Activity #1: Revolution and the Bible

Directions: Read the following Biblical passage in your groups, and identify what it says about political authority and revolutionary activity.


Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of him who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain; he is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrongdoer. Therefore one must be subject, not only to avoid God's wrath but also for the sake of conscience. For the same reason you also pay taxes, for the authorities are ministers of God, attending to this very thing. Pay all of them their dues, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.

What does Romans 13:1-7 teach about political authority and revolutionary activity? How might a revolutionary who followed the teachings of the New Testament interpret to Romans 13:1-7?
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Let us now trace the apostle’s [that is, Paul’s] reasoning in favor of submission to the higher powers, a little more particularly and exactly. For by this it will appear, on one hand, how good and conclusive it is, for submission to those rulers who exercise their power in a proper manner: And, on the other, how weak and trifling and inconnected [sic] it is, if it be supposed to be meant by the apostle to show the obligation and duty of obedience to tyrannical, oppressive rulers in common with others of a different character.

The apostle enters upon his subject thus—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. Here he urges the duty of obedience from this topic of argument, that civil rulers, as they are supposed to fulfil the pleasure of God, are the ordinance of God. But how is this an argument for obedience to such rulers as do not perform the pleasure of God, by doing good; but the pleasure of the devil, by doing evil; and such as are not, therefore, God’s ministers, but the devil’s! Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation. Here the apostle argues, that those who resist a reasonable and just authority, which is agreeable to the will of God, do really resist the will of God himself; and will, therefore, be punished by him. But how does this prove, that those who resist a lawless, unreasonable power, which is contrary to the will of God, do therein resist the will and ordinance of God? Is resisting those who resist God’s will, the same thing with resisting God? Or shall those who do so, receive to themselves damnation! 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. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. Here the apostle argues more explicitly than he had before done, for revering, and submitting to, magistracy, from this consideration, that such as really performed the duty of magistrates, would be enemies only to the vile actions of men, and would befriend and encourage the good; and so be a common blessing to society. But how is this an argument, that we must honor, and submit to, such magistrates as are not enemies to the evil actions of men, but to the good; and such as are not a common blessing, but a common curse, to society! But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: For he is the minister of God, a revenger, to execute wrath upon him that doth evil. Here the apostle argues from the nature and end of magistracy, that such as did evil, (and such only) had reason to be afraid of the higher powers; it being part of their office to punish evil doers, no less than to defend and encourage such as do well. But if magistrates are unrighteous; if they are respecters of persons; if they are partial in their administration of justice; then those who do well have as much reason to be afraid, as those that do evil: there can be no safety for the good, nor any peculiar ground of terror to the unruly and injurious. So that, in this case, the main end of civil government will be frustrated. And what reason is there for submitting to that government, which does by no means answer the design of government? Wherefore ye must needs be subject not only for wrath,
but also for conscience sake. Here the apostle argues the duty of a cheerful and conscientious
submission to civil government, from the nature and end of magistracy as he had before laid it down, i.e.
as the design of it was to punish evil doers, and to support and encourage such as do well; and as it must,
if so exercised, be agreeable to the will of God. But how does what he here says, prove the duty of a
cheerful and conscientious subjection to those who forfeit the character of rulers? to those who
encourage the bad, and discourage the good? The argument here used no more proves it to be a sin to
resist such rulers, than it does, to resist the devil, that he may flee from us. For one is as truly the
minister of God as may the other. . . .

Thus, upon a careful review of the apostle’s reasoning in this passage, it appears that his arguments to
enforce submission, are of such a nature, as to conclude only in favour of submission to such rulers as
he himself describes; i.e. such as rule for the good of society, which is the only end of their institution.
Common tyrants, and public oppressors, are not intitled to obedience from their subjects, by
virtue of any thing here laid down by the inspired apostle.

I now add, farther, that the apostle’s argument is so far from proving it to be the duty of people to obey,
and submit to, such rulers as act in contradiction to the public good, and so to the design of their office,
that it proves the direct contrary. For, please to observe, that if the end of all civil government, be the
good of society; if this be the thing that is aimed at in constituting civil rulers; and if the motive and
argument for submission to government, be taken from the apparent usefulness of civil authority; it
follows, that when no such good end can be answered by submission, there remains no argument or
motive to enforce it; if instead of this good end’s being brought about by submission, a contrary end is
brought about, and the ruin and misery of society effected by it, here is a plain and positive reason
against submission in all such cases, should they ever happen. And therefore, in such cases, a regard to
the public welfare, ought to make us with-hold from our rulers, that obedience and subjection which it
would, otherwise, be our duty to render to them. If it be our duty, for example, to obey our king, merely
for this reason, that he rules for the public welfare, (which is the only argument the apostle makes use
of) it follows, by a parity of reason, that when he turns tyrant, and makes his subjects his prey to devour
and to destroy, instead of his charge to defend and cherish, we are bound to throw off our allegiance to
him, and to resist; and that according to the tenor of the apostle’s argument in this passage. Not to
discontinue our allegiance, in this case, would be to join with the sovereign in promoting the slavery and
misery of that society, the welfare of which, we ourselves, as well as our sovereign, are indispensably
obliged to secure and promote, as far as in us lies. It is true the apostle puts no case of such a tyrannical
prince; but by his grounding his argument for submission wholly upon the good of civil society; it is
plain he implicitly authorises, and even requires us to make resistance, whenever this shall be necessary
to the public safety and happiness. Let me make use of this easy and familiar similitude to illustrate the
point in hand—Suppose God requires a family of children, to obey their father and not to resist him and
inforces his command with this argument; that the superintendence and care and authority of
a just and kind parent, will contribute to the happiness of the whole family; so that they ought to obey
him for their own sakes more than for his: Suppose this parent at length runs distracted, and attempts, in
his mad fit, to cut all his children’s throats: Now in this case, is not the reason before assigned, why
these children should obey their parent while he continued of a sound mind, namely, their common
good, a reason equally conclusive for disobeying and resisting him, since he is become delirious, and
attempts their ruin? It makes no alteration in the argument, whether this parent, properly speaking, loses
his reason; or does, while he retains his understanding, that which is as fatal in its consequences, as any
thing he could do, were he really deprived of it.
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Activity #1: Revolution and the Bible

**Directions:** Now that you have listened to Jonathan Mayhew’s sermon, answer in your group the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does Mayhew’s interpretation of Romans 13:1-7 compare to your group’s interpretation? What is different? How do you explain the differences? Was Mayhew correct in his interpretation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think this sermon, which was originally delivered in 1750, was so influential during the Revolutionary War?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Activity #2: Revolution, the Bible, and Monarchy: Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*

**Directions:** Your teacher has paired you with another student. One of you is to play the part of Thomas Paine; the other is to play a newspaper reporter. Together your assignment is to create an interview, made up of five questions and answers, about Paine’s views of monarchy in the Bible. Your source for these questions and answers will be the following excerpt from Paine’s famous pamphlet *Common Sense*.


In the early ages of the world, according to the scripture chronology, there were no kings; the consequence of which was there were no wars; it is the pride of kings which throw mankind into confusion. . . . Antiquity favors the same remark; for the quiet and rural lives of the first patriarchs hath a happy something in them, which vanishes away when we come to the history of Jewish royalty.

Government by kings was first introduced into the world by the Heathens, from whom the children of Israel copied the custom. It was the most prosperous invention the Devil ever set on foot for the promotion of idolatry. The Heathens paid divine honors to their deceased kings, and the Christian world hath improved on the plan by doing the same to their living ones. How impious is the title of sacred majesty applied to a worm, who in the midst of his splendor is crumbling into dust.

As the exalting one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority of scripture; for the will of the Almighty, as declared by Gideon and the prophet Samuel, expressly disapproves of government by kings. All anti-monarchical parts of scripture have been very smoothly glossed over in monarchial governments, but they undoubtedly merit the attention of countries which have their governments yet to form. 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's' is the scriptural doctrine of courts, yet it is no support of monarchial government, for the Jews at that time were without a king, and in a state of vassalage [subjection] to the Romans.

Near three thousand years passed away from the Mosaic account of the creation, till the Jews under a national delusion requested a king. Till then their form of government (except in extraordinary cases, where the Almighty interposed) was a kind of republic administered by a judge and the elders of the tribes. Kings they had none, and it was held sinful to acknowledge any being under that title but the Lords of Hosts. And when a man seriously reflects on the idolatrous homage which is paid to the persons of Kings, he need not wonder, that the Almighty, ever jealous of his honor, should disapprove of a form of government which so impiously invades the prerogative of heaven.
Monarchy is ranked in scripture as one of the sins of the Jews, for which a curse in reserve is denounced against them. The history of that transaction is worth attending to.

The children of Israel being oppressed by the Midianites, Gideon marched against them with a small army, and victory, thro' the divine interposition, decided in his favor. The Jews elate with success, and attributing it to the generalship of Gideon, proposed making him a king, saying, Rule thou over us, thou and thy son and thy son's son. Here was temptation in its fullest extent; not a kingdom only, but an hereditary one, but Gideon in the piety of his soul replied, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you, THE LORD SHALL RULE OVER YOU. Words need not be more explicit; Gideon doth not decline the honor but denieth their right to give it; neither doth he compliment them with invented declarations of his thanks, but in the positive stile of a prophet charges them with disaffection to their proper sovereign, the King of Heaven.

About one hundred and thirty years after this, they fell again into the same error. The hankering which the Jews had for the idolatrous customs of the Heathens, is something exceedingly unaccountable; but so it was, that laying hold of the misconduct of Samuel's two sons, who were entrusted with some secular concerns, they came in an abrupt and clamorous manner to Samuel, saying, Behold thou art old and thy sons walk not in thy ways, now make us a king to judge us like all the other nations. And here we cannot but observe that their motives were bad, viz. that they might be like unto other nations, i.e. the Heathens, whereas their true glory laid in being as much unlike them as possible. But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, give us a king to judge us; and Samuel prayed unto the Lord, and the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee, for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, THEN I SHOULD NOT REIGN OVER THEM. . . . . And Samuel told all the words of the Lord unto the people, that asked of him a king. And he said, This shall be the manner of the king that shall reign over you; he will take your sons and appoint them for himself for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots (this description agrees with the present mode of impressing men) and he will appoint him captains over thousands and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground and to read his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots; and he will take your daughters to be confectioneries and to be cooks and to be bakers (this describes the expense and luxury as well as the oppression of kings) and he will take your fields and your olive yards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants; and he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give them to his officers and to his servants (by which we see that bribery, corruption, and favoritism are the standing vices of kings) and he will take the tenth of your men servants, and your maid servants, and your goodliest young men and your asses, and put them to his work; and he will take the tenth of your sheep, and ye shall be his servants, and ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen, AND THE LORD WILL NOT HEAR YOU IN THAT DAY. This accounts for the continuation of monarchy; neither do the characters of the few good kings which have lived since, either sanctify the title, or blot out the sinfulness of the origin; the high encomium [praise] given of David takes no notice of him officially as a king, but only as a man after God's own heart. Nevertheless the People refused to obey the voice of Samuel, and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us, that we may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us, and go out before us and fight our battles. Samuel continued to reason with them, but to no purpose; he set before them their ingratitude, but all would not avail; and seeing them fully bent on their folly, he cried out, I will call unto the Lord, and he shall sent thunder and rain (which then was a punishment, being the time of wheat harvest) that ye may perceive and see that your wickedness is great which ye have done in the sight of the Lord, IN ASKING YOU A KING. So Samuel called unto the Lord, and the Lord sent thunder and rain that day, and all the people greatly feared the Lord and Samuel And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto the Lord thy God that we die not, for WE HAVE ADDED UNTO OUR SINS THIS EVIL, TO ASK A KING. These portions of
scripture are direct and positive. They admit of no equivocal construction. That the Almighty hath here entered his protest against monarchial government is true, or the scripture is false....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>