfully instituted by God. Either else should He approve all tyranny and oppression... Then when they are such, they are not God's ordinance. And in disobeying and resisting such, we do not resist God's ordinance, but Satan's, and our sin, which is the cause of such.... But St. James gives us contrary commandment, saying: Resist the Devil and he will flee away from you.*

h) *"This being then David's own private cause, it was not lawful for him in that case to seek his own revenge: Jer. 29:7: different circumstances (captives); special revelation; Dt. 13: If family members have to be punished, so do magistrates; Examples in Judges of the people rising up against Benjamin;1 Sam. 22:16ff: Saul's servants disobeyed him; Matt. 26:52: Peter's sword: He was a preacher foremost. "Wherefore if Moses and Aaron, God's elect and chosen servants had no more power over the people then His express commandment permits..."*

i) *1 Pet. 2:13ff: "Then if Paul charges not children with further obedience to their parents, then in the Lord, to whom principality they are by God's commandment and nature bound, will Peter bind servants to their masters any further then in the Lord?... God is the first and principal Father, Master and Lord, to whom first obedience must be given as He does demand: and to others in Him and for Him only, as we were taught at the beginning." ;*

j) *What if the people are divided, or against a community uprising? Pray and fast.*