

# **Biblical Examination of the Declaration of Independence**

## **Declaration of Liberty vs. Declaration of Independence Part 7**

### **The Perfect Law of Liberty**

But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass [mirror, NASB]: For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the *perfect law of liberty*, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed. (James 1:22-25)<sup>1</sup>

*The law of Yahweh<sup>2</sup> is perfect*, converting the soul: the testimony of Yahweh is sure, making wise the simple. The *statutes* of Yahweh are right, rejoicing the heart: the *commandment* of Yahweh is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of Yahweh is clean, enduring for ever: the *judgments* of Yahweh are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward. (Psalm 19:7-11)

The tragic two-fold consequence of replacing biblical liberty with Declaration and Constitution independence is summed up in the following warning:

For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. (Jeremiah 2:13)

### **The Declaration Speaks for Itself**

#### **Paragraph #2, Sentences 6-7**

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

As we proceed to biblically examine each of twenty-seven Facts (grievances), take note of how many of these same abuses can be leveled at the both the Declaration's signatories and the Constitution's framers.

#### **Grievance #1**

He [Britain's King George III] has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

Talk about an indictment against those in rebellion to King George.

Eleven years later, did the Constitution's framers (some of whom also signed the Declaration of Independence) respond to this charge against Britain's oppressive dictatorship by enacting wholesome laws for the public good, or did they merely enact a different set of unwholesome laws that also contributed to the public's ruin?

Patrick Henry's strident warning to his fellow Virginians at the Virginia Ratifying Convention in 1788 answers this question (again) arguably better than any other, if for no other reason than because of his notoriety. Although the following speech is nowhere near as renowned as his "Give me liberty" speech, I would argue it's many times more important. Tragically, it wasn't heeded, and America's been fulfilling Patrick Henry's warning ever since:

...I say our privileges and rights are in danger. ...the new form of Government ... will ... effectually ... oppress and ruin the people.... In some parts of the plan before you, the great rights of freemen are endangered, in other parts, absolutely taken away.... There will be no checks, no real balances, in this Government: What can avail your specious imaginary balances, your rope-dancing, chain-rattling, ridiculous ideal checks and contrivances? ...And yet who knows the dangers that this new system may produce: they are out of the sight of the common people: They cannot foresee latent consequences.... I see great jeopardy in this new Government.<sup>3</sup>

Patrick Henry not only recognized the immediate dangers of the newly proposed Constitution but also its future disastrous repercussions, which America is suffering today (even after the Bill of Rights was added), as is evident to anyone who's honest about America's present state of affairs.

### **Justified Hypocrites**

The Declaration's signatories were entirely justified in this first grievance against King George. Tragically, the Constitution's framers turned around eleven years later to become hypocrites, guilty of the very same injustice.

Just as there's only one law of liberty (Yahweh's perfect law of liberty), there's likewise only one wholesome and good law—identified as good (i.e., righteous) seven times by the Apostle Paul alone.<sup>4</sup>

There's only one good and wholesome law if for no other reason than because there's only One who's good—the one and only Lawgiver per Isaiah 33:22 and James 4:12:

[T]here is none good but one, that is, God.... (Matthew 19:17)

Any edict contrary to the Lawgiver's law is merely man making legal what Yahweh has dictated unlawful and making illegal what He has deemed lawful.

Case in point: the United States Constitution in which there's hardly an Article or Amendment that's not antithetical if not seditious to the Lawgiver's law.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the framers' Constitution is just as much, if not more, an unwholesome set of laws as were King George's against which they and their fellow "founding fathers" revolted.

### **Many Times Worse**

I maintain that the American framer's unwholesome Constitution is multiplied times worse than Britain's unwholesome laws. The abuses endured by America's colonials under King George III don't hold a candle to the abuses Americans have suffered and continue to suffer under the biblically seditious Constitution. Taxation alone demonstrates this to be true.

When you take into account the Constitutional Republic's graduated income tax, property tax, sales taxes, and all the other sundry taxes Americans are shackled with—all of which are unbiblical—the average American is taxed from 35-40% of their annual income. This compared to a mere 6% taxation by Britain in 1775.

## Grievance #2

He [Britain's King George III] has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

Which of the following is worse?

- 1) The suppression of the colonials' immediate and pressing demands?
- 2) The usurpation and abolition of Yahweh's moral law as supreme?

The latter was first accomplished with Article 6's claim that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and then firmly fixed in place by *Marbury v. Madison* and *Reynolds v. United States*, arguably the two most biblically consequential Supreme Court decisions of all time.

*Marbury v. Madison* (1803) declares "[A] law repugnant to the Constitution is void." Per Article 6,<sup>6</sup> this includes any biblical law incongruent or opposed to either the Constitution or its supplementary laws, including treaties with other nations.

This was made especially clear with *Reynolds v. United States* (1879). *Reynolds* addressed the Mormon Church's claim that polygamy was a right afforded them under Amendment 1. Because most Americans find polygamy repugnant, the consequential magnitude of Justice Morrison R. Waite's decision is lost on them. In fact, very few people are even aware of this decision and its impact upon Christendom.<sup>7</sup>

*Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices.* Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice?... So here, as a law of the organization of society under the exclusive dominion of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? *To permit this would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land.*<sup>8</sup>

Contrary to Matthew 7:21-27 and James 1:22-25, the Supreme Court in *Reynolds v. United States* ruled that a man's actions can be severed and isolated from his faith and judged illegal according to the Constitution and its supplementary edicts. This legal precedent paved the way for *any* Christian<sup>9</sup> action<sup>10</sup> based upon a biblical conviction—such as preaching against sodomy—to be arbitrarily outlawed in the same fashion. Had the framers instead established Yahweh's immutable law and its predetermined morality as the supreme law of the land, polygamy and human sacrifice (and all other issues) would have fallen under *its* jurisdiction and thereby determined to be either lawful or unlawful.<sup>11</sup>

The suppression of the colonials' immediate and pressing demands by King George doesn't begin to compare with the grievous consequences incurred from the usurpation and abolition of Yahweh's moral law as supreme by the constitutional framers.

## Grievance #3

He [Britain's King George III] has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

Because the grievances cited here are themselves biblically seditious, they contributed nothing toward eliminating the American colonies' overall government problems. Instead, they assisted in recreating what's at the heart of the colonials' grievances against Great Britain.

For Yahweh is our judge, *Yahweh is our lawgiver*, Yahweh is our king; he will save us. (Isaiah 33:22)

*There is one lawgiver*, who is able to save and to destroy.... (James 4:12)

There are no vacuums when it comes to legislated morality (or immorality as the case may be). Law is inherently a moral issue—the means for determining what constitutes good (what's lawful) and what constitutes evil (what's unlawful).

Consequently, because there's only One with the authority to determine what constitutes good and evil, there is likewise only One lawgiver. Thus, only the Lawgiver's law is true law. Anything to the contrary is calling good evil and evil good, per Isaiah 5:20. Anything to the contrary is lawlessness, *especially* establishing legislators given the alleged authority to create law in addition to the Lawgiver's law. It's biblical sedition at its worst.

### **Administrators vs. Legislators**

Biblical government requires administrators of Yahweh's triune moral law (the Ten Commandments and their respective statutes and judgments), contrasted with legislators who create (add to or take away) from Yahweh's completed law:

Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which Yahweh God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of Yahweh your God which I command you. (Deuteronomy 4:1-2)

Juxtaposed with "legislators" who *add to or take away from* Yahweh's law, administrators assist in *implementing* Yahweh's law (government) here on earth. This is accomplished on three levels: individual, domestic, and societal. Every Christian man should be an administrator of God's law on at least the first two levels.

Administrators represent Yahweh not the people or any one person.

And [King Jehoshaphat] said to the judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but Yahweh.... And he charged them, saying, Thus shall ye do in the fear of Yahweh faithfully, and with a perfect heart. (2 Chronicles 19:6-9)

The same for husbands and fathers. Your administration over your family should represent Yahweh who entrusted them to your care.

Yahweh our God is one Yahweh: And thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. (Deuteronomy 6:4-8)

And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. (Ephesians 6:4)

As representatives of God and administrators of His law, it's therefore our duty to search His law as it applies to any particular situation and then to teach and implement the law(s) applicable to that situation or need.

For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of Yahweh, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments. (Ezra 7:10)

And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose; and beside him stood Mattithiah, and Shema, and Anaiah, and Urijah, and Hilkiah, and Maaseiah, on his right hand; and on his left hand, Pedaiah, and Mishael, and Malchiah, and Hashum, and Hashbadana, Zechariah, and Meshullam. And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people.... So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. (Nehemiah 8:4-8)

These men were administrators, not legislators. However, this does not mean that supplementary stipulations cannot be implemented, provided they're consonant with Yahweh's prescribed law. For example, a father who governs his family under God's authority and by His law has the liberty to implement house rules, such as hygienic and household chores.

The same is true for administrators on all other levels of society. Biblical precedent can be found in Nehemiah's lots per Nehemiah 10:34, Jeremiah's land deeds per Jeremiah 32:9-14, Rachab's patriarchal requisites per Jeremiah 35:5-19, and Mordechai's Purim celebration per Esther 9. None of these are directly provided for in the Ten Commandments or their statutes, but all of them are in harmony with Yahweh's commandments and statutes.

### **Back to Grievance #3**

He [Britain's King George III] has refused to *pass other Laws* for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in *the Legislature*, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

Formidable to tyrants *or* subversive to the One and Only Lawgiver?

The colonials' problem with King George was *not* that he needed to pass additional laws on America's behalf but rather that he and his parliament had usurped Yahweh's exclusive legislative authority and created "laws" incompatible with God's moral law. These unbiblical edicts were consequently injurious to *both* the American colonials and Britains alike.

### **Compounding the Problem**

The American colonials' demand to an alleged right of representation in Britain's legislature only compounded the problem and made them complicit in King George's legislative usurpation. Compounding the problem even further, once secession from Britain was realized, the colonials simply replicated Britain's biblical sedition.

This was first accomplished with the original 18<sup>th</sup>-century state Constitutions and then with the federal Constitution created in 1787, none of which acknowledged God as the exclusive Lawgiver and thus His law as the only true law. Instead, they replaced Yahweh with We the People as America's Sovereign and His law with their man-made constitutions as the supreme law of the land.<sup>12</sup>

In so doing, the 18th-century founding fathers replicated King George's real sin against both God and the people of the American colonies. Against the people being that what all nations are looking for from their governments can only be found in Yahweh's perfect law of liberty, resulting in government that's a continual blessing to the righteous and perpetual terror to the wicked, per Romans 13:1-7.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, it wasn't so much a Declaration of Independence that America needed in 1776 as it was a Declaration of Liberty, as can only be attained individually via Christ's blood-atonement sacrifice and resurrection from the grave and socially via the Bible's perfect law of liberty.

### **Different Versions of the Same Sin**

King George's sin was not so much his oppression of the American colonials but his sedition against Yahweh. In replacing the Lawmaker's law with his own edicts, King George replaced the Lawgiver with himself.

The 18th-century founding fathers' sin, as particularly reflected in the Constitution's Article 1<sup>14</sup> and its legislative branch, was merely a different version of the same thing. Instead of replacing the Lawgiver's law with another King's "law," they replaced the Lawgiver's law with We the People's surrogate—the "law" of those who are allegedly supposed to represent We the People.

### ***Vox Populi Vox Dei***

In so doing, the founding fathers also replaced the Lawgiver, not with another King, but with a plurality of alleged Sovereigns. In Latin, this is expressed as *Vox Populi Vox Dei*, that is, the Voice of the People, the Voice of God. *Vox Populi Vox Dei* is especially demonstrated in both the Constitution's unbiblical election process<sup>15</sup> and unbiblical jury system.<sup>16</sup>

Republicanism is just another form of humanism expressed through its unbiblical majority vote in its elections and the jury system in the Constitutional Republic's courtrooms.

*Vox Populi Vox Dei* is the rallying cry of Constitutionalism, Republicanism, Democracy, and all other forms of humanistic government. This is juxtaposed against the rallying cry of the early American Scottish Covenanters "No King but Jesus!"

### **Divine Right of the People**

Constitutionalists often contrast the Right of Kings with the Right of the People. The only difference between the two is the number of people futilely clamoring to be Divine or Sovereign. Regardless whether ruled by one or many, it remains humanism—that is, man doing what is right in his own eyes, per Judges 21:25.

The "divine right" of the people, as expressed, among other things, in the Constitutional Republic's elections<sup>15</sup> and its courtrooms<sup>16</sup> not only replaces the "divine right" of the English Kings and their Parliaments, but *the Divine Right of Yahweh as God, King, Judge, and Lawgiver!*

Stay Tuned for Part 8.

## Related posts:

[“Biblical Examination of the Declaration of Independence”](#) (Audio series)

[“Biblical Examination of the Declaration of Independence, Pts. 1-6”](#) (Articles)

[Law and Kingdom: Their Relevance Under the New Covenant](#)

[A Biblical Constitution: A Scriptural Replacement for Secular Government](#)

[“Ecclesia vs. Church: Why Understanding the Difference is Critical to Our Future”](#)

[The Romans 13 Template for Biblical Dominion: Ten Reasons Why Romans 13 is Not About Secular Government](#)

[Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective](#)

## End Notes

1. All scripture is quoted from the King James Version unless otherwise noted.
2. YHWH, the English transliteration of the Tetragrammaton, is most often pronounced Yahweh. It is the principal Hebrew name of the God of the Bible and was inspired to appear nearly 7,000 times in the Old Testament. It was unlawfully deleted by the English translators. In obedience to the Third Commandment and the scriptures that charge us to proclaim, swear by, praise, extol, call upon, bless, glorify, and hold fast to His *name*, I have chosen to memorialize His name, per Exodus 3:15, in this article.  
  
For a more thorough explanation concerning important reasons for using the sacred name of God, see [Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain](#), the third in a series of ten free online books on each of the Ten Commandments and their respective statutes and judgments.
3. Patrick Henry, Ralph Ketcham, ed., “Speeches of Patrick Henry (June 5 and 7, 1788),” *The Anti-Federalist Papers and the Constitutional Convention Debates* (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2003, 2nd ed.) pp. 200-08
4. See Romans 7:12-16 & 1 Timothy 1:8.
5. See [Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective](#)
6. See [Chapter 9](#) “Article 6: The Supreme Law of the Land” of [Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective](#).
7. *Reynolds v. United States* helped turn what was Christendom (Christians dominionizing society on behalf of their King) in early 1600s America into today’s mere four-walled, stain-glassed Christianity, aka Churchianity. For more regarding the stark difference between biblical Christendom and today’s Christianity, see [Ecclesia vs. Church: Why Understanding the Difference is Critical to Our Future](#).
8. *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1879)

9. Not everyone claiming to be a Christian has been properly instructed in the biblical plan of salvation. Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:36-41, 22:1-16; Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:26-27; Colossians 2:11-13; and 1 Peter 3:21 should be studied to understand what is required to be covered by the blood of Jesus and forgiven of your sins.

For a more thorough explanation concerning water immersion and its relationship to salvation, the book [\*Baptism: All You Wanted to Know and More\*](#) may be requested from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for free.

Additionally, listen to audio series “I Had a Dream: Judgment’s Coming. Are *You* Under the Blood?” Part 1 can be found [here](#). Or a MP3 CD, containing all ten messages, can be requested from Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, PO Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363, for free.

10. This is not to say the cult known as The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (aka the Mormon Church) is Christian. It is not.

11. For more regarding how the Bible’s immutable/unchanging moral law applies today and should be implemented as the law of the land, see [\*Law and Kingdom: Their Relevance Under the New Covenant\*](#).

See also [\*A Biblical Constitution: A Scriptural Replacement for Secular Government\*](#).

12. See [Chapter 9](#) “Article 6: The Supreme Law of the Land” of [\*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective\*](#).

13. See [\*The Romans 13 Template for Biblical Dominion: Ten Reasons Why Romans 13 is Not About Secular Government\*](#).

14. See [Chapter 4](#) “Article 1: Legislative Usurpation” of [\*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective\*](#).

15. See [“Constitutional Elections: Dining at the ‘Devil’s Table.’”](#)

16. See [Chapter 6](#) “Article 3: Judicial Usurpation” of [\*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective\*](#).