

God's Law and Society



Foundations in Christian Reconstruction

Edited by Jay Rogers

God's Law and Society

Foundations in Christian
Reconstruction

Edited by Jay Rogers

All scriptures quoted from the King James Version unless otherwise noted.

God's Law and Society: Foundations in Christian Reconstruction

Copyright © 1999 by J.C. Rogers Productions, P.O. Box 362173, Melbourne, FL 32936
PDF version copyright © 2006 by J.C. Rogers Productions

All rights reserved. These writings may be reproduced in any form without prior written permission from the publisher. However, the booklet may not be resold for profit.

Printed in the United States of America.

Table of Contents

Introduction	6
About our “panel of experts”	8
1. Grace and the Law	14
2. The “New Testament” Church	20
3. Can we legislate morality?	27
4. The Christian Foundations of Civil Government	34
5. The Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution	40
6. Separation of Church and State	47
7. The Myth of Neutrality	54
8. Non-Christians and the Law of God	61
9. Freedom and the Christian Republic	68
10. What would a Christian America look like?	75
A Glossary of Terms	83

Introduction

This workbook is designed to be used with the ten part video series, *God's Law and Society*. The video and the workbook together are designed to be a training curriculum to help spark "A Second American Revolution"—a Neo-Puritan revival that will inspire Christians to reengage the culture, most specifically in the arena of public policy, with the message of Christ's Lordship over the nations of the earth.

God's Law and Society examines ten important questions:

Question #1:— Didn't the Apostle Paul say that we are no longer under law but under grace? If so, then what is the use of the Law of God under the New Covenant?

Question #2:— Was the New Testament Church really a "New Testament" Church as we think of it today? In what ways was their situation different from ours?

Question #3:— Can we really legislate the biblical standards of morality on non-Christians? The non-Christian doesn't even believe in the Bible, so how can we even talk about building a society based on the Law of God?

Question #4:— How did Christian philosophy influence our form of civil government? Can this influence happen again today?

Question #5:— Were the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution drafted to uphold the moral laws of God—or were they Deistic humanist documents? If they were Christian documents, where have we gone so far off track?

Question #6:— What about the "establishment of religion" clause in the U.S. Constitution? Doesn't the U.S. Constitution forbid the display of religion in the civil sphere?

Question #7:— What about the idea that the government should be neutral and should recognize that we live in a democratic, pluralistic society?

Question #8:— In a Christian republic based on biblical law, would non-Christian religions be banned or would they have as much freedom as they have now?

Question #9:— But wouldn't a Christian Republic run according to God's Law become oppressive to non-Christians?

Question #10:— What can Christians begin to do from a practical standpoint to begin to rebuild our nation according to the standard of the Law of God? What would a Christian America look like?

These questions are of concern to Christians, yet all thinking Americans today are concerned in some way or another by growing signs of national decay. The very foundations of our governmental structures are being shaken to the core. Many are wondering if we will survive as a free nation far into the new millennium. There is no doubt that America is in the midst of a grave crisis. Whether or not the Church responds with the correct answers will determine the future of our nation.

Who is to be the ultimate authority in our national affairs? Should it be the Supreme Court, the Con-

gress, the President, the majority will of the people, the opinions of television news pundits, the latest poll, the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, or some combination of these? Many Christians are appealing to our Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, or the Christian history of the United States, to provide a moral blueprint for reconstruction in America. While these appeals have great value, they lack the authority that is uniquely found in the Bible. Therefore, in attempting to answer these questions, we explicitly and unashamedly use God's Word.

Psalms chapter 2 asks: **"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?"**

Psalms 2 goes on to proclaim: **"The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against His Christ, saying, 'Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.' Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."**

Jesus Christ is pictured here as the present ruling King, the Son of God the Father, who has been given the nations for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession. It's important to realize that Jesus Christ is portrayed here as the *present* King ruling with a rod of iron over the kings of the earth and who, through His death, resurrection, ascension and glorification is now the locus of all power and authority, both in heaven and on earth (Matt. 28:18).

Restoring the "Crown Rights of King Jesus" is the theme of this presentation. We interviewed several Christian leaders who are involved with the work of Revival and Reformation. We culled the best of these interviews into short programs covering a variety of questions. While it will take you a little over 20 minutes to view each program, we suggest that you approach the material as strong meat that needs time to be digested.

Method for Teaching and Learning

The best method for teaching and learning this material is to systematically study each of the ten programs separately, preferably in a small group. The recommended method for teaching and learning the material in group meetings is as follows.

At the first meeting, each person who is part of the study group is given a copy of the workbook by the group leader. A separate ruled notebook for taking notes is also recommended. The group is encouraged to take notes as though it were a live seminar. The group will view the introduction and the first section of the video tape while taking notes and perhaps jotting down questions or points for discussion. A twenty to thirty minute discussion follows. The group leader should first ask if there are any questions about what was said in the video. He should attempt to answer the questions and promote discussion and debate among the group. Then the leader should prompt further discussion by previewing the questions at the end of section 1 of the workbook. Each group member is then given an assignment for the next meeting. They are each required to read the short articles and interviews with the Christian leaders in this study booklet. They should write out short answers to the questions at the end of each chapter.

At the next meeting, the group leader should review the material from the first week asking for volunteers to answer the discussion questions assigned for homework. This should be done quickly taking no more than a minute or two for each question. The leader will ask if there are any further questions or comments for discussion. After no more than 20 or 30 minutes for opening discussion, the next section is viewed; a discussion follows; and homework is assigned.

The panel we have chosen may not agree with each other on every point and you may not agree with their answers either. Our goal in this series is not to give patent answers to every question about God's Law, but to give you the principles by which to reason and answer these questions for yourself. Therefore, there are no "answers in the back of the book." It is hoped that you will draw your own conclusions as "wise Bereans" and search the scripture to find out whether these things are so (Acts 17:11).

We hope that as you do this, you will be impressed by an important fact. "**There is another king, one Jesus**" (Acts) who is enthroned in heaven as the ruler of the nations. Jesus Christ has been given the name **King of kings and Lord of lords** (Rev 19:16). While some would limit the rule of Christ over the nations to some future dispensation, the Bible clearly teaches that He rules *today* and that His Law has a broad application in our culture and society.

And we, His people, have the responsibility to take the role of stewards of His authority and seek to rule wisely as His ambassadors and representatives on earth. May we commit ourselves, by the grace of God to pray for and diligently work toward the restoration of the Crown Rights of Jesus Christ. As we do this, we will begin to see once again the reformation of all aspects of our culture according to the infallible Word of God, by the power of the Holy Spirit, and to the glory of the Triune God.

About our panel of experts

The 16 speakers in the video are not all included in this booklet, rather only ten have been chosen. The panel of speakers in this video represent a diverse group, although all hold to a rigorously orthodox view of scripture. All of the speakers are Reformed Protestant teachers who are sought after as conference and seminar speakers. There are literally hundreds of volumes of books on theology and Christian issues that have been written by this panel.

The speakers were chosen for their expertise in the topic of God's Law and how the commandments of scripture are applied to the reformation of society. They also are men who have been involved in effective application of God's Law. What you will be learning is not just theory, but practical wisdom gained through many years of experience. The leaders are well-known in various movements from pro-life activism, Christian education and home-schooling, to the Christian Reconstruction movement.

Please note that not all the interviews in the video are included in the booklet. In this first edition, we chose to limit the length of the booklet. Also, some comments included in the booklet do not appear in the video. The interviews have been edited for length, correct usage, and technical reasons. Another anomaly of *God's Law and Society* is that sometimes the speakers will appear to be meandering from the question asked and covering a tangential topic. The questions posed in to the individual speakers were often broader than the questions you will see here. In these cases, broader treatments were intentionally left in the video, as we wanted to cover related issues.

The video seminar was an outgrowth of an Internet resource called "The Second American Revolution." You can access all the text in this booklet, as well as streaming video from all of the sections. We wanted to make this seminar available for free to people who may not be able to afford the video.

<http://www.forerunner.com/revolution/>

George Grant, Ph.D., D.Lit., is the director of the King's Meadow Study Center, the editor of the *Arx Axiom*, *Stirling Bridge*, and *Mercury* newsletters, a regular columnist for both *World* and *Table Talk* magazines, the editorial director for Highland Books, and a teaching fellow at the Franklin Classical School. He is the author of some four dozen books in the areas of history, politics, biography, social issues and theology. He has studied political science at the University of Houston, theology at Midwestern Seminary, and literature and philosophy at Whitefield College and makes his home on a small farm in Tennessee with his wife, Karen, and their three children. Dr. Grant may be contacted at either the mailing address or the email address below.



King's Meadow Study Center
P.O. Box 1593
Franklin, TN 37065

<http://www.kingsmeadow.com/>

Jay Grimstead is the founder and president of Coalition on Revival (COR), a national Christian think-tank comprised of leading conservative thinkers. COR created several foundational documents for the Church: *The Essentials of a Christian World View* (a generic statement of faith); *The 25 Articles on the Kingdom of God* (a historically orthodox view of the kingdom of God); *The Christian Manifesto* (where the Church should stand and what it should do) and *The 17 Worldview Documents* (stating how to apply the Bible to every field of life). COR gave birth to a Church Council Committee of 60 theologians and other leaders. The goal is to convene a global Church Council in the years 2003, 2005, 2007 to discuss 21 position paper topics. COR works through the National Think Tank which is endeavoring to establish spiritual armies in the major cities of 36 states which organize themselves to rebuild civilization upon the principles of the Bible. COR's vision is to see Christians everywhere doing all they can to take every thought captive to the obedience of Christ (2 Cor. 10:5).



Coalition on Revival
P.O. Box 1139
Murphys, CA 95247

<http://www.reformation.net/>

Howard Phillips was chosen by a majority of delegates at the Constitution Party to serve as its candidate in the 2000 presidential election. A 1962 graduate of Harvard University (where he was twice elected president of the Student Council), Phillips served the Republican Party for two decades as precinct worker, election warden, campaign manager, Congressional aide, Boston Republican Chairman, and assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee. During the Nixon Administration, Phillips headed two Federal agencies, ending his Executive Branch career as director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, a position from which he resigned when President Nixon reneged on his commitment to veto further funding for "Great Society" programs. Since 1974, Phillips has been chairman of The Conservative



Caucus, a non-partisan, nationwide grass-roots public policy group which has advocated termination of federal subsidies to leftist ideological activist groups, opposition to NAFTA and the World Trade Organization, and efforts to oppose socialized medicine, abortion, and special rights for homosexuals.

The Conservative Caucus
450 Maple Avenue East
Vienna VA 22180

<http://www.conservativeusa.org/>

Rousas John Rushdoony, born in 1916, the son of Armenian immigrants, was ordained as a minister in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and distinguished himself as a missionary on the American Indian reservations. One of his early books, *The Messianic Character of American Education*, was a major influence in the fledgling home school movement in California. During the 1960s, Rushdoony was called upon in court cases as an expert historian on home schooling as a legitimate alternative to public education. Rushdoony was primarily influenced by the teachings of Cornelius Van Til's presuppositional apologetics and began to work to restore the historic Christian doctrines of postmillennialism and Christian dominion in society. Not until 1973 with the publication of R. J. Rushdoony's *The Institutes of Biblical Law* was there an attempt at a Biblical social philosophy that uncompromisingly affirmed the validity of biblical law. Since then hundreds of volumes have been published elaborating the details of Calvinistic social philosophy from a "theonomic" perspective. Rushdoony passed on in 2001. His son Mark Rushdoony now heads the Chalcedon Foundation.



Chalcedon Foundation
P.O. Box 158
Vallecito, CA 95251

<http://www.chalcedon.edu/>

Andrew Sandlin is the former pastor of Church of the Word, Painesville Ohio, an orthodox Reformed church, and former American editor of *Calvinism Today*. While a pastor in northeast Ohio, Andrew was instrumental in gathering an alliance of Baptist and Charismatic churches which were becoming increasingly Reformed in their doctrine and practice. This alliance grew into the Association of Free Reformed Churches. In 1995, he became the editor of *The Chalcedon Report* and the *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, two influential Christian Reconstructionist periodicals founded by R.J. Rushdoony. Andrew is a past president of The National Reform Association, an organization founded in 1864 with the purpose of promoting Christian principles of civil government. Andrew now heads Center for Cultural Leadership.



Center for Cultural Leadership
P.O. Box 70
La Grange, CA 95239

<http://www.christianculture.com/>

Steve Schlissel, is the pastor of Messiah's Congregation, a Reformed church in Brooklyn, editor of *Messiah's Mandate*, author of *Hal Lindsey and the Restoration of the Jews and Television or Dominion?* He is a monthly contributor to the Chaldeon Report which publishes his "All I Really Need to Know..." series. Steve has been a tireless defender of orthodoxy within the Christian Reformed Church (CRC). He serves as the Overseer of Urban Nations (a mission to the world in a single city), and is the Director of Meantime Ministries (an outreach to women who were sexually abused as children). Steve lives with his wife of 24 years, Jeanne, and their five children. Contact Messiah's Congregation to order books and tapes or to subscribe to the Messiah's Mandate.



Messiah's Covenant Community Church
1600 Sheepshead Bay Road Suite 3
Brooklyn, NY 11235

<http://www.messiahnyc.org/>

Randall Terry, was the founder of Operation Rescue in the 1980s, and has since diversified to a ministry addressing a full range of issues confronting America. He was the host of *Randall Terry Live!* a daily dose of spiritual, intellectual and historical medicine designed to heal America's wounds and return her to the character which caused people generations ago to call her "A Shining City on a Hill." Using Scripture as a foundation, Randall comments on a wide variety of subjects ranging from criminal justice to national health care, spirituality, economics, abortion, government, and education. Randall ran unsuccessfully for U.S. Congress in 1998 and for Florida State Senate in 2006.



Randall Terry
3501-B North Ponce De Leon Blvd
Suite #394
St. Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www.randallterry.com/>

Editor's Note: Due to some recent controversy surrounding Randall Terry, the producers of *God's Law and Society* have decided that for the time being his interviews will not be offered in video format. However, I have preserved the streaming videos on-line for anyone who wishes to view them. I also include here the interview transcripts in print format for the record of history and their instructional value. - JCR

Rev. Phillip Vollman, is the senior pastor of Shiloh Christian Church and an instructor at Reformation Bible Institute. He is the Secretary / Treasurer of the AFRC (Association of Free Reformed Churches) and Treasurer of New Start. He is a board member of the National Reform Association. He is a co-founder of Partners for Family Values, an organization to bring back morality in Lake County, Ohio. Rev. Vollman is involved with Christian street activism ranging from pro-life efforts with Operation Rescue to organizing the picketing of illegal pornography outlets in neighboring Ohio towns. Several of Rev. Vollman's church members have been candidates for political office, such as Joe Slovenec, a candidate for governor of Ohio and U.S. Congress, and Ron Young, who was elected for two consecutive terms as an Ohio state representative. He is married to wife Linda. He has five children: Phillip, Scott, Sarah, Katy, and Daniel.



Phillip Vollman
P.O. Box 46
Unionville, OH 44088

Dr. Monte Wilson is the founder of Global Impact, a missions organization with the goal of applying biblical truth to every area of life. Monte's call to the ministry came through an encounter with Arthur Blessitt during the height of the Jesus Movement (1970). He served as a pastor in Miami, Tallahassee, and Tampa, Florida. He soon began a ministry called, Reformers, and spent the next several years in Belize, Bolivia, British Guyana, the Philippines, and Surinam, and held leadership seminars in Peru, Spain and Finland. He then served as pastor for Covenant Community Church in Tallahassee from 1987 to 1995. Monte has served as Vice Chairman of the International Church Relief Fund (ICRF), a relief agency based in Santa Rosa, California. Monte's ministry, Global Impact, is probably best known for its widely distributed teaching publication, *Classical Christianity*. He is a graduate of Bethany College and Seminary, Bachelor of Theology, Master of Religious Education and Doctorate of Ministry degrees.



Monte Wilson III
9925 Haynes Bridge Rd
Suite #200-135
Alpharetta, GA 30022

<http://www.MindingSuccess.com>

Rev. Jeffrey A. Ziegler, is founder and president of Christian Endeavors and Reformation Bible Institute. Christian Endeavors, founded in 1983, is a Christian education organization providing theological lectures and materials to help churches across the denominational spectrum develop a comprehensive biblical world-life-view. Ziegler has lectured in over 600 churches and pastors conferences comprising 18 denominations and spanning the North American continent, Great Britain and Germany. Reformation Bible Institute was founded in 1985 to train pastors and laymen in the theological opinions of the historic Reformed faith. Since 1985, over 500 students have passed through the halls of RBI in Northeast Ohio. Rev. Ziegler is moderator of the Association of Free Reformed Churches and the Ohio Reconstruction Society. He is an author with articles appearing in *The Christian Statesman*, *The Forerunner*, and *Chalcedon Report*. Jeff Ziegler is the editor of the *Revival Flame* newsletter and *The Puritan Storm*, and is the president of the 135-year-old National Reform Association. Jeff Ziegler is married to wife Karen and has three children: Hannah Grace, Andrew Phillip, and Jeb Stuart.



Jeff Ziegler
35155 Beachpark Dr.
Eastlake, OH 44095

<http://www.natreformassn.org>

God's Law and Society - Part 1

Grace and the Law

The Apostle Paul wrote in Romans 6:14: **“For you are not under the law but under grace.”**

How to interpret exactly what this means has caused some confusion among many Christians. When discussing the Law of God versus the Grace of God, we often hear: “I’m not under the law” or “I’d rather err on the side of liberty than on the side of legalism.” Yet these statements belie a basic misunderstanding of the relationship between Law and Grace.

When many Christians speak of “grace” or “Christian liberty,” they are often advocating a license to sin or an “anti-Law” view (known as “antinomianism”) that is clearly condemned in Scripture. Likewise, when many Christians speak of “the law” what they are referring to is not the moral Law of God, but a system of legalism or traditions devised by men. This confusion has arisen due to a lack of basic definitions. We have the twin heresies of legalism (on one hand) and antinomianism (on the other) which have appeared in the Church as counterfeits to true Law and true Grace.

Legalism can be defined in two ways: (1) That obedience to the Law is the means by which we are saved; or (2) When rules or traditions of men are instituted as a standard of righteousness. The idea that man is able to keep the law under his own power and please God is biblically false. Salvation is a gift of God and we are saved by God’s own choosing; not our own.

When we say, as Christians, that we are not “under the Law,” scripturally, we can mean two things: (1) We are not under the Law as a means of obtaining salvation; and (2) We are not under the condemnation (or the curse) of the Law. We asked our panel of experts the following questions:

What does the Bible mean when it says that we are no longer under law but under grace?

Monte Wilson:— On an individual level, the average serious Christian really wants to glorify God, even those who have never heard of the Westminster Catechism [i.e., “Question 1”]. They want to be holy and spiritually healthy. But the whole American Christian milieu is so subjective and existential that they have no concept whatsoever of how to do that. There is no objective standard. You love Jesus, you pray, you feel good toward others, you tithe, but you don’t know whether you are pleasing God or not, other than your own subjective feelings.

Here is the law of God. Are you obeying it or not? Are you obeying it with an act of your will or is your heart really into it as well? **“Serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul” (Deut. 10:12).** It does give us an objective standard to evaluate our actions. It keeps us from second guessing, from false judgments. We are either progressing in sanctification or we are not.

We cannot ever be justified according to the law. But as a standard of holiness, that’s an entirely different use of the law. While we cannot be saved by the law, Jesus and Paul reinforced the integrity and the force of the law in the Christian’s life. The law does direct us. Jesus was constantly quoting the law. Paul used the law in many different ways to say this is how we should live. If you say the law is not relevant for the Christian, then what about adultery, thievery, homosexuality, abortion. The Christian is

left defenseless, directionless, standardless if he rejects the law of God. There is no way to make these judgments calls in the life of an individual or a culture.

There is an incredible amount of freedom in the Law. God gives only Ten Commandments. Man gives you 50 zillion. That's the image a lot of people have of theonomists. I know all the leaders of theonomy and none of them are like that. They are celebrative people who have joy and enjoy life. They have peace because they have parameters. The liberty you have under the law of God is incredible.

Jeff Ziegler:— The notion of being “under grace and not law” is something not to be underestimated or undermined. But what is it Paul is saying? We are not saved nor justified by law. We are justified by faith in Christ. It is His finished work alone that secures our redemption. However, how is it that we are to live our lives? Is it by every whim or every fancy of our own wicked heart—a deceitful heart that we cannot know? The Law of God has not passed away in terms of our guide for life in godliness. Jesus himself said that **“Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law” (Mat. 22:27)**. Christ as the fulfillment of the law gives us the grace, which is divine almighty power effective on our behalf. He gives us the grace to live according to the law not to transgress the law. We see in Romans 6:1, **“Shall we sin that grace may abound? God forbid!”** And how is it we know that we sin? We have an unchanging standard in God's Law.

Now granted, there have been portions of Old Testament Law that have been changed or nullified. For example, the sacrificial system is no longer needed and is repugnant to God because Christ is the final and last sacrifice. The dietary laws have been modified and changed. But the moral law is still binding. For example, the laws against bestiality in the Old Testament are no where repeated in the New. Yet no one will say that bestiality is somehow now under grace. It's still sin. The ideas and notions of our conduct are in the Law of God. They are not options. They are commands. They have not been nullified or abridged in any way by Christ's finished work. In fact, now that law is written upon our heart and our mind and we are given grace to follow hard after them in a way that was not possible in the old dispensation.

Of course, Christianity is ultimately personal and intimate. We come by the finished work of Jesus Christ into a living, real and vital relationship with God. The creation can touch the Creator—the Christ. That brings joy unspeakable and full of glory—there can be no doubt. But then what? This personal, real and vital relationship must be manifest. The Great Commission says that we are to be a witness unto all nations. We are to teach those nations all the things that Christ did depict and declare. That means that we are to enforce, declare and disciple the nations, every tribe, every kindred, every ethnic grouping under and according to God's Law.

The idea that religion is only personal is actually heretical. That's an ancient heresy called Gnosticism. They said that the material world was evil and the unseen world was innately spiritual. That's why so many Christians in that era, and even today, have not had a proper view of sexuality, the family, the role of the Church, their role in society, and even the idea of work and creating wealth. They think the material world is evil. And therefore, they must cultivate material monastic ideas to be closer to Christ. But the idea of being close to Christ, the chosen fast of God, is to go out and set at liberty the captives. So whether it is preaching the Gospel to men so that they may be redeemed. Or whether that means going into the civil realm as a politician and declaring the Crown Rights of Jesus Christ there and ruling diligently according to the Law of God. Or whether that means being a home schooling mom and raising a generation of champions for Jesus Christ. At every realm, Christ the expression of the Gospel, His life is real and vital, and therefore it must have an outward flow.

Randall Terry:— There are well meaning Christians who say: “We’re not under the Law, we’re under grace.” Obviously, for the means of salvation we are under grace. We are saved by grace, not by the works of the law. But don’t be so quick to write the law off. Paul said, **“Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: we establish the law” (Romans 3:31)**. In 1 Timothy 1:9,10, Paul said that the law is not for the righteous; the law is for the wicked—and he went on to list murderers, man stealers, etc. The law is still for today with regards to its behavioral aspects. It’s still wrong to be involved in theft, murder, adultery, bestiality and homosexuality. You can’t just throw out the law.

Christians will often say: “Jesus said just love your neighbor and love God.” *Absolutely!* But that’s the summation of the law. You don’t know how to love God and your neighbor unless you look to the law to define it. Paul said, **“To those who are without law, I became as one who was without law.” (1 Cor. 9:21)**. He said, “I am not free from God’s law, but am under Christ’s law.” The moral mandates of Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation are still binding on all of us.

There is a Proverb that says: **“Do not rebuke a fool lest you be like unto him” (Prov. 26:4)**. Then there is another one right after it that says: **“Rebuke a fool in his folly lest he be wise in his own eyes” (Prov. 26:5)**. So when Christians take Scriptures out of context to try to justify or to vindicate retreat and cowardice, I say to them: “Wait a minute. The Bible says that Jesus is the Prince of Peace, but it also says, the Lord is a Man of war. He’s the King of kings. He’s the Lord of lords.”

We need to be like the early Church of whom it was said: **“These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also” (Acts 17:6)**. They weren’t greeted by the Chamber of Commerce and a key to the city. They were greeted with conflict, controversy and sometimes a beating and a key to the jail. So if we want to be like the early Church, we are going to have to be involved in conflict and controversy. My observation is that a lot of Christian leaders want to run from the three “C’s” of conflict, controversy and confrontation in order to embrace the three “C’s” of comfort, cowardice and compromise.

In America’s history, those who are self-conscious enemies of Christianity have often used the banner of Christianity or Christian words or phrases: “Mercy, kindness, brotherly love, Christian duty.” They’ve used it when they suited them, but my observation has been that they mean something else when they say: “Mercy, kindness, brotherly love, Christian duty.” Now it’s come to the point where you have people saying it’s our Christian duty to embrace the homosexual movement. And this, of course, is absurd because a Christianity that is in conflict with the Scriptures isn’t Christianity at all. So we as Christians must remember, the Scriptures are the first and last word on what Christianity is, what Christianity does, what Christianity believes, and what we as Christians have a duty to do. If it squares with the Scripture, then let’s go. If it’s in conflict with the Scripture, then it’s heresy.

George Grant:— Christians have wrestled since the first century with the question of the two covenants, the Old Covenant and the New Covenant, the continuity between the two, and where there may be discontinuity. Clearly, the Bible claims authority for every word, every “jot and tittle.” Jesus makes it clear that there is not one word of all of the Scriptures that has passed from authority or applicability in the life of the believer. So in that sense there is absolute continuity. The Apostle Paul wrote to his young disciple Timothy, **“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished all every good works” (2 Tim. 3:16,17)**. There were no other Scriptures other than the Old Testament when the Apostle Paul wrote that. The Gospels had not yet been written. The letters were still in individual churches. The canon of the New Testament had not yet been assembled. The Apostle Paul clearly stated that the Old Testament is authoritative. In that sense there is no discontinuity.

In another sense, there is absolute discontinuity for we have a new and better covenant in Jesus Christ. The cross of Jesus Christ is the fulcrum upon which all of history turns. Through the cross we see both the New and Old Covenant in a totally new light. The Old Testament and its standards are by no means abrogated. Yet they are transformed by the grace and mercy of God. It works like this: The law of God is the tutor or schoolmaster that leads us to Jesus Christ. In Christ and by His grace and mercy alone we have the power to live before God righteously with the cloak of Christ's perfection draped across our shoulders.

The Westminster Confession divides the Old Testament law up into the civil law, the moral law and the ceremonial law. We today do not sacrifice cows or lambs as payment for our sin, because we have had a greater and more perfect sacrifice in Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God. It is helpful to make these distinctions. At the same time, those laws are so intertwined that they are difficult to separate. Sometimes there are all three in a single sentence. You have to do some real exegetical gymnastics to get them all pruned apart from one another.

Some of the Old Testament Law is easily applied to our time. Thou shalt not steal. There is no place in the New Testament that says that bestiality is a sin. Yet there is hardly a Christian who would not say that sexual relations with an animal is perverse and wicked and a denial of God's standards of righteousness for the believer. We have to take the cross, the grace and mercy of Jesus Christ, and bring that lens to all of the Law, moral, ceremonial and civil, and see the application of those things to our day. We cannot take a cafeteria style approach and start picking and choosing which parts of God's Word we apply and which parts we do not.

R.J. Rushdoony:— Covenantal thinking has all but disappeared. That's why in my *Systematic Theology*, I gave it particular space, because it is foundational. The Bible is divided by two covenants, really one Covenant, the original renewed again and again, in the New Testament from a nation to the Church, the nation symbolized by twelve tribes, twelve Apostles now in the church, as the new Israel of God. Paul refers to the Church in Galatians 6:6 as "**... the Israel of God.**" This means that we have a duty. We have to occupy the whole world. The Great Commission is to make disciples of all nations. To bring them all into the fold together with all their peoples because Christ is the ordained King of all creation. We have a magnificent calling. I don't believe God programmed us for defeat.

I know that some of my premillennial friends in the ministry feel a little bit out of sorts because of our stress on victory. They say, "It has an unfortunate appeal for our people. They don't like to be losers. As amillennialists or premillennialists, they feel that they are on the losing side. And you talk about victory and it has a real tug on their heart-strings. They like the idea."

And they should. I believe that the impulse in all their being is God-given. We are a people called to victory not defeat. "**This is the victory,**" the Apostle John tells us, "**that overcometh the world even our faith**" (1 John 4:5).

Questions for Part 1

1. The grace of God means infinitely more than forgiveness of sin and unmerited favor; it also includes: _____ and _____.

2. Grace alone is the means of both our justification and our sanctification.

Give a brief one sentence definition of the terms:

Justification: _____
_____.

Sanctification: _____
_____.

3. What does Law have to do with Grace? Very much! How can we be saved unless we first know that we are sinners? This is why we need to preach the Law of God to sinners in addition to preaching salvation by grace through faith alone. Did Jesus Christ and the Apostles appeal to the Law in their presentation of the Gospel? List three New Testament passages which support the continuing validity of the Law as a behavioral standard.

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

4. The Holy Spirit works through the moral Law as a means of grace to bring sinners to salvation. The moral Law of God always remains the measure of sanctification for the believer. The Law of God, when codified as a basis for civil law, restrains the passion of the sinner (for example, capital punishment is a deterrent to murder). The New Testament teaches us that the Law has three purposes in the life of a believer and society. Look up the scripture passages and list the three uses of the Law.

a. (Romans 1:14-16) _____

b. (Galatians 3:24) _____

c. (James 1:22-24) _____

5. Many people view Law and Grace as being opposites. But both are true and necessary as standards of true conversion. Ultimately, there is no contradiction between being “bound to obey the moral Law” and “being under grace.” This right understanding of the relationship between Law and Grace is foundational to everything else that will be covered in this series on *God’s Law and Society*. Explain in one paragraph this relationship between law and grace. Is there grace within the law? Is there a law of grace? Use scriptures to back up your statements. Use an additional sheet of paper if necessary.

Quote:

6. Discuss: Isolate and comment on the uses of the law outlined by John Calvin in the quote below.

“Here it is of importance to call to mind what was formerly taught, first, that since God by his Law prescribes what we ought to do, failure in any one respect subjects us to the dreadful judgment of eternal death, which it denounces. Secondly, because it is not only difficult, but altogether beyond our strength and ability, to fulfill the demands of the Law, if we look only to ourselves and consider what is due to our merits, no ground of hope remains, but we lie forsaken of God under eternal death. Thirdly, that there is only one method of deliverance which can rescue us from this miserable calamity, viz., when Christ the Redeemer appears, by whose hand our heavenly Father, out of his infinite goodness and mercy, has been pleased to succor us, if we with true faith embrace this mercy, and with firm hope rest in it.”

— John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*

God's Law and Society - Part 2

The "New Testament" Church

The New Testament and especially the Gospels and the Book of Acts has become the *only* standard for many modern Christians. 2 Corinthians 3:6 is often quoted to suggest that the Old Testament is no longer valid for the "New Testament" Christian.

The Apostle Paul wrote, "[God] has made us sufficient as ministers of the New Covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit, for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life" (2 Cor. 3:6). Paul goes on to describe how the glory of the Old Covenant is surpassed by the New. While this is certainly true, the question remains: Does the New Testament then make the Old Testament invalid?

You must have heard the question: "Is *that* in the New Testament?" Perhaps you've quoted a scripture in Deuteronomy or Proverbs that demands justice, or calls God's people to action, and someone responded with the throwaway line that supposedly ends all debate: "But that's in the *Old* Testament." Or perhaps you've heard this objection: "When did Jesus *Himself* ever do that?"

These questions crop up thousands of times a day in conversations, Bible studies and churches all over the world. But the theological presuppositions undergirding these questions are in error. When someone asks the question, "Did Jesus ever do *that*," they are simply implying that if Jesus did not do "*that*" Himself, then we aren't called to do it either. A Christian who asks, "Is *that* in the New Testament?" is implying that biblical truth from Genesis to Malachi, especially the Law, is not binding on us today.

We asked our panel the following questions pertaining to the New Testament Christian and our relationship to the Old Testament Law:

Question #2:— Was the New Testament Church really a "New Testament" Church?

Steve Schlissel:— The Old Testament is the Book of the New Testament Church. So it's a problem to say, "I'm a Christian, therefore I'm a New Testament Christian."

If you open up the first page of the New Testament, what does it say on the first page, first verse?— "**This is the genealogy of Jesus the Messiah, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham**" (Matt. 1:1). Who's David? Where did I read about him? The Old Testament! I guess so. Abraham now, he must be New Testament, right? No? Old Testament? What you have when you go to the first page of this book we call the New Testament is a message that says, "What are what are you doing here? Do you know who these people are? Because I am going to tell you about Jesus Christ who didn't just suddenly come onto the earth." He has a history. He was prophesied from of old. He was promised to somebody. He comes in terms of a context. If it could be any stronger, I don't know. Matthew goes through a list of 14 generations, and another 14 generations, and another 14 generations. Where are those people from? The Old Testament! That's how we get started in the first book.

Then you go on to the second book, Mark, and what do you have? Mark uses imagery from the prophet Isaiah everywhere in his first chapter. Throughout the book he is using this imagery that he

picks up from Isaiah's prophecy, this majestic book. Mark says, "You have no business here until you go back and read Isaiah and the Old Testament. Then you can know what I am talking about."

The whole material foundation of Jesus' ministry was: "**And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself**" (Luke 24:27). Consequently, even if you want to call yourself a new Testament Christian, what does the New Testament tell you? The New Testament tells you to go back to the Old Testament. Now that's just the beginning. When you go through the book of Acts, their discussion was about the pivotal change in administrations, as they came into the new world that has come about because of Christ's work. What is the critical change? Is it that the Old Testament is no longer valid or functional? No. It is that Gentiles can become "Jews" without becoming Jews. That is, they can become Jews without being circumcised.

The distinctive peculiarities that were associated with the Jewish people before Christ are no longer binding upon Gentiles. And so this Gospel that was located in Israel and that was acted out every day in the sacrifice of the Temple service, in the work of the priests, in the offerings, in the feasts, in the calendars, now have come to rest in Jesus Christ about whom they always spoke. They were always looking forwards to Him. There were arrows all along the way pointing. Look to Jesus to find the meaning of this sacrifice. Look to Jesus to find the meaning of this service in the Temple, this priesthood. Now that Jesus has come, the meaning has come. He has taken it all up in Himself. He has gone up into heaven. There is a Temple. There is a kingdom. There is a city. There is a church. And now on earth you have outposts of what has happened in heaven, the final fullness that is there, anywhere on earth. That is the big difference.

The Law didn't change. The Old Testament didn't change. God's morality didn't change. God didn't suddenly say, "Now that my Son has done His work, it's okay if you don't worship me. It's okay if you have other gods. It's okay if you have no day of rest. It's okay if you commit adultery. It's okay if you commit murder." God's values didn't change. They are eternal. The Lord never changes. He never varies. What happened in the New Testament is that this Law has shed those things which kept it local and has gone up to heaven and from heaven it is poured down upon the whole world.

The best way to think about the Bible is that it is one book. It has an anticipation and a working out in history prior to Christ. Then the final chapter is written in the New Testament. I know it is 27 books. We call it 27 books, but it is really the last chapter of the Old Testament. The New Testament Church's book was the Old Testament.

When Paul wrote to Timothy, he told him, "**From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise for salvation which is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. 3:15)**. Now how could that be if it were for the Jews, and not the Christians. To be wise for salvation in Jesus Christ sounds pretty "Christian" to me.

Phil Vollman:— It is interesting to note as you read the book of Acts (That is the romantic book that pastors like to preach from. We go back there all the time preaching out of the book of Acts. We get all pumped up and we preach on the mighty acts that Paul, Silas, Stephen and even the deacons who were used of God to effect mighty miracles) what is instructive for us to remember is this: You don't find the word "love" one time in the book of Acts. You don't find the word "piety" one time in all the 28 chapters of the book of Acts. What you *will* find is 114 references to words like: "riots," "uproars," "tumults," "sword," "persecution," and "peril."

Now the thinking pastor realizing that, if he is a sincere seeker of truth, will begin to ask himself some questions: "What were they doing that we're not doing?" If we can answer questions like that

truthfully, we will realize that what the church did back then was they went everywhere and as they went they preached and unapologetic Gospel of Jesus Christ that went far beyond personal salvation, and my “personal Jesus,” and my “fire insurance.” They insisted on the Crown Rights of King Jesus. Paul said in Acts 17, **“There is another King, one Jesus.”** That was a political statement.

Knoxian social theory is the idea that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is enough to effect change in the real world where they really kill babies, where they really sodomize our sons, and where they really enact social policy detrimental to our health and well being.

If you hold to a covenantal worldview, you understand that God has established three monopolistic institutions on the face of the earth: the family, the church, and the state. They are all distinct and they all have according to God and under God their own spheres of influence. But what we realize now and what we forgot for so many years is that they are all under the same standard. That standard is called the Law-Word of God. It is the responsibility of the church to fulfill its prophetic and Levitical role in time and history. That role consists of teaching the civil magistrate what God has said about ethical and moral matters. And it is to be prophetic when the civil magistrate through its incorrigible attitude says, **“We will not have this man to reign over us” (Luke 19:14).**

If we embrace those things, we realize that we have just declared war in time and history on all those who will not bow the knee to our King the Lord Jesus Christ. We’ve issued the declaration of war. And if we are smart enough, we realize that there will be a cost to fulfilling this Great Commission.

Jay Grimstead:— Jesus asked His disciples to pray: **“Our Father who art in heaven hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven” (Mat. 6:10).** What we know is that Jesus could not have meant, “None of this is supposed to happen for 2000 years until I come. You are supposed to pray this prayer for 2000 years but expect *none of it* to happen until I come!” Nobody in their right theological mind would claim that is what He meant. We know that He had to mean that very year. That century, they were supposed to try to start getting the Roman Empire become a realm where God’s name was honored, His will was done and His kingdom was coming. They pulled it off almost by accident. They actually did it! They came along direction from being a persecuted minority under a one world government where they were killing them to actually running the Roman Empire.

Augustus Caesar was considered, “The Son of God and the Savior of the World,” according to Roman statements. There was a coin that the Sanhedrin were used to seeing. It had an image of Augustus Caesar on one side. On the back it said, “There is salvation in none other than Augustus and there is no other name given among men by which they may be saved.” That was a direct quote from a Roman coin that Peter was giving them in Acts 4:12, **“For there is none other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.”**

He was essentially saying, “Gentlemen, what we are trying to tell you is there is a new world Emperor on earth now—a political, legal Emperor—that your Caesar must bow to or He is out of touch with reality.”

Jeff Ziegler:— The battle in America is between two ideas or notions and it is the Lordship of Jesus Christ versus the authority of the state or “Caesar.” And that’s really always been the question. Even in Christ’s day, in the Gospels we see that the issue is always framed around: What allegiance do we owe to Caesar? What are our duties? And what allegiance do we owe to Christ?

Romans 13 gives us the parameter by which we are to judge our actions in this way. Romans 13 de-

clares what kind of civil magistrate or elected official is endorsed by God. This kind of civil magistrate be he a monarch, a king, a parliamentarian, a congressmen, a president, must affirm God's law, punish wickedness, and affirm and reward righteousness. That is the kind of civil magistrate we are to obey.

"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil ... For he is a minister of God to thee for good ... for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Romans 13:3-5).

However, if the civil magistrate becomes tyranny to God's ways and in fact punishes righteousness and rewards wickedness, by virtue of their call to obey God's Law-Word in every jot and tittle, by His grace, Christians must be resolved to resist tyranny and to stand against such injustice.

While there was no implicit call to resist the tyranny of Rome by Paul, the fact that he gave us that filter in Romans 13 actually was a defense of the civil disobedience of the early church. The very preaching of the Gospel, the serving of Christ as the Lord of the nations, as He being God alone and not the Caesar cult, that was an act of civil disobedience. That's the reason why the Christians were persecuted and hounded and sent to the catacombs and put into the coliseums in the fierce competitions and the persecutions of Imperial Rome. It was the fact that they were not obeying the Caesar cult. So Romans 13 is a defense of the Gospel, but when we act upon the Gospel, when we preach the Gospel, when we live the Gospel, it is inevitably going to bring us in conflict with Caesar—or the state that would be God.

When we look throughout the book of Acts and we see the Apostles, the deacons, and simple Christians being brought before civil magistrates giving an account for their faith and the Apostle Paul is one of these. And the question comes down to: When it is Christ versus Caesar, do we obey God and His Law or man? That is the issue between Christ and Caesar and on that there can be no neutrality, if we consistently live the Gospel, preach the Gospel, demonstrate the Gospel. Even the idea of rescuing babies—the early church were taking abandoned babies that were left under the bridge abutment to die by Roman paganism. They were taking them as their own and adopting them and raising them in the faith. That was against Roman law. A true Gospel expression will always bring us into conflict, not with the civil magistrate that God ordains, but with the civil magistrate who seeks to dethrone God and become God himself.

R.J. Rushdoony:— The New Testament: Consider what Paul was doing: offerings to alleviate the poverty of the saints during the famine in Palestine; counseling that the needy be cared for, but "He who will not work, let him not eat." We do know that anyone who became unemployed was given three days income. After that they found work for him. Another Christian would hire him, but at lower than his normal pay so there would be no incentive to stay under that diaconal care. We know from 1 Corinthians 6 [paraphrase] that Paul said: "Don't go to the civil courts. They're ungodly. Create your own courts." And they did.

"Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?" (1 Cor. 6:1).

They were so efficient that after a while pagans were coming to the church courts and saying: "Adjudicate our problems for us. It takes years to get a case heard in the civil courts and it bankrupts us and then we don't get justice. Would you do it for us?" When Constantine became Emperor, he called in the bishops and he said, "The courts of the Empire are failing. We have cases that have been in the courts forty years with no justice. I want you men when you go out in the streets to wear the garb of a Roman magistrate by my orders so that the people of Rome and of the Empire will no that they can

come to you for justice. Well, that's where the bishop's garb comes from. Unless a bishop has heard me lecture on the subject, he doesn't know where his own bishop's robe originates.

Then the deacons took care of the sick, the poor, the orphans and the widows, of needy people in general, of captives, because as the Roman Empire began to breakdown, pirates and lawless bands would take men for ransom, hold men captive. One bishop in the early church ransomed 15,000 captives. When Rome fell, for six centuries, the only courts of Europe were the church courts for arbitration. When Rome was gone, the government, the state was gone, but Europe had justice because the church provided it. This was the pattern through much of the Middle Ages. It was the pattern of the Reformation. I have written of Calvin and Geneva and of the work of the diaconate. There were two offerings taken every Sunday: one for the work of the deacons so that all of the needy were cared for so that apart from crime, the church through these diaconal courts and through various independent Christian agencies provided for the basic government of the community.

Randall Terry— It's kind of fun to listen to Christians who say: "Well, I'm a New Testament Christian." First of all, what other kind of Christian is there? But second of all, the early Church had nothing but the Old Testament. The New Testament lies hidden in the Old; the Old Testament lies open in the New. For us to think we can enjoy, understand and practice the Christian religion with just Matthew to Revelation is foolishness. Paul said: **"All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness so that the man of God may be perfect thoroughly furnished for all good works"** (2 Timothy 3:16, 17). If someone doesn't know their Old Testament, they don't know right doctrine, right correction and they can't be equipped for good works.

Imagine Timothy getting a letter from Paul (2 Timothy 3:16,17) and he reads: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." Then Timothy sets this letter down. What does he have on his desk? A pocket New Testament? No! He had Genesis to Malachi. When Paul wrote that, he was speaking about the Old Testament.

There have been a lot of times when people have come up to me and said, "Where's that in red letters, brother Terry?" speaking of course of the words of Jesus. To which I say: "The words of Jesus start with Genesis 1:1 and go all the way through the book of Revelation. Jesus is the Word made flesh. Don't bring this false dichotomy that the words of Jesus are only the ones recorded in Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, and maybe 2 Corinthians. This is silliness. The words of Christ, the words of God, are found in the whole Bible. If you want to understand Jesus, if you want to know Jesus, you have to study the whole Bible. Christian duty is not defined solely by the words in red. Christian duty is defined by Genesis to Revelation.

Jesus himself said: **"Think not that I am come to destroy the law ... but to fulfill ... Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law until all be fulfilled"** (Mat. 5:17,18).

In fact, Jesus said something very interesting. **"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called he least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven"** (Mat. 5:19).

I think that Jesus was actually prophesying about the debate and the problem that His Church would have about the Law of God. He didn't say that if you attack the Law of God, you are not saved or you are not a Christian. He just said you are going to be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.

Questions for Part 2

God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit. One God, three persons. Jesus Christ is “the same yesterday, today, and forever” (Heb. 13:8). There is “no shadow of turning” with God the Father (James 1:17).

True, we are under a glorious New Covenant sealed in Divine blood. It is true that the New Covenant is far superior to the Old. But part of the New Covenant is the promise of God to write the Law on our hearts.

“After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people” (Jer. 31:33).

Why would we try and dismiss what God wants to write on our hearts? The whole Bible is the Sword of the Spirit. We don’t want to go into battle with three-quarters of our sword broken off!

Obviously, portions of the Law are no longer practiced today because Christ has come. Obviously, our justification before God is through faith—but “faith without works is dead” (James 2:26). Obviously, certain portions of the Law have been superseded by the New Testament. But only in the light of the *whole* counsel of God, will we be able to provide biblical solutions to the problems confronting our culture (problems relating to economics, politics, education, medicine, justice, crime) because the Bible addresses them all—flawlessly. The standards, warnings and solutions God gave to Moses or King David, King Solomon or the Prophets, are far superior over anything that liberal humanists could ever offer.

1. Roman 13 is often quoted by those who say that we must obey and honor civil rulers no matter how wicked they are. Let’s look at what Romans 13 actually says:

“For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil ... do that which is good, and thou shalt have the praise of the same ... For he is a minister of God to thee for good ... for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil” (Romans 13:3-5).

List six responsibilities of the civil ruler as a minister of God according to this passage:

- a. EXAMPLE: He is not a terror to good works, but to evil.
- b. _____
- c. _____
- d. _____
- e. _____
- f. _____

For discussion: Suppose the opposite is true. A wicked ruler arises who is a terror to the Gospel; who does not reward righteousness; who rewards wickedness instead; who is not a servant to us for good; who murders the innocent and fights unjust wars; and who does not avenge evil. Are Christians

to attempt to resist or depose such a ruler? If so, then in what manner? Which passages of scripture describe resistance against evil civil rulers? (Note: there are literally dozens of examples in both the Old and New Testament. Identify at least ten.)

2. Jesus and the apostles never held earthly political office. This fact of history is often used to argue that Christians should not be involved in civil politics as we preach the Gospel. Yet in fact, John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Apostles did attempt to influence civil rulers.

Question: What passages in the New Testament speak directly of the relationship between the Gospel and the civil magistrate? (List a scripture passage pertaining to John the Baptist; Jesus; and the Apostle Paul.)

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

3. When the New Testament writers mentioned the “scriptures” which writings were they referring to?

4. Many people suppose that the spoken words of Jesus recorded in the Gospel superior in any way to the Law and the Prophets.

In what way are the “words in red” superior?

In what way are these sayings in no way superior?

5. Read 2 Corinthians chapter 3 out loud as a group. This passage is often cited to argue that the Old Testament Law has faded or become less important.

For discussion: In what way is the New Covenant superior to the Old? Does this “greater glory” negate or nullify the Law?

God's Law and Society - Part 3

Can we legislate morality?

Another objection that crops up a thousand of times a day in the culture wars is: "You can't legislate morality." The non-Christian doesn't even believe in the Bible, so how can we talk about building a society based on the Law of God? We asked our panel:

Question #3:— Can we legislate morality?

Andrew Sandlin:— There is a great deal more in the Bible about political truth than most people recognize. Much of it is in the Old Testament. But since the modern evangelical ethos tends to oppose the abiding authority of the Old Testament, they don't recognize the political implications and the political standards that the Old Testament sets forth. I realize that the Bible does not speak specifically to every conceivable political issue, but it speaks to many more issues, directly or by implication, than most modern evangelicals would admit.

We certainly believe in the ethical precepts of the law. But it is not ours to do away even with the case laws. We may not always understand how to apply all of the case laws, but we have to take all of the Law of God seriously. It is not ours to pick and choose. I like this law against homosexuality, but I don't like this law governing marital intercourse. We have to abide by the Law of God when it is established even if we do not understand it well. We need to work hard on the task of exegesis, understanding the Law of God. But when we do come to an understanding, we need to abide by it.

It is not our responsibility to select certain portions of the Law of God that we like. I realize that in late 20th century America, we have certain tender sensibilities about how abortionists or homosexuals should be treated. We live according to a "rights" theory of life, rather than a responsibility view of life. So there are some of God's laws that do, especially on first reading, seem harsh and difficult. The question we have to ask is—Are we going to conform our ideas and practice to the Law of God?—Or are we going to permit the modern culture dictate to us our ethical values? No, even though there are some difficulties in the Law of God and difficulties in enforcing the Law of God, if we are going to say that we believe the Bible, *sola scriptura*, then we have to say that the Law of God must prevail in the society even in the parts that we consider difficult.

George Grant:— When people say, "You Can't Legislate Morality," they are ignoring the very nature of legislation itself. Legislation is merely the codification and law of someone's standard of morality. This is right and this is wrong. If you violate these standards, you will get in trouble. If you adhere to these standards, you'll be safe. The whole thing is a logical fallacy. If you can't legislate morality, then you can't legislate.

The Bible says: "**Thou shalt not steal**" (Ex. 20:15). Whether we believe the Ten Commandments or not, in our culture we adhere to this absolute that taking someone else's property is wrong. We didn't come up with that idea ourselves. It is drawn out of the biblical standard that was the bulwark of our culture. The same thing is true with, "**Thou shalt not kill**" (Ex. 20:13). It's one of the Ten Commandments. It's not something that the Supreme Court or the framers of the Constitution came up with.

Now there are those who say there are no moral absolutes. There are those humanists who say that man is the center of the universe. That man can decide all things. But that is not a workable philosophy. There always must be some absolute to which we adhere. We do it, whether we do it consciously or not in modern America even with all the assaults of the humanists. And when we stray from those standards it is inevitable that we get into trouble. It's one of the reasons why there is so much confusion and disarray in our culture today. Nobody really knows what is right. Companies don't know what standards to uphold in their hiring and firing practices. In the end if you don't adhere to the Ten Commandments, you're going to have a philosophy that is all over the map.

G.K. Chesterton said: "If a man will not obey the Ten Commandments, he will be forced to obey the ten thousand commandments." We live in a society with thousands of rules and regulations pouring in upon us, because we refuse to repair to that one simple straightforward standard, the standard God has given us in His law.

When the Founding Fathers drew on the biblical standard for absolutism in law, they made statements like, everyone of us has the God given right to life liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In humanist societies like Nazi Germany, there is nowhere to draw the line between what is and what is not human, what is and what is not an appropriate action for a government to take, what is and what is not proper retribution. You wind up with concentration camps, medical experiments, the destruction and genocide of whole people groups. Ultimately, without absolute standards, we are left at the mercy of the strong, the powerful and the perverse.

R.J. Rushdoony:— The Council of Chalcedon in 451 AD declared that Jesus Christ was "very God of very God and very man of very man, truly man and truly God, two natures without confusion but in perfect union." Now what this did was to block the possibility of any other incarnation of God. The most common such incarnation was in the state. The state either through its office or through its ruler or through a particular line was held to be divine, god walking on earth. So that the Prime Minister, like Joseph in Egypt, was a high priest. That's why he married priest's daughter. He could not be the Prime Minister and the high priest of Egypt without that marriage.

"And Pharaoh ... gave him to wife Asenath the daughter of Potipherah priest of On. And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt" (Gen. 41:45).

With the Council of Chalcedon the church made clear that there could be no confusion. Jesus Christ is the unique Incarnation. Since then, we've had Hegel tell us that the state is God walking on earth. And whether you are a member of one of the parties on the left or right, you are Hegelian. Republicans and Democrats each in their own way are Hegelian.

Then the Church has seen itself in ancient pagan terms as a continuation of the Incarnation. Protestants reject that doctrine, but it's creeping into Protestantism on other grounds. The Church is the Body of Christ and therefore somehow the Church is God's voice on earth. But the Body of Christ refers to the humanity of Christ. The regenerate of Christ are the new humanity of the new Adam, the last Adam, Jesus Christ. We were born in the old humanity of Adam; we are reborn in the new humanity of Jesus Christ.

"The first Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45).

The Church as the Body of Christ is not divine. It represents the new humanity, the Body of the last Adam, Jesus Christ, not His deity.

Randall Terry:— To the Christian who doesn't understand the application of the Law of God in today's culture, I would ask this question: "Is homosexual behavior wrong?" If the answer is yes, "Why is it wrong?" Only the moral absolutes of the Scriptures can make homosexual behavior wrong. This is why some of our friends in the so-called Christian Right have cornered themselves on the homosexual issue. "Let's just have family values. Let's have traditional values." Whose tradition? Sodom and Gomorrah's?—Whose family values? John and Bill's?

If you do not adhere to the Law of God as being the only legitimate source of right and wrong that is unchanging, absolute, transcendent, given to us by God, then ultimately, you cave in on the homosexual issue, because "these are two consenting adults who say that they love each other." "It's a free country, etc." This is why so many Christian leaders have been so tepid or downright silent on the advance of the homosexual agenda: recruiting our children, propagandizing our schools, homosexual rights, and now homosexual marriage. If the Christian community does not return to its roots of loving the Law of God, it's going to be steam rolled and not just by the homosexual movement. God only knows what is right on the heels of that.

As the Church has abandoned the Law of God it has also abandoned the courage, even the militancy, that is required of us. (After all, scholars call this the Church militant. The Church triumphant is in heaven). So we as the Church militant have been sitting on our hands for forty years. What has that gotten us? They legalized pornography—We did nothing. They drove prayer and the Bible out of government schools—We looked the other way. They legalized the killing of innocent children—We did nothing. They started to give homosexuals special rights—We've kind of wrung our hands a little bit, but still have done nothing. If we continue to do nothing, we are going to be overrun. We are going to be, as Christ said, the salt that has lost its savor, and be thrown out into the street to be trampled underfoot of men. What kind of America do people want to leave for their children. What horrors are down the road, stuff that was unthinkable thirty years ago, stuff that is unthinkable today? What horrors await down the road if we don't stand and fight?

There are Christians who say that we cannot deal with the cultural-political issue facing us based upon the Law of God. They give a bunch of reasons. Some are PR reasons: "It makes us look bad. It makes us look narrow." Some are ideological reasons: "Well, these people don't believe in the law of God so we can't quote it to them." To all of those I say: "Wait a minute, stop." The language of Scripture is the language of God. God spoke to us in His Word. If we think we can improve upon the Law of God, if we think we can be wittier than the Law of God, if we think we can be more clever and get people to go along with us, then this is just a surrender of the Christian religion to the enemy. We cannot surrender the premise of there being a God who is Sovereign, the Rule-maker, and the Law-giver, and then expect to prevail on the field of battle. He who frames the question wins the debate. If we don't believe in moral absolutes and then we get into a cultural-political debate, how are we going to win? They say: "I feel this." We say: "Well, we feel this!" It's feeling against feeling. It's who can be the most clever, who can take the best poll. My feelings aren't really that relevant. God's feelings are. God's Law is.

Monte Wilson:— The problem with picking and choosing is that it is not an attitude of submission, but of what is culturally acceptable. While I personally may be repulsed by certain laws in the Old Testament, the fact is they come from God himself, so my revulsion is just an exposure of my greater need for holiness.

When you are reading the Old Testament, you always have to read it through the New Testament. I am not suggesting that you adopt the entire thing, obviously the New Testament has made some very fundamental changes. But as soon as you your position is: "I like this, I don't like this," that presents some problems.

All of law emanates from a holy God. The Puritans taught that the laws of God were beams of his holiness. You better be careful if you look and say that execution of someone other than a mass murderer is reprehensible. You are talking about the nature of God. This reflects His mind, His holiness. No, we are the ones who are barbaric toward the injustice that these crimes represent. We need to re-think how we approach these laws. When we say that it is unfair to penalize adultery, again, I go back to the Puritan belief. This is the Law of God. It expresses his holiness. Maybe we're the ones who need to be adjusted. Then we can discuss the penal sanctions. Before you get into that conversation, of how we deal with criminals, we need to come into agreement. God is not barbaric. Now we can have the conversation about which laws should be applied.

Jeff Ziegler:— The idea that we can be governed by many moralities, or pluralism, is really a myth. We are either in obedience to God's Law or we are in opposition to God's Law. Now there is a concern in a mechanistic sense that we are going to impose God's Law through an ecclesiocracy, that is a rule through the clergy, or through some dictatorship as in an Islamic nation. That is a misinterpretation of biblical Law. Biblical Law when it regards civil polity, is the ultimate decentralized government. Scripture does not support nor trust dictatorships. The whole idea behind God's judgment at the Tower of Babel was that man was coming together. He had all of his strength in one central location and had a global government. And God by once stroke of the hand decentralized that government and turned the languages against one another and formed nation-states from that one expression of a global tyranny.

“And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach up into heaven ... So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of the earth” (Gen. 11:4,8).

That is the paradigm of the liberal. Liberals and humanists think in terms of statism. They must have the state to coerce and to force their ideas upon the people. They don't have another way of thinking. The state is messiah for them. When they look upon us and see our ideas and notions, that we are fighting for biblical law being applied to all of life, they can't think in any other terms. They think it's going to be a top-down theocratic, oligarchic or monarchic system. Nothing could be further from the truth. It's not revolution or political dictatorships that we place our faith in, rather it's the power of conversion. We are converting literally millions to the idea that God's Law is supreme. We see these revolutionary trends in home schooling, in ecclesiastical reform, and in the civil realm as we elect expressly and explicitly Christian politicians—not simply neo-conservatives—but Christians who acknowledge God's Law.

As we see this, one family at a time, one church at a time, one community at a time, one state at a time, America will be converted. It will be through conversion and not revolution that we see this great reordering and restructuring and reanchoring of our society to God's Law. Now there will always be those who are autonomous rebels, who trample underfoot the Son of God, who count the blood of the covenant to be unholy. They will always seek to overthrow God's rule. In the family, we see it with divorce and abortion. We see it in the church with ecclesiastical anarchists, those who will not be governed by sound doctrine. We see it in civil states. But only if they resort to violent means to overthrow godly order would they be suppressed. But they would not be suppressed by clergymen, but by a decentralized federal republic.

Phil Vollman:— To pastors I speak as a pastor and I want pastors to hear me. Two things are needed in this hour. Number one, sound orthodoxy is needed. For as one noted theologian has noted recently, “You can't beat something with nothing.” If we don't return to a Reformed faith, that is to say, the orthodox historic Reformed faith, we will not have the tools ethically to take dominion in the earth in time and history as Christ Jesus has commanded us to do. There is no arguing that point.

But there is something else that is needed on this hour and I think it is equally important. Pastors need courage. There is a great famine of courage. It will take courage to embrace the historic Reformed orthodox Christian faith. I know this personally. But it will also take courage once we have embraced that faith to apply that faith then in time and history locally in our neighborhoods where we live. When God begins to judge a nation, the first thing he does is begin to give his people a cowardly clergy. I am very fearful today that America is being sanctioned, judged, with cowardly clergy. They are all around us. You look at the clergy today and what do you see? You see politically correct and religiously correct men of the cloth who are afraid to speak the truth for Christ.

What is it costing us? So far there are over 40 million dead babies. Militant homosexuality, militant feminism, militant humanism are running amok in our culture. We have a madman in Michigan named Jack Kevorkian who has right now killed or been responsible for over 86 deaths. There is not one prosecutor in Michigan who will stand up to him. We have two states now with right to die laws. And we have the most wicked, vile president in our history. There is no end in sight.

Now I'm a pastor. I know about fear. I know about loneliness. I know about the loss of reputation. But I am convinced that if we don't see a revival in courage in this nation. If we don't see some men begin to stand up in courage, conviction and Christian principle and stand faithfully in a world of cowardice and compromise, then we are going to deserve everything that is coming our way, we and our children.

The great Russian prophet, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, wrote many prophetic things about his own people and the future of America. When asked, what went wrong in Russia that God would visit upon them the brutality of communism, he only had one thing to say, "Russia forgot God." America has forgotten her God. She's forgotten her God because her shepherds have forgotten her God. This is not rocket science. When the pastors are walking in the fear of God and yet the comfort of the Holy Ghost, when the pastors are teaching sound orthodoxy, when they are wedding that with courage, to the things that they must do, there is victory, there is peace, and there is hope.

If we don't see a raising of the black regiment in this hour. If we don't see a parson's revolution. Well then I would say, America is about to enter a long and a dark period. For as the pastors go so goes the Church. As the Church goes, so goes the nation.

Questions for Part 3

1. To sum up the question of legislating morality: Every law is an attempt to legislate *someone's* morality. Civil law must have some standard:

either it is _____

or it is _____.

2. If man's law is called *autonomy* (self-law), then God's law might be called *Theonomy*.

Theonomy is a term for the belief that the moral law of God is to be applied as a standard of righteousness for governing individuals and society. The term comes from the Greek for God's law and is the concept that all of the moral laws (those excluding the non-ceremonial and dietary laws) given to Moses and recorded in the Pentateuch are binding on people of all nations forever. Theonomy posits God's law as the only just standard for regulations in every human institution: family, church, and state.

For discussion: Is there any "middle way" or neutral ground between man's law and God's Law?

3. The Chalcedonian Creed

Christological heresy divided the Church in the fifth century. Some stressed the humanity of Christ; while others stressed His divine nature. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds defined Christ as being both God and man, however, there arose some further confusion over whether He was a fully integrated God-man; or a half-God, half-man having different natures at different times.

The Council of Chalcedon was called to define the nature of Christ as both fully God and fully man diminished in neither aspect. Christ alone is both God and man, He is the unique mediator *between* God and man. He is our *only* priest. The Chalcedonian Creed implies that all power and authority is invested in Christ by the Father. In Chalcedon, we find the union of the heavenly and the earthly. Christ was both God and man. As God, He brings the power of heaven to earth. As man, He links the eternal power of God with the temporal power on earth.

The Definition of Chalcedon

Following, then, the holy fathers, we unite in teaching all men to confess the one and only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. This selfsame one is perfect both in deity and in humanness; this selfsame one is also actually God and actually man, with a rational soul [meaning human soul] and a body. He is of the same reality as God as far as his deity is concerned and of the same reality as we ourselves as far as his humanness is concerned; thus like us in all respects, sin only excepted. Before time began he was begotten of the Father, in respect of his deity, and now in these "last days," for us and behalf of our salvation, this selfsame one was born of Mary the virgin, who is God-bearer in respect of his humanness.

We also teach that we apprehend this one and only Christ-Son, Lord, only-begotten—in two natures; and we do this without confusing the two natures, without transmuting one nature into the other, without dividing them into two separate categories, without contrasting them according to area or

function. The distinctiveness of each nature is not nullified by the union. Instead, the “properties” of each nature are conserved and both natures concur in one “person” and in one reality [hypostasis]. They are not divided or cut into two persons, but are together the one and only and only-begotten Word [Logos] of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus have the prophets of old testified; thus the Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us; thus the Symbol of Fathers [the Nicene Creed] has handed down to us.

The Lordship of Jesus Christ (as both man and God) is of great importance. In a certain sense, this idea has become the foundation of Western culture. This principle defines true liberty under the law of God because it acknowledges the *only* valid claim of Lordship of the One who is the source of true human freedom. Christ is our only God and our only king. This would lead us to conclude that there are limits of authority in all human institutions. By implication, this creed directly challenges every false claim of Lordship by any form of government: state, church, family or individual.

Question: All human authority derives from the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Christ alone can proclaim:

(Matthew 28:18).

For group discussion: What implications does the authority of Christ have for the basis of civil law? What implications does the Lordship of Christ have for human liberty?

4. Read Genesis 11 and 1 Samuel 8 in their entirety. From these two passages, answer the following questions in a short paragraph or two. What biblical basis is there to argue that God detests dictatorships—or top-down, centralized governments? If God does not desire a centralized civil government to rule over men, then what type of government does He advocate? How does the moral law of God bring men liberty in such a government?

5. The Law of God expresses His character, nature and holiness. To love God and desire His mercy is to delight yourself in _____ (Psalm 119:77).

For discussion: The Law of God might at times seem harsh, difficult or extreme to us. What is the reason for that? If we do not understand how to apply a particular law, then what should we do?

God's Law and Society - Part 4

Christian Foundations of Government

Is it possible to build a Christian nation? The Great Commission given by our Lord, “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations” (Matt. 28:18-20) states that we should now be busy teaching the nations “to obey all that I have commanded you.” Note that Jesus stresses making *disciples of nations* and not merely preaching salvation to individuals. Jesus tells us here that evangelism also includes obedience to “all that I have commanded you”—in other words, obedience to God’s Law. In this segment, we’ll explore the “greatness” of the Great Commission, the idea that successful evangelism includes nation building, teaching the nations of the world to obey Christ.

When many people hear talk of building a “biblical” or a “Christian” nation, they equate this idea with a civil government run by the Church. Many fear the Church taking over the government (and rightly so!) because they correctly understand that a nation run by a particular church or religion could lead us to tyranny. But when we speak of building a Christian nation, we are talking about restoring a Republic based upon laws and moral principles found in the Bible. We are talking about nothing more than restoring the form of government many of our nation’s founders intended. Our goal is not a state run by the Church, but a nation that accepts and honors Biblical Law.

The most advanced model for government is a Christian Republic: a decentralized representative government, which protects the God-given rights of minorities, while recognizing Biblical law as the basis for all legislation and civil authority. We should understand that the Puritan model did not lead us to a utopia—or a perfect society—but it was a necessary first step in the successful founding of our nation. We begin by studying the models of the past and asking the questions:

Question #4:— Did a Christian philosophy influence our form of civil government?

Howard Phillips:— Throughout history, there have been three political parties. One is the party that believes in the sovereignty of God, and today I work with such a party, the U.S. Taxpayers Party. The other is a party that believes in the sovereignty of man and man’s reason; Libertarians are of that view. The third is every other party that believes in the sovereignty of the state, that the state is God walking on earth. That philosophy came into full flower in the 1960s during the presidency of Lyndon Johnson. During that presidency, every perverse cause from which America now suffers, received federal funding. We saw the federal government become the provisioner of the forces of cultural disintegration and social chaos in our country.

The federal government has no role as an instrument of salvation. Salvation is by the blood of Christ and faith in Him by God’s grace. But government should stop being an instrument of moral degradation. I had the opportunity to be a “fly on the wall” during a period of extraordinary change in America. During the Johnson administration when they were launching the Great Society, I was chairman of the Republican Party in Boston. I spent a lot of time in the black community in Boston. I saw how federal funds were being used to destabilize the black family, to promote the notion of welfare rights, to promote abortion, homosexuality, the idea of quotas, forced busing. I saw how the black churches were destabilized with federal funds. I saw federal funds going to radicals of very left wing beliefs.

As director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, I came to see exactly how that was being done. I worked very hard to persuade President Nixon to veto the continuation of that funding. Tragically, President Nixon, like all of his successors, not only signed into law additional appropriations, he in fact created new entities that did more harm. So did his successors. As we see the federal government's budget grow year after year, more and more of this money is being used to fund people who are evangelists for ideas which are antithetical to the founding Christian premises of the United States of America.

Congress has the right and duty to set policy in areas which are assigned to Congress in the Constitution (especially in Art. 1, Sect. 8). But the federal government does not have any power to act beyond its delegated enumerated powers. What I particularly object to is Congress giving money to private organizations which use tax dollars for cultural, ideological, economic political advocacy, whether it's for the National Endowment for the Arts, the Legal Services Corporation; whether it's to groups such as Gay Men's Health Crisis, in the name of AIDS education; whether it's to "Murder Incorporated," otherwise known as Planned Parenthood, which uses tax dollars to the tune of billions over the years to advance its agenda of promiscuity and liberal abortion. That is not only morally wrong, but it is completely unconstitutional.

R.J. Rushdoony:— One of the things most people don't understand about Christian Reconstruction is that first it is nothing new. It has been the historic position of the Christian church over the centuries. In Western Europe and the America it has receded in the past century or two, but it has been the Christian way of life. Then what we have to understand is that in our time, we've had a totally false picture of reality, a top-down view of whatever faith it is that people hold, that we have to capture the upper echelons of society, or the machinery of the state, and impose something on the people.

We have never had a more top-down culture than for about 1500 years, than since Rome fell. Rome fell because it confused simplicity with efficiency. They simplified the state and centralized more and more as if that were the answer. The more they centralized, the more they destroyed the fabric of society. We are following the Roman pattern. We are centralizing as though that were the answer and we are destroying the pattern of society.

Now as Christians we believe that the basic starting point is the regeneration of man. Then man takes and applies that faith. For Christians the basic government is the self-government of the Christian man. Then the basic governmental unit is the family. This means that every father and mother will be more important in the sight of God than heads of state, because He controls children, property and the future. Then the third is the church as the government; fourth, the school as a government; fifth, your job governs you; then sixth, society governs you with its ideas, beliefs and standards; and seventh, one among many forms of government, is the civil government.

Today, we are implicitly totalitarian. We speak of the state as *the* government. That's totalitarian. So we have to rid ourselves of such things. The Christian theonomic society will only come about as each man governs himself under God and governs his particular sphere. And only so will we take back government from the state and put it in the hands of Christians.

George Grant:— The words covenant, compact and constitution are all closely related terms. They are all derived from one another, covenant being the foundation, compact being the fruit, and then constitution being the declaration of covenant to a broader body. There is in the American Constitution the idea of democracy in the House of Representatives. The people were to gather together as they did in the day of Moses and appoint those who would represent them in groups of fifties, hundreds, thou-

sands and so forth. The Senate is a covenantal body that was to be elected from out of the state legislatures. This is a type of oligarchy. The executive and judicial branches are a form of aristocracy or even monarchy derived from biblical precedents of the king and the heads of the families.

Episcopalian, Congregational and Presbyterian forms of government reflect the diversity of authorities of both the Old and the New Testaments and the Founding Fathers sought to mirror that rule. Congregational rule is a kind of democracy, a bottom-up affirming of natural leadership from within the congregation. Episcopal forms of government are appointive, along the lines of a monarchy. Presbyterian forms are representative. The Founding Fathers drew on all of these as they attempted to create constitutional standards for this country.

Reformational thought and Puritan thought has influenced our form of government and the nature of our culture in every way imaginable. The way in which we present our debates: the rules are ordered according to the standards of church councils and general assemblies. *Robert's Rules of Order* emerged from Puritan ethics. The architecture of our public buildings and the invocation of prayer at the beginning and end of every session of our legislature are derived from Reformational and Puritan thought, life, culture and practice.

Phil Vollman:— Solomon in all of his wisdom said, **“Wisdom is the principle thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding” (Proverbs 4:7).** He spoke in Proverbs 29:2, **“When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.”**

It's my observation that America has been mourning in a certain political sense for about 140 years. It's getting worse and worse. Frankly, I'm a little amazed and not a little appalled at how we could have missed this little nugget of truth found in Proverbs 29. “When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice.” I am now convinced that when we lost our covenantal worldview and Christians began their long, slow retreat back into the Christian ghetto we call our church, the wicked rushed into the vacuum we call politics. No wonder politic became very dirty.

We are working right now, night and day up in Leroy, Ohio at Shiloh Christian Church to arrest that slide. We believe yes, politics is dirty. But it's only dirty for one reason: Christians abandoned it. We believe there is no human endeavor that is outside of the jurisdiction of our King and Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ. We are raising up from within our own midst citizen legislators like Ron Young. What we did to get him elected (We give all the glory and credit to Jesus, but He uses earthen vessels, weak people, like ourselves) we planned a strategy, picked an opponent, put in twelve phone lines in his basement, hired someone who knew how to do these things, and then recruited the members of our church. And for just about the better part of the year, we came to his basement, got on those phones, and called every registered Republican and Independent voter in the district we were trying to get him elected.

Something very strange happened. We defeated a five-time inner circle Republican incumbent by this unknown named Ron Young. It was a miracle. What we felt God was doing was trying to show us the truthfulness of Solomon's utterance. “When the righteous are in authority the people rejoice.” Now what has happened in the past two years with Ron in the State House? He has effected a revolution down there. For the so-called “fiscally conservative” Republicans (you know, those men who are suffering from PTA: Permanent Testicular Atrophy) he has been able to put courage into them, backbone into what they are doing.

Ron is epistemologically self-conscious, that is, he understands what his belief system. When he speaks, he speaks as a man with integrity, courage and a worldview. He doesn't take his finger like so

many politicians and put it into the air wondering where the political winds are blowing. No, he goes down there and sets the agenda. The job he has done in two short years has been nothing short of a miracle. You have to believe the scripture and then you have to work. You have to roll your sleeves up. You have to give your money and then you have to labor. In other words, you have to get in the fight.

We believe that out of this church of 275 people, there are going to come forth from the loins of this church, presidents, vice presidents, senators and congressmen. Why? Because this is what the church did in her beginning. This is what the church has always done. This is what the church will do again. We understand that Christ was not crucified in a cathedral between two candles. Christ was crucified out there at the town garbage heap. He was crucified in a place where cynics talked smut and where soldiers do their thing. That's where churchmen ought to be. That's where the churchmen will be once again, and that's where we are going.

Jeff Ziegler:— There is great consternation and controversy about what Christ's Lordship actually means in the real world. Most Christians will not argue with the fact that He does rule our lives. He is the ruler, the Lord, the King of their families and their church. But much beyond that, the idea of Christ's Lordship begins to fall on deaf ears. The retort you often hear revolves around the time period when Christ is before Pilate's inquisition and says, **"My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36)**. Let's put this in context however. Christ was not saying that His kingdom was not manifest in the world. What he was saying to Pilate "My kingdom does not gain it's authority from Rome or the Sanhedrin. My authority comes from on high." Pilate understood this. The irony is that the pagan tyrant understood, but Christians don't today. So the authority of Christ's kingdom is not of this world, but nonetheless, the kingdom has invaded this civil realm, the family realm, "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Every aspect of society is touched by the kingdom of God.

Now how does this work practically? If every time we'll confess, "Every knee will bow" before Christ, that He is the Lord, that monarchs, kings, state representatives, congressmen, and presidents must bow their knee before God. By what standard will they bow the knee? Yes, it gets back to God's Law. The kingdom has no place in terms of seeking approval or legitimacy here in the earth. It doesn't need the president's approval to exist. It's authority comes from the other world. And therefore it is superior and higher. But the kingdom is manifest in the world and Christ's Lordship is manifest in the world in the civil realm, in the family, in every aspect of society, economics, science etc. Christ's Lordship has the claim.

We talk about the crown rights of Jesus Christ. By virtue of the finished work of Jesus Christ, He has the right to rule. He has the keys to the kingdom of heaven. He has reconciled all things in heaven and in earth, the visible and the invisible, the living and the dead. He rules over all. Christ's kingdom is comprehensive in scope and absolute in its authority.

Questions for Part 4

1. When we advocate a biblically based state we should not imply the domination of the state by the Church. To the contrary, we should want a godly separation of powers. It assumes that men (even Christians) are capable of great evil and that the powers of government should be limited and separate. A Christian nation is based on the principle that civil government ought to be founded on the moral laws found in the Bible. Therefore, the issue for which we ought to be contending is the place of Biblical Law in civil government. This is the true path to building a Christian nation.

a. Why should the state not dominate the church?

b. Why should the church not dominate the state?

For discussion: In your opinion, has the state infringed on the “establishment of religion” clause prohibiting the free exercise of religion in public life? If so, describe how?

2. Is there any human endeavor, such as civil government, that is supposed to be outside the Lordship of Jesus Christ? (Use scripture to back up your answer.)

For discussion: The retort we often hear revolves around the time when Christ stood before Pilate and said, “My kingdom is not of this world” (John 18:36). What did Jesus mean by this statement?

3. Building a Christian nation assumes that a large portion of the population would be truly converted. It assumes that members of each church and denomination would work hard to get their representatives elected to office. It would also imply the idea religious liberty or freedom of religious conscience as a God-given human right. In other words, there would be no establishment of a particular Christian religion by the state. How then should the Church have an influence in civil government?

4. We should work for the day when our civil offices, from the local city council to the U.S. Congress and Presidency is occupied by Christians. This level of success is not an impossibility, but it does imply a national revival to precede or accompany a reformation of government, a day when our leaders would recognize Biblical Law as the basis for government and that Jesus Christ is Lord over America.

Christ is both priest and king. Although the offices of the church and state should not be confused, we often see men who are “prophets to their nation” and who also held political office

List five biblical characters who were dual office holders, that is they were both prophets and civil rulers.

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____
- d. _____
- e. _____

5. Describe how the ideal of a godly “dual office holder” could be applied to American civil government without violating the godly separation of powers.

6. For discussion: A Christian Republic can be defined as a decentralized representative government, which protects the God-given rights of minorities, while recognizing Biblical law as the basis for all legislation and civil authority. It could be argued that the more a government recognizes God’s Law as a basis for its legislation, the more freedom will be available for religious and ethnic minorities, and that unless we recognize God’s Law the state will become more centralized and tyrannical as time goes on. Do you agree or disagree with this statement. Explain why?

7. When we speak of the state we use the term “the government” but there are other forms of government besides the civil sphere. List at least three other forms of government that govern you.

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

For discussion: Describe how Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Congregational forms of church government informed the American constitutional form of civil government.

God's Law and Society - Part 5

The Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution

There is no question that Christianity governed the social, philosophical and political landscape of colonial America. At least 50 of the 55 signers of the United States Constitution were professing Christians. Even men like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin who were technically deists or humanists were so profoundly influenced by the Christian worldview that they upheld many of the philosophical presuppositions of the more orthodox majority. As a result, uniquely Christian notions such as the fundamental depravity of man (or "original sin") led to the abolition of any "divine right of kings" to rule, and substituted in its place the separation of powers and strict limits on centralized government. Our founders believed in the rule of law not of man. In short, they desired to build a Constitutional Republic.

Tragically, however, there is no question that the tare of Enlightenment humanism was also sown into the fertile soil of the American experiment. Slowly, incrementally, religious humanism has all but become our nation's *de facto* religion. All religions have at their heart certain truth claims that cannot peaceably co-exist with contrary claims. For example, man is either fallen or he's not.

And so the increasing codification of religious humanism has led to the ultimate irony: the Christian philosophy that gave rise to this country is scarcely able to speak its name when it comes to the arena of public policy. That is what has given anti-Christian organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union their strength. The fact that a liberal organization can use as a propaganda ploy the popular idea that all of our Founding Fathers were deists and not Christians is indicative of how far our nation has backslidden from the truth.

Let's hear what our panel of experts has to say:

Question #5:— Were the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution drafted to uphold the moral laws of God—or were they Deistic humanist documents? If these were Christian documents and America was founded as a Christian nation, where have we gone so far off track?

Howard Phillips:— The Declaration of Independence is, in effect, the articles of incorporation or the preamble for our federal union and the Constitution of the United States is the bylaws. The Declaration says that "we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights." It acknowledges that our rights are a gift from God, that we are His creatures. It is a simple statement of fact that if God is "Sovereign," as the framers acknowledged Him to be, that law is inevitably the will of the Sovereign. The laws of God cannot be overturned by a two-thirds vote of Congress or even a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court. Abortion is always illegal in the sight of God. If a civil government chooses to permit it, that doesn't make it legal in His sight. It simply criminalizes the civil government which advances it.

The Declaration goes on to make the point that government derives its just powers from the consent

of the governed. There is a theological principle there in that the governed are God's creatures who owe a duty to their Creator to the degree that they delegate policy setting functions and control of resources to civil government. They have an obligation to God to hold civil government accountable to them, so that they may be accountable to Him.

The link between the Declaration and the Constitution can be seen in the very first sentence of the Constitution after the preamble which says that "all legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." "All" ... "vested," meaning that they can't be surrendered.

One of the problems is that Congress simply is not doing its constitutional duty. Look at the question of impeachment. That's not an independent counsel's responsibility. Under the U.S. Constitution, impeachment is the responsibility of the U.S. House of Representatives. If the House determines to bring charges against the president, then it's the responsibility of the Senate to determine whether he should be convicted and removed from office. The Republican congress pushed for giving the President line item veto authority. It was unconstitutional for them to do so. I am glad the Supreme Court recognized that. The Constitution permits the President, indeed mandate that he shall be, our chief executive. But it does not authorize him to be our chief legislator. Congress cannot delegate legislative functions to the President. Congress has given policy setting functions to regulatory agencies. That violates the letter of the first sentence of the body of the Constitutional law.

Steve Schlissel:— If we were going to found a republic, we would want to do it a little more self-consciously as Christians. But we have to understand something and not be naive. It always depends on men of good will continuing it, because no matter how good your document, you can always have a liberal saying that the document is no longer relevant. You can always have an argument, "That was then, this is now." This is why the greatest Christian minds in history have always recognized that it is not what laws you have, but your philosophy of law. If your philosophy of law is that law is simply something men create, then what man can give, man can take away. If your philosophy of law is that it is divine in origin, and self-consciously so, then we have to do our best to abide by God's law.

Now I need to qualify that because every source of law in every system is always its god. So if men create laws, then you believe men are gods, which is exactly what we have today. We determine laws based on popular opinion. The more people we can get to hold a particular view, we say that it must be right. If yesterday 27 percent of the people believed it was right and 73 percent believed it was wrong so it was against the law. The Supreme Court comes and changes it. A great propaganda campaign ensues, then opinion changes and we keep the laws. "Get the opinions, keep the laws, change the opinions, change more laws."

Homosexuals know this very well. "Let's convince people that homosexuality is not a choice that we make, not a result of perhaps of fractured childhood, or some other sin that was committed against them. But let's say that it is genetic. And then let's say that it is not fair that we can't get married. Let's continue to get that message out." Now we see ourselves toying with the very institution of marriage which is the foundation of any society. If you tinker with that your days are numbered. The marriage unit is the fundamental unit in the culture. From there the future comes. But I'm convinced that we are going to have homosexual marriages because in our culture the religion of the public square is egalitarian humanism. Homosexual marriages resonate with that and from that. It makes sense to have homosexual marriages based on their worldview. It's an abomination based on our worldview.

Jeff Ziegler:— There is no question that our founding fathers were an amalgamation of some Deistic humanists, Puritan thought as well as high Anglicanism, all mixed together and jostling for position in the context of our founding federal documents. However, there was an acknowledgment of man's

overriding depravity, the idea that absolute power corrupts absolutely was not a foreign idea to these men. In looking at the Hebrew Commonwealth in its decentralized forms of government, our founding fathers in their wisdom, set about to create a system where there would be checks and balances against this idea of absolute power, government by man, tyrannical carnality, with three branches of government, all of which are supposed to work to counter balance the other. At least theoretically, they would keep in check any tyrannical impulse.

Unfortunately, that assumes these three institutions are appealing to God's Law. No matter how good the system, unless it is under the aegis and covering of God's Law, any system can revert to tyranny. It can be the tyranny of the majority of paganism, of humanism. Even in Israel, in the Hebrew Commonwealth, when they began to apostatize and fall away from God's Law, what did they begin to cry out for?—a tyrant, a king **"like all he other nations"** (1 Samuel 8:5). They paid the price for it in terms of wars, tyrannical suppression and taxation, and ultimately in the division of their nation in two separate entities and then the invasion of foreign pagan powers to bring them under the enslavement of their anti-God ways. So they ultimately paid the price and we will too if we don't turn back to God's Law.

When we can compare biblical law versus natural law, scripture is the final immutable authority on every subject of which it speaks. It is binding not only on the regenerate that is the Christian, but the unregenerate alike. You'll either are following God's Law and prospering accordingly, or you'll be broken by it. It doesn't change. So whether you acknowledge it or not, it exists, and all men are judged by its standards.

Now there is certainly natural revelation. God has made himself known in the creation—there is evidence of his creation everywhere. But ultimately it is not evidence that man needs. It's conviction of sin and to have his miscreant depraved nature arrested. The role of the civil magistrate is to keep a biblical and sound order, to prosper the righteous and to punish wickedness. You can't do that by natural revelation or natural law. Now it's true that in a godly or predominantly godly society, men will understand natural law in a way that mimics or comes close to biblical law. We see that in the embryonic stages of our nation. However, natural law can be co-opted and pirated by corrupt alien and humanistic worldviews. Natural law can be interpreted from many different angles. In so doing, morality become relativistic.

However, that cannot be said of the Ten Commandments because not only do we have the explicit injunction **"Thou shalt not kill"** (Ex. 20:13) or **"Thou shalt not commit adultery"** (Ex. 20:14). But we have case laws which interpret that law and how it is to be administered in the civil realm. So biblical law is superior because it is defined revelation. It is specific and applicable.

Randall Terry:— I believe that America is locked in a life or death struggle that is a battle of allegiances. It's a covenantal battle. On one hand you have those who self-consciously adhere to the Law of God and believe that's the foundation of civilization. And on the other hand you have those who don't. But the way I see history and the way I see the Scriptures is once you depart from the Ten Commandments as being the foundation of right and wrong, you are in a free fall. Make it up as you go—the Supreme Court, a majority vote, the biggest gun, whatever you can pull off by trickery or the latest poll.

Once you depart from the Ten Commandments, you have relativism, humanism, the abandonment of absolutes. You have *anything*. How long before child pornography is mainstream? How long before we have, not just homosexual marriage, but homosexual unions between adult men and small boys? If the Law of God is not true, then people might say: "I think that's disgusting." But they can't say: "It's wrong." And then the argument can be used: "How dare you impose your morality on that homosex-

ual man and that boy who want to have this relationship—or on that child who is a willing participant in child pornography.” Anything goes. You have this sliding scale into the muck and mire and literally into the jaws of hell. That is where we are headed if we don’t return to the old paths, the ancient paths, to the Law of God.

George Washington said, “It is impossible to rightly govern in this world without God and the Bible.” He didn’t say the Koran, the words of Confucius, or the babblings of ancient philosophers. He understood that it was the Bible, the place where God’s records of right and wrong are kept. Today, when we speak of pluralism we are saying that all ideas are created equal, all religions are equal, all moral codes are equal. The Founders knew nothing of this. They would have thought that that would lead to chaos. Obviously they were right.

King George III referred to the American Revolution as the “Parson’s Rebellion.” Many of those parsons were survivors from Scotland, of the oppressions of the English against the Scots, who had fled to America. These were die-hard Presbyterians who believed in the Law of God and the Reformed religion. They believed in the sovereignty of God and the depravity of man. They understood why we have law.

The enemies of the Christian religion and the Law of God confuse law with faith. They accuse us of using the mechanisms of government to make everyone a Christian. That is simply not true. Faith in Christ is between the individual and God. The Law dictates people’s behavior. The reason why we have laws against theft is because God said: “**You shall not steal**” (Ex. 20:15). The reason why we have laws against murder is because God said: “**You shall not murder**” (Ex. 20:13). We do not want to use the mechanisms of government to create a Christian republic based upon personal faith. We do want there to be a self-conscious recognition that the Law of God, which God gave Moses on Mount Sinai, undergirds this republic and all of civilization.

George Grant:—King George was appalled at the American Revolution, not because he saw that there were colonists who were rebelling against the rule of parliament, but because he saw the covenantal implications. He called it the “Presbyterian Parson’s Rebellion.” He saw it as a continuation of the Scottish rebellion against his father some twenty years prior in which the covenanters rose up and established certain standards against which the king could not act. In other words, they were saying that there is but one Christ and Savior who wears the crown of all authority over all the nations of the earth. There is but one King of kings and Lord of lords. The king of Great Britain didn’t much like that notion. He thought that he had a divine right to rule. The American Revolution was drawn from covenantal concepts that held the king in check and required action for justice when the king stepped beyond his bounds.

A number of the Founding Fathers were influenced by Enlightenment ideas—ideas that ultimately came to be known as Deism or Unitarianism. Many were free thinkers. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were examples of these men. They demonstrated the fruit of their free thought in their private lives. But in their public demeanor they were gloriously inconsistent. Benjamin Franklin was best known in the Constitutional Convention for calling for prayer that divine providence would guide all the proceedings of that great assembly. Thomas Jefferson read the Bible every day, even if he only read portions of it as he was wont to do.

The fact is that the Founding Fathers lived in an inescapably Christian culture. And though they were not perfect men and though they did not always have their theology buttoned up and sewn up tight, they were men who lived in the midst of a Christian culture and reflected that Christian culture in much of their thinking. Even the most profligate of the unbelievers, Franklin, was deeply engaged

in the theological debates of the day. The great evangelist, George Whitefield, was one of Benjamin Franklin's best friends and was constantly engaging Franklin in thinking through the implications of the Gospel. Deism was a seed thought that filtered into the proceedings and thinking of the Founding Fathers. But Christianity was the cultural backdrop, it was inescapable for them and the Christian capital that we have inherited 200 years later even this far away from them is evident.

The Founding Fathers wanted to have it both ways. They wanted all the fruit of Christianity without confessing its root. Ultimately, that sowed seeds that in many generations to come would bring about a bitter harvest. To be honest, we have to look at the Founding Fathers and see grave mistakes. The Constitution begins with startling words to come out of a Christian environment, "We the People," rather than "under God." They readily confessed their Enlightenment roots. There are problems with our Founding Fathers and their thought. But they were not a contradistinction to the great Christian heritage of the west. They embraced and affirmed it, often times unconsciously, but nevertheless constantly in all that they did, all that they said, and all that they passed on to us.

Questions for Part 5

1. The American Revolution could not have occurred without the 150-year-old Puritan foundation in America. Some of the Puritans had misunderstandings about theocracy and neglected the separation of powers. The Massachusetts colony in the 1600s could be described as an ecclesiocracy.

If a *theocracy* is a "civil government under God" with separation of powers, then what is an *ecclesiocracy*?

How would life in a theocracy be different from an ecclesiocracy? What should we be advocating—a theocracy or an ecclesiocracy? Why?

2. At first, some of the Puritans made a mistakes by constructing an ecclesiocracy, rather than a true theocracy. On the other hand, it was the Puritan experiment with self-government which finally led to the emancipation of the colonies from the tyranny of the British crown in later years. In all fairness to the Puritans, we must realize that they came to the New World at a time when the Protestant Reformation was still very much in progress in England. A unifying and comprehensive church confession describing the relationship between church and state had not been adopted. Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Haven, Plymouth and later many of the other colonies experimented with alternate forms of theocracy. Our model of government is republican. A republic differs from a democracy or a monarchy in that it is a government under the rule of law, rather a government under the rule of men.

The model that most closely reflects the United States Constitution was the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut. The following is from the preamble of the Fundamental Orders.

Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence so to order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the River of Connecticut and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one Public State or Commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our Successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, as also the discipline of the Churches, which according to the truth of the said Gospel is now practiced amongst us; as also in our Civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such Laws, Rules, Orders, and Decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed as followeth:--

Describe how this document advocates a theocratic government under God and God's Law, rather than a state run by the church or by men.

3. *Deism* is simply a belief in a God, or a Supreme Being of some type. A Deist does not believe that Jesus Christ is God, and does not accept the Bible as the Word of God. For a Deist, Truth is self-evident and discernible to the rational mind. Some religious philosophers during the time of the Renaissance, such as René Descartes, wanted to completely abolish the Greek philosophical worldview, which relied on presuppositions that were unprovable. Descartes proposed a universal picture of the world, based on human reasoning and mathematical proofs. Deism proposes a "clockwork universe" originally created by God or a Supreme Being, but left to run on its own according to universal natural laws. Truth is understood through the existence of natural revelation, natural law and the "necessity of reason."

Protestants of the Enlightenment era, including John Locke and David Hume, recognized that God and God's Truth were revealed in nature. They believed that the character of God could be understood through both natural law and biblical law. Locke and Hume argued that since man was created in God's image, man was able to grasp biblical truth through human reason. Deism took the argument a step further and proposed that natural revelation was the *only* standard and denied the necessity of the Bible altogether. Thus the *necessity* of reason gave way to the *sufficiency* of reason. Deism then became a broad term use to describe the group of Enlightenment era philosophers—from Locke and Hume, who were orthodox in almost all of the central tenets of the Christian faith—to François Voltaire and Thomas Paine, who were openly hostile to Christianity.

For discussion: How did Deism influence American thought? How is it compatible with a Christian view of civil government? How is it antithetical to Christian view of civil government?

4. The Declaration of Independence itself carries the following phrases:

“When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the Powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of **Nature’s God** entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.”

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their **Creator** with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

“We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the **Supreme Judge** of the world for the rectitude of our intentions ...”

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the Protection of **Divine Providence**, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.”

It can be argued that these names of God do not indicate a philosophy of Deism, but refer to the God of the Bible—Jesus Christ. Look up the following scripture verses and then describe how the names of God in the Declaration of Independence correspond to the attributes of God declared by the Bible.

a. Nature’s God (Isaiah 40:28)

b. Creator (Genesis 1:1,27)

c. Supreme Judge (Hebrews 12:23)

d. Divine Providence (Matthew 5:45)

6. For discussion: How did the biblical doctrine of the “total depravity of man,” emphasized by the Protestant Reformation, inform and influence the structure of our constitutional republic? How does it enable the people to keep evil rulers in check?

7. For discussion: What is the difference between the Deistic idea of “natural law” and the Christian idea of Biblical law? Which is superior and why?

God's Law and Society - Part 6

Separation of Church and State

Another one of the liberal humanist's battle cries is the supposed "violation of the separation of church and state" that appears in many lawsuits. From Madelyn Murray O'Hare's successful campaign to keep prayer and Bible reading out of public schools to current attempts to make the Christian's declaration that "abortion is murder" or that "sodomy is sin" a hate crime, we are seeing the gradual erosion of religious freedom in our country.

Politics and religion don't mix? That would have been news to Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, George Washington and many other of our nation's founders. These men often brought their so-called "private" religious beliefs into public policy. In fact, they made no pretense to hide the fact that their Christian beliefs were the undergirding for their political theory and action. We asked our panel:

Question #6:— What about the separation of Church and state? Does the U.S. Constitution forbid the display of religion in the civil sphere?

Steve Schlissel:— This idea of religious neutrality is not true to our founding. We had explicit statements in various state constitutions, Maryland, Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, where there were references to the Christian religion as being the one that is protected in the land. In fact, there were restrictions of office bearing, that you could not be an office holder in a state unless you held to the Christian, and more specifically the *Protestant* religion, that you held to the creeds in regard to the confession of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and that you believed that the Bible is the word of God and infallible. If you didn't believe that, you couldn't be an office holder in various states.

Now we take today's propaganda to say that there was separation of church and state which means "religious neutrality." It's just a smoke screen. It is some rival using a "Klingon cloaking device" that says, "I'm not really here." What we have is another religion. This other religion is viciously intolerant. How intolerant is it? Well, Reggie White, the great pro-football player, said to the Wisconsin legislature that he does not believe that homosexuality falls into the same category as race. He said, "Race is something you are born with. It is a disposition from God. You cannot choose it. However, homosexuality is a behavior that people choose to engage in." Well that was it for Reggie! This tolerant society, this "bleeding-heart let-everybody-do-their own thing" worldview found suddenly that their tolerance limits were met with a statement that suggested that homosexuality is a sin.

In Los Angeles recently, there was a convention of doctors meeting to discuss homosexuality. But because they didn't follow the "lavender agenda" the very discussion (although they didn't come to any conclusions) was condemned by the Los Angeles city council as "hateful." The people at the hotel were harassed. In fact, they had to shut down the hotel to these conventioners and put them in another hotel that had a little more guts because of the threats that came from the homosexual community.

The homosexual community goes into St. Patrick's cathedral in New York City and tosses condoms. They mock fornicate every year in their wild lascivious parades in front and they are not touched. But Christians that protest at abortion clinics are arrested and hauled off. Tolerance always has limits. Tol-

erance is always religiously informed and we are not working in a tolerant system.

People who say anything against the current agenda find their life's work is now suddenly meaningless. There was a police chaplain in New York who was there for many years. He suggested that a Homosexual district attorney was a problem to him. That was the end of his career. He was forced to resign. What happened to tolerance? Why can't he have a different view?

In the case of Matthew Shepherd's slaying in Wyoming, it was played up by the media to be a result of advertisements placed by Christians encouraging homosexuals to find freedom in Christ. These loving ads, they twisted into these intolerant bastions of hate. "They are looking to kill us all!" Nothing could be further from the truth. These people are gentle and meek and sweet. That is very clear to anybody with an impartial view of it. You don't even have to be a Christian to see their motives. What happened? The intolerance brigade came in and started their campaign against the Christian faith.

In the public square, there will always be one religion governing what is permissible and what is impermissible. If it is not the Christian religion, it won't be a religiously neutral government. It will be a government that is advocating another religion.

Howard Phillips:— The Constitution of the United States guarantees liberty of conscience when it says: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof" in the First Amendment to the Constitution which begins the Bill of Rights. The core principle underlying the First Amendment was found in the writings of Thomas Jefferson and in the Virginia Declaration of Religious Liberty. Jefferson asserted correctly that to compel a man to subsidize with his taxes the propagation of ideas he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical. The states which came together to form our federal union each had religious establishments at the time of the Constitution's ratification: a Catholic establishment in Maryland; an Anglican establishment in Virginia; a Congregational establishment in Massachusetts. In all cases, it was understood that the British Common Law was the core of the legal system in all of the states which came together to found the Union. British Common Law had its roots in Holy Scripture which began to take root under King Alfred in Britain.

Everyone has a right to his opinion, but America got underway with a Christian legal system. States were permitted to apply the death penalty for premeditated murder. The individual could worship as he saw fit and the federal government would not interfere with him, nor would it require him to support with his taxes anyone else's form of worship.

What we neglect to appreciate is that religion is not just Christianity, Buddhism, Judaism. Religion is any organized body of ideas about the nature of God and man. Humanism is a religion. Advocacy of homosexual conduct is in many ways a religion. Earth worship, radical environmentalism, one-worldism, all of these are forms of religious faith. They are belief systems which are coherent and comprehensive. People have a right to those opinions, but they don't have a right to require us to subsidize them with our taxes.

That is why it is unconstitutional for Congress to turn over our tax dollars or control over our policy to other law systems, such as those at the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, NAFTA, the World Trade Organization. Under the principle of accountability, which is core to any system of representative republicanism, it's essential that Congress not turn over policy setting functions to private non-profit corporations, to bureaucrats, to any kind of entity which does not have to stand for election in a manner in which the voters can say: "yea or nay."

Andrew Sandlin:— We strongly support the separation of church and state. We do not support the separation of the state from *God*. There is a vast difference. The church is under the authority of the law of God just as the state is. We're not looking for an *ecclesiocracy*. We are looking for a godly decentralized *theocracy*, the rule of the law of God. We certainly do not want the rule of the institutional church over society. We don't support medieval notions like that. We simply believe that the law of God should govern in society.

If it's not a Christian nation, it's going to be some type of nation. An Islamic nation? A secular nation? A science fiction nation? There will be some religion that will be enforced in society, we believe it should be Christianity—within the narrow limits of the law of God not a heavy top-down bureaucracy.

The purpose of civil government is to enforce the Law of God appropriate to its sphere. We read in Romans 13 that the civil magistrate is to punish civil evil and to protect the righteous. When we start talking about "inalienable rights," although in some sense that terminology is permissible, it's not specifically biblical. Therefore, I think we have to go back to what the Bible specifically says. I am not in any way attacking the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution, we can have certain refinements.

The idea that we supposedly have the right to pursue the longings of our own heart is essentially a liberal idea. That's what liberals have held for the past 200 years and especially the last 50 years. The important thing is responsibility to the Law of God and to God as our sovereign.

Monte Wilson:— It's a bit simplistic to think there can be a wall between the church and state. There are some boundaries. So often what people hear is a "separation of *faith* and state." That's ludicrous. There is no such separation. If you say there is going to be no *ecclesiocracy*, then yes, obviously. But if you are saying that your faith is not going to have anything to do with how you vote, or that morals are not rooted in some kind of faith structure or system, then that's irrational. There should be a separation between the church and state in their *functions*. The church has the spiritual sword and the state has the steel sword. But whenever you start legislating laws, you start legislating morality. And the question becomes: Whose morality?

Somebody's God is going to rule, whether it is the Christian, Muslim, New Age or whatever it is. That is not a consistent position with the Christian faith. Norman Geisler said that we don't work for a Christian nation, but a free nation. That's not really true. We are to make disciples of all nations. A nation is not free that is not under Christ. We do want it to be a Christian nation. And I think that is even a good thing for non-Christians.

R.J. Rushdoony:— Among the early colonists were separatists or independents or people who maintained the form of establishment but really wanted no part of it. The Congregational Church of Massachusetts was the established church of Massachusetts and legally part of the Church of England. They never broke with the Church of England. The actually had Church of England men in some of the pulpits. In fact, the man at Salem whose family was deeply involved in the witchcraft trials was Church of England. It was only subsequently that they came to a belief that there should be a Christian establishment rather than a church establishment. However, with the Constitution it was believed that legally and on good grounds, the states if they chose could establish a church or several churches or simply say that Christianity is the established faith, but not impose it on the states and counties. In many cases, they settled down to a county by county establishment.

Even in my lifetime, especially in the west, you could go to a county in Nebraska, Minnesota, Wis-

consin, and everything would be controlled by a particular church which was the dominant church in that area – it could be Catholic, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Reformed – they were not intolerant of each other. In some places, where I spoke, the priests or the nuns would ask me into the parochial schools to talk about my work among the Indians. Or the Lutheran pastor would ask me into the public schools to speak. He ran it. In some cases the priests ran the public schools and the nuns taught. No one saw anything wrong with that, they were not intolerant one of another. It worked out beautifully on the local level. But we shattered all of that because of Madelyn Murray and her lawsuit.

Jeff Ziegler:— The main differences between the Roman Empire under the Caesar cult and the early Church’s reaction to it and Christians today in a constitutional republic, despite the fact that we’ve lost so many of our freedoms, we still have remedy at law to begin to work within the process to restore and reconstruct our nation along biblical lines—simply to restore it to what it once was. Under the Roman authority, Christians did not have the means to defend themselves. Christians did not have the right to an appeal. But we have that process here. We have the right to defend ourselves. We have a Constitution. We have a Bill of Rights. We have elected representatives that we can work with, lower civil magistrates that we can work alongside, convert to the faith and even elect those who are explicitly Christian to these lower realms and then begin to work up into the governmental powers that be.

Reconstruction and reformation is a ground-up idea. The idea of seizing control of Washington D.C., of the Congress and presidency, is hopelessly naive. We have to reconstruct families. We have to reconstruct churches. We have to begin to work at the local level. We have to develop regional zones of kingdom influence. Within that realm, we are exhibiting, testifying, and working for the Crown Rights of Jesus Christ. So in that realm Christians have a greater hope and an easier road to hoe than the early Christians did versus the imperial power of Rome.

It’s not as if this is a new thing that we are talking about. Our nation was founded under these strictures. If you go to any of the early colonial charters, the Fundamental Charters of Carolina, for example, there was a test for Christian orthodoxy for all civil magistrates and even land owners that they had to adhere to before they could be a recognized and vibrant part of the social fabric. We are not talking about anything that has not been done. It was done and accomplished in our nation and prior to the War Between the States, America prospered under such a mandate.

So we are not talking about Ayatollah Khomeini’s Iran. We are not talking about Islamic law. We’re talking about biblical law. If we go back and we look at the Commonwealth of the Hebrew Republic, before the kings, we see a very decentralized system of government. Many people have the notion that Moses was a dictator, but that was only in the initial stages of the Exodus, which was primarily a military operation. Soon after that we see that Moses was going to wear away the people and God not only gave 70 elders, but princes and captains of fifties and tens.

“So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes” (Deut. 1:15).

So you had this incredibly decentralized system of government among the tribes of Israel. People could say it was inefficient, but the whole idea was a check and balance against man’s depravity. We modeled our constitutional republic after the Hebrew Commonwealth. That’s what we’re talking about here.

George Grant:— When people talk about trying to separate religion from the civic arena, they forget that so much of the structure of our Constitution even the idea of our Constitution are the direct

fruits of Christian ideas. For instance, the covenanters of Scotland and England believed that it was necessary to lay down in manifesto form, in covenantal or contract form, the standards by which society would be judged, and the principles upon which a society would be established. That is where we get the idea of a Constitution. A Constitution is a document or covenant drawn out of the ideals of Christian thought. In the Constitution itself we see a number of basic principles that came right out of the Reformation, right out of the life of the early Church, right out of biblical principles.

For instance, there is the concept of sphere sovereignty. There are different spheres of influence, different institutions that have different powers and different authorities. They are separated from each other. They serve as checks and balances. They hold one another accountable. Our Constitution makes provisions for state governments, which have powers that our federal government does not have. There is a legislative, executive and judicial branch. This separation of powers is based upon the biblical understanding of original sin that will necessarily infect the best institutions and the best laid plans.

The Founding Fathers put into place these biblical concepts. There is the notion of delegated authority. Congress does not have authority on its own accord. It has authority that is delegated to it by the states and by the people. It exercises that delegated authority within certain limited parameters lest we wind up with a kind of legislative dictatorship. We have in the Constitution a manifesto of rights. Those rights will always inhere in the people and cannot be broached at all. These are biblical concepts.

The idea that we would separate powers so that congress can override the executive branch, that the judicial branch can override both the legislative and executive branch, that congress can pass laws that will exempt certain types of legislation from the judicial authority of the Supreme Court, is a concept directly derived from Church government found in the Scriptures.

The Founding Fathers knew that if they were going to establish a society they had to take into account sin, accountability, the notions of delegated powers rather than derived powers, and that all of these things would be protected by a series of checks so that the unjust would not ultimately run roughshod over the people. That is the essence of the Constitution. It is the fruit of biblical ideas.

Randall Terry:— It's interesting. The enemies of Christianity, the Biblephobes, the Christophobes, say: "The Christians are so dangerous! They're trying to take over the country!" What do they have against us? That we are pro-life. That we are against homosexual marriage. Other than that, what do we want? We want people to control their own home, their children's education, their retirement funds. The statists on the other hand, who believe that the state is the messiah and the lawgiver, want to tell you what to do with your children, your retirement money. They want to tell you that you have to pay a property tax to live in your home or they'll take your home away from you. They want to tell you what to do with your business. They want to force you to be the government's tax collector. And on and on. The tyranny we are enduring today is not from Christians. It's from those who believe that the state is our savior, because for the state to be our savior, it also must be our master and lord.

I believe that the hour is upon us when we must stand now in the public square in government according to the principles of the Law of God. People look at how bad things are around us and things are bad, but it's also an opportunity, because what we are seeing is the collapse of humanism. We are seeing the chaos of that worldview. If we would just step onto the playing field, we could win because we have solutions that are tried and true. Their solutions are all failures. They have a house of cards and the house is on fire. So let's stand for what is right. Let's use the opportunities that are before us to stand for the Law of God, to stand for Christ. I believe that if we will do it that God himself will honor our efforts and America can be restored. America can be free again.

Questions for Part 6

1. The Constitutional distinction between church and state is very different from the idea promoted in our day. The very phrase “separation of church and state” is very misleading. It is not a Constitutional phrase at all, but it came afterward in the writings of Jefferson. The Danbury Baptist Letter written by Jefferson in 1802 contains the celebrated phrase “a wall of eternal separation”—which the U.S. Supreme Court and other courts have used to interpret the Founders’ intentions regarding the relationship between civil government and religion. But most have taken Jefferson’s intent out of context. Jefferson’s intent was to assure Baptists in the state of Connecticut that their right to free worship would never be infringed upon by the federal government. Here is an excerpt from the text of Jefferson’s Danbury Baptist Letter:

Believing that religion is a matter which lies solely between man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that *their* legislature should make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; thus building a wall of separation between church and state.

The words, “wall of separation,” appear just above a section of the letter that Jefferson circled for deletion. In the deleted section Jefferson had explained why he refused to proclaim national days of fasting and thanksgiving, as his predecessors, George Washington and John Adams, had done. In the left margin, next to the deleted section, Jefferson noted that he deleted the section to avoid offending “our republican friends in the eastern states” who cherished days of fasting and thanksgiving. In your opinion, may a civil ruler make use of prayer proclamations and laws regarding fasting, prayer and public scripture reading as part of his civil office? Why or why not?

2. The first amendment states that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

For discussion: Have modern judges, in their zeal to disestablish state religion, actually prohibited the free exercise of Christian beliefs in the public sphere.? Can you think of any examples of how this has occurred?

3. The very idea of having a “wall of separation” originated as a Puritan distinction between the spheres of authority of church and civil government. The church and the state are separate spheres of governmental authority. Separation of church and state does not mean separation of the civil sphere from God and God’s law. The issue is not whether the church should intrude on the state’s affairs. The church should not. Neither should the state intrude on the church’s affairs. But Jesus Christ intercedes in the affairs of both. Civil government is not secular; it stands under the moral Law of God!

Thus, the Bible supports separation of church and state but it does not support the separation of the church, nor the state, from _____ and _____.

4. The first amendment of our Constitution was designed to keep the United States federal government from establishing a national Church. This was mainly a response to the English who had imposed tax-supported high Anglican clergymen on some of the Puritan colonies prior to the Revolution. But the first amendment was never designed to limit to role of the church in the public sphere. This was the understanding of most American legislators until the 20th century.

Two of our 18th century founders , Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson (not noted for their Christian orthodoxy) proposed a national seal. Not only does this seal depict a scene from the Bible, but it uses scripture as a mandate to resist tyranny.



For discussion: As a group read Exodus 14. Some of the founders saw the Exodus story as a model for the War for Independence. Explore the parallels between the American Revolution and the Exodus under Moses.

5. Detractors of theonomy and theocracy like to argue that the civil law and its sanctions were limited to Old Covenant Israel because there was no separation of church and state in Israel's theocracy. Even a casual survey of the law of Moses disproves this conjecture. The Old Covenant commands that alien and sojourners in Israel, even those who were uncircumcised heathen, were bound to the civil law (Lev. 24:22). Yet these foreigners were not required to keep most of the ceremonial aspects of the Mosaic law (Ex. 12:43,44,48; 9:33; Deut. 14:21). Only the circumcised were allowed to participate in the Passover, the old covenant communion meal. The two marks of the covenant separated members of the Old Covenant church from members of the state. There was also a separation between the priests of the ceremonial law, the Levites, and the magistrates of the civil law, the elders and judges.

Question: In light of the following passages (Lev. 14:35; 27:11; Deut. 1:16; 16:18; 19:12; 21:2; 25:1) explain how God's Law made a distinction between religious and civil authority.

6. Others will use the argument that God's preferred form of government is a monarchy, and will point to Moses and the establishment of kings in Israel. However, God also established judges among the tribes: **"So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes"** (Deut. 1:15).

Question: How does this model reflect our Constitutional representative government?

God's Law and Society - Part 7

The Myth of Neutrality

One of the most common objections to Christians bringing the morality of the Bible into politics is the idea that somehow there ought to be a public square that is neither secular nor Christian, but “neutral.” Jesus addressed the issue of neutrality when He told His disciples in Matthew 12:30: **“He who is not for Me is against me, and he who does not gather with Me scatters abroad.”** The very idea that we, as followers of Christ can peacefully coexist with a pagan world system is refuted by the Lord himself, **“Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth, I did not come to bring peace, but a sword” (Matthew 10:34).**

Many Christian leaders prop up the idea of “neutrality in the public square.” This viewpoint expresses the essence of antinomianism: that the righteousness of one’s conduct can be divorced from the moral Law of God—or that one’s political views can be divorced from one’s theology. In truth, the only option besides a biblically based society ruled by the Law of God is a pagan society ruled by lawlessness. There is no neutral ground.

The myth of pluralism is the number one fallacy which undermines the social ethic of the modern Christian conservative movement. Our vision for America has become truncated by an anti-Law position. The Word of God is clear on one thing: the moral Law of God is the standard, not natural law, not pluralism, not what man thinks is right in his own eyes. The Bible provides the vast majority of laws needed to govern a society. Those it does not directly define, it addresses in principle. Although we may not always agree on interpretation, we should agree on the Law of God as the standard. Either we stand for the Lordship of Jesus Christ in the totality of life, or we become enemies of the cross.

We asked our panel of experts to comment on the myth of neutrality:

Question #7:— What about the idea that the civil government should remain neutral and recognize that we live in a democratic, pluralistic society?

Phil Vollman:— There is one truth frustrated pastors in this hour must major on, center on, focus on. Worry about everything else after the victories start rolling in. There is one major truth they must begin to preach on. Neutrality is a myth. There is no such thing as neutrality. God did not design the fabric of the universe to allow for neutrality. There is not one atom in this whole universe that can claim neutrality. Jesus was very clear in this. He said, **“I am the way, the truth, I am the life. No man cometh to the Father but by Me” (John 14:6).**

There is no neutrality. This is a winner take all battle. It’s either going to be the disciples of Jesus Christ in time and history who are out there leading the fight for righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and doing it in the public square which will produce the peace that we are all after. Or it’s going to be the disciples of Molly Yard, Margaret Sanger, and Joseph Stalin who are out there doing that. The feminist is not neutral in her worldview or in her apologetic. The humanist is not neutral in what he does and says. Teddy Kennedy, Bill Clinton and Hillary Clinton are not neutral.

It is time for the church to wake up and realize this issue. We are the largest single institution within the confines of the contiguous 48 states. There are more people in America who profess Christ. Some estimates have said 40 million, some estimates are as optimistic as 65 million. We are the largest single

institution in this nation who say that we believe in Christ. At the same time, we are the most irrelevant and the most impotent. Why is that? We have forgotten that truth: There is no neutrality.

If homosexuals who comprise less than five percent of this nation, who are without the Holy Ghost, the holy scriptures, the patriarchs, the oaths and promises, can turn this nation on its ear in the space of 25 years, what could 40 million Christians moving under the power of the Holy Ghost and with Reformed orthodoxy undergirding them, what could we do? We could win. And we could win quickly. There is no neutrality. If we could learn that, if the pastors of America would simply learn that, the battle would be over inside of three months.

George Grant:— One of the great prophets of humanism at the beginning of this century was the science fiction writer H.G. Wells who wrote a book called, *The Future of The World*, in which he portrayed the scientist as a priest of a new religion. There is one quote that Wells uses: “The philosopher kings of the new age of science will elicit from a people worship, and that worship will lead us to a utopia.” Here is a man of science using inherently religious language to try and bring about some type of societal reconstruction with the religion of humanism.

So many of the blessings that humanists enjoy are the fruit of the Christian faith. We would not have a free market economy and the prosperity we have today were it not for the biblical principles of economics practiced and adhered to in the early centuries and the founding of western civilization. Science, technology, medicine are the direct fruits of Christian principles applied. There were no hospitals in ancient world. This was the ministry of a local church in Caesarea. Non-ambulatory medical care grew out of the concern for the poor, afflicted, despised and rejected. So much of what we appreciate and enjoy in Western civilization, what the humanist takes for granted, is really the fruit of Christianity. Our art, music, literature and architecture are all the fruit of Christian principles. Even when humanists go on modern crusades—battles against intolerance, battles to save the environment—each one of these grows out of a Christian concern for stewardship and justice. Even the hobbyhorses of the humanists and those who would despise Christianity in our day are derived directly out of Christian principles.

There is a very strong, powerful religious left in America. It is odd that people would bemoan and bewail the influence of prominent evangelicals in the market place of ideas. We never seem to hear complaints about the Rev. Jesse Jackson and others from a more liberal perspective. The fact is that people of faith have things to say in the public arena. To exclude one or another because of an ideological bias is absurd and ultimately undercuts the argument of liberalism and humanism. All through the Scriptures we see that one of the first impulses of a flagrant sin manifested in a culture is to find a justification for it in the Church or among religious leaders. We see among the minor prophets, they were chided for not coming alongside the violators of the standards of justice and blessing them. Sinners are always looking for chaplains for their sin. So today, the advocates for abortion on demand, homosexual rights, for the transformation of our culture into a secular paradise, are always beckoning for the religious to come alongside and bless their efforts.

Steve Schlissel:— I have a hard time understanding what the difficulty is in looking for to the law of God for a norm for civil polity. The difficulty I have is—let’s not talk about non-Christians who don’t love God and what He has to say—but Christians love the Lord. They know Jehovah. They know his goodness. They see his mercy. They know his wisdom. They know that they don’t know everything, but they know Someone who does know everything. Let’s start with that. God knows everything.

Now let’s go back to an idea that we find in the Old Testament. We lost Eden through the sin of our own parents. Now God brings a whole people out of bondage—a stark contrast—into the glorious

freedom of the children of God on earth, if they do everything He says. He says it over and again. "If you do what I tell you in this land, you are going to have Eden back. It's going to be glorious. There is going to be rain. There is going to be fruit. There is going to be prosperity. There is going to be food. You won't even have diseases. You are going to be so happy if you do what I say."

"The LORD shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless all the work of thy hand" (Deut. 28:12).

Now do we believe that was the case? Do we believe it was the case because God was going to do continued supernatural miracles? Or rather because in the Law, God was giving His people the keys to living on earth? I think that's not to big a jump to say God gave them the Law in love. Deuteronomy is the book to read on this. Over and again He says, "I love you. That's why I'm giving you this Law. It's not because I'm setting you up. I'm not looking to trap you. Follow this because this is the way."

"Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye harken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the LORD thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers: And he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee" (Deut. 7:12,13).

Now let's bring this to today. We become Christian. Our neighbor becomes Christian. Even our whole neighborhood becomes Christian. What happens? Even our whole state becomes Christian. Even in fact the whole nation. Then we look to each other and say, "I wonder how we should rule our lives? What laws should we have?" Now God has spoken already. He has given a while body of laws in history to a people that He loved and adopted as His own that He liberated not to put them in bondage but to keep them in freedom. Doesn't it make sense to that we should go to that law and apply ourselves to see how it applies to our culture today.

There will be difficulties. Their culture was highly agrarian. Ours is highly technological. There are other big differences between us and Israel. But in principle we should expect that given the wisdom of God, we should find those governing ordinances which would lead to maximum freedom, maximum peace, even maximum prosperity. Prosperity doesn't happen from manipulating God or playing games or hitting the right keys to get a result. It happens by having our Father in heaven telling us what to do. We do what He says and then in time He blesses us.

Jeff Ziegler:—Probably the greatest evidence of humanism's collapse and the reactionary statist hand being felt is in the former monopoly that we call public education. Public education is no such thing; it's government indoctrination. After all, whether it be Hitler, Stalin or Mao, tyrants always try to grab hold of the next generation to perpetuate their rebellion. The public school system on a number of different fronts is beginning to collapse—academically, economically because people are no longer voting for levies, and because it is becoming more centralized in Washington D.C. Centralization is never an answer. Any business man could tell you that if the public school elitists definitely wanted to succeed, they would not want to centralize, but that is what they are doing. As these things begin to happen, more and more individuals leave the public school system either for parochial schools, private schools or for home school.

The correct reason for home schooling is not simply the quality of education in the government run school system. It is to say that the government has no authority whatever over you children., You are the one who is ultimately responsible.

As more have home schools, as more move to the parochial schools what is happening is a literal depopulation of the public system. Laws are being enacted at the state and federal level to destroy the

freedom the parents have over their children. Home schoolers think that they have fought most of the legal battles in the 1980s. Actually they are going to see that their own success is going to breed a greater backlash by the state against their efforts. Ultimately, the state believes, whether at the local municipality, state or federal government, that they own the children. And that is where the great backlash of a collapsing humanism is going to be felt. It is going to take courage, conviction and sound theology by Christian parents not only to resist the tyranny, but to fight for justice.

Randall Terry:— This whole topic of the Law of God begs the question: “What is the duty of the Christian?” Is it my duty simply to evangelize? Or is my duty to be a light in every arena, every power base? Moreover, is it my duty to take the Crown Rights of King Jesus, as His ambassador, into education, government, the arts and media? Because if my duty does involve heralding His law in every arena, then the Church in America is failing radically today.

If God is sovereign, if His law is true, then it is impossible for civil government to be neutral on issues of law. All law is based in some religious code. Jesus said, “Either you are for Me, or you are against Me.” That would certainly apply to kings and princes. If the Christians who were alive in the 1770s behaved and believed like the Christians of today, there wouldn’t be an America as we know it. Those Christians understood that it was part of their religious duty to resist tyranny, to fight for justice, to apply the law of God to cultural and political issues. We make up theological excuses as to why we shouldn’t get involved. It’s interesting to note that all revolutionary literature was written by pastors. These guys weren’t just political activists., they were involved in a revolution against the mightiest power that the world had ever seen. That was the kind of theology that undergirded, motivated and animated them. Would to God that we could have a revival of that kind of religion in America today.

R.J. Rushdoony:— Our Lord said, **“Occupy until I come” (Luke 19:13)**. We are told that **“the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ” (Rev. 11:15)**. The Old Testament is rife with prophecies concerning the nations being under the Christ the Messiah. Now this is clearly an important aspect of our faith. Some years ago, Weingarten wrote a book made up entirely of the texts of the Old Testament that predict the triumph to come in Christ, how all the nations shall be His. Isaiah says that even in Egypt, being a type of the unregenerate world, five cities out of six will call upon the name of the Lord, an image of great victory.

“In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear unto the LORD of hosts” (Isaiah 19:18).

So if we are going to fight with an eye towards winning, we’ve got to have a postmillennial faith. Now you can go to heaven without it, but you’ll do better in this world and in the world to come, if you stand in terms of the fact that we are to bring everything into captivity to Christ. All our thinking is presuppositional. We begin with axioms of thought, premises that we believe, and we think in terms of that. As Christians we think in terms of the fact that God is, and all things must reckon with God and make an accounting to God. If we do not believe, we begin with the premise, God is not and I am alone in this world. It’s a dog-eat-dog world. It’s survival of the fittest. So you live accordingly and the world goes to hell in a hand basket. It becomes trashier. So ideas do have consequences. To believe that we are the people of victory that Christ is going to triumph and only when all things are put under His feet will the last enemy, death, be destroyed.

“For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be de-

stroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:25,26).

Howard Phillips:— Some people mistakenly believe that there is such a thing as neutrality. There is no such thing. Positing that the world was created impersonally by random chance is a religious view. Positing that the state has a right to steal by majority vote is a religious view, one which contradicts God's commandment, "**Thou shalt not steal**" (Ex. 20:15). The very notion that it is okay for the President of the United States to commit adultery represents a religious view, which is antithetical to the Christian view. "**Thou shalt not commit adultery**" (Ex. 20:14). There is no such thing as neutrality. All views are inevitably and inescapably religious. The idea that people have a right to welfare is religious. The idea that worship of the earth transcends rights of property is a religious view. It's religious to say that any form of sexual conduct is permissible. That's an anti-Christian religious perspective.

The question is: Will the government fund those anti-Christian perspectives? I don't know of any Christians who are asking the government to fund Christian activism, Christian evangelists, Christian ministries, and Christian churches. But the liberals are saying, "We want you to fund our churches. We want you to fund the church of sodomy by giving more money to homosexual organizations which tell people that homosexual conduct is okay. We want you to fund the church of child killing by giving more money to organizations which kill babies. We want you to fund the church of the New World Order by giving more money to organizations which promote the loss of the national independence and security of the United States of America and its law system in favor of other law systems such as those of the UN."

The beliefs of the people who wrote our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, while they may have been theologically diverse, were implicitly Christian and were fundamentally at odds with the Marxist-Leninist beliefs, for example, of Alger Hiss who wrote the charter of the United Nations. He had a religious view which was reflected in the UN charter. Our Founders had a religious view which is reflected in our Constitution and Declaration of Independence. The difference is that under the Constitution there is liberty of conscience. You can believe whatever you want to believe. You are not required to subsidize somebody else's faith. That's the way it should be. It isn't always followed. Under the United Nations, you are consistently required to subsidize the faith of those who run the UN—a faith which requires fewer people; restricts populations; changes cultural and religious policies affecting male headship of families. The UN has an explicit dogma and insists that the money sent to it be used to advance that dogma. The problem is that our congresses and presidents have forgotten that the government of the United States is not supposed to require us to subsidize any private dogma.

Jay Grimstead:— One of the reasons I am convinced there will be very soon a collision course between biblical worldview people and anti-biblical thinking is this—(and this is something my mentor Francis Schaeffer would have said even though it is not actually a quote; it is pure Schaeffer thought.)— There is a built-in philosophical inevitability in humanism, atheism and socialism that drives them, whether the socialist humanists know it or want it or not, to a point in a future where they must absolutely without any option call for a total tyrannical state control over everybody's freedom, finances and family. They must come to that point. They have no options. They will come to that point even though they don't even know that. They don't even know they are headed towards something like a United States Nazi-type government. It may be benevolent looking. They may dress it up softly in velvet. But the U.S. Constitution at some point will be rescinded. There will be a governmental socialistic humanistic effort where they have to say, "We are going to take total control of your lives." There is no other option for them. And we have to prepare for that because it is a philosophical inevitability based on humanism.

Questions for Part 7

To the Puritans and many of America's founders, the Covenant and the Law of God were obvious foundations of Christian social order. Covenant theology laid the groundwork for a political theory. Our founders believed that government and all society came into being as a contract on the basis of God's eternal covenant. They held that the moral law of God must be the foundation for a society's laws and government.

1. Civil governments are obligated to follow God's moral laws. If they are not, then Christians have no real standards by which to influence legislation. There is no other standard besides the moral law of God to effect the Reformation of the America except democratic pluralism: What the majority thinks is right in their own eyes.

For discussion: Describe the difficulty of a nation will face in creating laws that are based on majority rule.

2. Democratic pluralism has led us to the current state of affairs in our nation. In early America, especially in the Puritan townships, there was a type of theocratic pluralism, or liberty under the moral laws of God.

Describe the difference between a theocratic pluralism, in which the government makes no law establishing a particular Christian religion, yet abides by God's Law; and a democratic pluralism in which the majority opinion is the basis for all legislation.

3. It is only through grace that we fulfill the law. Further, no system of law can ever sanctify a society. However, the moral law of God still serves as the standard of sanctification for both the individual and society. The Law also acts as a means of grace to bring some to salvation.

"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." (Galatians 3:24).

However, if the society's laws are based on God's laws, what could we expect concerning revival and spiritual awakening in that society?

God's Law and Society - Part 8

Non-Christians and the Law of God

The question inevitably arises about practitioners of non-Christian religions:

Question #8:— In a Christian republic based on biblical law, would non-Christian religions be banned?—Or would non-Christians have the same freedom of worship?

Let's see what our experts have to say:

Monte Wilson:— Yes, there would be other religions. They would be there. The only time there would be civil penalties would be when people broke the laws of the land which were explicitly Christian. I am presently trying to help the nation of Zambia to reconstruct their nation according to biblical lines. Islam is not going to be taught in the schools. Only Christianity will be taught. The laws rooted in the Ten Commandments are going to be kept. If you can practice your religion and not cross these laws, you can live and be free in the society.

If God decides to pour out His wrath on a false religion, He is holy God and He can do that. But for a Christian state to judge where a person was in their journey towards God, I think execution would be more toward breaking of civil legislation. There would not be an outlawing of the worship of God in the home. While there should be restriction to their behavior and practices with regard to the civil law, there is no outlawing of their religion.

George Grant:— Inevitably, cultures are an expression of the values of a people. The values are drawn out of traditions and habits and language of a people. A culture is a legacy of faith. You can't get around that at all. Cultures that attempt to get around that are just cultures in transition from one faith to another. Culture is a manifestation of faith. G.K. Chesterton said, "A culture is the accumulation of rituals, traditions, symbols and habits, those things which grow out of a people's perception of what matters most." In other words, a culture is a legacy of faith." Because culture is drawn out of the word "cult," as T.S. Eliot says, the manifestations that we have in society, the way we relate to each other, the way we do business, the way we transact our regular rituals in community, are necessarily drawn from cult or from faith.

Religion is an inescapable concept. Everyone worships someone or something. When people start talking about some humanistic values, or putting man at the center of all things, they have turned the worship of God into a worship of self. As a result, they have propounded this notion that we are all gods and sovereign over our sphere of influence. History demonstrates that when man thinks he is in control, those are the times when society is the most out of control. Today, we have more consistently applied the religion of humanism than in any time in history and look at what it has wrought! What a societal mess it has made! Humanism is an utter and complete failure, precisely because man's actions are so arbitrary and ultimately so cruel. Humanism is a failure because we have made a god out of a creature rather than the Creator.

Steve Schlissel:— In order to answer the question, we really need to get over the idea that we have unbound latitudinarian tolerance. No culture does. Every single culture has restrictions. For example,

there are groups that want to offer child sacrifice. We don't permit that. There are groups that want to offer public sacrifices of animals today. Now in the Old Testament we had it, but Christian societies today forbid it. (There are little exceptions around the globe.)

So we don't have tolerance for every group. But we could have tolerance for those who have formal allegiance to the God of the Bible. Some might include Muslims in that because they say that the God of the Bible they worship is the God therein revealed. Certainly, many more would be sympathetic to Jews worshipping with freedom of conscience. But the idea is not we would go into the home and regulate the worship in the home or the thoughts of the people.

There is an old story about Abraham that is told by the rabbis. They say that an Arab visitor came to him one day and he extended typical eastern hospitality. He said, "Come into my tent my friend." The sat down at a meal and Abraham set about to witness to him to find out what his religious convictions were. The Arab told him, "Oh, I'm an idolater and here are some of my idols." Abraham became indignant, furious, and threw him out of his tent and chased him into the desert.

And God, the rabbis say, came to visit Abraham and asked him, "Abraham, how old was that man?"

Abraham said, "He was about eighty."

And how long was he with you, Abraham?"

"Oh, about five minutes."

"And what did you do?"

"I threw him out," Abraham answered.

God said, "I've been bearing with that man for eighty years and you couldn't bear with him for five minutes.

The lesson is that we need to be tolerant to understand that it is the Lord who gives faith. We have to give wide berth to the working of the Spirit to bring that about. With a Christian consensus and with a strong Christian conviction our tolerance can be considerable. It's when we are weak that we tend to overact and have knee-jerk reactions to other faiths. But nevertheless the laws would have to be Christian laws that govern the land.

Andrew Sandlin:— We certainly do not want an Ayatollah fundamentalist regime. That's not what we are looking for at all. In a biblically oriented society, political power would be greatly decreased. In these areas of capital crimes and other penal sanctions, over a long period of time by means of godly peaceful democratic change we want the Law of God to be enforced. It's not our goal to go out and impose our views on everybody else. That really is a slander against the Christian Reconstructionist position. Our goal is not to harm any particular group or any minority, but certainly it is to require that all people submit themselves to the Law of God.

If somebody says: "That's absolute religious freedom," then no we don't believe that Satanists should be permitted to sacrifice children. But that's true in this society. When people talk about intolerance, there's always a level of intolerance. In this country, we don't permit Mormon men to have more than one wife. The biblical view is that they can believe what they want to believe and privately prac-

tice it. But under the Old Testament law, the public worship of a false god is forbidden.

In a biblical society, cults, or people who do not hold to a bare minimum orthodoxy, can hold their faith. They can teach their children their faith. But as far as public worship, the Bible does seem to forbid public worship that is contrary to Christian worship.

If somebody says, "That sounds intolerant," then there is always going to be some level of intolerance somewhere. Right now in this country, we don't have manger scenes on civil government lawns. We, of course, consider that to be intolerant. Every civil government is going to adopt certain laws that are essentially religious in nature. That is the nature of man.

We certainly cannot permit the public proselytizing of religions that are going to undermine our religious faith and also the state itself. But that has nothing to do with imposing our views on someone else's conscience. We do believe in liberty of conscience. People are free to believe what they want to believe and say what they want to say in the private sphere and train their children. But in certain cases there will be some intolerance. If we want to get rid of intolerance, let's just get rid of the law. Every law is intolerant.

R.J. Rushdoony:— Now concerning Calvin in Geneva—there are points where I would disagree with him—Calvin was born and raised a Catholic. The Catholic model was still in the minds of the reformers. They wanted to reform the Catholic Church. That was their goal. So they began with the belief that the society had to be Christian. Now Calvin in Geneva never commanded the city. He was an outsider brought in as kind of an efficiency expert to make a city that was a business community function. Prior to his coming, drinking, gambling and fornication occupied too much of the people's time and efficiency was going down hill. They liked Calvin because he brought about efficiency. He made people sober, God-fearing. But they didn't like it for themselves. The rulers of Geneva were happy with the results, but unhappy that Calvin expected the same type of behavior of them. The libertines were really very close to controlling the city most of the time. They brought in Servetus to challenge and oust Calvin. During the time of the trial, Calvin actually had his bags packed and was ready to leave. But the Roman Catholic model was still in the background there.

With Cromwell it was different. Cromwell was faced with churches who wanted an established national church—still the old Roman model. The Presbyterians, who were the most powerful group, were emphatically for an established group. That to them was salvation. The Separatists disagreed with them, but the other groups wanted to command the establishment. Cromwell wanted not a church establishment, but a *Christian* establishment. He wanted England committed to a Christian faith, not to a church. That's what he worked for. He had to fight the churches. It was the churches that defeated Calvinism and most of all the Presbyterians. It's the great blot in Presbyterian history that they brought in Charles II, a thoroughly degenerate man, and believed he would keep his word to them that he would go along with their idea of an establishment. Of course, he broke his word to them immediately and 2000 clergymen had to leave the Church of England. Over a course of time, the Presbyterians virtually died out in England.

Randall Terry:— People who reject the Law of God cannot bear to be consistent with their own lawless world. They'll say, "The seventh commandment, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery'—that's not binding for today." But they don't want someone sleeping with their spouse. They don't want someone stealing their car. They don't want somebody usurping their parent's authority. So it's funny that they mock us, but in a world without the law of God, you have chaos, oppression tyranny and everyone doing what is right in their own eyes. And they cannot bear consistency with that chaotic world. It terrifies them. If they were to be successful in eradicating the Law of God and the mores of Christian civili-

zation, what would they have? They would have the collapse of their whole world. Just go to a country that doesn't have the Ten Commandments as its foundation. Go to a chaotic Hindu nation, some of the African nations, or a Muslim nation. Look at the oppression, the tyranny, the chaos. Do they want that? It's the Law of God that gave the stability to Christian civilization that they enjoy while they mock us.

When the Planned Parenthood types and People For the American Way folks say all great world religions are basically the same, I want to laugh. Go to Haiti where witchcraft is one of the dominant religions. Go to a voodoo hut and look at the little skulls of little children. Go to India and talk to some of the women who used to be child prostitutes in Hindu Temples. Or maybe go see a widow tied to her husband's funeral pyre against her will and burned to death. This is the fruit of a non-Christian religion. Or go to the Mohammedan countries and look at the oppression of women there.

Where would you rather be a Buddhist? In Tibet or in America?—Where would you rather be a Hindu? Downtown Madras or America?—Where would you rather be a woman Muslim? In Tehran or in America? The umbrage of Christian freedom because of the Founder's love for the Law of God gives more liberties, freedoms, rights and protections to Hindus, Buddhists and Muslims than countries based upon their own religion.

For those who would say: "Go to Holland. They have euthanasia, legalized drugs, homosexual rights." I would say: "Go to Holland." Look at that country. Look at the venereal disease, the suicide rate among kids, the lives destroyed by drugs. Look at the women whose lives have been destroyed on street after street of legalized prostitution. That is a country that is debauched and is dying. If people want America to become like Holland, my advice to them would be: "Go to Holland."

Questions for Part 8

1. According to our panel of experts, any person in a Biblically ordered society—Jew, Moslem, Catholic, Protestant—would be free under the civil law to worship. The civil government would have no power to restrict religious worship. Jews, Moslems, Catholics, and Protestants all accept the Old Testament and may accept the Ten Commandments as a basis for civil Law.

According to our panel of experts, non-Christians may peacefully co-exist in society as long as they do not publicly blaspheme God nor disobey other civil laws in accomplishing the goals of their religion. Why must the state *not* regulate matters of worship according to individual conscience?

2. Should there be “intolerance,” for religions that do not abide by the moral law of God as a standard for ethical behavior? Can you think of faith-based practices of other religions that *would* be banned in a theonomic society?

3. Jesus gave the task of punishing the evil doer to the state; but acts of mercy and preaching the Gospel to the lost belong to the church. The civil government *does* have an obligation to see that all people obey the moral law *only* as it falls into its civil jurisdiction.

A *sanction* is defined as a reward or punishment for obedience or disobedience to a law. A sanction can be either a penalty for law-breaking or an affirmation of good conduct.

a. According to Romans 13:4, the civil magistrate has the power to wield the _____.

This civil sanction is interpreted to mean that the power to wage war and execute criminals for capital offenses is given by God to the state alone.

b. According to Ephesians 6:17; Hebrews 4:12; Rev. 1:16; Rev. 19:15, there is also the _____, which is symbolic of the _____ (Ephesians 6:17).

This spiritual sanction is also used against God’s enemies, but is given by God to all believers as a powerful tool in converting the hearts and minds of non-believers.

Compare and contrast the temporal authority of the steel sword to the eternal authority of the

sword of the Spirit in the following scripture passages: Isaiah 2:4; Isaiah 34:6; Matthew 26:52; Romans 13:4; Ephesians 6:17; Hebrews 4:12; Rev. 1:16; Rev. 19:15.

4. For discussion: Does the New Testament change or rescind the Laws of the Old Testament regarding capital punishment?

Many Christians would balk at the idea of instituting a government that would execute adulterers, homosexuals, witches, blasphemers and incorrigible children. If you believe that the punishments for some capital crimes have been altered or lifted, answer the following:

a. Which laws or sanctions have been changed?

b. By whose authority has God's Law been changed?

c. If the moral law is still true, but death is no longer a penalty for all the capital crimes listed in the Old Testament, then which punishments do apply?

d. Who decides which punishments apply?

God's Law and Society - Part 9

Freedom and the Christian Republic

Most Christians would readily agree that the moral laws of God, and certainly at the very least the Ten Commandments, provide some type of guide for moral behavior or a standard by which to judge whether our faith is borne out by works (according to James 2:17). But other questions inevitably arise: "What about the ungodly and the sinner? How can we expect the unconverted to obey the high standard of the Law of God? What about those of other religions besides Christianity? Wouldn't we be forcing our beliefs on them?" These are certainly valid questions and in this segment, we'll deal with this issue:

Question #9:— Would a Christian Republic which upholds God's Law become oppressive to non-Christians?—Or would there be greater freedom for all?

Jay Grimstead:— God has given great wisdom to all mankind on how to run life; how to families; how to run governments; how to have just courts and just laws—in the Bible. The Bible is the owner's manual that comes with the machine. He certainly knows better than all of us put together what makes us run well and what would make a good society and what could make a prosperous joyful, peaceful, orderly society. We believe that He has given us these laws in the Bible. We also can prove from looking at history that this already worked marvelously wherever they seriously attempted it. It worked in Geneva, in Scotland and to a certain degree in England. It worked marvelously here in America in the 1600, 1700s and even into the early 1800s.

When saying that America did a great job, I don't mean that there were not problems. It's not that we want to duplicate everything they did. We would want to eliminate slavery right from the beginning. It should have been done at the Constitution. It was our very bad mistake. There is no excuse for that. It needs to be repented of. But compared with any other society in history, there has never been such freedom for blacks, whites or women in the world as we had here. The Biblically thinking women, blacks, Indians, Chinese, Jews—anybody who would be considered an ethnic group—say the same thing. It's not the clear thinking biblical people in those groups who would have trouble with this.

Howard Phillips:— Some people think that Christians who have a Constitutional view are moral imperialists. Quite the contrary. We are seeking to defend ourselves against the immoral imperialism of those who are using the power of civil government to advance their religious agenda, which involves environmental extremism, abortion, homosexuality, the destruction of the traditional family. We want the federal government to be limited to its delegated enumerated powers. We do not want to subsidize our perspective by giving money to organizations or individuals who are using the courts, or who are lobbyists, or who are editorial writers, or securing government grants to advance our agenda. We simply want to stop others from requiring us to send our tax money to Washington to advance their agenda.

If you do it our way, instead of supporting a Leviathan government which costs you two trillion dollars a year, you'll be able to keep your own money. You won't have to pay a penny in income tax, sales tax, inheritance tax, capital gains tax, business tax. Social security will be privatized. The federal government will get out of the land business. Federal expenditures will be less than 500 billion dollars

a year and the government will support itself the way it did for most of our history, through excises, imposts, duties and apportionment among the states. We think that if people see that they can be free again, that they do not have to have one spouse working to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family, that they will rally behind this kind of approach. This is not moral imperialism; this is liberty.

I would encourage those who believe in ghettoizing their faith to listen carefully as they recite the Lord's prayer which talks about building His kingdom on earth as it is in heaven. Our job is to occupy until He comes. There is nothing in Scripture that can be cited as an excuse for not doing our duty to seek His justice and His glory.

R.J. Rushdoony:— Law is the will of the sovereign for his subjects. Thus Law represents the word of the God of the society. Now whose Law you have, He is your God. So if Washington makes our laws, Washington is our God. As Christians we cannot believe that. For centuries, God's law has functioned wherever God's people have been, whether in Israel or in Christendom. This is a new and modern thing that we turn to the state's law. One professor of law, the dean of a law school, told me that he found that even into the 1840s, courts in the United States, decided cases out of the Bible—out of God's Word, out of His Law—because He is God.

Now we do not recognize God as God over the United States. The oath of office for the president of the United States used to be taken on an open Bible turned to Deuteronomy 28 invoking all the curses of God for disobedience to His law and all the blessings of God for obedience to his law. Now basically, you can have two kinds of law: *theonomy*—God's law; or *autonomy*—self-law. That's what it boils down to and autonomy leads to anarchy, which is what we are getting increasingly.

Andrew Sandlin:— Theonomy will ensure the blessings of God according to the book of Deuteronomy. A people whose ethical foundations are the Law of God are promised the blessings of God. Even if we want to speak pragmatically, theonomy would drastically reduce the size of our federal government, state government and even municipal government. It would get the civil government out of our lives. It would destroy these messianic regulatory agencies. In a theonomic society, the vast majority of people would be very happy. The tax man wouldn't be seizing nearly as much money.

If people actually knew what the law of God taught, most people would be in favor of that, because it would decentralize our civil government, it would punish those who need to be punished. The whole general situation of society would be much improved. Of course, that's not the idea that is set forth by many of our liberal opponents who think that we are out to seize political control to produce some radical social change. That's what *they* do. They seize political control for radical social change. We're not in favor of that. We believe that society is much greater than politics. Politics is only a small part of society. We believe that godly change comes through regeneration, godly families, godly churches, intermediate private institutions having nothing to do with the civil government, and volunteer work. So we're not looking for some Ayatollah Khomeini civil government. We are at the opposite end of the spectrum from that.

The biblical principle of removing evil incrementally little by little is given by God to Joshua and Moses. It is necessary first for the church to educate the populace about the truth of the Word of God. The church is much more important than the state, although it has separate functions just as the family does. We don't believe that it will happen all in one day, one month, one year, ten years, or perhaps even a century. We won't be able to enforce the law of God as we'd like to. We've been in an era of apostasy in this country for at least 150 years. We can't expect to turn things around over night.

Randall Terry:— It's been said: "Either a man will be governed by the Ten Commandments or he'll be governed by the ten thousand commandments." The growth of the bureaucracy in America and all these bizarre laws that govern so many aspects of our lives has come because our culture and government has rejected the Law of God and has become a law unto themselves. They are pretenders to the throne of God. They don't have Ten Commandments, they have ten thousand commandments.

It's interesting to note that most of the Ten Commandments are negative: "*You shall not ...*" That is generally the purpose of law. It's to proscribe evil behavior. The purpose of law is not to mandate good behavior. That concept comes from the French Revolution. "*Equality, Liberty, Fraternity ... or Death!* You're going to be good. You're going to give money to other people. You're going to help other people. Or if not, we'll kill you or put you in prison." Much of American law today is the direct opposite of the Ten Commandments. The government forces you to give your money to things you don't believe in; to have your money go to projects that might be inherently immoral.

Look at the Old Testament and the freedom that it gave. Look at American law today having departed from much of its Christian roots and you have these constant intrusions into our lives. They are forcing us to be good. "*You will give your money to this program.*" — "*You will give your money to that program.*" — "*You will do this.*" — "*You will do that.*" It's more like the French Revolution than Christian liberty. The end result is that we become the servile subjects of the great savior state, the divine state, who tells us everything we have to do in our businesses, and our families, and even what pastors can and can't preach from the church pulpit. This is not freedom.

Jeff Ziegler:— Freedom, liberty, has one chief end, and that is to advance Christ's rule, His reign, over all the nations and all the realms of the earth. Liberty without the sure anchor of Christian orthodoxy is really a Greco-Roman idea. It leads either on one hand to unfettered licentiousness and moral anarchy, or on the other to a paternalistic tyranny. Because when you have moral anarchy, the state will move to suppress that anarchy. Without Christian orthodoxy, the hope of freedom and liberty that our founding fathers fought for is elusive at best.

When autonomous man seeks liberty from God, his first action is to revolt against God's law in order to fulfill the lusts of his flesh. Thereafter this period of anarchy, the messianic state seeks to suppress this moral anarchy. At that point, you have tyranny. You have the liberal or the right wing imposing their own morality apart from God. And so the whole idea of liberty is connected intrinsically to the idea of God's moral law.

Liberty apart from God's law is an impossibility. There is no neutrality on this issue. It's either God's law or chaos. And if we have chaos, we will have tyranny. God has designed all governments, whether they are fascist, communist or democratic republics, to gravitate towards stability. The only question is: Will it be the governance of God's Law or communism or fascism or any other man-centered humanistic ideal? So man can have his licentious, lust-filled day in the sun. But he will pay a price in the ultimate loss of all freedom.

It is no accident that apostasy and heresy in the church and civil tyranny among nations walk hand in hand. The orthodox expression of Christianity is the final guarantor of our freedoms. And so if heresy and infidelity to orthodoxy gains ascendancy within the church, it will eventually work its way out into the civil sphere. People often ask me why we have such oppressive government in America today. And my answer is: Don't point to Washington D.C., because, while it is Sodom on the Potomac, the real problem lies with the pulpits of America. Unless we affirm Christian orthodoxy and the resulting freedoms it has birthed and guaranteed throughout the years, we will continue to be enslaved by our statist masters.

Steve Schlissel:— You have to understand a couple of things to understand these capital cases. Number one is that there is good reason to believe that the capital cases, except for murder, were worst case offenses. That is to say that you needn't have administered capital punishment. Banishment might have been a substitute that was acceptable. There could have been negotiated settlements for various offenses. The one area where God said you must execute is murder. The murderer must surely be put to death.

“Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall surely be put to death” (Numbers 35:31).

Now in these other cases we have the expression of God's wrath and vengeance on these sins that are appropriate in a covenant-keeping culture, that is in a faith environment where people are self-consciously committed to the Lord and His Law, and in cases where there is a flagrant “in your face” violation. There is not really too much to fear. Even if the Law was administered, it would have the result of driving homosexuality underground, which is exactly where the Law of God would keep it.

Now the converse of this is what we face in our day, is not so much the danger of homosexuals being killed, but of Christians being killed in our nation, or at least persecuted and segregated, because only one group can occupy a prominent place in the public square. It's either going to be God's people out there enjoying the neighborhoods, breathing the air or it's going to be God's enemies owning the public square and polluting it. It's not ever both. The righteous hate the wicked and the wicked hate the righteous it says in the Proverbs. **“An unjust man is an abomination to the just: and he that is upright in the way is an abomination to the wicked” (Prov. 29:27).** That is simply a truism, Which would we rather have governing the public square, righteousness or wickedness? I know when I look now I see wickedness.

George Grant:— When we start to pick and choose which Old Testament laws we will adhere to and which ones we won't, we ultimately set ourselves up as judges over God and over all of history. If we start to pick and choose which parts of the Old Testament Law we like and which parts we think are judgmental and which parts are helpful, we have established man as the ultimate standard, the ultimate arbiter of all of law. That means we are ultimately vulnerable to whoever is in power, whoever has control, whoever is able to wield the most authority in the society. That puts us in a very vulnerable state.

I would much rather be judged by God than by a man who I do not know. I would much rather be judged by the merciful, loving Creator of heaven and earth than by an accumulation of men, however wise they may be, and no matter how educated they may be. The foolishness of Christians in our day to negate God's law in favor of politics is absolutely frightening. What we are saying is that we would prefer man-made law over God. Didn't we see enough of that with Hitler and the tyrants of the world?

In the history of the world, societies that adhere to biblical principles are always the most free—economically, socially, culturally, racially. If we want freedom, opt for the freedom giving, liberty giving standards of Almighty God. If on the other hand, you like the standard of Stalinism, Leninism, Nazism, or Maoism, then go ahead and walk down the path of the wisdom of the 51 percent, the wisdom that flows out of the barrel of a gun.

Monte Wilson:— I look at capital punishment for murder as predating the Mosaic Law with Cain and Abel. It is obvious that murder requires execution, with the biblical requirements of witnesses. If a nation would say that *adultery* is a crime not only against the marital covenant but against the social

structure of the nation, therefore there is a civil penalty for it, that is in keeping with the Old Testament. This is evil. There is a civil penalty. If a nation chooses to do that we could never judge them as being barbaric. It would not be wrong to execute. I am saying it is not necessary as long as there is some kind of civil penalty.

Taking presuppositions that there has been a revival, that the nation has in fact turned to God, that there has been national repentance, that there has been some kind of reformation and return to *sola scriptura*—it is the final authority in all matters that it addresses. Murder is murder. Coming back to where we are today, it unnecessarily muddies up the water of the debate about abortion. People would say, “If we had a Christian nation, should we execute abortionists?” I believe it will happen. We will have that kind of Revival and Reformation. Then the laws about murder will apply.

Questions for Part 9

We must accept this simple principle: God rules. His Law is supreme. And he requires all men in all nations at all times to obey his laws. And when His law and man's law conflict, His law is the unquestionable authority. Man's law at that point is unrighteous tyranny.

1. For discussion:

a. Whose law is eternal—God's or man's?

b. Can God's Law be rescinded, revised or improved?

c. Does God hold His Law or man's law to be higher when the two are in conflict?

d. Does God want His people to obey His Law or man's when the two are in conflict?

e. Does God hold all rulers in all nations—including non-Christians—accountable to His Law, or are the lost free to do what they want?

f. If the lost are free to do as they please, to what standard will God hold them accountable?

g. By what standard will He judge them?

h. How can the Holy Spirit convict them of sin if the measure of sin—the Law—has been removed?

2. We need to forever settle in our minds and hearts the supremacy of God's Law. Not only is God's Law above man's law, but it must undergird man's law. For man's law to be legitimate, it must be founded on biblical law. We want our nation and all its institutions to be self-consciously built on the laws and principles of God's Word. Any other foundation will crumble. God's Law is over all human authority. And God's Law is the only unchanging, transcendent law, the only set of moral absolutes upon which human authority can rest.

Outline three examples of modern laws which conflict with God's moral law.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

3. God's Law is supreme. Heaven and earth will pass away, but God's Word will not. And if our culture is going to survive, every power base must be rebuilt on the bedrock of God's Law.

Using the three examples you gave in question two, how should Christians go about advocating reform? That is, what would you do to change these laws, and what laws (if any) would take their place?

4. There is a great irony for antinomians and non-believers in that *everyone* is a theocrat. Wherever is the source of a man's law, there will be his god. Explain why this is an inescapable truth.

5. Theonomists may disagree on how to apply the Law of God, but they should agree that the moral Law of God is the only standard. Even atheists borrow from God's moral law whenever it benefits them. There are already a multitude of laws on the books that borrow from biblical law. Look up the following scriptures and explain how some of our modern civil laws are based on biblical law.

a. (Lev. 19:14) _____

b. (Deut. 19:11) _____

c. (Deut. 19:18,19) _____

d. (Deut. 22:8) _____

God's Law and Society - Part 10

What would a Christian America look like?

Most Christians today—and even many non-Christians—are dismayed at the increasing godlessness in American society—a godlessness that is all the more tragic when one considers the high form of biblical Christianity that was once our national heritage. From kids being gunned down in their schools—to a government that sanctions children being cut down in the womb; from school boards who won't let students recite the preamble of the Declaration of Independence because it's viewed as sexist, pro-life and anti-socialistic—to cities that allow homosexuals to parade naked in our streets. America's slide into apostasy seems all but complete. There is no doubt that Dr. Francis Schaeffer's warning several decades ago has come true with a vengeance—America has become “a post-Christian nation.”

People blame this tragic decline on all kinds of things; for many Christians the most popular whipping boy is the devil. For these same people our culture's slide into a dark night of barbarism takes the form of a self-fulfilling prophecy: The devil is in charge of the world, Society is predestined to get worse and worse, why polish brass on a sinking ship. If Christians had been doing their job during this decline—if we had been living the radical Christian lives that the Lord of Glory calls for and deserves—then perhaps we could fairly blame the devil and the evil inherent in the fallen world. But let's be honest. The enemy is prevailing not because he is so strong—but because we have grown so weak.

The good news is that this is slowly beginning to change. There is a growing group of Christians who believe it is their responsibility to challenge the anti-Christian character of the culture—not with any partisan political agenda; not with the arm of the flesh—but with the sword of the Spirit, and specifically as far as the arena of public policy—the Law-Word of God. This small, yet fast-emerging group sees it as their obligation to change society in ways that will bring our nation into conformity with the moral Law of God.

We must rid ourselves forever of a world view of defeat and begin to equip ourselves to be the world-changers Jesus Christ predestined us to be. Our goal must be nothing less than a great American Reformation, to see as Samuel Adams stated after the Declaration of Independence was signed, “the restoration of the sovereign to Whom all men ought to be obedient”—the establishment of a self-consciously Christian Republic.

Yes, America can be changed for the better, if God's people will realize one important fact: this is the victory that overcomes the world - even our faith; that the gates of hell will not prevail against the church of Jesus Christ, that all power and authority in heaven and on earth has been granted to him so we can confidently go into all the world and disciple nations; that he will answer the prayer that he taught us to pray our Father. We have a *destiny*—the Kingdom of God—come on *earth* as it is in *heaven*.

In our final segment, we asked these two questions to our panel of experts.

Question #10:— What can Christians begin to do practically to rebuild our nation according to the standard of the Law-Word of God? What would a Christian America look like?

George Grant:— The reformers talked about four or five uses of the Law in modern society. There was *usus normativus*: application of the Ten Commandments to everyday life of the believer. There was *usus civilis*: the application of the law of God to government, society, and culture. There was *usus motivatus*: the use of the Law in motivating us toward Christ to cause us to hunger for His grace and mercy. God’s Law shapes our principles and concepts for the family and business and affairs with our neighbors in the community. The reformers believed that the law of God was applicable to a wide array of different aspects of our lives. Viewed through the lens of grace the law had full validity and full power for life in the New Covenant.

Jesus told his disciples, “If you love Me, you will obey My commandments.” In John chapter five, Jesus confronted the Scribes and the Pharisees, the great upholders of the Law, “You don’t know me, because you have not really believed in Moses.” Ultimately, the Law of Moses is there to lead us to Christ. The first use of the law of God is as a tutor to leads us to Christ. The law becomes a schoolmaster. It shows us the ultimate holy standards of God and lets us know that in our own flesh and by our own strength, we are incapable of fulfilling the demands of the Law. Therefore, the Law leads us to Christ and drives us to the mercy seat.

Secondly, the Law becomes a standard for behavior in the life of the believer. If, as Christ’s disciples, we do love Him, we will seek to obey His commandments by the power of the Holy Spirit. We are not set free to do whatever we wish simply because we have the forgiveness of Christ. Christ calls us to have good strong marriages, to check our tongues, to make sure that we are honest in all of our dealings, to love one another in accordance with the Ten Commandments. The law becomes a standard of holiness, a standard of righteousness in the life of the believer.

But because Jesus Christ is Lord over the totality of life, there are no institutions that slip out from under that Lordship. The standards of the Law also apply to societies at large. Therefore, a society that seeks to be just and good and true will recognize the Lordship of Jesus Christ and the authority of His Law. It will have civil laws that recognize that the Ten Commandments are right when they say Thou shalt not steal—Thou shalt not kill—Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife or goods. A good society, a just society is a society that recognizes that basic fact: Jesus Christ is Lord.

Monte Wilson:— I am still dealing with how we take the next incremental step away from “paganville” and modern “church-o-rama” which denies so much of the Bible toward some type of biblical sanity. I haven’t really given the implications of a Christianized nation that much thought. I can say what the law of God says and stipulate, but when it comes to application there first needs to be a long running conversation with men who have the same presuppositions.

When it comes to application, it is problematic because we are looking through the eyes of the New Testament. There has been a change. You cannot deny the book of Hebrews. But what kind of change has taken place and how does that change express itself when it comes to applying Old Testament law.

We may be the most free nation on the face of the earth, but that is relative to the freedom we had as a nation for the first 100 years—at least until the Civil War. We would be amazed at the freedom as a culture that submits to the Law of God actually experiences.

Jay Grimstead:— God allowed our Coalition on Revival organization to bring theologians together from different theologies and sweep through 2000 years of Church theology and boil it down into a beaker—into a fine white powder at the bottom. We came up with the *42 Articles On Christian Worldview*. They are marvelous. It’s a generic statement of faith for all denominations. We have sent these

42 Articles to every denomination where we could get a central address. We received nothing but rave notices about how wonderful and how comprehensive this is, and how it fits their denomination—Lutheran, Episcopalian, Assemblies of God, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Independents. We left out areas like eschatology, baptism, church government, and modes of worship. We intentionally did not speak about those things.

What I am telling you is there is far more doctrinal unity potential than in every city than anybody knows about because of the *42 Articles*. Everywhere I go, it blows people away because they didn't know they had so much in common with the Lutherans or the Assemblies of God or the Baptists.

You start with a group of serious Christians who are obedient and who are willing to die for the cause—to die for Jesus, the brethren and the Truth. If we don't have that, we can't make headway in any century, but particularly at a crisis point in history like we have now—the coming collision course between Christian philosophy and anti-Christian philosophy. We must have people willing for martyrdom and holy living.

Then there needs to be a number of committees in each city for the Christians involved in the arts, communications, law, economics, family counseling, medicine, etc. They must connect into a united spiritual army of Christians in every city. I am proposing that we find people to run for office and attempt—systematically, professionally and constitutionally—to capture the majority of seats in every state legislature, city council, county board of supervisors, the U.S. Congress, and then take the mayor, sheriff and governor seats.

We must be about the business of rebuilding civilization on the principles of the Bible. That would be our restatement of the Great Commission.

Phil Vollman:— We were a church of about 25 families when we decided to make the switch. I stood in my pulpit on a Sunday morning and said, “We are going to become a Christian Reconstructionist church. We are going to embrace the Reformed faith with all the vigor that God gives us.” I said to my people, “You followed me when I had no theology. Follow me now as we learn this together.” We were your typical evangelical, born-again, Spirit-filled, activist church. Our theology was about a mile wide and an inch deep. We were sincere and that's why God kept us together all those many years and blessed our efforts. But we had reached the point where He was demanding maturity. We had reached the point where we realized that there is no such thing as neutrality. We were finally aware of the fact that you can't beat something with nothing.

In our long odyssey to become epistemologically self-conscious, that Sunday was the jumping off point. We set about to systematically teach the Reformed faith, starting with a virile Calvinism, followed up by an optimistic and victorious postmillennial eschatology. Then I taught for 18 months on the Ten Commandments. We became covenantal in our worldview and then we became Knoxian in our social theory. In other words, we liked the idea that there was greatness in the Great Commission. We liked the idea that the death burial and resurrection of Jesus was enough to accomplish His plan in time and history. We liked the idea that when He said on the cross, “It is finished,” that's exactly what He meant. We liked the idea that the Lord's prayer says, “Thy kingdom come Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.” We were smart enough to know that in heaven the battle is won. We realized that in heaven there are no wicked, there is no sin, there is no fight up there. The fight is here in time and history where Christians have been called to the kingdom.

Putting all these things together all this new theology started to take form and shape, not only in our hearts where it must begin, but also in our day to day living. And so after five years, we realized we

had the wedding of charismatic zeal, but tied to Christian orthodoxy. We believe that finally we have the tool of dominion. When the day comes when the zeal of the charismatic movement which indeed is blessed of God is finally wedded to sound Christian orthodoxy, we are going to see something in the earth, that is going to cause people to look and listen.

I believe we are on the beginning edges of that. My own background speaks of that. No one could ever take us to task for a lack of zeal. But zeal without knowledge is very dangerous. The beginning works are already done. The Christian Reconstructionist authors for the past 25 years—Chilton, Rushdoony, North, Gentry, Bahnsen—have written the works. It's up to the pastors now to start reading those materials and breaking it down as God has gifted us with an ability to do. What our job has to be is to take those fat books and break them down into something that our people can understand. As we do that and combine that with day by day street activity and acts of mercy, God is going to bless local churches like we have never seen before. It's just called the Great Commission.

R.J. Rushdoony:— At the beginning of this century, 80 percent of the world's Christians were in the Americas and Europe. Now only 40 percent, because more and more of the new Christians are in Asia and Africa. We have today a country in Africa [Zambia] that is Christian Reconstructionist. Now here are blacks running a country trying to reorder everything according to the Word of God. We don't hear these things because we feel that we are the center of the world and what we are and what we do is all important. But things are happening very dramatically.

The media isn't given to reporting on Christian successes or Christian martyrdoms. They act as though Christianity is dead and we are too stupid to lie down and be buried. But the reality is much different. That's why there is so much animosity to what we are doing. They know it is catching on. When the President and Vice President of a country in Africa have affirmed that they believe that God's law should rule the country, that is major news, but the media won't touch it.

Jeff Ziegler:—The way that the state attempts to supplant God is to intrude upon the God-given rights of personal property and the pursuit of happiness—the things which are codified in our founding documents. This is true of communism, fascism, socialism and even a democratic republic. When the state begins to tax property, when it says that property which is given to you by God is now subject to their rule and their reign. You no longer own that property. You have become a serf through property taxes and income taxes. God gives you the power to get wealth. He is not the disburser of wealth, but gives you the power to get wealth to honor God. When they begin to tax income, property and things of this nature, they are intruding upon rights that God has given you. If they curtail your speech regarding the Gospel. We see that around abortion mills in these "buffer zones" where you cannot preach the Gospel or declare God's Law. These notions to control the freedom to worship God are all signs of tyranny.

But the good news is this. Tyranny only goes so far and so long before it begins to burn out. First, because of its own corruption. Second, because there is only so much money and so much property to tax. Eventually, this insatiable appetite for more has to be curtailed by simple arithmetic. In America today, we have reached the point where moral corruption, infidelity to God's law in the civil realm, humanism as a life assistance in the collegiate realm among the intellectual elite, Darwinism, all of these

notions are coming to the end of their political and social life span. In fact, I can hear the death rattle in the throat of humanism. They know it. This is in one way encouraging, but in another way it leads us to the most dangerous period. Whenever these systems begin to collapse, men who have tied their fortunes, their lives, their reputations to these corrupted and fallen paradigms become very vicious and violent.

We see this in the old Soviet Union. When the Soviet Union began to collapse, it was uneven. We see anarchy, murder, the Russian Mafia. Yet there could be more political tumult there and in Eastern Europe. We don't see the end of this yet. The same thing could happen in America. When humanism ultimately collapses and Christians rise to the fore, we could see things like the break-up and realignment of the United States. What is happening in the Soviet Union could certainly happen here. Those are dangerous times when one system is collapsing and another system arises. My great hope is that there is sufficient reformation and reconstruction in the church so that when the paradigm of humanism ultimately collapses, we will be able in the crisis to fill that vacuum. Otherwise, we'll exchange one tyranny for another.

Randall Terry:— I've traveled all over the country for years speaking in churches, teaching the Ten Commandments, and quizzing entire congregations: "How many of you know the Ten Commandments?" I tell them to get out a pen and paper and write them down. It's amazing if two percent of any congregation knows the Ten Commandments. If we say we want to rebuild the country on the Ten Commandments, that's a good thing. But if we don't know the blueprint, how are we going to build? Would you trust a carpenter to come into your house if he didn't know how to read blueprints and didn't know how to build? That's absurd!

So I'm urging Christians first by asking them point blank: "Do you know the Ten Commandments?" Can you say them in order? Can you identify them by number? Question number two is: "Are you obeying the Scripture that commands you: 'Teach your children these commandments'?" When I realized that I didn't know the Ten Commandments a few years ago, I was embarrassed. Then I learned them. Then I taught them to my children.

Learning the Ten Commandments is a great starting point. Once you've learned them, begin to meditate on them. Think of the implications. What are the cultural and political implications of the fifth commandment, "Honor your father and your mother"? The French Revolution and our government says that every child is a child of the state. Wait a minute! That is a direct assault on the fifth commandment. The eighth commandment says: "You shall not steal." That means I can't take a candy bar out of the grocery store. But that means that the government doesn't have the right to take more from us than God himself. God only requires ten percent of the faithful. For the government to take anything over 9.9 percent is tyranny and theft. It's a violation of the eighth commandment.

So the challenge before us is not just to memorize the ten commandments, but to have a comprehensive worldview that is based upon those commandments. When you do, frankly it's pretty exciting because you see how the Law of God reaches into every area of life. And it brings about incredible blessing and incredible freedom.

The beauty of the Law of God in the Christian religion is that it is the schoolmaster that leads us to Christ. It's that portion of God's word that convicts us of our sin. It's that portion of God's word that helps to equip us to do the work of the ministry. But even higher than that, the words of Jesus himself: **"Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations. Teaching them to observe all things I have commanded you"** (Mat. 28: 19,20).

Questions for Part 10

1. The following exercise should be completed as a group shortly after viewing part 10.

Do you know the Ten Commandments? Without using your Bible, list all of the Ten Commandments. If possible list them in the order they are given in scripture (Exodus 20: 1-17).

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____
- d. _____
- e. _____
- f. _____
- g. _____
- h. _____
- i. _____
- j. _____

We have found that no more than two percent of all Christians surveyed can list them in order! How did your group do?

2. The battle for America is a battle between two spiritual allegiances:

- a. _____
- b. _____

3. In the public square, our modern culture war can be likened to a covenantal battle between the Neo-Puritans and the Neo-Pagans. The battle in the Church is also a covenantal battle. It is a battle between those who hold to a victorious ecclesiology, and believe in the Lordship of Jesus Christ over the totality of human life—and those who believe we are predestined for defeat, and that the earth belongs to the devil and the Antichrist.

How does a belief in the continuing relevance of in God's Law indicate a belief that the church is to be victorious in history?

How is antinomianism compatible with a defeatist worldview in which the church retreats from the work of cultural reformation?

4. Our vision should be to see Christians everywhere doing all they can to take every sphere of society captive to the obedience of Christ. Even now a spiritual army is being enlisted by our Commander in Chief, Jesus Christ, to see revival come to this sin-sick land and then to rebuild America upon the principles of the Bible. Soldiers are being enlisted, the lines of battle are being drawn. The Great American Reformation has begun!

Enemy occupied territory—that is what this world is. Christianity is the story of how the rightful king has landed, you might say has landed in disguise, and is calling us all to take part in a great campaign of sabotage. — C.S. Lewis

Question: The above quote by C.S. Lewis is an allegorical or parabolic picture of what the church ought to be doing in a world that is under the influence of evil. Explain the symbolism in Lewis' quote.

5. This series on *God's Law and Society* is likely to provoke, in most intelligent people's mind, more questions than it answers. As stated at the beginning of this booklet, the goal of this series is not to give patent answers to every question about God's Law, but to give you the principles by which to reason and answer these questions for yourself. It is hoped that you will draw your own conclusions as "wise Bereans" and search the scripture to find out whether these things are so (Acts 17:11).

For discussion: The following is a list of the most common questions and objections many Christians have to theonomy or "Christian Reconstruction." How would you answer these questions?

- a. In what specific sense, and to what scope, does Christian Reconstruction see Old Testament Law as applicable to modern society?
- b. What practical means does Christian Reconstruction advocate for applying Old Testament Law?
- c. Would theological orthodoxy (or "correct opinion" on matters of Christian doctrine) be an area enforced by civil government?

- d. Who would determine what is orthodoxy and how would it be determined?
- e. What penalties would be prescribed for heresy?
- f. How would Christian Reconstruction define freedom of religion?
- g. Is freedom of religion an “inalienable right” to be protected by the government?
- h. Are all of the moral laws of the Old Testament applicable to modern society?
 - i. What about Old Testament laws that require stoning, such as Exodus 21:17, “And he who curses his father or his mother shall surely be put to death”?
 - j. How does theonomy differ from goals of the so-called “Christian Right”? In what ways are the two movements similar?

A Glossary of Terms

There is a wisdom which is from above and a wisdom which is from below which is earthly, sensual and demonic (see James 3:15,17). A number of terms appear in *God's Law and Society* which, although well-known to Christians of past centuries, may escape the understanding of 20th century believers.

The following is a run down of the popular (yet false) doctrines of 20th century evangelicalism. We should emphasize that these beliefs have only become widely accepted only in the last 150 years. These "ism's"—or belief systems—have led to the theological escapism and cultural retreatism of the evangelical church. The demise of morality in American society in recent years can be directly attributed to these belief systems.

Antinomianism: Literally, "anti-law," a position which states that since man is saved by faith alone, he no longer bound to obey the moral Law of God; a system in which the Law cannot apply to governing individuals or society. Antinomianism is the logical (yet false) conclusion to dispensationalism's severe separation of the covenants of God.

Dispensationalism: The belief that God has worked in different ways throughout history through different economies or dispensations. A dispensationalist makes a major distinction between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Dispensationalism is the direct opposite of *covenantalism* which teaches a unity among the covenants of scripture.

Experientialism: Learning through experience or subjective revelation, while ignoring empirical study, objective research, or the study of facts or theory. Experientialism leads to the practice of ignoring objective Truth found in scripture when it appears to contradict subjective experience.

Mysticism: The experience of direct spiritual communion with God and belief that knowledge of God, spiritual truth or ultimate reality can be attained through ecstatic revelations, intuition, insight, or the "Inner Light" not discernible through the five senses. In one sense, all Christians are *mystic* in that we "walk by faith and not by sight." However, mysticism places direct spiritual revelation above the Word of God, or places great emphasis on "extra-biblical" revelation.

Pietism: An emphasis on personal devotion in prayer and Bible study over formalism and intellectualism; the pietist emphasizes personal spiritual experience; and is often overly sentimental and emotional. Pietism is distinguished from true Piety which requires outward works in addition to inward faith.

LOGOS: True Wisdom

The following are some terms which frequently appear in this video. Although these terms are not often used in popular modern Christian writings, they would have been well known to past generations of Americans. Some of these terms you may know, others you may find obscure, so we have included this glossary to eliminate any confusion.

These are a number of “-ology’s”—a suffix which comes from the Greek word, *logos*, or “reason.” These are studies of the principles of reason, which will become useful in helping the evangelical church to regain its theological moorings and obtain influence in American culture.

Theology: The study of the nature of God and Scriptural truth. An organized body of opinions concerning God and man’s relationship to God.

Christology: Theology related to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as the second person of the Trinity.

Ecclesiology: Theology relating to the Church.

Epistemology: The study of human belief systems; the nature and limits of human knowledge; analyzing why we believe the way we do and whether truth is attainable through human reason and knowledge.

— **Epistemologically self-conscious:** to be aware of your belief system; to become more consistent in the implications of your beliefs; and to realize that your beliefs and ideas have consequences.

Soteriology: Theology of salvation.

Reformed Theology: The Protestantism of the Reformation period which includes the doctrines of Martin Luther and John Calvin. These doctrines include: *the sovereignty of God*, *justification by faith alone*, *the authority of Scripture*, and *the universal priesthood of the believer*. Calvin is thought to have emphasized more strongly the doctrines of *predestination* and *election*. However, Luther also advocated a strong predestinarian doctrine in his *Bondage of the Will*. Reformed theology represents the recovery and restoration of historic orthodoxy found in the New Testament and early the Catholic period systematized in St. Augustine’s *City of God*.

— **Catholicity:** Unity or literally, “universality.” The term “Catholic” with an upper-case “C” is used to denote the Roman Catholic Church, while “catholic” with a lower-case “c” is used in creeds and confessions to denote all Christians. All true believers in Jesus Christ are, in this sense, catholic, because they hold to the universal faith. Any form of unity that does not necessitate the preservation of orthodoxy is a false unity.

— **Orthodoxy:** Literally, “correct opinion,” the body of biblical doctrines systematized by the creeds of the early Church, such as the Apostle’s Creed and the Nicene Creed. Orthodoxy on the primary level is the basis for unity among Christians of widely different beliefs and practices. On the secondary level, orthodoxy can refer to the doctrines of specific denominations and church movements. For instance, Calvinists and Arminians are both Protestant, but differ vehemently on soteriology. Each side holds to the creeds of the Church fathers which are orthodox in the primary sense, and so true Christians may hold diverse views and still have a basis for unity.

Eschatology: Theology and doctrine relating to the “last things” or the end of human history and the Second Coming of Christ. The study of eschatology is divided into three major belief systems: premillennialism, amillennialism, and postmillennialism. The different views of eschatology do not determine biblical orthodoxy. All Christians who believe in the literal, physical return of Christ are orthodox

— **Premillennialism:** Literally, “before the thousand years,” the belief that the actual, physical Second Coming of Christ must occur prior to the beginning of the millennium, or a literal thousand year period. Premillennialism places the Church in a position of an “evangelism-only” role in the end times and tends to view the end of history with wickedness on the increase and a remnant Church surviving or escaping tribulation.

— **Amillennialism:** Literally, “no thousand years,” the belief that the “thousand years” of Revelation chapter 20 are a metaphor for the Church age; an amillennialist believes that history will continue until the Second Coming of Christ with no major victories for either good or evil in society, but sees both upward and downward movements of righteousness and evil in the world throughout history.

— **Postmillennialism:** Literally, “after the thousand years,” the belief that Christ will physically return to the earth only after a non-literal millennium is completed. Christ’s reign over the earth from heaven increases during the millennium which is thought to be “a very long period of time.” Postmillennialism places the Church in a role of transforming entire social structures before the Second Coming and endeavoring to bring about a “Golden Age” of peace and prosperity with great advances in education, the arts, sciences and medicine.

Notes

