
The Romans XIII lie

NOTE: This article references PDF files which require Adobe PDF reader. If you do not want to read them online or for some other reason prefer to download the file, click the right button on your mouse and select *Save Link As*. You can, of course, print the files if you prefer.



CHAPTER 13

LET every soul be subject unto the higher powers. [R]For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. [Acts 5:29]

2 Whosoever therefore resisteth [R]the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. [Titus. 3:1]

3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

I find it interesting when the government gets religion. More accurately, I find it suspicious. Particularly when they speak under the banner of separation of Church and State.

I recently listened to a program on a web site called Love Guns and Freedom. Gianaluca Zanna Pastor Walt Mansfield from Ohio who exposed FEMAs use of pastors to perpetuating the Romans 13 lie.

I have run into this debate before. I debated this with a friend on a web site whom I am sure believes he is a good and devout Christian. He is absolutely convinced that the perverse interpretation delivered from the pulpit of FEMA (Which obviously violates their so-called separation of Church and State) is true and correct. That we should allow the absolute rule of His Majesty Obama and his court. By the way this is

the same FEMA which violated the Constitution during the Katrina crisis and labeled the forefathers as terrorists.

I shall make a few observations first.

It is interesting that the court and his adoring serfs liken Obama to the mythical character of Robin Hood. Particularly since Robin Hood was an outlaw. What does that make Obama?

Another problem with this characterization is what Robin Hood stood for. Robin Hood lived in a era, so the myth goes, where the Normans were inflicting unjust rule over the Saxons with a leader who had usurped the power he was intrusted with. Prince John, the usurper, continually wrote "executive orders" which were in conflict with the the rule of law set forth by the rightful King of England—King Richard. King Richard was, at the time, off fighting against terrorists in the Middle East.

Indeed, the characterization of the Prince John is more apt to describe Obama.

The second observation is that those who call themselves the *foederal* (original spelling) government are being hypocritical. They use pieces of scripture to build their religion. This is not unusual since most "religions" do the same thing. They will feed you the lines of Jesus taking care of the poor. Yet, they ignore the scripture, "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." (2 Thessalonians 3:10) Taking care of the poor actually goes back to the Old Testament. Taking care of widows and orphans and those who cannot take care of themselves is Christian teaching. James 1:27 tells us, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." In the Old Testament, when harvesting crops the farmers were ordered to leave a certain amount of food laying for the poor to gather. The onus was on *the people* to do this, not the employees of

the people.

The third, and most interesting, observation in my mind is the fact that before the American War for Independence, the clergy was used to inspire the justification of their cause. The clergy was among the most educated in that era. Their opinions were highly regarded. When the war started they became the first Chaplains in the service of the United States actually participating in the battles.

One of the most wasteful uses of tax dollars is supporting those "Non-Profits" that support government positions. These "Pastors" who spew the Romans 13 nonsense actually get paid by the national government, according to some accounts.

Patrick Henry warned of this during the debates in Virginia to discuss the ratification of the Constitution. On June 9, 1788 he warned:

> ***Congress, by the power of taxation, by that of raising an army, and by their control over the militia, have the sword in one hand, and the purse in the other. Shall we be safe without either? Congress have an unlimited power over both: they are entirely given up by us. Let him candidly tell me, where and when did freedom exist, when the sword and purse were given up from the people?***

ROMANS XIII

The text in question is Romans, Chapter 13 beginning with Verse 1.

> *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. 2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the*

> *power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. 5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. 7 Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.*

Of course they completely bypass Romans 1:

> *21 Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. 22 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, 23 And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. 24 Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: 25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. 26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: 27 And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.*

In 1865, Andrew W. Young wrote *The Government Class Book*. This book was used extensively in schools throughout the States. Young was an educator who wrote several books on the topics of

civics. In Chapter III—*Laws, defined.*—he wrote:

> ***Sec.7. If, as has been said, the laws of the Creator form a perfect rule of conduct for all mankind, and ought in all cases to be obeyed, then all human law ought to agree with the divine law. If a human law is contrary to the divine law, or if it requires us to disobey the commands of God, it is not binding, and should not be obeyed.***

So-called Progressives love to use the words of Thomas Paine "The atheist." Like many religious orders use pieces of scripture—including Romans 13—to make points, so too the Progressives.

This is really the crux of the matter at hand. The use of pieces of scripture rather than taking the Bible, or other work, as a whole.

Progressives like to quote Paine as attacking "Christianity" when he really attacked "Religion." Religious orders. He wrote *Common Sense* in support of the American War of Independence.

Yes, that dirty person violated Romans 13! *How dare he!*

Progressives do not like his message to the Quakers in the Appendix to the work:

> *O ye partial ministers of your own acknowledged principles. If the bearing arms be sinful, the first going to war must be more so, by all the difference between wilful attack, and unavoidable defence. Wherefore, if ye really preach from conscience, and mean not to make a political hobbyhorse of your religion convince the world thereof, by proclaiming your doctrine to our enemies, for they likewise bear arms. Give us proof of your sincerity by publishing it at St. James's, to the commanders in chief at Boston, to the Admirals and Captains who are piratically ravaging our coasts, and to all the murdering miscreants who are acting in authority under*

him whom ye profess to serve. Had ye the honest soul of Barclay ye would preach repentance to your king; Ye would tell the Royal Wretch his sins, and warn him of eternal ruin. Ye would not spend your partial invectives against the injured and the insulted only, but, like faithful ministers, would cry aloud and spare none. Say not that ye are persecuted, neither endeavour to make us the authors of that reproach, which, ye are bringing upon yourselves; for we testify unto all men, that we do not complain against you because ye are Quakers, but because ye pretend to be and are NOT Quakers.

Alas! it seems by the particular tendency of some part of your testimony, and other parts of your conduct, as if, all sin was reduced to, and comprehended in, the act of bearing arms, and that by the people only. Ye appear to us, to have mistaken party for conscience; because, the general tenor of your actions wants uniformity—And it is exceedingly difficult to us to give credit to many of your pretended scruples; because, we see them made by the same men, who, in the very instant that they are exclaiming against the mammon of this world, are nevertheless, hunting after it with a step as steady as Time, and an appetite as keen as Death.

The quotation which ye have made from Proverbs, in the third page of your testimony, that, "when a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him"; is very unwisely chosen on your part; because, it amounts to a proof, that the king's ways (whom ye are desirous of supporting) do note please the Lord, otherwise, his reign would be in peace.


The Quakers were screaming for peace. Most notably John Dickenson of Philadelphia at the First Continental Congress. The use of arms was abhorrent to them. The Quakers may have even referred to Romans 13 in their defense—though I cannot find records to prove that.

Thomas Paine was not recommending a double-barrel shotgun shot into the air.

Another person progressives love to quote (except for his stance on the ownership of firearms) is Thomas Jefferson. The seal of the United States that he designed included his personal quote:

> *Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God.*

n heraldic phrase. The first gold, and an enameled rose, red and white, for England; the second white, with a thistle, in its proper colors, for Scotland; the third green, with a harp of the whole, SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. MDCCLXXVI. For the reverse, he proposed the following device: Pharaoh, sitting in an open chariot, a crown on his head and a



JEFFERSON'S DESIGN.

sword in his hand, passing through the divided waters of the Red Sea in pursuit of the Israelites. Rays from a pillar of fire in a cloud, expressive of the Divine presence and command, beaming did not think it of sufficient importance to put it on record; and nothing more was done, I believe, until the spring of 1779. Jefferson, you know, soon went to Virginia; Franklin was

This leads to the final argument against the Romans 13 lie.

FEDERALISM

> *"When government acts in excess of its lawful powers, individual liberty is at stake."—Justice Kennedy, Supreme Court, Bond v. United States (564 U.S. __ (2011))*

Most children were taught even before Communist Cores schools that the *foederal* government is that government which resides and does business in the District of Columbia.

The Supreme Court made one of its rare unanimous decisions concerning the concept of federalism in the case of Carol Anne Bond v. United States in 2011 (PDF; Alternate PDF with notations). It strengthened the Tenth Amendment of the Bill of Rights. More importantly, the short decision is a primer on what federalism actually is.

The important text of the brief 14 page decision written by Justice Kennedy starts at Section III on Page 8. It should be read by every student in the Great State of Arizona, if not the whole States United. It is more important to understand this concept than passing the immigration test. Most of the employees you put into office DO NOT understand this concept.

If you have children, you should download and print this decision. Read it with them and discuss it.

THE CONSTITUTION DEFINES THE GOVERNMENT

A final analysis takes a look into why rebellion against a tyrannical government—particularly in the United States—represents compliance with Romans 13.

The Constitution of the United States defines the government. It defines it very clearly in Article IV, Section 4:

> *The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government,…*

This does NOT mean the "Republican Party." This is a form of government. It is NOT Democracy. There are elements of Democracy involved. Even Thomas Jefferson conceded that pure Democracy could only be exercised on the local level, i.e. county/city level.

It also defines the responsibility of those entrusted with protecting the rights of the People under the terms of that document. Article II, Section 1; Clause 8 of the Constitution requires the President to take an oath to:

> *Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."*

The "government" expanded this oath for "all others" in 5 U.S. Code §3331 specifies:

> *An individual, except the President, elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services, shall take the following oath:* ***"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."*** *This section does not affect other oaths required by law.*

Let us make something clear, at this point. The Constitution of the United States is not just the document that bears that title. The Constitution of a country is simply the "Law of the Land." When the Pharaoh of Egypt said, *So let it be written, so let it be done*, it became part of the Constitution. The Articles of Association, Declaration of Independence and Articles of Confederation are equally a part of the Constitution.

Those people we hire at election time are our employees. Their

job—whether national, State or local—is defined in the Declaration of Independence.

> *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.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,…*

What is the duty of the People?

> *That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.*

Jefferson was paraphrasing the liberal writer John Locke. Liberal is the correct term. Liberal actually means a person who believes in limited government.

I urge you to view a copy of the Declaration of Independence. Look at the list of grievances outlined. Do you really believe that the Constitution of the United States was intended to turn those grievances into government bureaucracies?

In fact the example our forefathers gave to comply with Romans 13 was given on April 19, 1775 in Concord and Lexington.