

Limits of Submission to Government 1

sermonaudio.com

Resistance to Tyrants

By Shawn Mathis

Bible Text: Romans 13
Preached on: Sunday, September 8, 2013

Meets at:

Chapel of SDA

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

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

Are you going to record me? That could be a dangerous thing. Please, when you record me, don't transmit it on the internet through electronic medium of any sort. If you send it through mail, have it transcribed accordingly and security mail of some sort. I don't trust the NSA.

I have a picture of America tomorrow. It may be 15 years from now, it may be 50 years from now but imagine America tomorrow in which Christians are forced out of offering public services such as food, photography, room and board and many government jobs because discriminatory laws forces the selling of services to those of transgender nature, polyamorous relationships, pedophiliacs, incestuous partners and public populationists. Profession Christian counseling will be restricted to religious institutions only and forced out of state licensing period. Christian doctors will be forced out of any kind of work involving reproduction because they will not toe the line with respect to abortion, euthanasia and transgender surgery. Mental health care requirements to provide for aborticides will also include access to euthanasia, prostitution, transgender surgery and anything else deemed "health related." Christians will lose in court cases because any moral view they take against the current law will be deemed violation of separation of church and state. Government will have a secret watch list of Christians being deemed a dangerous influence: lists include email, gps locations and phone records for Christians. This is what I perceive at the rate we're going now of the future of America.

Now, some of that may seem far fetched but many of you are like, "Wait a minute. He's got something up his sleeve." IRS today target conservative organizations, that's a known fact. Chaplains restricted and fired for proselytizing: an OPC minister, Charles McElhaney, I have an email and George is in touch with the man. Other restrictions upon the military, there is a list of them from Todd Starnes at Fox News Radio. They are not systemic yet, widespread, but they're happening in pockets and being sustained or at least being even challenged right now but the fact is they were there to begin with, these restrictions upon Christian chaplains. New Mexico Supreme Court to Christians: violate your conscience or suffer economic consequences. San Antonio just recently passed a law that is against any form of hate speech. It is a very broad-based law that would,

apparently with the reading of it, include preaching, anything against homosexual, transgender, etc.

In New York City for the last couple of years, it started actually a decade ago, the fight forbid and has forbidden churches from using public schools because of separation of church and state. Separation of church and state means, according to the 2009 Iowa Supreme Court ruling and part of their rationale, I have access to all of this if you want the links, argued that a secular perspective must be used in respect to the Constitution and not any religious argument and it became more explicit when US District Court Judge Walker, I think it was in 2010, overturned Prop 8 in California, the homosexual marriage bill or the anti-homosexual marriage bill, because it closely aligned with religious use and it's a violation of church and state and that that could "harm gays" as he quoted an official document from the Pope at the time, Benedict, because the Roman Catholic Church is officially against homosexual marriages.

Colorado baker, you don't hear much about this in the news, a Colorado baker is being sued for not selling cakes to a homosexual wedding, I think it's in Lakewood. It sounds like the photographer, doesn't it? Or perhaps the other one out in Washington, in which case she closed recently because there was so much of a mafia pressure upon her by the homosexuals there.

A Christian school at Thousand Oaks, California, countersues before they get sued by a couple of teachers that were rejected because they could produce no evidence of being a Christian and a recommendation from a pastor so they were going to sue the Christian school because they would say that's, what? Discrimination. And the Christian school apparently thought it was best to jump the gun before they got sued, countersued to protect their right to hire Christian teachers. This is for a profit organization. The school is not a non-profit. There is a distinction in the law between a profit and non-profit and this is where a lot of the debate is going on right now.

Governor Christie in New Jersey recently forbid counselors from trying to convert homosexuals. Anyone whose got a license from the state which apparently you need to do if you want to be a professional counselor, even a Christian counselor, are now forbidden from trying to "change or convert homosexuals" in their counseling.

The Obama administration subverts religious freedom of the Denver business, Hercules Industries, because of the employer mandated health care coverage. This, again, is a for profit organization, right? In the public domain, as it were. And they said, "No, we cannot provide this coverage because it goes against our conscience as Christians." The Obama administration naturally says, "No, your conscience only covers worship. When you're in the public square, you must toe the line."

Religious groups at this point are narrowly exempted from the law. I didn't put this down but Westminster Theological Seminary and a couple other seminaries are also suing the government because they are not non-profit but they are for profit but religious organizations. Apparently religious organizations in some people's mind can't make

money. How dare you make money? So they are trying to sue the government because of the Obama care mandate as well with its abortion elements in it.

Military classes recently, this is again...they updated this from about a year ago when the gentleman complained about it in the military training class. They got a court order and forced the Pentagon to cough up all their documents of training that they've been given out there. It was in Pennsylvania. I'm not sure how widespread, again, in the military this is but the military class described, I saw the list, evangelicals as "extremists" along with other known terrorist organizations in the same kind of list as an example of extremists you should be wary of. Evangelical Christians as well as conservative Roman Catholics. Fox News Radio talking Starnes again.

In the Christian Post, the news article about another judge recently. This is still ongoing, this judge said, "Widespread systematic persecution of LGBTI people," does everyone know what that is? Lesbian, bisexual, transgender and I don't know what "I" is. Indeterminate perhaps. He's probably serious. There is a category of in between. Let me please read this. This is US District Judge Michael A. Posner, "Widespread systematic persecution of LGBTI people constitutes a crime against humanity that unquestionably violates international norms." As a homosexual group went after a Christian who was over in Uganda trying to support the Ugandan government which passed an anti-homosexual law and, unfortunately, he went across international boundaries so they are trying to use international law against him.

And Obama's use of drones for assassination, the Washington Post article you can read as well as one in Salon, a judge recently backed Obama's administration on the secrecy of targeting and killing of "suspected terrorists" with a secret court and the like. ACLU didn't like it, that's how bad it was. Went to court and, again, it wasn't big in the media this year in the winter, in January. And the judge, just read the article, I say put "Washington Post," Google that, the judge says, "I know this is my summary. I know this is kind of ironic. I'm supposed to make a decision on stuff I don't have access to because it's all secret but at the end of the day I'll give the benefit of the doubt to the government," and so the ACLU lost and, as we know if you recall, Obama, it came out a year ago, agonizes but nevertheless goes over a hit list himself personally. That assassination with the use of a drone actually killed an American citizen although it was his son. He was not targeted as an enemy. The one who was targeted as an enemy was a US citizen and never brought to court nor with a warrant.

The summary from the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance and there was a number of these kind of alliances I have run across or legal institutions as well that are trying to fight this kind of atrocious activity, at least this to us seems atrocious. Murdering us would be really atrocious, obviously. Serve your own kind and stick to religious activities, that's what the Obama administration is telling us and you are free to depart from secular norms but as Jesus called to serve your needy neighbor, right? Self services to them, for instance. And not restrict yourself to prayer if the neighbor needs food and you may discover that your faith shaped way of operating is illegal.

So my picture of the first page of Christians being forced out of offering public services such as food, photography, room and board because of antidiscrimination laws is not America of tomorrow but it's becoming America today. Professional Christian counselors who will be restricted to religious institutions and forced out of state licensing is already happening right now in New Jersey. It's in the process. Christian doctors forced out of work involving reproduction because they will not toe the line to abortion and transgender surgery, even transgender surgery of children, the first of its kind open in a hospital in Boston a couple of years ago. It's already happening. They're being told to shut up or quit or they are getting fired. Federal health care requirements to provide for aborticides, that's already happening and I added in euthanasia, why not?

We forget sometimes as Christians and I certainly believe many Americans who aren't Christians forget perhaps because they don't have the imagination to extrapolate from current reasoning. You don't need much of an imagination to extrapolate from aborticides to euthanasia to prostitution such as in Holland. It's for health. They were complaining, I think it was in Italy, recently and like some of the laws changed and they were losing a little money and it was getting squeezed out of them and the like and so they had to drop their mistresses. It's just so commonplace as described in the news.

Transgender surgery should be and probably will be. Not a lot of counseling. Health related would also involve counseling, wouldn't it? "Psychology"? Anything else deemed health related.

Christians will lose in court cases because any moral view they take against the current law will be deemed violations of separation of church and state. That's not America of tomorrow. That was already argued implicitly in the Ohio Supreme Court case of 2009 and more explicitly by the US District judge against Prop 8 when he says, "It is harmful. It is of harm to the gay community to argue along these lines and is too close to religious argument therefore in violation of church and state." The reasoning is already there, the rationale.

Then the government will have a secret watch list of Christians being a dangerous influence. The list includes emails, gps locations and phone records. Obviously, I'm talking about NSA. Whatever you think of Snowden, I'm glad this information is coming out, a lot of it.

Then pastors regularly jailed or fined for hate speech. It has happened after a sort as I read the one case where he says it's a crime against humanity. I believe that's in Massachusetts, that case. He went over to Uganda and came back and they went after him in the court cases. It's not regularly occurring but, again, this is extrapolation in the future. It could happen.

There are, on page 4, legal thought and actions are already there. The groundwork is already there, in my opinion, to have that America of tomorrow today. In the first place, NSA surveillance found in violation of practices. Not just kind of minor practices, although there was a lot of that which is what you're going to get in the bureaucracy, I'm

sure, but there were even gross violations of the Constitution according to a 2011 judge. Again, it was a secret court. We only know about it, as I recall, through Snowden.

Manipulated international standards. That came out a couple of days ago. That is, international standards of encryption. The encryption that you have for banking online, buying a product online, that is, it hides the data from the enemy, as it were, somebody who wants to rip it off. A lot of those standards were set up by the NSA and it turns out, of course, they set it up and set up back doors and made it purposely weak, etc. etc. Secret deals with Microsoft and Google, apparently, and if they didn't get their way, they would force them, again, apparently with their secret courts and secret warrants if they even get a warrant. I don't know because it's all secret.

Clandestine hacking of US servers. You can't break the encryption code which they said they could break a lot of it now because they've been already manipulating businesses, forcing them or agreeing with them secretly. You got to the server before it encrypts and grab the data, that is, the computer. Server is a fancy name for a specializing computer.

Then, of course, the use of general warrants which is what a lot of the NSA is grabbing the data out there on the internet. A general warrant is, "We're kind of concerned in general, so please give us access to people's stuff we wouldn't normally have access to unless we had a specific warrant." That is, an actual legal cause; a murder is going to occur. That's what we have today and this is what we typically think, "Hey, you've got to have a warrant before you come into my house, Mister. You've got to have reasonable cause, a specific reasonable cause." A general warrant is kind of like, oh, I don't know what they did in England or America in the late 1700s, they just kind of said, "Well, we're generally concerned so we'd rather grab you off the street or grab your data or grab whatever because we're generally concerned. We have nothing in particular." That's the kind of warrant they're using and there is every reason to believe it's unconstitutional and a long history of unconstitutionality but, again, that's not my speciality, nevertheless you should be aware of it.

So those are the actions and that's just the NSA. I'm sure others of you have a lot longer list than I can pull out. Let me give you some quotes from our current President and it's important to use the President because the man was voted in and the man was voted in, of course I believe, by a lot of Americans who were ignorant and just followed the media or followed their emotions, etc. etc. because that's how a lot of Americans are. They think they're thinking when they're not, they're emoting. But those who promoted him who actually read his works and know his background, they promoted him anyway such as this year he said, I think it was the Ohio...I didn't write down the details here. Again, I have the links to all of those. At a commencement speech, I think it was in Ohio? Someone remember? In the spring of 2013, that's the one he says, "Don't fear tyranny." Everyone remember that one? "They are warned that tyranny is always lurking just around the corner. You should reject those voices because what they suggest is that our brave and creative and unique experiment," catch all those adjectives there? "And self-rule," he obviously redefined self-rule than how I understand it, "it's somehow just a sham with which we can't be trusted."

Now, I give that quote and I've read the sections around it and it could be construed differently and I grant that but let me keep reading what else he says elsewhere and you'll understand what he means. Obama, the same commencement speech, "We have this experiment. It's unique, creative and self-ruled." "To conquer fascism and disease, to visit the moon and Mars, to gradually secure our God-given rights for all of our citizens regardless of who they are or what they look like or who they love." Did you catch that word there, "gradually"? You either have them or you don't or what? Yo gradually make them as you go along.

Again, now the coup-de-gras of understanding what President Obama's mindset is is to read something like, I don't know his book that tells you that, the audacity of "Hope," page 93, President Obama, "Implicit in the Constitution structure in the very idea of ordered liberty was a rejection of absolute truth. The infallibility of any idea or ideology or theology or ism, any tyrannical consistency that might lock future generations into a single unalterable course," he got that right. That's how liberals on the whole think. Again, not quoting the media. I can't find this quote in a lot of conservative media because, frankly in my opinion, a lot of conservatives really middle the road.

The Hillsdale President quoted this on Hugh Hewitt once and I was impressed; he did his homework too. This is what our President believes and if you think he's the only one that believes it...no, I'm talking to the wrong audience. None of you think that he's the only one that believes it or all your friends. Come on, they need to hear this stuff. This guy and what he believes and what he's pushing the argument that his Obama administration has made in some of the cases such as the Lutheran church case in which a lady tries to come back and apparently they said, "No, we can't have you back because of your sickness. You're not going to be very..." apparently it's a very serious sickness, what would be considered a handicap. Well, you can't do that on the job, can you? A normal secular job, it's against the law to tell a handicapped person, "You're too handicapped to do the job," as a rule in a lot of situations, I suppose, short of the guy has no arms or something. So she has some sickness. They fire her. She goes to court. I don't think they fired her, I think they were talking about it. She goes to court and, of course, what do they say? Like a good Christian group, "Well, we're going to discipline you. You can't take us to court. That's a violation of the biblical laws in which you uphold." She is considered a teacher and a minister, I think, in the Lutheran church, or at least with regards of teaching at a school. Here's the whole sticky part: it's a school not a church. The Obama administration is saying all they have is freedom of association, of course, that's restricted. You don't have absolute freedom of association, that's why you have discriminatory laws, anti-discrimination laws. But of course, her defense was, "No, it's a religious organization not just freedom of association." So it went to the Supreme Court. You don't hear about this in the media, again, because it's not relevant to them. The Supreme Court unanimously, think about that, said, "You're off your rocker, Obama administration. What kind of reasoning is that?" It's not restricted narrowly religion to worship but to whatever activity they do, in this case it's teaching.

That's how he thinks. Remember, he is the head of the administration and if they think something different that he disagrees with, he has the responsibility to say otherwise and so when you see the Obama administration you should think Obama. If he doesn't know what they're saying, that's his fault. His bureaucracy is too big, that's his fault. He should cut it small so he knows what they're saying. I mean, that's what it means to be the President. He's in charge of it. It should reflect what he believes.

So all this to say why this class is relevant and the class is: the limits of submission to government. I purposely chose that title to reflect the broader and simultaneously narrow topic. It's broader because limits can talk about both sort of like a boundary. Which side are you on? How much could you and should you obey? Then the other half would be how much should you not obey, right? To flip over the boundary marker and resist and how much resistance and to what extent? So that's a number of topics, really, that can go on but I want to actually narrow but first let me explain this. The limits, that tells you the boundaries of submission both to it and then no more submission beyond that, hence the word "limits." Submission, of course, obedience to another under God. Obedience to another but under God so I've already given you an answer to the limits, haven't I? Resistance both active and passive, negative and positive and everything in between. That's what I mean by resistance. If I'm refusing to do what you're told, to actively opposing the government by undermining it with force of arms and there is actually a whole range of things that you can do. Then, of course, government is that which is duly appointed as social authority over men. Okay? Duly appointed social authority over men.

So the general topic is limits of submission to the government and, in particular, I'm going to highlight and emphasize the vindication of arms because that is the corner of controversy even in the Christian church. Dispensationalists, not as a whole but some of them because of their down-playing of natural revelation and, of course, also the Old Testament natural law, more precisely and the Old Testament, many of them won't really stand up and defend, I have found out in my research, force of arms. They'll just say, "No, you've just got to be slaughtered," or you run away or something. That's as far as they go so they pretty much follow and it's been a strand in the Christian church and I'm not going to pretend that nobody and no leader in the Christian church has ever argued for passivism. There's been a lot of them but there's been more and a bigger strand and the bulk of the Christian church has believed in defensive arms under certain conditions.

So, in particular, the vindication of the defensive arms. I'm going to argue from an historical perspective. I'll give you an outline of the history of it. Then the historical arguments. I've read, what was it, 10 or 12 booklets, sermons and even a book or two on this topic from the 1500-1600s. This is a turbulent time in which there was lots of wars and struggles and civil wars and the likes so they had on the ground boot experience of how to answer this question, defend it and give the nuance and the like or the vindication of the defensive arms.

Then your favorite part, I'm sure, modern applications. I'm giving a lot of cases here. George just recently gave me a book, McIlveney, intelligence advisor, "The coming persecution of Christians and traditionalists in America," so he apparently gives a

summary of a lot of these, which I presume are court cases. I didn't bring my computer up here. I recently ran across from the Religious Freedom Defense Fund or something like that, AFI, I think it was, Alliance of Freedom Institution, and the court date of another group back in 2011 putting together a summary of court cases and he told wnd.com, the news source, he said it seems to me in my 25 years, there has been an increase legally in terms of going after Christians like I've give you a summary and he had more that he has gone over so there are really no statistics, per se, of the increased pressure upon Christians. Please correct me if I use the word "persecution." I don't want to use that because it has connotations even today of something very serious. It's serious in one sense but certainly not like what they have in Africa.

He says it is increasing and that's his and the other organization's opinion and the one organization has a 99% track record of beating the government. In a nation our size, 300 million Americans, the odds are you're going to have an increase of lackiness because there are more people who aren't Christians that are going to have weird views and they're going to think that they can get away with something and there's always going to be a lawyer out there who thinks, "I can still make money whether I win or lose," and they're going to go to court with it. So apparently a lot of them get slapped down because it's just being silly and I've read some of those cases. They were just absolute silliness. But I've already given you evidence of US District judges using shady reasoning, as it were, actually fallacious reasoning, historically speaking of what the use of the word separation of church and state means. It's already there. Thus we will have the modern application questions where I'll give you a couple of days so you can think about it now and mull over it, write it down, and we can talk about scenarios.

Now, I'll just skip here and remind us that you must respect other people's differences. I don't want an argument in here. People can get quite emotional when it comes to legal and social issues of how to respond to them and what's acceptable and what's not even though historically in the church there has been the overwhelming of them, the leaders and the churches and even some of the confessions, allowing and arguing for just wars and hence by implication defense and just defense against tyrants which is a sub-category, right? Now you have war against your own nation.

They weren't all in agreement exactly what it looks like if the people themselves individually as a group can do it or if they always have to have a leader or a magistrate so they weren't always in agreement and I'm not going to tell you that I have all the answers, okay? But I bring it up because this is what I painted, it is a picture of tomorrow and we need to be prepared for it. If not in my lifetime, I believe in my daughter's lifetime and she ought to know about the Christian response, how to live with it, how to accept persecution too. We're going to have to go through a lot of persecution, I believe, before and if we ever get to the point of having to ever use defensive arms because one of the....and it's pretty consistent what I read is to do everything you can to avoid war because war is terrible.

So this is twofold when I say the limits of submission to government. The limit is how much are you going to stretch yourself and accept persecution because the American

church is not seeing persecution. We don't really understand persecution. We are, as I like to say, spiritually fat, dumb and happy as a whole. So the kind of questions that will come up then in the course here that you're going to be thinking is: what to do if the government comes to take your guns. What to do if the government comes and takes your children. What to do if the government comes and takes your pastor, you might just say, "Take him." When to flee. When to fight. Should you fight. That's why I said one of the highlights here will be the vindication of defensive arms, not that I think for the NSA who's listening, anytime soon I think we're going to have to do that as Christians or as Americans. This is an interesting duality here. We're citizens of this world and we're citizens of heaven, aren't we? We're American citizens and, again, the history of the church has been and the arguments that I have read and I believe are true, is that it's okay to take up arms to defend your country. Not as a Christian as such. Your country doesn't have to be Christian anymore than Rome was Christian but there were Christian centurions who could at the drop of a hat go to war for Rome.

Then I want to explain what this course is not about. What it's about in general, the limits of submission to government, in particular the vindication of arms, defensive use of arms. What it's not about, you don't have that on your sheet. You're not getting everything I have in my outline. Sorry. It's not about what is the best or proper type of government: aristocracy, democracy, monarchy, whatever. We're not going...that's not what I'm going to go after although it's hinted at, of course, in this course. It's not about the proper means to institute a government. How should we start a new government, should we do it through hope, through votes, etc? Although, again, that will be hinted at because we have to remember, brothers and sisters, the bulk of Christian history, Christians have found themselves that is in a de facto government. That's just the fact of the matter. This is where they are. They grew up a Christian and here they are under a communist regime so I'm not going to ask the question, "Well, now they're in a communist regime, should they all get together and take out the communists." It's going to be perhaps implied there but that's not what my main focus is going to be on.

Now, the class will cover, as you see here, some preliminary things. I'm going to explain the Bible, how to use the Bible, so I'm going to go over in short order the larger Catechism question 99. I had a sermon on it, a three part series on that and I have a handout which is eight pages for you. I don't expect you to read it but it's important so that when you go to the Bible and you try to wrestle with the question, "What does it mean to flee? How much should we flee? Does the Bible talk about war? What about war?" you'll understand how to read the text and understand what the text is saying, what can be implied or that is inferred by good and necessary consequences from the text and the like and that requires a little overview of how to read the Bible essentially. There is a lot of confusion that way. Then we're going to go over shortly the history of the doctrine of resistance and of submission to the government. Then I'm going to go over the historical arguments in short order so you can hear the different ways and arguments that are made about submission to the government, especially with respect to defensive arms.

Then lastly, the modern application. Excuse me, after that, we'll go over the Bible texts, those texts like Romans 13, right, the government has a sword. What does that mean.

What does that mean. There have been arguments historically that text means you can never go out against the king, for instance, in Tudor England or something like that in the 1500-1600s and saying you always must submit to the king. Always. I know, I'm not arguing to an audience like that. You can't wrap your head around that but that's part of the argument that they did historically that is quite fascinating. Then texts that seem to say the opposite. What do you do with the Sermon on the Mount? You should be peacemakers? How do you go to war and be a peacemaker? We'll talk about that. Then lastly, application. Have those questions on the last two days of class.

I'm going to be gone for two weeks in October so you'll hear something else from Larry or one of the elders or Leonard. Then we end the 15th of December. I'm going to take two weeks off at the end of December so the last class will be the 15th.

Now, special and general revelation. This is important, again, this is all the groundwork so that you can go to the Bible and understand and also when you hear the arguments, understand how they're arguing. They argue the twofold approach to things. There is a special revelation that is that which is directed from God, specifically the Bible, right? It's infallible. It's inerrant. It's inspired by the Holy Spirit. That's what we go to for faith and practice. I don't think I need to dwell on that. General revelation, however, general revelation is that knowledge given to us outside of the Bible. It's twofold: from your conscience and from creation itself. That we are made in the image of God so we have innate knowledge and that God has created the world in a certain way; we can observe that. You see that in particular in Psalm 19. That's a classical text that talks about both revelation from creation and revelation from the Bible. Then Romans 1:18, of course, which emphasizes the conscience: all men know there is a God and all men know that lying and stealing and coveting and homosexuality and transgenderism, in betweenism and whatever else you want to call it, is against God. If you look at the list, it's quite explicit and he's saying this is what they know from their conscience. Forget the Bible because the revelation of the conscience and revelation from creation is not contradictory to the Bible but the way God has designed it, the Bible is more clear because we have the Holy Spirit and that's the agent and the instrument he uses to clarify what is apparently becoming more and more obscure in men's consciences in America.

Now, the mode of general revelation, that is, the consequence thereof is what we all natural law in the Christian tradition, both before and after the Reformation. It's part of the reformed tradition. It's something we don't hear about in some circles very often, I think, because of the overemphasis upon theonomy. The moral law that can be known independent of the Bible is natural law. Did everyone catch that? The moral law is the same. I said that before. The Ten Commandments and the moral law are the same, it's just that the natural law is the moral law that can be known independent of the Bible. You see that again in Romans 1. There is a list of all of these. Disobedience to parents and that kind of things, they know that. That's part of natural law that they can observe in their hearts and in creation.

We see this in the Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter 1, of the Bible, paragraph 6. Chapter 1, paragraph 6, in that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of

God and the government of the church common to all human actions in societies which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the word of God. Now, I would argue just war theory, proper defense, submission of limits to the government, are also ordered by the light of nature, Christian prudence and according to the general rules of the word and even specific rules of the word.

Confession of Faith, chapter 20, of Christian liberty, paragraph 4, chapter 20, paragraph 4. This is about the abuse of Christian liberty and for the publishing of such opinions or maintaining of such practices as are contrary to the lights of nature or what we would say, natural law. Or to the known principles of Christianity. Two different categories in reformed thinking but they're not contradictory categories. Whether concerning the faith, worship or conversation that they may be lawfully called to account and proceeded against by the censures of the church. So natural law, that is that which could be observed outside the Bible but not contrary to the Bible and actually harmony of the Bible is part of our Christian tradition, part of our reformed tradition. The Reformers and the Puritans didn't simply quote a Bible verse with respect to social, civil and political law issues that we have a lot of debate over, right? Even in Christian circles, we debate but what are the parameters? Should it be this? Would we be comfortable under, I can't remember his name in Holland, Kuiper. He isn't a traditionalist the way we think. They're a little different over there. We would probably consider him a little more liberal how he uses the laws and everything else. They didn't just quote Deuteronomy 20 and say, "There's my just war theory." They argued through natural law as well and general revelation.

Okay, we have 2 ½ minutes. Any questions? George?

Yeah, that might work. I don't see why it wouldn't. The other person could start talking about it and they would say, "Sure, I think I have high morals. My high morals include transgenderism." That's where we are, George. If you want to see something, I wouldn't say depressing but sad and a terrible dystopia of America future, go to massresistance.com, I think it is. Type in "mass resistance." The gentleman and others who have been keeping an eye out since 2003 when the court through a technicality allowed homosexual marriage contrary to the will of the people in Massachusetts and how it's just spreading like wildfire and all of the implications legally there in Massachusetts. That's the picture of America tomorrow with respect to transgender laws.

Yes?

No, freedom of speech....the military is unique because you have a lot more restrictions. You sign a contract and you knew what you were getting into. I still agree that it's wrong but I'm telling you...this is what I'm saying, you asked, "Well, what about the first amendment? What about this amendment? What about the laws?" Every law has limits. You do not have a right to yell "Fire!" in a crowded theater. That's a classic argument that there are...and we don't. You can get in trouble for that. Well, yeah, I agree but how do you define the limits of it? The best way to define it is if we're all Christians, frankly. That is, we all have the same kind of mindset that when it comes to a lot of details, the

law doesn't specify it. Nowhere in the Bible does it say, "Hey, you know, when it comes to yelling 'Fire!' in a theater, you just can't do it." You try to deduce that from the passages of the Bible or the law or natural law even, I think the natural law plays into it. We would call it sanctified common sense perhaps. That's where we are so the laws are there but they'd never be considered absolute, not even the right to bear arms is ever considered absolute and so now they're just shuffling around slowly. Each generation, less than that, I mean, I was born in 1972, brothers and sisters. Those of you who were around in 1972, think how much has changed in 40 years, in my lifetime, from the rights of children being trampled on in 1973, the Supreme Court ruling on abortion and not a single state or leaders have said, "I refuse to enforce that law." I think our forefathers are rolling in their graves hearing that kind of law passed and not a single, that I know of, someone tell me if I'm wrong, back in 1973 just saying, "I'm going to ignore you. You can take me to prison. I'm your governor. I'm not going to enforce that law."

So go ahead and write then down, please. We're out of time and if you have questions, next week we'll cover a few in the morning but, again, scenarios. I have given you two days. I can make it three if I have to if you think you've got a lot. So please tell me ahead of time. Write it down on a piece of paper so I know what I'm getting into. I'm serious. Maybe I'll have nobody and nobody will have any questions then I'll only give you two days but if I have a lot of questions, I've got to be prepared for it.

Let's go ahead and pray.

I. Preliminary (2 Days)

A. Topic Explained (DAY 1)

1. Intro

a) America Tomorrow

(1) Christians forced out of offering public services such as food, photography, room and board, and many government jobs because discriminatory laws forces the selling of services to those of transgender nature, polyamorous relationships, pedophiliacs, incestuous partners and public copulationists.

(2) Professional Christian counseling will be restricted to “religious” institutions and forced out of State licensing.

(3) Christian doctors forced out of work involving reproduction because they will not “tow the line.”

(4) Federal healthcare requirement to provide for aborticides will also include access to euthanasia, prostitution, transgender surgery, and anything else deemed “health-related”

(5) Christians will lose in court cases because any moral view they take against a current law will be deem violation of separation of church and state.

(6) Government will have a secret watchlist of Christians, being deemed a “dangerous influence.” List includes email, gps locations and phone records of Christians

(7) Pastors will regularly jailed or fined for “hate speech.”

b) America Today

(1) Examples of oppressive laws:

(a) IRS target conservative organizations

(b) Chaplains restricted and fired for proselytizing, OPC Pastor and Dr. Charles McIlhenny. Other restrictions in military (Foxnews radio, Todd Starnes).

- (c) NM Supreme court to Christians: violate your consciences or suffer*
- (d) San Antonio anti-Christian speech law*
- (e) NYC law forbidding churches from using public schools*
- (f) Separation of church and state means reading laws with secular perspective according to 2009 Iowa Supreme Court Ruling on same-sex marriage.*
- (g) US District Court Judge Walker overturn prop 8 because it is closely aligned with religious views which could "harm" gays*
- (h) Colorado baker being sued for not selling cake for homosexual wedding*
- (i) Christian school at Thousand Oaks counter-sues to protect right to hire with Christian teachers for-profit.*
- (j) Christie and New Jersey forbid counselors from converting homosexuals.*
- (k) Obama administration subverts religious freedom of Denver business with employer-mandated healthcare coverage (Hercules v. Obama). Religious groups narrowly exempted.*
- (l) Military classes describe Evangelicals as "extremists" along with terrorists (Foxnews radio, Todd Starnes)*
- (m) "Widespread, systematic persecution of LGBTI people constitutes a crime against humanity that unquestionably violates international norms," wrote U.S. District Judge Michael A. Ponsor [Christian Post]*
- (n) Obama's use of drone for assassinations (Washington Post, Judge backs Obama administration on secrecy of targeted killings of terrorism suspects*
- (o) Summary from "Serve your own kind and stick to religious activities and you are free to depart from secular norms. But answer Jesus' call to serve your needy neighbor and not restrict yourself to prayer if the neighbor needs food — and you may discover that your faith-shaped way of operating is illegal. Possible case studies: Need volunteers to research" [Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance]*

(2) Legal Thought and Actions Already There:

(a) *NSA surveillance: found in violation of practices by 2011 Judge; manipulated international standards; secret deal; clandestine hacking of US servers; general warrants.*

(b) *Obama "They'll warn that tyranny is always lurking just around the corner. You should reject these voices. Because what they suggest is that our brave and creative and unique experiment in self-rule is somehow just a sham with which we can't be trusted." [Spring, 2013]*

(c) *Obama: "To conquer fascism and disease; to visit the Moon and Mars; to gradually secure our God-given rights for all of our citizens, regardless of who they are, or what they look like, or who they love." [Spring 2013]*

(d) *"Implicit in [the Constitution] structure, in the very idea of ordered liberty, was a rejection of absolute truth, the infallibility of any idea or ideology or theology or 'ism,' any tyrannical consistency that might lock future generations into a single, unalterable course..." President Obama, The Audacity of Hope, p. 93*

2. **Topic In General: Limits of Submission and Resistance to Government**

- a) ***Submission: Obedience to another under God***
- b) ***Resistance: Active and passive; negative and positive***
- c) ***Government: Duly appointed social authority over men***

3. **In Particular: The Vindication of Defensive Arms**

- a) ***Historical Perspective***
- b) ***Historical Arguments***
- c) ***Modern Application***
- d) ***Thus these types of questions: what to do if...***

- (1) The gov't comes to take your guns
- (2) The gov't comes to take your children
- (3) The gov't comes to take your pastor
- (4) When to flee; when to fight; should you fight?