

40 DAYS
TOWARDS A
MORE GODLY NATION

WHY ONLY CHURCHES CAN LEAD US
TO A
HAPPIER, HEALTHIER, SAFER, &
MUTUALLY PROSPEROUS AMERICA

NEIL MAMMEN

RATIONAL FREE PRESS

AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION

40 Days Towards A More Godly Nation

Copyright © 2012 by Neil Mammen. All rights reserved.

Edition 3.0 with Study Guide

The NBF & No Blind Faith Logo and Symbols are copyright No Blind Faith © 2007

All scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

When individuals are quoted, unless explicitly stated, the author does not intend to endorse those individuals or any of their *other* writings, positions, lifestyles or beliefs.

Unless noted, all *emphasis* in quotes were added by the author.

Rather than use awkward phrasing, the author has chosen to use the generic mankind, men, man, his or he to indicate both genders and has chosen to violate the plural rules, using “their” instead of “his or her” where appropriate.

Footnotes are designed for the common use and ease of reading and is repeated for convenience, rather than using the standard terse methodologies.

For our Evangelistic Christian doctrinal beliefs please refer to www.NoBlindFaith.com

Cover Art: The Declaration of Independence and US Flag overlaid with the Geneva Bible. Conceived by the author, designed by Jared Duba of DepravedWretch.com

Published in the United States by

Rational Free Press in association with the American Family Association

Mailing address: PO Box 8321, San Jose, CA 95155-8321

www.RationalFreePress.com and www.afa.net

Other Books by the same author:

Who is Agent X: Proving Science and Logic Show it's More Rational to Think God Exists. Rational Free Press, 2009. An easy to read book to stump your atheist friends with logical and rational answers. Available at www.NoBlindFaith.com

Copies of this book and resources for this series can be purchased at

www.40DaysToAGodlyNation.com

A daily 1 minute broadcast on the concepts of this book can be heard at

www.J3IP.wordpress.com

This book is published by Rational Free Press. It is based on the book “Jesus Is Involved In Politics! Why aren’t you? Why isn’t your Church?”

The views expressed by the author are his alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of AFA.

ENDORSEMENTS

Tony Perkins

President, Family Research Council

Neil Mammen has produced a valuable resource for every pastor - indeed, for every Christian - in America with this book! He combines a strong grasp of Scripture, of Christian apologetics, of politics, of the "culture wars," and of simple logic to produce a unique handbook that will educate, inspire, and equip. The next time you encounter someone who spouts simplistic statements like, "You can't legislate morality," refer them to this book.

Kevin McGary

President, Frederick Douglass Foundation of California

Author, "Instanity!" and "Lifestyle of the Rich in Kingdom"

Thank God for Neil Mammen! With the purposeful undermining of religion in America today, this book is a timely and dutiful reminder of God's truth and his desire for His people to fully participate in His handiwork....the establishment and perpetuation of this great nation through government and politics! This book is a powerful reminder that NOW is the time to activate, motivate, and propel The Church body into active participation in government and politics!

Dr. Frank Turek

Founder, Cross Examined (Author of "I don't have enough Faith to be an Atheist," "Legislating Morality" & "Correct, not Politically Correct")

Hey Christian Citizen-- Wake up! Politics affects your religious liberties! In this great book, Neil explains what you can do to preserve your freedoms and save your country.

Brad Dacus

President, Pacific Justice Institute

This book challenges the wide-spread complacency facing much of America's churches today. A must read for those unsure of the role Christians should play in government.

Rev. Walter Hoye

Founder, Issues4life, (un-constitutionally imprisoned for standing up for his constitutional rights and obeying our "Primary Moral Code")

This book is a biblically bold, uncompromising and timely treatise that offers more than suggestions, exhortations, commendations and testimonials. This divinely inspired message offers a strategy that cannot fail.

Phil Fernandes, Ph.D.

Pastor, Trinity Bible Fellowship; President, Institute of Biblical Defense

Neil Mammen, a first-rate Christian apologist, argues persuasively in this important and timely book that Jesus should be Lord over every aspect of our lives, including our political views and actions. Neil refutes popular myths such as: "America is a democracy....," "Jesus would support big-government socialism," and "Christians should focus on heavenly things; we have no political responsibilities." At a time when our country needs us the most, we must stand up for truth and righteousness in the political arena. Forsaking God's moral laws will destroy our culture. If the Church does not take a stand for God's righteousness, who will? This book is a must read for those who want to see America once again blessed by God.

Tim Wildmon,

President, American Family Association

Neil Mammen demolishes the myth that Jesus was not engaged in the politics of his day, and in the process sets the church of today free to carry out its proper role in shaping public policy decisions. When the sanctity of life, the definition of marriage and public standards of morality are at stake, the church cannot remain silent. This book is a primer for Christians who want to fulfill the calling of Christ to be salt and light in the culture of our day.

CONTENTS

WEEK 1

1	<i>The Consequences of Inactivity.....</i>	<i>1</i>
2	<i>Jesus Was Involved in Politics!.....</i>	<i>8</i>
3	<i>What Happens When God Judges A Nation?.....</i>	<i>22</i>
4	<i>Our Godly Constitution and Declaration of Independence.....</i>	<i>28</i>
5	<i>Who Gives Us Our Rights?.....</i>	<i>33</i>
6	<i>What are God Given Rights anyway?.....</i>	<i>38</i>
7	<i>What then is the Purpose of Governments?.....</i>	<i>45</i>

WEEK 2

8	<i>Obvious Connections: Politics plus Lawmakers equal Laws.....</i>	<i>52</i>
9	<i>Why is Interpreting the Law so Important?.....</i>	<i>58</i>
10	<i>But You Can't Legislate Morality?.....</i>	<i>69</i>
11	<i>But The Church Should Stay Out Of Politics! Besides, Christian Involvement In Politics Always Fails!.....</i>	<i>79</i>
12	<i>The United States Is A Republic, Not A Democracy.....</i>	<i>83</i>
13	<i>But Laws Don't Change Hearts.....</i>	<i>92</i>
14	<i>It's Wrong To Force Your Moral Values On Others! Suicide Statements!.....</i>	<i>100</i>

WEEK 3

15	<i>Where Do Our Moral Values Come From? What Is The Source Of Our Republic's Law?.....</i>	<i>104</i>
16	<i>How Can God Exist When There Is So Much Evil In The World?.....</i>	<i>110</i>
17	<i>But Where Do Moral Values Come From?.....</i>	<i>118</i>
18	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Introduction.....</i>	<i>127</i>
19	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Is God Capricious? Is God Good?.....</i>	<i>136</i>
20	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Do We Need To Follow All Those Laws About Pork Or Stoning People?.....</i>	<i>144</i>
21	<i>But What About The Sermon On The Mount?.....</i>	<i>150</i>

WEEK 4

22	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Why The Emphasis On Sexual Sins? Part I</i>	153
23	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Why The Emphasis On Sexual Sins? Part II</i>	162
24	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Other Sexual Sins</i>	172
25	<i>Why The Law Was Given: Other Marriage Issues</i>	179
26	<i>But We Shouldn't Just Impose Our Laws Blindly On Others</i>	187
27	<i>The Consequences Of Bad Laws: A Quick Summary & Why We Must Elect Moral Conservatives: The Long Elevator Pitch</i>	193
28	<i>But The Church Needs To Focus On Starving Kids And Not On Same-Sex Marriage Or Abortion!</i>	200

WEEK 5

29	<i>What Would Jesus Do?</i>	207
30	<i>But The Church Isn't Focusing On Social Issues At All, We Are Lacking In Compassion</i>	212
31	<i>Is Jesus A Socialist? Part I</i>	218
32	<i>Is Jesus A Socialist? Part II</i>	225
33	<i>Is Jesus A Socialist? Part III</i>	230
34	<i>The Tragic Consequences Of Welfare</i>	235
35	<i>Politics And Christians Of History</i>	239

WEEK 6

36	<i>But You Will Turn People Away From The Gospel!</i>	243
37	<i>How Then Shall We Vote?</i>	250
38	<i>Can A Christian Be A Single-Issue Voter?</i>	255
39	<i>The Call To Action: What Pastors, Christians And The Church Can Do Right Now!</i>	259
40	<i>Conclusion: We Can Win This Battle</i>	275

Appendix I: What Can Churches Do Legally & Other Questions

Appendix II: Some Common Objections

Appendix III: How Then Shall We Legislate?

Study Guide at end of book

Day One

California allows anyone born in California to change the gender marker on a California birth certificate with an appropriate court order.

California Health and Safety Code sec 103425

A California law today. Will this be a Federal law soon?

I re-visited some Muslim countries this year, they have no old pastors, their pastors have a short lifespan. They keep being murdered. Pastors are the first in line.

Ex-Muslim Convert

When they came, they came for the pastors first. They targeted them.

Ex-Hindu Convert (but could have been said by an Ex-Muslim convert or a Chinese Christian or even a Swedish Christian)

The Consequences of Inactivity

One Sunday morning, your pastor reads the passage in Leviticus which includes, among other things, a section on homosexuality. On Monday morning, the church is sued for “hate speech” (Hate Speech Law, HR1592 introduced by Representative John Conyers, Jr. March 2007¹). The ensuing legal struggle drains money from your church accounts and forces your pastor to focus on the church’s financial survival, instead of shepherding. Whether they win the suit or not, those who file the suit have been as effective as they were with Pastor Ake Green in Sweden who suffered in the same way *and* was thrown into jail for the same reason.

You swat your child’s hand at the supermarket. As a result you are arrested and put in prison for one year for “spanking your child” (AB755 introduced in the California Assembly by Assemblywoman Sally Lieber, February 2007, reissued as AB2943 in 2008²).

Judges who admit that they will acknowledge God and consider His Natural Law³ in their rulings and interpretations of original laws⁴ are fired from

¹ Some have argued that this will not be the automatic result of this law. However, it seems to me that we have evidence of this sort of oppression in Canada and Sweden from laws similar to these. In addition, history has shown us that many pastors, lest their churches lose tax-exempt status, shy away from political issues even when they are legally allowed to make certain comments on politics. They throw the baby out with the bath water, a result of a law forced through by Lyndon Johnson to muzzle non-profits. We will discuss this in detail further.

² Lieber has since had to make many modifications to her bill, but with a fully morally liberal house, senate and president those who wish to pass this at the federal level would probably not need to do so.

³ Referred to as “The Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God. They are referring to the nature of God and how his laws necessarily manifest themselves in His creation. We’ll discuss this in this book.

their posts (Judicial Inquiry Commission, Alabama 2003).

Same-sex marriage is legalized by five California Supreme Court Justices and those who practice homosexual behavior become a “protected” minority. These Supreme Court Justices were appointed or elected to office because of the passivity of Christians. A constitutional amendment to the California Constitution to *protect* marriage and limit it to one man and one woman passes with a majority. But before anyone can celebrate, the same Supreme Court announces plans to overthrow the amendment despite the will of the people. Another judge goes on a witch hunt to overthrow it, even reading emails trying to determine if the authors of the proposition are anti-gay bigots, (as if that’s relevant *after* the people have voted on it). Ironically the judge turns out to be gay, making one wonder that if the proponents of the law’s biases are to be considered, why wasn’t his bias also considered. Another judge, forces the release of the names and addresses of all donors to the amendment proposition. These individuals are harassed, and receive death threats. Eventually the courts override the people’s vote and homosexuality becomes a civil rights issue not a behavioral choice.

Shortly thereafter, your cousin’s church refuses to hire a very nice gay man as the Youth Pastor at their church. Days later they are slapped with a civil rights discrimination lawsuit and they see their church bankrupted by legal fees.

Your parents have been attending a small church in a prime downtown location for almost 30 years. Suddenly, their church is sued for not allowing a gay couple to attend their annual married couples’ retreat. Besides the cost of the suit, the church loses its tax deduction. The congregation wakes up one morning to find out that since their tiny downtown church lot is worth millions of dollars, they now have to come up with tens of thousands of dollars each year to pay property taxes. To make matters worse, Church members find out that they all owe back taxes on deductions they’ve already taken on their tithes and offerings. The IRS, run by a Treasury Secretary, appointed by the president has no compassion. Your parents can’t come up with the back taxes and have to declare bankruptcy.

A judge rules that home schooling is illegal unless the parents are ‘state credentialed tutors’ (Second Appellate District, Los Angeles County, 2008). This unconstitutional ruling is *not* overturned by the state senators (who were elected due to the non-involvement of Christians). As a result, parents who refuse to send their kids to a state approved school risk losing them to child protective services.

Yet, when you send your child to the very same state approved public school, another judge rules that your parental rights cease once your child has passed through the public-school doors, especially when it relates to sexual values and the teaching of homosexuality and sexual matters (Fields v. Palmdale School District Ruling 2005).⁵

⁴ That is laws that were written by men and women who acknowledged God’s natural laws in their codification of those laws.

⁵ www.citizenlink.org/FOSI/abstinence/education/A000001079.cfm

The definition of gender is expanded to include any gender an individual chooses for himself or herself. It becomes illegal to insist that a person's gender be determined biologically. School kids are given the freedom to choose the girls' restroom or the boys' restroom depending on whether they view themselves as male or female that *day* (SB777 passed by California, the California Health and Safety Code sec 103425 and an actual attempt by a Los Angeles School to adhere to this).⁶

Oh, you are over-reacting!

Am I being an alarmist?

Unfortunately, I don't think so. We have already seen examples of people in the United States and Europe persecuted and suffering under such laws.

Here in the "free" United States, Christians have been thrown in jail for distributing Bibles on public property. They have been slapped with huge lawsuits; churches and Christian organizations have lost leases or have had to spend millions on legal fees just to be able to build on property they own.

In Philadelphia, a 70-year-old African American great grandmother was charged with "ethnic intimidation." She and ten other Christians were arrested and thrown into *jail* for having the audacity to stand on a sidewalk during a gay parade and preach. These peaceful men and women faced 47 years in prison and fines of \$90,000 each.⁷ Forty seven years! Am I really over-reacting? You tell me. This is happening in America. What happened to free speech? Why are Christians being targeted? Why do you think you won't be next?

At 8:30 p.m. on October 31, in Salem, Massachusetts, police officers arrested an evangelism director preaching the gospel to a crowd of rowdy Halloween partiers.⁸ The police arrested him for *disturbing* the peace. Yet alarmingly, he was but one of many *other* just as loud "street entertainers" that night. Do you think he was being targeted? That could be your church high school group being arrested.

A pastor in Phoenix, AZ was sentenced to jail for 10 days and 3 years of probation because a judge forbade their church bells to chime except for 2 minutes on Sundays. It's important to note that the bells were lower in volume than an ice-cream truck, which is allowed to chime anytime during daylight.⁹

In Alameda California, Superior Court Judge Frank Roesch yelled at parents who had sought to excuse their elementary kids from a controversial pro-homosexual curriculum forced on them by their school board. The judge

⁶ "Legalizing" Gender: California allows anyone born in California to change the gender marker on a California birth certificate with an appropriate court order (California Health and Safety Code sec 103425 et seq). Equitable jurisdiction has been found to give courts authority to grant change of gender for people born outside of California. See also www.transgenderlawcenter.org

⁷ www.covenantnews.com/repent051013.htm

⁸ Watch the video here: www.youtube.com/watch?v=eYuaOenys60 the city proceeded to discriminate against him and judges ruled against him despite the fact that the city law specifically allowed what he was doing. Watch the video and decide if our reaction should be one of passivity as the tide turns against us. Or should we change those who make, judge & enforce our laws to be those with Godly Worldviews?

⁹ Defended by the Alliance Defense Fund www.telladf.org/UserDocs/PainterOrder.pdf

called the parents bigots and refused to let them pull their kids from class *despite* a federal law that says parents can do this.¹⁰ Why weren't there Christians on that school board?

In South Dakota a cash strapped municipality ignored the law and issued a \$17,000 property tax bill to a church.¹¹ Now the church is having to fight them in court. It could be your church next. Are you sure you want to start paying property taxes or spend millions on legal bills? Will you wish there were a few more Christians on your Board of Supervisors when they decide to tax *your* church?

Continuing with their anti-Christian record, the City of Phoenix at the request of their City Council threw Michael Salman in the Tent City Jail with violent felons for 60 days after telling him:

*"Until the appropriate permits and approvals have been obtained, church related activities, including Bible studies, are not allowed [in your residence or barn]."*¹²

Perhaps more Christians should have been in that City Council.

In Oakland, California, my friend, the kind and gentle Pastor Walter Hoye, a member of the National Black Pro-Life Union was standing outside an abortion clinic with a sign that said, "Jesus Loves You, can we help." He dutifully stayed behind the 8 foot range that the law required him to be at. Yet, the manager of the abortion clinic accused Walter of aggressive behavior towards her and had him arrested. Coincidentally, Walter had hours of video footage of the *entire* episode that showed no aggressive behavior. The manager was on it, with a measuring tape ensuring Walter was the legal distance away. In fact Walter meekly backed off whenever he was approached by her. The defense showed the judge the video, proving that the clinic manager was committing perjury and had lied about Walter being aggressive. Yet despite the video tape proving his innocence, Walter was told he could not come within 100 feet of the clinic. When he stood on his Constitutional Rights, he was thrown into jail for 30 days. What value were his Constitutional Rights? They were only on paper, with no elected official to defend him. What value was the physical evidence? It is of no value if the authorities have decided to make America a corrupt 3rd world nation, just like the nations I grew up in. The perjuring clinic manager was not even held to account for lying under oath. Why? Because the DA was anti-Christian! Why do you think *you* will be exempt from things like this?¹³

With changes like this, do you think Christian free speech and free worship will last long? When will they come to arrest you for your Bible study? All of these actions reflect a specific strong anti-Christian and anti-God bias by those in control. All of these *unfair and un-American* actions against us were taken by people that *we* Christians have the power to appoint or dismiss.

¹⁰ The Pacific Justice Institute is continuing to defend the parents legally. www.PJI.org
<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=117841>

¹¹ <http://www.citizenlink.org/content/A000012987.cfm>

¹² https://www.rutherford.org/files_images/general/07-17-2012_Salman_Fact_Sheet.pdf

¹³ Defended by Life Legal Defense Foundation. Read Pastor Hoye's story and watch the video www.ildf.org/articles/WalterHoyeVsOakland contact his organization here www.issues4life.org

Yes, someone *is* over reacting; but it's not us. May I suggest that it's those with an anti-Christian bias? If Christians don't at least *start* reacting soon, perhaps it will be too late. Remember, appeasement only means that the crocodile will eat you last.¹⁴

Christians in other countries also thought this could never happen to them. In Canada, parents had their kids taken by child protective services simply for refusing to *agree* that they would *abstain* from spanking their own children.¹⁵ Focus on the Family Canada, is not allowed to broadcast any radio shows that are either critical of the homosexual political agenda or disclose the physical consequences of the behavior even if that data is taken from a medical source like the Centers for Disease Control.

In Sweden, Pastor Ake Green was thrown into jail for reading a Bible passage on homosexuality; he was not on some public street corner. He was reading this while in his *own* pulpit.¹⁶

In Britain, a Christian was arrested for merely handing out pamphlets at a rally. A spokesman for the police said the campaigner had *not* behaved in a violent or aggressive manner, nor had he said anything, but officers had arrested him because "the leaflet contained biblical quotes about homosexuality."¹⁷

America is one of the greatest missionary nations in the history of the world. If we are not careful, the Church in America will come under persecution. A persecuted Church does not fund missions.¹⁸

Politics and Laws

All the laws I mentioned earlier are genuine currently proposed laws, originated by senators and representatives, some waiting to be passed. All these laws and all the oppression of Christians could have been stopped by Christians and the Church. How can I say that? Easily because it turns out that according to Barna polls, there are over 60 Million Evangelicals¹⁹ in the United States but in many elections over 40 million of us don't vote. With up to 40 million of us sitting on the sidelines,²⁰ presidential and senate races are being won or lost by a few hundred thousand votes. *We could have determined every one of those outcomes and stopped the persecution of the saints.*

**Join us now on this journey, as we work Towards a More Godly Nation.
Your children's freedoms will depend on you.**

¹⁴ "An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile - hoping it will eat him last" Winston Churchill.

¹⁵ www.cbc.ca/news/story/2001/07/09/parents_spanking010706.html

¹⁶ www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive/ldn/2004/jul/04070505

¹⁷ www.annointed.net/Article1040.html

¹⁸ Of course in the 1st Century the Persecuted Church inadvertently funded missions as its members ran to other nations for their lives. But now there's no place for us to run to. This is the last stand on earth.

¹⁹ From a power point presentation by David Barton, the facts and sources are documented on his web page at www.wallbuilders.com/LIBissuesArticles.asp?id=3930 see also www.reuters.com/article/domesticNews/idUSN0741145420070207

²⁰ While the ratio of those who voted in 2004 to 2006 reduced by the same amount, the fact remains that if those Christians were encouraged by their pastors and got out and voted it would not have reduced amongst us and we'd be winning every single race.

Additional Reading

Additional Reading sections are optional and are added to provide you with more information and background.

Churches are the Only Way to a Happier, Healthier, Safer and Mutually Prosperous America

I make this audacious claim in the subtitle of this book, yet as you read more, I pray that you will see how this is the logical, rational and natural result of a majority of Christians and churches becoming politically active in the *biblical* way. Statistics and studies show that if we do this effectively, we can minimize government, Americans will be happier, they will be healthier, our society and streets will be safer, our prisons will be emptier, we will need fewer law enforcement officers,²¹ and our mental institutions will be underpopulated. Not only that, but poverty and hunger within the United States will be reduced, our schools will be more effective, and we will all be mutually prosperous. But just as important, I hope to show you how a healthier America will result in more outreach, more missionaries, more financial and medical aid to the rest of the world and most importantly *true* justice. Oh, and lower taxes.

Can we get there? The solution will be up to us. Sadly, if we don't try, we will continue to spiral down and the consequences will be dire. Meanwhile, be encouraged that many of our goals are shared by non-Christians. It's the methodologies that we disagree on; I hope to equip you to be able to show others why our methodology actually works, and to point you to information that shows this rationally, logically and statistically.

Pastors are the key to the solution

Your pastor has taken the first and critical step by going through this series with you. Our most difficult challenge will be gently helping *other* pastors in neighboring churches see the crucial role they play in informing their congregation about God's heart about existing, future and pending laws. Pastors are the key to equipping and preparing their congregation to respond to the moral ramifications behind current cultural issues. They cannot endorse candidates and we don't want them telling you whom to vote for, but they can turn our nation toward godliness if they teach the logical and rational basis of God's Moral Law. This will educate Christians to be able to make their own wise and godly voting decisions. We also hope they will encourage their church members whom they identify as godly men and women to run for office. Moreover we ask that they interact with and educate their representatives. Our representatives need to know what Christians view the heart of God to be regarding laws that are affecting the country. Pastors are the best conduit for this.

We also need to convince other pastors to do their part in getting the entire Church, the Bride of Christ in America, to throw its mighty weight behind the legislative direction of our country. By doing this we can change our nation spiritually, politically, legally and culturally. Let me prove this to

²¹ But don't worry, the free market will find lots of alternate productive and rewarding jobs for them.

you step by step in this book.

It may be a lofty goal, but it is attainable if we focus on common goals, remove misperceptions, and talk winsomely with pastors.

I intend to show you that not reaching the goal will exact a grave cost in our children's lives and worse, have ramifications for the *eternal* salvation of billions of people outside this country. Not trying to reach this goal will be violating our Lord's second greatest commandment: Loving your neighbor as yourself.

My Journey

I was born in Ghana, Africa and have lived in Jamaica, Sudan, Ethiopia, Yemen and India. At the age of 18 my family was kicked out of Yemen because my father had given his Bible to a Muslim colleague.

In many ways, this book describes my journey which started as a young foreign student in the 80's who, though a Christian, was a progressive in ways, pro-choice, and not interested in politics.

This book shows you what I've learned since then about politics, the law, and morals. It explains the thinking, growing and maturation process I went through. It is thus a way to talk others through the same learning dynamic. I didn't want to write a dry technical explanation because there are plenty of those out there, and frankly, I can't sit through many of them.

The knowledge I will present to you changed me, and if I, of all the stubborn folk can change, I know America can change. And as I want to show you, if we change America, we change the world.

Day Two

But Jesus didn't get involved in politics. He didn't try to change the Roman laws. He said, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's and give to God what is God's." If Jesus didn't do it, then we shouldn't.

College Coed

Jesus Was Involved in Politics!

It was a candle lit room full of college students – a typical emerging²² type church setting. I had been invited to speak to the young adults. Many had tattoos and weird hair, yet after spending three weeks with them, teaching apologetics and the dangers of blind faith²³ and seeing positive responses, I decided to venture into uncharted waters and try to help these students understand why Christians need to be involved in politics. I was doing well, feeling good about the impact I was having on this particular topic, when suddenly out of the darkness a coed interrupted. “That’s all well and good, but Jesus didn’t get involved in politics,” she declared. “He didn’t try to change the Roman laws. He said, ‘Give unto Caesar what is Caesar’s and give unto God what is God’s.’ If Jesus didn’t do it, then we shouldn’t.”

There seemed to be a stunned silence in the room.

Was this a valid objection? Let’s see if we can respond to it.

If Jesus did not do something, does that mean we should not do it either?

Just because Jesus did not do something that does not mean it is a bad or unwise thing to do. Though the Romans killed and massacred people, Jesus never said or did anything about that. He didn’t condemn them for it.²⁴ He could have stopped their evil practices with a wave of his hand. But he did not. Does this mean we should allow people to massacre others? Of course not! There were slaves²⁵ everywhere in the ancient world. Jesus never fought for

²² By this, I mean the good evangelical kind, not the heretical emergent kind. Confused? I know - everybody is. For more information go to www.str.org and look up “emergent church.”

²³ See www.NoBlindFaith.com for more information on a Rational Logical approach to Faith.

²⁴ You cannot arbitrarily attribute our Lord's many statements on love as a vague fuzzy condemnation of the Romans' cruel practices. After all He was not reluctant to let loose specific condemnation on the Pharisees. Why then would he be reluctant to condemn the Romans specifically for slavery or abuse. Yet we know He did not condone it.

²⁵ Do note that as far as I can tell the Jews never had slaves the way we think of slaves. The Old Testament allowed what would be called indentured servitude or those of prisoners captured during a war. The former was a system in which a person could pay off his debt by becoming and indentured

their freedom. He did not even say they should be freed. Was he condoning racism and slavery?²⁶ No, that's ridiculous.²⁷

Obviously, just because Jesus didn't do something doesn't mean we should *also* not do it.

The clincher here is marriage. Jesus never got married,²⁸ yet we don't hear the same people arguing that because He was not married, no one else should be. That would clearly be invalid and illogical.

What if Jesus did do something?

The reverse of an invalid argument, however, may be valid. I hope we can agree that if Jesus *did* do something, that is probably a good indication that we should do strive to do likewise. Keep this in mind as we investigate this further.

German and U.S. Politics

Many people seem to be confused about who the "politicians" of Jesus' day were and how laws were enacted in Judea.

For perspective, let's compare the relationship between Judea and Rome in 33 A.D. to a more recent situation, the lengthy U.S. occupation of Germany after WWII.²⁹ Suppose a German citizen living under American occupation at that time started calling for change in American laws. How effective would that be?

Not very.

Why would a citizen of Germany under U.S. occupation not be allowed to get involved in American politics? Obviously because he could not vote in the United States, nor did he have any rights of U.S. citizenship.

Jesus and Roman Politics

So when we look at Jesus, His comment about Caesar and His non-involvement in Roman politics, we first have to ask, "Was Jesus a Roman citizen?"

No, he wasn't!

servant of the person to whom he owned money. When the debt was paid, he was free to leave or become a bondservant, someone who loved his master so much that despite the fact that he was legally free, he chose to remain under the master's protection and providence. This was far different from the U.S. version of slavery. The latter was a side effect of the wars of conquest and aggression. But one was never allowed just to kidnap a person and make him or her a slave.

²⁶ By the way, the response, "Well, Jesus didn't drive a car either" doesn't work. Because the answer would be, "Well, that doesn't apply because cars hadn't been invented."

²⁷ Interestingly in light of the fact that He never spoke out against slavery, my atheist friends say he approved it. But we know that is ludicrous. There are multiple passages in the Bible that condemn slavery e.g. Ex 21:16 Anyone who kidnaps another and either sells him or still has him when he is caught must be put to death.

²⁸ *The DaVinci Code* tries to claim that Jesus was married, for a great rebuttal, see www.str.org and do a search for DaVinci. Or see *The DaVinci Code: Fact or Fiction?* Hanegraaff, Maier, Tyndale House Publishers, 2004.

Of course, you could argue, "But Paul says we can get married later, so the analogy is not a good one." However, what that merely shows is that just because Jesus didn't do something it's not a sufficient reason for us not to do it. Obviously, Nicodemus's involvement in politics and Paul's approval of and Peter's involvement in marriage can be shown as equivalent valid examples of this.

²⁹ It took a long time to train a nation of people under submission to fascists to become good democratic citizens.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Three

The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.

Psalms 9:17 KJV (emphasis added)

*This is what the LORD Almighty, the God of Israel, says: Listen! I am going to bring a disaster on this place that will make the ears of everyone who hears of it tingle. 4 For they have forsaken me and made this a place of foreign gods;... they have filled this place with the **blood of the innocent**. ... 9 I will make them eat the flesh of their sons and daughters, and they will eat one another's flesh during the stress of the siege imposed on them by the enemies who seek their lives.'*

Jeremiah 19:3

What Happens When God Judges A Nation?

W

ith a final bloody push, the kings of Assyria brought their charioteers and men to the heart of Israel and camped right outside her walls. They'd already laid waste to every town in their path. God had allowed an *evil* king to come right to Jerusalem's door.

After spending 40 years in the wilderness building up a ragtag group of cousins into a fighting force, some 800 years building up the nation of Israel and 40 years building Solomon's kingdom into this immensely rich and influential empire; within a few generations, God sends the Assyrians to crush Israel. A few years later, He sends the Babylonians into the lone surviving nation of Judah to destroy it and burn it to the ground. The Babylonians do this so completely that the Ark of the Covenant disappears forever, Solomon's great Temple is razed to the ground, and the gold in the Holy of Holies melts and runs into the dirt.

The horrors of these sieges are seen in events that fulfilled the horrific prophesy of Jeremiah quoted above:

2 Kings 6: 26 *[During the siege] as the king of Israel was passing by on the wall, a woman cried to him, "Help me, my lord the king!" 27 The king replied, "If the LORD does not help you, where can I get help for you? ..." 28 Then he asked her, "What's the matter?" She answered, "This woman said to me, 'Give up your son so we may eat him today, and tomorrow we'll eat my son.' 29 So we cooked my son and ate him. The next day I said to her, 'Give up your son so we may eat him,' but she had hidden him."*

This woman was not complaining that she had to eat her own son; she was complaining that she did not get to eat her neighbor's son *as well*.

Why?

Why did God do this to His people? Weren't these His children, His chosen? Why did God abandon them like that? Why did He let them be so horribly tortured and destroyed?

Why? We know why, don't we?

What was usually happened in Israel, just before a foreign nation came in and attacked it? What was slowly happening in the years before the destruction of the temple? What was happening to the heart and the culture of Israel and Judah?

***Judges 2:11** Then the Israelites did evil in the eyes of the LORD and served the Baals. **12** They forsook the LORD, the God of their fathers, who had brought them out of Egypt. They followed and worshiped various gods of the peoples around them. **They provoked the LORD to anger** **13** because they forsook him and served Baal and the Ashtoreths. **14** In his anger against Israel the LORD handed them over to raiders who plundered them. He sold them to their enemies all around, whom they were no longer able to resist.*

And

***2 Kings 17:1** ...Hoshea son of Elah became king of Israel in Samaria, and he...did evil in the eyes of the LORD. **3** Shalmaneser king of Assyria came up to attack Hoshea, [and] seized him and put him in prison. ... **5** The king of Assyria invaded the entire land, marched against Samaria and laid siege to it for three years...**7** **All this took place because the Israelites had sinned against the LORD their God...** They worshiped other gods **8** and followed the practices of the nations the LORD had driven out before them, as well as the practices that the kings of Israel had introduced.*

So, what was the routine? Well quite simply, prior to most attacks and sieges we see the Israelites abandoning God. This was primarily reflected in their abandoning His law, doing things like sacrificing their children and disobeying His guidelines. We see that He then punished them, because they turned away from Him, because they abandoned His principles and did not fear Him anymore. In fact, the history of Israel is littered with stories of their abandoning God and being punished (and for some reason never learning). But if you look at that passage above, you notice that it wasn't just the people of Israel and Judah that turned away from God. It was their kings in particular.

2 Kings 17:7** All this took place because the Israelites had sinned against the LORD their God...**8** and followed ...**the practices that the kings of Israel had introduced.

In other words, God punished the people because of their *leaders* whom they followed.³⁰

When we read the first-century historian Josephus's history,³¹ we see again how certain leaders of the Jews rebelled against Rome, bringing the wrath of that mighty empire down on everyone. As a result, Jerusalem was completely destroyed; hundreds of thousands of Jewish families slaughtered

³⁰ This will be of special importance when we get to the part where we discuss our submission to authority and the founding fathers.

³¹ For an easy to read version of Josephus' historical account, please see Paul Maier's excellent translation of this fulfillment of prophecy, documented by an eyewitness. Go to www.JesusIsInvolvedInPolitics.com and do a search for 'Maier Josephus.'

and only one stone wall was left of Jerusalem, as a warning sign to all who dared to defy the Roman army. An event predicted by Jesus 37 years earlier.

What about the good people?

During these sieges and attacks, God obviously saved a few people like the widow who helped Elisha.³² But here's the real question: Did *all* the "innocent" people – that is, all who still loved God – get spared? Oh sure, we'd like to think so. However, the Bible never says they were saved. In fact, we know that the good were taken into exile along with the bad. For instance, Daniel, Shadrach, Meshack, and Abednigo,³³ good men taken from their families and most likely castrated into eunuchs. Women raped, babies smashed and, as we have seen, cooked and eaten. Are you telling me those babies disobeyed God?

No, of course they didn't. The good suffered along with the bad. The good experienced the terrible judgment of God just as the bad did. The good were raped, beaten, kidnapped, and orphaned, and they had their heads smashed *just* as did the wicked.

What's my point? My point is that when God judges a nation for the behavior of certain people in that nation or because of its leaders; you and I, the followers of Christ *and our children* will also suffer the physical consequences!

Let me repeat that. When God judges our nation because of others, or because of our leaders, you and I, the followers of Christ, and our one- and two-year-old children will also suffer the physical consequences! True, *we personally* will never suffer the spiritual consequences, but as you will see later, I will make the case that our grandchildren may not only suffer the *physical* consequences but they may *also* suffer the spiritual consequences. Do we want their blood on our hands?

Remember too, Exodus shows us that not only do our kids suffer because of our evil choices but succeeding generations will also suffer for what we do, or allow to happen.

Exodus 34:7 Yet he does not leave the guilty unpunished; he punishes the children and their children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation.³⁴

When did we stop believing that this passage was true? Or that it didn't apply to us? I believe this means our kids will suffer the physical consequences of our folly and not the spiritual consequences. As far as the physical consequences for the sins of the fathers, such as divorce, there are *natural physical, emotional, and psychological consequences* of abandoning the moral laws of God, and these will affect children to the third and fourth generations. Divorce has measurable effects.

Are you confused at this point? "What does divorce have to do with

³² 2 Kings 4:1-7

³³ Sadly we never remember their real names: Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah

³⁴ It is of value to note that the Jewish Rabbi "Rashi" (AD 1040-1105) indicates that the punishments were only to the children who hated God themselves. Of course, parents can influence children to hate God.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Five

*"It is not for kings ... to drink wine, not for rulers to crave beer,
lest they drink and forget what the law decrees,
and deprive all the oppressed of their rights.*

Proverbs 31:4-5

*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that
they are endowed by...*

Declaration of Independence, 1776

Who Gives Us Our Rights?

Do we get our rights from the Government?

As Proverbs 31:4,5 quoted above indicates, the Bible is concerned with rights. There are at least 6 other verses in the Bible on rights, which seem to indicate that this is an important issue.³⁵ If the Bible is concerned about rights, it would seem that we Christians and pastors should also be concerned about rights. So let me ask you this: Who gives us our rights? Do we get our rights from our own government? Do we get our rights from other people, i.e. the masses? If we do get our rights from the government, what could happen to those rights? What if instead we got our rights from the people (in a democratic fashion), what could go wrong in *that* scenario?

Does the Constitution grant us rights?

While the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights presume that we all have rights, many make the terrible mistake of thinking that the Constitution *grants* us those rights. This could not be further from the truth. To understand where the rights spoken of in the Constitution come from, we have to look to the Declaration of Independence. This vital document was the road map, the goals for what later became the contract amongst the people of the US, i.e. the Constitution.

Do you remember this from the Declaration of Independence?³⁶

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.

Hopefully you were able to finish it on your own when you read it at

³⁵ Pro 31:5,8,9; Ec 5:8; Is 10:2; Lam 3:35; Job 36:6

³⁶ By the way if some yokel tries to argue that the Declaration of Independence is not a Christian influenced document, I recommend you refer them to this excellent book: "Defending the Declaration: How the Bible and Christianity Influenced the Writing of the Declaration of Independence," Gary T. Amos, Providence Foundation (1996).

the beginning of this chapter. First, let's notice: Who gives men their rights? Is it given to them by government? Let me ask you that again. Are your rights given to you by the government? No. Absolutely not! According to the Declaration and thus our founding fathers, our rights are given to us by God, the Creator. They are *unalienable*. The word was purposely chosen. You can't give them away, lose them, or abdicate them; they are an inherent part of you. Note though, that evil people may *unjustly* prevent you from exercising them.

Why do rights *have* to come from a Creator?

We should all recognize that rights can't be self-assigned. Nor can they be assigned by the majority or the state. Why? Well, rights cannot be self-assigned because that would be meaningless. There has to be some logic or reasoning, something to back the claim that you have rights. Or I could just stand up and say, "I have the right to be Emperor." That is sheer silliness, of course.

You could appeal to fairness, but then who says anyone needs to be fair when it comes to rights? In fact, we should ask where the concept of fairness comes from. Where does even the concept of equal rights come from? Who says that a brown Indian immigrant born in Ghana is equal in value to a white American-born man? This is not something that comes out of evolutionary instincts.

One person tried to argue with me saying "we get our rights from a social contract." But do you think the African slaves contractually agreed to be slaves? How silly. They had no contract; it was oppression and violence that kept them there. Are you trying to suggest that they thus had no inherent rights? What rot!

What if rights were assigned by the majority or by the state? If that were true that would again mean the African slaves really had no rights before the majority and the state arbitrarily gave them those rights. That makes no sense. African slaves always had God-given rights, but these rights were constantly being violated until the majority and the state finally realized this and recognized the rights the slaves always and *already had*. Notice the difference, they always had the rights, but until the law was changed they were not allowed to *exercise* their pre-existing rights.³⁷

But, if they always had those rights, where did they get those rights to begin with. Rights have to be given by an authority.

Who could that authority be?

What if the government gave us our rights?

If the government gave us rights, then it could chose to take them away. It would also mean that in times when the government chose *not* to give rights to slaves it was *not* morally wrong in doing so.

Don't gloss over that. It is an important point. You see, if rights come from the government, then there is no inherent moral value that says that everyone must get the same rights. Government can arbitrarily hand out rights

³⁷ You can look at this way. Let's say someone steals your car. Do you still own the car? Yes. Do you still have a right to drive it? Yes. But until the thief is caught and the car returned, you can't *exercise* your right to drive it.

just as a king could hand out dukedoms or knighthoods. And in the same way, government can arbitrarily *take* away those rights just as the Soviets and the Nazis did.

This is insidious if you take it to its logical conclusion. If government were the giver of rights, this would mean that you could only call what the U.S. did during the slavery era a *preference*. You could not say it was wrong since in this scenario the slaves had no inherent rights. Again, this is key. You cannot place any moral value on rights if the very basis of those rights is decided by the *preference* of a group of men or women who feel a certain way at a certain time.

The truth is that slaves on American soil and worldwide have always had rights, those given to them by the Creator, but they were being immorally and unjustly oppressed by the government and the people of the United States.

In the same way, if the government had been the granter of rights, then the slaves received rights that weren't theirs previously; they just got some *new* rights, and the whole battle for their God-given rights was a farce. Worse yet, if popular opinion should shift one day, those rights could be just as "justly" taken away.

The only way any person could claim he *already had* rights, which could never ever be taken away from him by any other human, is if someone who was in charge of *all* humans were to give that person those rights. Then regardless of majority ruling or culture or change in attitudes or economic standing, that human would always have those rights.

Now of course, people can illegally and unjustly violate your God given rights, but no one truly has the authority to take them away. A king cannot justifiably take them away because who gave him his right to be king, he got it by force or by genetics. The majority cannot justifiably take them away. Powerful evil men may repress you, but they cannot change the fact that you have those rights. Your economic status cannot change them. Culture cannot change them. Attitudes cannot change them. Time cannot change them.

Only a Being who has authority over the entire human race can change them. And there is only one such Being.

One of the major concerns of politics is rights, which is directly tied to true justice. But rights come from God; therefore politics must be concerned with God. There is no way to avoid this connection. Moreover, this works both ways, because the minute anyone argues that rights are not granted by God, they are in the unenviable position of trying to argue that African slaves never really *had* rights. It is just that a bunch of nice white people decided out of the kindness of their hearts to give these poor black slaves and brown Indians some rights. Of course, this is a despicable racist position, but it is the logical conclusion of the faulty premise. As we know and believe, the rights of the slaves were given to them by God, and contrary to that, the government during the 1800's violated these human beings' pre-existing God-given rights. We all recognize the immorality of it. Even my atheist friends

believe it was immoral,³⁸ though they are being illogical in this, for at the end of the day they cannot define slavery as anything but a preference, or a less modern approach to social engineering, or a less socially acceptable practice, since they believe no authority over all mankind exists.

What if there is no God?

Technically we can argue that if there is no God, then morality is merely the preference of those who are in power i.e. might makes right. This immediately has a very unpalatable consequence as it means that if Hitler had won World War II, it would have been morally acceptable to kill Jews since the victor – that is, the mighty – determined the morality of that situation. Similarly, had the South managed to succeed and secede after the American Civil War, slavery would have been “morally correct” for the South. This is obviously completely abhorrent to all of us today, but how do we *determine* that, if there is no standard and no standard giver?

What happens if you take the Creator out of the Constitution?

Now since we’ve determined that these rights are not given to us by the government but by the Creator, what happens if you take the Creator out of the U.S. Constitution? That is, what if you now claim that the Creator does not exist anymore, or that His existence is not valid, or that His existence in the Declaration or in the laws of the nation violates the U.S. Constitution.

Well, if you take away the Creator, you take away what? You take away those very same rights.

Let me say that again: If you say there is no Creator, you are saying that we have *no* unalienable rights.

This is actually a logical dilemma for atheists. Atheists may hold to slaves having rights prior to the emancipation, but they can’t logically defend that view. They can’t claim that those slaves always had or deserved those rights. The best they can say is, “We, as atheists, *prefer* that those slaves had had rights.” Or they may say, “Society now prefers that those slaves have rights.” And these preferences may change with the tide or popular opinion (as the rights of the Jews changed in Germany over time).

So, if there was no God, one could never appeal to a right or a wrong about “rights.” In other words, no atheist could ever argue that humans have a priori rights or that it is wrong to take those rights away from them. Sure, they could argue that it is *now* not normative or legal to take their rights away, but before the Constitution of the United States was ratified, they would have no rational or legal basis for it. And in truth, there is no precedence in history for *any* nation to give all men equal rights. Look at the history of humankind. It took the United States, even with its sound Constitution, many years to come to awareness of its application to slavery and eventually give all humans equal rights.

³⁸ One of course I argue that if there is no God then the atheists in the 1800s would not have known this intrinsically since all cultures around them had slaves. As to the where the intrinsic knowledge of morality comes from? If you are a Christian, the Apostle Paul says it’s all inherent in us and if we reject it, it’s in spite of our conscience. But we’ll leave that debate for later when we discuss how to determine moral law without appealing to the Bible.

“God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that His justice cannot sleep forever.”

*Thomas Jefferson*³⁹ (who does not sound very deistic here)

Why is this so important to this topic?

If you haven't figured out why this is important to this topic, it's quite simply this: Without a godly and Christian moral foundation, our Constitution is meaningless and our Country would never have been founded. In other words, I'm showing you how important Christianity was and is to the very foundation of our country. Remember that shortly after Americans declared their independence, France tried the same experiment *without* God and it resulted in massive bloodshed and failed.

Without our constitution, our laws, our rights and any concern for true justice would be meaningless. Without Christians at the helm of our Great Nation, these moral foundations will not be preserved and then suffering will come upon our children and millions of innocents. Can we abdicate this responsibility?

Additional Reading

Atheists have a problem

There is another important conclusion that we can arrive at: Since atheists don't believe that God exists, they cannot rationally or logically agree with the Constitution when it comes to the rights people already have. They may emotionally agree with it. They may *feel* that it is right that everybody has equal rights, but they cannot rationally arrive at that. It is merely irrational belief, an unsubstantiated feeling – that is, a preference.

Atheists cannot appeal to a de facto authority who has given mankind rights. Why? Because there are no unalienable rights in a world without God, the strong determine what rights the weak have. The concept of unalienable rights is ludicrous for atheists. To them, the only justice is a bigger stick or gun. The Declaration of Independence and its dependent Constitution set about identifying that injustice and correcting it. Rights say our founders, were from God, not from might.

And the danger is that if someone merely *prefers* that people have rights and has not come to it logically, then maybe one day he could be persuaded to change his preference. Perhaps that change will be for a noble cause, such as imposing fascist rule for the protection of the nation from an invading force or to protect it from economic collapse like Hitler did. However, a believer in God can never justify the removal of anyone's rights, since those rights derive from the existence of God. This is even more powerful if he has derived the existence of God from facts and not from feelings or from traditions. And it would be illogical for a rational Christian to suddenly to think that God changed His mind about equal rights for all mankind.

³⁹ Panel Three on the Jefferson Memorial in WA DC. From Notes on the State of Virginia.

Day Six

If men, through fear, fraud, or mistake, should in terms renounce or give up any natural right, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. The right to freedom being the gift of Almighty God, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave.

Samuel Adams, The Rights of the Colonists (1772)

What are God Given Rights anyway?

The editor I mentioned previously, also tried to argue at one point that governments can and do take away our rights all the time. His example was “being forced to wear seat belts.” Presumably, he feels that driving without a seat belt is a right, but his statement showed that he misunderstood not only the Constitution but also the very concept of a “right.”

Driving is not an unalienable right. God gives you certain rights. Driving a car on government-funded roads any way you wish to, is not one of them. Drive all you want in your own driveway or your own property without hurting others. That’s a right. But, if the public decrees that they wish you to wear a seatbelt while driving on the public roads, which *they* made for you with combined funds, then you may disagree and I may even agree that the government maybe overstepping its correct boundaries, but you can’t claim that God gave you that right. The only “right” you can insist on, is that they treat you as fairly as everyone else on that same road (equal rights).

So if driving is not an unalienable right, what is? The Constitution and the aptly named “Bill of Rights” enumerate some rights. Here is a brief list to give you an idea: Life; liberty; the pursuit of happiness;⁴⁰ justice; freedom from unreasonable search and seizure; freedom of religion;⁴¹ freedom of speech; freedom of the press; the people's right to keep and bear arms; the freedom of assembly; the freedom to petition; the right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment; freedom from compelled self-incrimination; the right to a speedy public trial with an impartial and local jury; habeas corpus; freedom to move

⁴⁰ “The evidence of [the] natural right [of expatriation], like that of our right to life, liberty, the use of our faculties, the pursuit of happiness, is not left to the feeble and sophistical investigations of reason, but is impressed on the sense of every man. We do not claim these under the charters of kings or legislators, but under the King of Kings.” --Thomas Jefferson to John Manners, 1817. ME 15:124 as quoted in <http://etext.virginia.edu/Jefferson/quotations/jeff0100.htm>

⁴¹ “The constitutional freedom of religion [is] the most inalienable and sacred of all human rights.” -- Thomas Jefferson: Virginia Board of Visitors Minutes, 1819. ME 19:416 as quoted in <http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff1650.htm>

around the country;⁴² equality under the law (derived from equal rights) – and so it goes.

For more information on our rights as penned by Jefferson, you may wish to refer to www.etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff0950.htm

But how do I determine what a right is? Don't get confused between rights and goods

Many people confuse “rights” with “goods.” It’s critical to differentiate the two. Here’s an easy way to look at it⁴³: If a ‘right’ depends on someone *else’s* service, work, or money, it’s not a right, it’s goods, and it’s certainly not a God given or Constitutional Right.

FDR for instance, tried to create a second bill of rights. In that bill, he wanted to include things like the right to a good education, the right to healthcare, the right to your own house, the right to a good paying job, and the right to adequate food, clothing and recreation.⁴⁴

But, if you have your thinking hat on, you’ll immediately realize that while these are nice things, they all violate the very concept of God given unalienable rights. Why? Because while you may have the right to *not* be *prevented* from having an education, you don’t have an entitlement *to* that education. Why? Because that education will be dependent on someone else providing the labor to give you that education. Same for the food, someone had to grow that food. Someone had to harvest it and clean it. As soon as something is a product of someone *else’s* work, it becomes a good, not a right. You always have a God given right to your *own* goods, but you have no right to someone *else’s* goods. That’s called stealing. And if goods are what you are promising to someone, however noble those goods are (like healthcare or a home), eventually you’ll have to enslave *some* men to guarantee those goods to *other* men. Our founders were not idiots. They understood quite well, why rights were not goods and why they could not write a constitution that guaranteed goods to anyone, unless they were the fruit of your *own* honest hard work.

Notice the difference

The right to *bear* arms is not an entitlement to a *free* firearm. The right to *free* speech is not an entitlement to a *free* printing press or radio station. The right to the pursuit of happiness is not the entitlement to or a *guarantee* of happiness. And of course the right to *own* a home is not the entitlement to a *free* home. I hope you see the great difference. This is critical, anytime you vote on something, ask yourself, “Is this law acknowledging a true right or is it mandating goods that are a result of someone *else’s* hard work?”

Notice too, that the constitutions that *have* a bill of rights for educa

⁴² Wait...is this really a right or just a Southwest Airlines commercial? And do you have to wear a seatbelt when you *move* around the country?

⁴³ My sincere thanks to Judge Andrew Napolitano of Fox News. I was looking for an easy way to articulate this when he explained it so well, while hosting the Glenn Beck show. I have elaborated a bit. Some people use the concept of negative rights and positive rights, but I got confused by that. This is much simpler to understand it seems.

⁴⁴ www.worldpolicy.org/projects/globalrights/econrights/fdr-econbill.html

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Nine

*The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when it was adopted, it means now. —
South Carolina v. United States, 199 U.S. 437, 448 (1905)*

Why is Interpreting the Law so Important?

W

hat kind of judge do we want on the Supreme Court?

Over the years many Supreme Court judges have decided that it is their role to mold the American people to bring about change by the way they interpret the law. They've abdicated their role as "Interpreters" and feel that it is their duty to update the laws to reflect the current culture or the current moral values. In fact, two of the laws Christians think are the most damaging of all have been imposed on this nation by these types of judges, i.e. Abortion and same-sex marriage. Most of these laws would have had no chance had they been offered to the general populace and legislators to vote on. This is not what judges were *ever* supposed to do. Judges were supposed to be what we call strict constructionists. A strict constructionist⁴⁵ is a judge who interprets the law as it was *originally* intended by the *original* lawmakers, leaving the molding of society to the lawmakers. I'll explain why this is so important and why it's of great interest to pastors, Christians and even fiscal and moral liberals shortly. But do remember how we showed that even Jesus is a strict constructionalist when it came to *His* Constitution.

Why is interpreting the original intent of the law so important?

Recall that the US Constitution is a perpetual *contract* between the people of the USA about how we will run our country. So any deal that was made 230 years ago still stands; unless we all agree to change it. Imagine if your grandfather left you a company which had a contract that he'd made with his partners. Do you think that some unelected judges have the right to arbitrarily come in and tell you that the terms of the contract are now to be changed according to their personal whims. What's funny is that the same judges, had they been evaluating a contract between two private parties, would consider it unethical to reinterpret the terms of the contract. Yet, many of them have no hesitation in coming up with arbitrary standards of reinterpretation when it's the people's contract, the US Constitution, that is under consideration.

⁴⁵ Sometimes also called strict constructionalist or originalist. There is some question of the exact definition of the former term, as it seems that Antonin Scalia, one of the current Supreme Court Judges says he really *isn't* a strict constructionalist. However, he does adhere to the definition that I am using, so regardless of the optional definitions, when I say Strict Constructionist or Strict Constructionalist, I imply the definition that I have provided here.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Ten

A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Politics is nothing more than the practical application of our most deeply held beliefs.

Rabbi Daniel Lapin⁴⁶

But You Can't Legislate Morality?

I was sitting in a Thai restaurant with an engineering colleague arguing about abortion. He was one of the best and the brightest, a liberal Christian with a Ph.D. from a very prestigious university, an author of multiple patents, with a deep analytical mind. I was presenting him arguments from a sermon that I use in churches titled “How To Win Arguments Against Abortion, Without Appealing To The Bible Or Religion.”⁴⁷ Halfway through the conversation and after a bite of red curry chicken, he looked at me and said, “But you know, you can't legislate morality.” I almost choked on my rice.

I use this highly learned and achieved man to show that this opinion is held at all levels of education and intelligence. I've heard it from a great many people. In fact, just recently, a well-known liberal politician said that he didn't want to be in the business of legislating morality for others. People spout this at me all over the place. It's usually the first objection. Sad to say, it often comes from Christians. I even had a Christian criminal attorney spout it at me. I usually try to give them a way out, and I always ask, “Is that something you've thought about at length, or is it just something you've heard someone else say and are merely repeating.”

Now, if we can't legislate morality then indeed Christians may not have any overriding justification to be involved in politics. But what if we *do* and *must* legislate morality? If we do legislate morality, would you agree that we Christians might indeed have a vested responsibility to be in politics? After all, if politics is about legislation and legislation is about morality then surely there is a tie there between the source of our moral values and our religion and faith in God. Especially so, if as we've said the consequences are severe punishments from God and increased pain and suffering for the poor, defenseless and minorities.

So can you legislate morality or not?

“You can't legislate morality.” If you think about it, that statement is

⁴⁶ American Alliance of Jews and Christians, www.RabbiDanielLapin.org

⁴⁷ Available at www.NoBlindFaith.com

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Eleven

Infanticide, which might seem contrary to human nature, was almost universal before the rise of Christianity, and is recommended by Plato to prevent over-population. [Notice how this is the same cry by today's pro-abortionists]....In antiquity, when male supremacy was unquestioned and Christian ethics were still unknown, women were harmless but rather silly, and a man who took them seriously was somewhat despised.⁴⁸

Atheist Bertrand Russell (emphasis added)

Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves,...defend the rights of the poor and needy. [Notice it speaks of rights not goods]

Proverbs 31:8-9

Blessed are they who maintain justice, who constantly do what is right.

Psalms 106:3.

But The Church Should Stay Out Of Politics! Besides, Christian Involvement In Politics Always Fails!

Look how we've failed every time we've tried to get involved in politics! What good has the Moral Majority done? How useful was the Christian Coalition? The Church should stay out of politics! We should focus on changing the culture and hearts, not laws!" A pastor friend of mine was attacking every Christian organization which had ever dared to become politically involved.

On another occasion, a lady on FaceBook come on to my profile after I'd condemned those in leadership (yes, I was just taking the lead from Jesus and calling them snakes and rats). This lady is a Christian, yet rather than speak out against sinful people who were really hurting others, she seemed to spend more of her time attacking fellow Christians who had the "gall" to stand up for righteousness. You know, she was the kind who think that bad people will actually stop doing bad things if we would just be *nice* to them. When I suggested that "just praying" was not an option she went ballistic. "Just pray!" she hollered (electronically), "Just pray! You think petitioning the Almighty creator is 'just' praying."

But this is a fallacious objection. I'd said, "We can't *just* pray, we have to speak out against evil, take over the legislature, and change the law." It's true; we can't "just" pray. We have to take action. James⁴⁹ is quite clear about

⁴⁸ Bertrand Russell, *Unpopular Essays*, 1950, New York: Simon & Schuster.

⁴⁹ James 2:26 *As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without deeds is dead.* What sort of deeds is James talking about? He's talking about justice. James 1:27 *Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress...*

this when he says, “Faith without deeds is dead.” Same with all the Israelite battles like Jericho. They had to go out there and obey God’s commandments before God acted. Not because He couldn’t, but because He has chosen to allow us to participate with Him. Imagine if they’d just *prayed* and sat tight despite God’s commandments to them?

So, what has God commanded us to do with regards to justice? What do the verses in the chapter heading quotes say? We are to *maintain* justice and *do* what’s right, not *just* pray about it! What does James 1:27 say? True religion is not just praying, it’s also feeding orphans and widows (and it’s certainly not *making others* pay for it). Would it have been biblical to “just pray” for the Jews in Hitler’s Germany and not try to protect them like the Ten Booms did?

In the pastor’s case, his biggest gaffe was thinking Christians had always failed in politics. To put it kindly, he was completely ignorant about history. Sadly, he is not unique in this. And to tell the truth, it’s natural that many of us would believe this. After all, newspapers and TV are always too willing to show us the failure of Christian leaders, and the U.S. seems to be getting worse not better despite the many attempts by Christians to change laws.

What we easily forget is that not only does the media *not* report *all* the news, but most of us also have a sparse knowledge of history. Let us look at what Christian involvement in politics has *actually* done since 33AD for the causes of true justice, for the protection of unalienable rights.

Has Christian involvement in politics always failed?

This idea is simply false. I’m tempted to ask people who state this if they would have tried telling that to the *Christian* William Wilberforce who stopped slavery in England almost six decades before it was stopped in America? Yet, even *he* had to try every year for almost 47 years before he was fully successful in achieving true justice. Imagine telling Wilberforce not to get involved in politics and to “just pray.” What hypocrisy? Compared to that, the battle against abortion, another battle for *true* justice, has another 11 years to go.⁵⁰ How about complaining to Rev. Martin Luther King that Christian⁵¹ political involvement wasn’t effective in changing the civil rights laws? But that’s just looking at the big successes, how about all the little successes, like laws that said the king was not above God’s law, laws the British Christians imposed on India that prohibited sati, the killing of Hindu widows on their husband’s funeral pyre (again true justice). We mustn’t forget too, the original laws to limit marriage to one man and one woman that over rode the native traditions that allowed leaders and chiefs to have multiple wives. How about the Church influenced law in Northern Europe in the 1200s that insisted that the wife had to consent to marriage, rather than the customary marriage by

⁵⁰ And we are gaining ground; we’ve succeeded in turning a majority of Americans *against* abortion on demand. Gallup’s 2009 poll showed 51% of Americans identify as “pro-life” and 42% as “pro-choice.” www.gallup.com/poll/118399/more-americans-pro-life-than-pro-choice-first-time.aspx

⁵¹ Yes, the first people to rally to this cause were Christians and pastors, not New Agers or atheists. The Civil Rights cause was first preached in the churches across America. Sadly, some churches preached the resistance to this movement as well, in full violation of the Scriptures.

capture and kidnapping that had prevailed until then. I kid you not!⁵²

Don't forget too, the laws that outlawed social injustices like:

1. Infanticide
2. Child marriage
3. Temple prostitution
4. Forced prostitution
5. Child prostitution
6. The superstitious killing of twins⁵³
7. Women as second class citizens
8. Abandonment of elderly in the wild
9. Revenge killings⁵⁴
10. Honor Killings
11. The abuse of children
12. The purchase of wives
13. Animal cruelty⁵⁵
14. Sale of children to pay family debts⁵⁶
15. The abuse of prisoners
16. Killing special needs/deformed kids.
17. Child labor⁵⁷
18. Gladiatorial combat
19. Death games
20. Bribery
21. Selective gender abortions
22. Cruel and unusual punishments
23. A man's right to divorce his wife for any reason vs. only adultery.⁵⁸

All these were stopped by laws that came about due to Christian political action. We could go on, as there are thousands of laws in all Christian and post Christian cultures that were based on just the moral values of Christians. Notice that all of these battles were for actual *rights*, not goods. This was not "economic" justice. But true *moral* justice. People's God-given rights were being violated and the Church stepped in to stop that injustice. They didn't step in to equalize results and bring about socialism.

What's more relevant to pastors and Christians is that, most of the changes in these laws started because of a *sermon from the pulpit of a church*. It wasn't something that the Church shied away from. Christians and churches who were involved in politics took it upon themselves at great costs to change the law and their societies. The same societies that now assume that all those values are self-evident and forget the very people and the very religion, which brought those *just* and *moral* laws into existence. All these laws took years and years and numerous heartbreaking tries to implement and they only came about because Christians and their pastors took a stance publicly, politically, legally and judicially and just as important financially. Don't forget that all these laws were fought and rejected over and over again by those very same societies that later embraced these ideals. And in each case, there was a huge backlash of unpopularity and malice against these particular pastors and their churches. Wilberforce was one of the most unpopular, reviled and hated men in England during his campaign to free the slaves. Do you think pastors should have *not* spoken about the horrors of slavery in churches in those days lest racists be turned away from the gospel?

For a list of the ways Christians have used politics to change society see Alvin Schmidt's, *How Christianity Changed the World* (Zondervan 2004).

⁵² stason.org/TULARC/travel/nordic-scandinavia/2-5-6-Christian-and-pre-Christian-laws.html

⁵³ www.dundee.gov.uk/slessor/

⁵⁴ #9, #10, #11: www.newadvent.org/cathen/09066a.htm

⁵⁵ The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was started by William Wilberforce.

⁵⁶ #14 and #15 Cod. Theod., lib. III, tit. 3, lex 1, and Cod. Theod., lib. IX, tit. 3, lex 1

⁵⁷ Alvin J Schmidt, *How Christianity Changed the World* Zondervan, 2004 pg. 142.

⁵⁸ Cod. Theod., lib. III, tit. 16, lex 1; Cod. Just., lib. V, tit. 17, leg. 8, 10, 11. This law protected women from being left destitute. But it was sadly overturned in the US with No-Fault Divorce.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Thirteen

All laws have moral foundations, and all morals have religious foundations. Politicians are in the business of making laws. Thus, all politics is religious in nature. A politician's religious views are just as critical as his economic views. A politician who does not understand this will not be a good lawmaker, and you should never vote for him.

***Objective Morality & Politics,
No Blind Faith Sunday School Class***

Train a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not turn from it.

Proverbs 22:6

I've never known a man worth his salt who in the long run, deep down in his heart, didn't appreciate the grind, the discipline. There is something good in men that really yearns for discipline.

Vince Lombardi

But Laws Don't Change Hearts

How many times have you heard it said, “Ah, but laws don't change hearts!”

The idea here is that we should *not* focus on changing the laws of the land because that doesn't work; instead, we should just witness to people, and *Christ* will change their hearts. We just need to preach the Gospel. Then over time we'll see social change and true justice. When people say this, I ask them if this is an idea that they came up with on their own after some research or if they are blindly repeating what they heard someone else say.

Note that we are not talking about changing your heart to accept Christ, only the Holy Spirit can do that. We are talking about if laws can influence your views and change your beliefs and thus bring about behavioral and social change?

So let's look at this carefully. Is it true that laws don't change hearts?

As you know, I am from India, yet for many years I kept refusing to do the Indian thing, which is, have my parents arrange a marriage for me with a rich beautiful lady doctor from India. My roommates would look at all the pictures my mom sent of these pretty, young and rich doctors or scientists and tell me that I was an idiot. Yet, I could never bring myself to allow them to arrange a marriage for me. I wanted to fall in love first.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Note that I am not in any way saying that arranged marriages are a bad idea. My sister had an arranged marriage and couldn't be happier. She and her husband are now completely in love and they both and we all feel that they are perfect for each other.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Fifteen

*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.*

The Declaration of Independence of the United States of America

Where Do Our Moral Values Come From? What Is The Source Of Our Republic's Law?

I am pro-life. Don't get me wrong," said the youth pastor, "I just don't think we should be forcing biblical values on non-Christians."

I was so shocked at this, that my jaw dropped (yes, it was...groan... 'shock and jaw').

We've discussed and hopefully convinced you that the main job of politicians is to codify laws. And I hope I've been able to convince you that despite what my Stanford Ph.D. friend *used* to think, in any government, one *must* legislate morality. We also said that the United States is a republic based on a *fixed primary moral code*.

We've also seen that the types of laws we make are *critical* to a nation. They have the capacity to change people's hearts, especially the hearts of children who grow up under them. *The moral fabric of any nation is reflected in its laws.*

I also hope you're convinced by now that, logically, one group *has* to force its moral values on other groups. So now we need to decide *which* group gets the upper hand. If we care about the poor, the widows and all kids, which is the group that we should want to *get* to do the forcing? Whose law is that "fixed primary moral law" that our republic should be based on. And just what is Natural Law? How's it different from biblical or pro-life laws?

Remember, I said earlier, "If we think our country is great *just* because it is a republic and not a democracy we'd be missing something. After all, both Rome and Nazi Germany *were* republics also." Yet, we can clearly see what happened there. Why did those systems destroy themselves? Well, if you study their history you'll see it was because the rights of certain people eroded over time and their governments started allocating goods as rights to others; both lead to oppression. How did this happen? It was because their primary moral law was not fixed or was not really moral to begin with. Remember, Hitler did nothing illegal; every act he took was fully *legal*. They were all just

horrendously *immoral*. In most cases the German legislature passed a special law to allow Hitler to do what he wanted to do. In others, the Courts reinterpreted the law for Hitler's agenda according to the "people's" mood. Many communist countries claimed to be republics too, yet most fell apart in less than 40 years; because in addition to their unfixed moral law, their economic systems were un-maintainable.

So, what is the primary difference between the U.S. and Nazi Germany or Rome? As indicated in the Declaration of Independence, the founding fathers intended our fixed primarily moral law to be what? ...It was to be the *unchanging* "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God."⁶⁰

The Laws of Nature and [the Laws] of Nature's God: What are these laws? How did we get them?

To the founding fathers and all Christians these laws come from God. But *our knowledge* of the laws can come from three sources.

1. The Revealed Laws: To protect us from pain (and show us the path to Salvation), God supernaturally revealed many of the laws through the Bible. We believe these revealed laws are far superior and fuller than the next two sources.
2. The Conscience Laws: Other laws are written in our conscience. We *all* have them, though over time we can learn to harden our hearts to some of them. We also refer to these laws as the Self-Evident Laws. See Romans 2:14-15.⁶¹
3. The Moral Laws of Nature, the Discovered Laws: The third set of laws, are laws that we can logically derive just from nature. And if you think about that, it makes sense. After all, if God exists, He would have created an orderly universe based on a system of laws, laws that we believe are part of His very Character. If we study Creation we'll learn how it works. Just like the natural laws of physics.

Let's look at that last set, the Discovered Laws (or the Discoverable Laws). As mentioned, in this last group, are the laws that even if we didn't learn them from God, we could eventually figure them out by rational thought. Even before Christ, men like Cicero (a contemporary of Julius Caesar), figured out that there *was* a Natural Law and it was ordained by *the* Supreme God *or* gods (Cicero just didn't know *which* God that was). Cicero realized that if you keep evaluating what prevented pain and worked and what caused pain and thus *didn't* work, you'd eventually be able to come up with an objective rational system of moral laws. They wouldn't be complete, but they could each be valid. As we'll see in the chapter titled "Why The Law Was Given: Introduction," moral laws are what keep us safe, they are the instructions for reducing pain. These Discoverable Laws were also called "The Natural Law." Obeying the Natural Law would allow any civilization to advance rapidly, be the most productive and reduce the causes of pain and suffering. When we violate these

⁶⁰ In case someone tries to claim that "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" is a deistic term, I recommend you refer them to "Defending the Declaration: How the Bible and Christianity Influenced the Writing of the Declaration of Independence," Gary T. Amos, Providence Foundation (1996). This excellent book decimates any such ridiculous notion showing about 4 centuries of Christian and Calvinistic use of those terms.

⁶¹ Romans 2: 14 *Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law, 15 since they show that the requirements of the law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts now accusing, now even defending them.*

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Sixteen

You ask me why I don't believe in god, I'll tell you. Last week there was an earthquake, and over 100 little children died. What sort of a mean evil god lets that happen?

*Paraphrase of an atheist's opening argument in a debate with
William Lane Craig. www.williamlanecraig.org*

It's a sad day for us all, for even today in an age of enlightenment, 50% of all humanity has a below average education. 50% of the people in the world earn below average paychecks, 50% of the world is heavier than the average and half of the entire world has a below average intelligence i.e. their IQs are below 100. We must change this!

My introduction to a talk titled "Christians need to start thinking critically again"

How Can God Exist When There Is So Much Evil In The World?

As the quote above indicates, many atheists start their attack on Christianity with the premise that if God existed, He would not allow death, suffering or evil to exist. What this person is really asking is: How can there be a *good* God when there is so much evil in the world? After all, if one was just arguing that God existed, we could try to argue the existence of a "bad" god who enjoys seeing people suffer, could we not?⁶²

So, the atheist claim is that, because there is evil and suffering, no good God could possibly exist. This, they say, means that either He is *unable* to stop the evil, meaning He isn't powerful; or that He is *unwilling* to stop evil, meaning He isn't good. Yet, we Christians claim that Objective Moral Values can't exist without God and we need Objective Moral Values in our nation, thus our nation needs God.

⁶² Note later in this book we will prove that in actuality, a bad god cannot exist. Which reminds me of a story: Once in a college debate I had our team say, "We are just arguing about the existence of a supreme being, not on his character or nature, so presume for all intents and purposes that 'the being' we are arguing for, enjoys torturing you personally." We then defined the basis of the debate on the Big Bang and the need for a non-mechanistic free will extra-dimensional first cause. This immediately eliminated 80% of the other side's argument, we literally saw them peel off the top 20 pages of their debate and toss it aside. They then had to scramble for points to debate us on. Naturally, we wrapped up the debate with a disclaimer saying we do believe that God is good and anyone who wanted to find out why was encouraged to talk to us afterwards. Of course, if the atheists had tried to argue that a bad God could *not* exist they'd have defeated their own argument.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Seventeen

You ask me why I don't believe in god, I'll tell you. Last week there was an earthquake, and over 100 little children died. What sort of a mean evil god lets that happen?

Paraphrase of an atheist's opening argument in a debate with William Lane Craig. www.williamlanecraig.org

Can Moral Values Come From Sources Other Than God?

I want to take a quick pause here and remind ourselves why we are going through this. We are trying to show that true morals cannot exist without God. And in the same way the *discovery* and *comprehension* of those true morals is best done by those who *acknowledge* God. Today we will attempt to do that.

Now since we've already seen that all laws are based on moral values; and that these laws are going to be critical to our children and grandchildren's well-being; and that laws change hearts. I hope we realize that if we care about society we will care that men and women of God *are* the ones making the laws of your society. Pastors should especially care about this shouldn't they? For they are the ones that usually have to deal with the heartbreaking consequences of bad laws. Besides how heartless would your pastor be to not care if laws were being made that was going to cause people to suffer.

Maybe there are no objective morals

Some atheists abandon the "God doesn't exist because of evil" argument that we read about yesterday and instead argue that all moral values are merely our *current* preferences and thus there is no objective morality. And in truth, if there is no God, then all our moral values really *are* just preferences. But here's the catch for the person who tries to argue this. Any atheist who tries to argue that moral values are merely preferences will be forced to admit that it *was* morally acceptable to enslave Africans in the past because it was society's choice back then to do so.

I was once in a FaceBook argument with a person who was very relativistic and thus morally liberal. He stated that there were no objective morals and even mocked my saying that "torturing babies for fun" was an objective moral value. He said he *personally* wouldn't ever torture babies for fun, but who was he to make that decision for others and thus morals were not objective. I was stuck.

Just then another friend came on and essentially said this, "That's despicable! Can you give me one good reason for *any* human anywhere in time

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Eighteen

I'm not a Christian because I don't need all that guilt.

A security guard at Advanced Micro Devices (while I was working there in the 80's).

Heaven's Just a Sin Away.

Country Music Song: The Kendalls, 1996

Western religions have spent millennia inflicting shame, guilt, repression, and punishment upon human sexuality -- especially women's sexuality.

Council for Secular Humanism⁶³

Why The Law Was Given: Introduction

The problem with you right wing fundamentalist Christians is that you want to force *your* close-minded intolerant morals down *our* throats! Why don't you mind *your own* business and keep *your* morals to *yourself*! What two consenting adults do in the privacy of their own home is none of *your* business and certainly none of the state's business."

I was doing one of my favorite things, debating non-Christians on line. I always make sure I'm in a controlled environment though, as debating on un-moderated sites is not worth the hassle. This person was quite angry because I'd been discussing same-sex marriage. Since we were moderated, he used no bad words but went on to attack my statistics, my motivations and my character.

So far we've been talking about morality and the laws of man and God. I've been saying Christians need to be part of the law making process of a secular government like that of the United States, but did my online nemesis have a valid point?

Does it even make sense for us to be imposing our Judeo-Christian moral values on non-Christians and non-Jews? Maybe we should just observe them in our families, and that would be enough.

To address this, we need to figure out a few things:

First, we need to figure out why the moral laws were given by God. Are they only applicable to Christians? What about social groups or cultures or even governments?

Second, we need to determine what the actual moral laws are – that is,

⁶³ [www.secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=library &page=haught_17_4](http://www.secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=library&page=haught_17_4)

is “don’t eat pork” a moral law and if not, how do we differentiate?

Third, if the moral laws are violated and we are imposing them on non-Christians, what sort of punishments should accompany them? Clearly, we don’t think we should be stoning people who eat pork or work on Saturdays.

Fourth, we need to figure why societies made any laws at all to begin with. What were each society’s purposes and goals for the laws?

In the next few chapters, we’ll break all of these down and hopefully answer all those questions to your satisfaction.

Now I’m quite sure that once we start to talk about this in detail, all of us will immediately understand that it’s obvious why the laws were given and why they are what they are. But for some reason we never seem to factor that into our discussion with non-believers or into our own thoughts about politics. And to tell the truth many of us have never really given it much thought. *I* certainly hadn’t until someone challenged me.

Why did God give us the laws and why do most non-believers think God's laws are oppressive?

As can be seen from the quotes at the beginning of this chapter, most skeptics, non-Christians and many non-“Christian Worldview” Christians believe that the moral laws of God were made by some ruling class or sexually repressed priests to oppress us. And this may make sense if you view it from a non-Christian, non-God believing viewpoint. After all, if there is no God and we are being compelled to follow restrictive rules that seem to have been designed to prevent us from enjoying ourselves, what thinking person would not object? However, I believe I can show, that this is a close-minded and in fact small-minded view. These people are not looking at the big picture and are certainly not looking at it with maturity or experience.

If we put aside our biases and look at this rationally, we can immediately figure out, even from a humanistic perspective, why most moral laws exist. First, let’s look at our *own* U.S. laws and see if we can glean anything that would apply to God’s laws.

When a group of senators or representatives (or even misguided judges) come up with a new law, what is their motivation? It could be so that they can manipulate the nation to gain power or money. But, if we were to assume the best of our legislature, we would assume that they were making those laws for the *good* of society.

Mary-Katherine’s first trip home

While I was writing this book, our own lovely daughter Mary-Katherine was born. Yet, before I could bring my own amazingly cute⁶⁴ daughter home, the hospital handed me a piece of paper. It looked very official and told me that I’d have to make sure that her very first journey in a car was in a state approved regulation car seat that had been installed to specific standards. If I failed to do this...well the consequences were ominous.

Now let me ask you this: Why did my state legislature decide that they needed a law requiring that babies be put in restrictive rear-facing car seats –

⁶⁴ Yes, she is indeed amazingly cute. Go to www.JesusIsInvolvedInPolitics.com to see a picture.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Twenty

BARTLET: *I like your show. I like how you call homosexuality an “abomination!”*

JACOBS (Dr. Laura-like radio psychologist seated nearby): *I don't say homosexuality is an abomination, Mr. President. The Bible does.*

BARTLET: *Yes it does. Leviticus!*

JACOBS: *18:22.*

BARTLET: *Chapter and verse. I wanted to ask you a couple of questions while I had you here...Here's one that's really important, because we've got a lot of sports fans in this town. Touching the skin of a dead pig makes one unclean. Leviticus 11:7. If they promise to wear gloves, can the Washington Redskins still play football? Can Notre Dame? Can West Point? Does the whole town really have to be together to stone my brother John for planting different crops side by side? Can I burn my mother in a small family gathering for wearing garments made from two different threads? Think about those questions, would you?*

The West Wing TV script (which was lifted from an urban legend email by the writers)

Why The Law Was Given: Do We Need To Follow All Those Laws About Pork Or Stoning People?

Ah,” the angry atheist arrogantly said to me, “Yes, you’re the kind of person that wants us to listen to God’s laws, the God who says slavery is good, who says we should stone people for working on Saturday and who thinks that gays should be executed.”

I’d just sat through a debate at Stanford University watching Christopher Hitchens get decimated by Jay Richards of the Discovery Institute. Hitchens had spent his time on stage not responding to a single debate issue. Instead he’d spent his allotted minutes telling everyone what large male organs he had, how he hated Mormons and how all Christians were idiots and making a crude sexual jokes along the way. Jay had stuck to the topic and delivered a very systematic statement about why God existed and the ideas behind Intelligent Design. One of these arguments was the existence of objective moral values.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ If Objective Moral Values exist then God exists. Objective Moral Values do exist so God exists. See <http://www.leaderu.com/offices/billcraig/docs/washdeba-craig1.html>. Read all his debates. It’s worth the time and will equip you to evangelize using facts and logic.

After the debate, I'd gone up on stage to talk to Jay⁶⁶ and had gotten dragged into an argument with a very belligerent atheist. He was wearing a very faded "Silicon Valley Atheists" T-shirt and seemed primarily angry at Hitchens for doing such a lousy job. (Of course he used different language.) I'd made the mistake of asking him what Hitchens could have said to refute Jay. Instead of a response, he launched into attack mode. It seemed unrelated to my question, but later, on the internet, I found out that this was his standard spiel. It was obviously rehearsed. But don't think he's the exception; this is a standard issue that many non-Christians have when you start to witness to them. It would be unloving not to have a valid and logical response to them.

Whenever we talk about the law, we naturally run into these sorts of complaints. Many of my friends add "But wait, doesn't the Old Testament also have the weird dietary laws and even weirder laws about not patching old clothes with new cloth and so on?" Their conclusion is that the Old Testament does not apply anymore.

Or we get the ignorant ramblings of an email letter which was plagiarized by TV show writers of *The West Wing* to try and shame people who believe the Bible is God's Word as shown in this chapter's heading quote.⁶⁷

Since we are not living in a Jewish theocracy, our country is not under every one of the laws of Moses.⁶⁸ So, my non-Christian readers let me put your minds at ease. At no point are we insisting that every one of those Old Testament laws are to be reinstated in our society or that they all have legal power today. Not even my God-fearing Jewish friends want this.

However, as we've often said in this book, there is a valid case for analyzing these laws and seeing what common sense guidance we can glean from them. So while they don't have legal power in our country, they do have great advisory value for legislating the "lesser" laws. In a later chapter I will propose some guidelines that we should (and have used in the past) to arrive at our "lesser" laws.

But now, let us look at the Old Testament laws, since the question is

⁶⁶ I became friends with Jay when I'd hosted him for our August Apologetics Speaker Series at our local churches. Pastors and student leaders, if you ever need a great speaker on Intelligent Design or the concepts of the Free Market, let me heartily endorse Jay Richards. www.discovery.org. Say Neil sent you.

⁶⁷ For a point by point rebuttal of the nonsensical claims of *The West Wing*, see the response by Hank Hanegraaf of the Christian Research Institute (CRI) at: www.mastershouse.org/issues_&_answers/homosexuality_hanagraaf2.htm

⁶⁸ Now we understand that we are now under the Laws of Christ. Gal 5:18 says... if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the Law.

But does that mean we can do anything we want? Not at all. If we are led by the Spirit of God, then we won't do things of the flesh. And what are they? Paul tells us clearly:

Gal 5:19 Now the deeds of the flesh are evident, which are: immorality, impurity, sensuality, 20 idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, outbursts of anger, disputes, dissensions, factions, 21 envying, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these, of which I forewarn you, just as I have forewarned you, that those who practice such things will not inherit the kingdom of God.

And what are the consequences if we are led by the Spirit?

Gal 5:22 But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, 23 gentleness, self-control; against such things there is no law.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Twenty-six

“go-ange yata loma tata sahasra vatsara, go-vadhi raurava-madhye pace niranta”

Translation: Cow killers and cow eaters are condemned to rot in hell for as many thousands of years as there are for each hair on the body of every cow they eat from.

Sri Caitanya Caritamrita adi lila, chapter 17 verse 166 Caitanya Mahaprabhu⁶⁹

But We Shouldn't Just Impose Our Laws Blindly On Others

Imagine that one day some of my old Muslim college friends from the Middle East came to the United States to settle down. Assume that they eventually became a majority in a particular city and decided that since the Islamic cultural and moral values indicate that women should cover their hair at all times, they wanted to make that an American law. How many of us would accept that?

None of us would, and we'd fight against it. Why? Because as far as we are concerned just because *their* religion teaches them to cover women's hair it does not mean that we should do so. It is not *our* moral value.

Now imagine a different scenario. It's the early 1800's, a Jewish man living in our European town tries to convince us that we should all wash our hands after touching sick or dead people.

“This is the law of Moses,” he tells us. Yet we ignore them. It's not *our* moral value we say.

And lest we think that in the 1800's they washed their hands after touching dead people, we would not be up to date on our history of hygiene. They didn't.

Yet, the orthodox Jew is insistent and desires greatly to convince us Gentiles. So he decides to do a scientific and statistical study. Over the next few months he shows us in his study how washing hands reduces disease and death. So even though we have yet to believe in parasites, viruses, or bacteria (not discovered till the late 1800's), we *discover* a law of nature and thus pass a *legal* law that says food preparers and medical practitioners must wash hands

⁶⁹ www.bhagavad-gita.org/Articles/holy-cow.html

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Thirty

Who will rise up for me against the evildoers? Who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?

Psalm 94:16

If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the truth of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing him. Where the battle rages, there the loyalty of the soldier is proved, and to be steady on all the battlefield besides is mere flight and disgrace if he flinches at that point.

Attributed to Martin Luther (not King)⁷⁰

He is saying that if we avoid the very conflict point that the devil is attacking, we are not confessing Christ. That toughest, most unpopular and most contested issue is precisely where we prove our loyalty to God.

But The Church Needs To Focus On Starving Kids And Not On Same-Sex Marriage Or Abortion!

The Church and the Moral issues

Looking at some of the latest magazine articles from Christians on both sides of the political spectrum, there seems to be discontent with many about so-called “Christian Right Wing” organizations. I have seen this in magazines and in publications. Of special note are comments by Jim Wallis (the self-described member of the “Christian Left”) who has written many books about Christians in politics (most of which I’ve read diligently). Interestingly, he and I agree on the idea that Christians should be involved in politics, but that’s where the similarity ends. Wallis contends that Christians should focus on “social” issues, but not moral issues. He and other left-leaning Christians argue that we should follow Christ’s lead and not try to impose our morals on America by trying to stop same-sex marriage, adultery, divorce, or abortion. Instead, they say, we should address hunger, poverty, injustice, and racism.

When I brought up this topic with my gorgeous wife,⁷¹ she looked at me quizzically and asked, “*Is there a difference?*” That is a great question! Is there a difference between moral and social issues?

⁷⁰ Most probably a paraphrase of *Weimar Ausgabe Briefwechsel* 3, 81f from a 19th Century novel, *The Chronicles of the Schoenberg Cotta Family*, Elizabeth Rundle Charles, (Thomas Nelson, 1864)

⁷¹ She really is gorgeous. I’m not just saying this to gain favor with her.

What is Morality? Why were the laws given? Revisited

As we've already discussed, as Christians we realize that all moral issues are "moral" because they have *consequences*. God gave us moral laws not to take the fun out of life, but to provide instructions on how to live well⁷² and not hurt others or ourselves. To drum it in: Sin is not sin *just* because God said so. There are *reasons* why He said so. He said so because when we commit sins, we will hurt ourselves and others. God told us what sin was because He loves us and wants us to be safe.

Remember *He is not capricious, and His Law is not capricious.*⁷³

It is easy to look at trends like adultery and No Fault Divorce and see how they hurt our society. Broken families are one of the major causes of poverty, hunger, and violence.

It is a simple analysis. Moral issues, abortion, adultery, and divorce lead to the breakdown of the family, which leads to more of the above ills. Maladjusted kids have kids who get further messed up.⁷⁴ A vicious cycle feeds on itself. It takes only one generation to foul up a civilization, and it may take tens of generations to heal it, if that is possible at all. Many nations simply have died, relegated to the dustbins of history.

This is why God said adultery and divorce are bad. His rules for living are not "old-fashioned moral values," just there for His pleasure or for tradition or to avoid us from having fun, that when disobeyed, have no consequences. When God said disobedience would result in generations of curses, this is what He was talking about!

The argument on by many fiscal and moral liberals is that we Christians should be addressing hunger, poverty, injustice and racism, not same-sex marriage or abortion. But, as we've shown, godly laws and morals regarding adultery and divorce have a *direct* effect on the first three of their favorite causes. ***That is, there would be far less hunger, poverty and injustice if people respected God and obeyed His Moral commandments with regard to marriage and the sanctity of all life.*** After all, if a pre-born human is of no value and can be aborted, why should one worry about a post-born human? Also, we have already clearly shown that it was precisely *Christians* who have done the most to try to eradicate the fourth issue, racism.⁷⁵

In other words, Wallis does not want to fix the flawed laws that cause

⁷² Remember that we've already established that God's laws apply to all men, saved or unsaved. If the unsaved adhere to his law, they and their societies will also be blessed physically.

⁷³ © 2007. This statement would make a good T-shirt, giving you many opportunities to witness when people ask what you mean by that. Just make sure you know why the law was given. "*God is not capricious, and His Law is not capricious*" also works but may intimidate some from asking questions.

⁷⁴ Yet, it would be fallacious to assume that if no divorces occurred, none of these social ills would exist. We are fallen people. Yet, as we have statistically and rationally shown, the increase in divorce is tied to the increase in these social ills. Similarly, No Fault Divorce has led to more divorces and its subsequent consequences. Same-sex marriage is expected to decrease the number of married households, devalue marriage in general, and cause more social problems. All bad laws have large social and unjust consequences. The Bible articulates this often when it talks about rulers who do not fear God.

⁷⁵ Yes, this is historically true. Christians have been the most active in reducing and eliminating slavery and racism when you count the number of people who did not suffer under it but fought for its eradication. And you can't argue that evangelical Christians have enslaved people more than any other religion. Historical evidence does not support that assertion.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Thirty-one

“The poor are not statistics,” Rabbi Jackie Moline said. “Whatever one thinks of Congressman Ryan’s ideas, it is unimaginable to look into the face of a child who would go hungry without government assistance and say, ‘Sorry — we need to reduce the deficit.’”

*Fiscal liberals attacking budgets that ask for responsible spending.
They have a preconceived idea about who is responsible to help the poor.*

*Jesus was the first socialist, the first to seek a better life for mankind.
Mikhail Gorbachev, as quoted in the Daily Telegraph (June 16, 1992)*

Is Jesus A Socialist? Part I

I have a picture on my computer. It’s of a group of protesters at a rally. One young lady is holding up a very large sign that says, “Jesus was a Socialist!”

While we may think the sentiment is admirable and many liberation theologians would like us to believe that it is true, the reality is it’s a complete misunderstanding of what our Lord told us to do.

Remember how we discussed in an earlier chapter (*What about the Sermon on the Mount?*) how there is no logical way to apply the Sermon on the Mount to governments. It was directed to us as *individuals*. Imagine again how ridiculous it would be if you went to a judge because someone had assaulted and mugged you, and the judge insisted that we follow Christ’s admonition so you were now legally obliged to let the mugger hit your other cheek and take your clothes. Those with a limited understanding of the Bible tend to make the same mistake when they look at all the other teachings of our Lord. The complaint that I hear over and over again is that Jesus told us to love our neighbors. Thus the conclusion they come to is that we should collect taxes and feed the poor with that money. We should then raise more taxes and give to the needy in the form of free healthcare and housing. It would be the most loving thing to do. It’s what Jesus would want us to do.

Now I fully agree, Jesus did say, you and I should give to the poor, take care of others, sacrifice for our neighbors who aren’t even related to us, provide medical assistance to the stranger, food to the hungry and shelter to the homeless, and we should visit the prisoners.

*But He said **you and I** should do it.* James 1:27 says, “*Religion that our God our Father accepts ...is this: to look after orphans and widows.*”

Note it clearly says “*Religion*” not Government. *Jesus never said the government should take care of the unfortunate.* He said, “*You, the individual in your faith and in your church, follow me.*” He said, “*You do as I tell you to*

PAGES SKIPPED....

Day Thirty-seven

“People who put economics over moral values are generally known as prostitutes, drug dealers or thieves.”

Anna Mammen, 2001

The purpose of government is very, very narrow scripturally. It isn't to help the poor. It isn't to redistribute wealth.

Gregory Koukl, Prostituting the Vote⁷⁶

You call this job creation? Are you serious? A government job is negative job growth. It's five times worse than job growth. Because for every government job you create, you have to create five private sector jobs just to pay that salary. If congress created 100,000 government jobs, that means we are half a million more jobs in the hole than when we started.

Me, on a rampage on FaceBook

How Then Shall We Vote?

I had just graduated from college with my Master's degree in Electrical Engineering and Solid State Physics. I had just moved to Sunnyvale, CA. I was 22, Christian and a headstrong liberal. Then I got my first paycheck. The shock of seeing Uncle Sam, Mother California, Sister Santa Clara County and numerous other entities I could not fathom, take away 40% of my pay, nearly made me a conservative overnight. You know how it goes. But I was not a U.S. citizen then. I didn't even have a green card. (They're not green, by the way; they're pinkish). I was an H1-B. That meant I had a visa that lets you work in the U.S. But I couldn't vote, so I was experiencing what is commonly known as “taxation without representation.”

Now you may well be thinking, “The reason you became a conservative was because you were greedy and mean spirited and didn't want poor people taking your money.” But this would be far from the truth. I'd been brought up in a giving family, so synonymous with my getting a paycheck was the habit of giving. But *I* wanted to decide who to give to, not let some government official do it for me.

Over the next few years, while attending an evangelical church, I started looking at moral issues, looking carefully at social issues, getting into big long discussions with my conservative and liberal friends, reading and arguing passionately. I came kicking and screaming due to the overwhelming logic and reason into the conservative camp. The only thing conservative about me before that time were my clothes and my belief in Christ. Tony Compolo would have loved me back then. And in fact, it still wasn't until the early 90's

⁷⁶ www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5510

and after I lost about three long and involved arguments about guns that, I finally became a believer in the 2nd Amendment. Prior to that, I was actually anti-gun and thought the 2nd Amendment was stupid.

Every year or so, my roommates received thick election booklets in the mail. They usually ignored them. One day I decided to read one and almost had a heart attack. Government officials were trying to pass some sort of bond. The more I read, the more I realized that a bond was worse than a credit card debt. You borrow money now and pay almost three times the amount later. That meant more of my hard-earned money being spent by a group of folks who made four times what I made. Any way I looked at it, it sounded like more taxes to me. I told my roommates they had to vote against it. They then asked me what I thought of the other propositions and how they should vote on them. They created a monster.

Within a few years, I had started writing “Neil’s Biased Voting Recommendations.” Although he had invented the Internet and I worked for a company with Internet access, Al Gore had not made email easily available to my friends yet, so I’d make a few printouts for them, and they would make copies for other friends. For over six years while I could not personally vote, my voting recommendations were being read and presumably followed by many voters. I’d get phone calls from folks I didn’t know, asking me how I thought they should vote. When email became commonly available, people began forwarding and printing my recommendations for others. The secondary effects were not huge but it seemed that my opinions were being parlayed into about a hundred votes.

I also got a few critics. One person blasted me for trying to create sheep who blindly voted as I told them too. He told me I should not be imposing my ideas on other people. (I asked him if he was imposing *that* idea on me. That ended the interaction for some reason.) But as a consequence, I had disclaimers that said, “I would rather you did your own research, but if you don’t have time, here is my research.” I also always told people why I recommended something, so they could freely decide if they agreed with me. I am not interested in blind faith voters any more than I am interested in blind faith Christians.

So how *should* we vote? The voting guidelines

Here are some biblical, logical and Christian Worldview guidelines that we can apply in almost all arenas. If you agree with and act on them, I believe we can effect some great changes in our nation. You’ll notice that some of these repeat various overlapping themes.

1. Vote biblically.
2. Vote for morality over economics (morals over money). For example, do not vote for someone who will generate jobs but is pro-choice or socialistic. You are hurting society and your kids, *and* violating God’s laws.
3. Remember being *just* fiscally conservative is self-defeating as we showed. The breakdown of the family and the moral issues will soon become unsolvable fiscal issues. We want a Fiscal *and* Moral Conservative. Vote for the former only as a last resort.
4. Never vote for any law that would “stick it” to a group of individuals who are not doing anything immoral. It’s mean-spirited, ungodly, and reminiscent of what the

Nazis did and eventually it will bite *you*. Remember, when income taxes were first sold to the Americans in 1913, they were told, only the filthy rich would pay them. They started at 3%. Yet, in a few short years, tax rates were as high as 90% and everybody was forced to pay taxes. This has been repeated many times in the last few years. Think luxury taxes, or recently “Cadillac health plan taxes” or even unfair taxes on an isolated group of people like doctors. The National Socialists did this to any group of people they did not like, like the Jews.

5. Vote for long term results over short term results.
6. Make sure the person you vote for, knows the difference between God given unalienable rights and “goods.” A right is something that we are given from God and is *not* based on someone labor. Goods are things that are the product of someone’s work. You have a right to your own goods or the goods you have negotiated and paid for, but you have no right to anyone else’s goods. For instance food, healthcare, clothing and a house, are all goods. No one has an unalienable right to these. The only right they have is the freedom to strive to gain these goods without unfair rules, regulations or oppression. A government that allocates goods as rights will eventually have to enslave some or all men fiscally or physically to ensure an ample supply of those goods.
7. When voting for a proposition, ask yourself: Is this proposition allocating goods as rights? If so vote “No.” Even if you really wish you could have those “goods.”
8. Do not vote for the public to pay for things like a ball park. A ball park is a “good” not a right. It’s not the government’s job to provide it. It’s wrong for you to force others to pay for that good. If ball parks were such good investments then private venture would have paid for it. Imagine if it was some politician’s cronies trying to force the government to buy them a bigger factory because they would hire more workers which would need more stores and homes etc.? Where do you draw the line? When governments get involved in private enterprise they mess things up. Governments should give tax breaks to everyone equally and stay away.
9. Vote for lower taxes, higher taxes put a burden on parents and force them to have to both work. This, as we have seen unfortunately increases crime, anger and dysfunctional kids. Higher taxes also reduce the money available to churches for the work of God. Churches are who should providing welfare for the needy. High taxes kill jobs. Recently a medium sized company in California decided to move their headquarters to the Netherlands (how ironic). Why? Because the Dutch government promised that their tax rate would go as low as 10% compared to the over 35% it is here. This would move about 300 jobs to the Netherlands for the company’s finance and administration departments not to mention all the rent and tax money from those 300 jobs and entertainment budgets and so on. The US and California need to incentivize these folks to stay, not chase them away.
10. Do not vote for bonds. They are just an expensive way to borrow money. If your government cannot afford something even if it’s critical, like any responsible company or person, it has to cut its spending somewhere else. In a company, if you have to spend more on R&D, you spend less on the Christmas party. In a family if you spend extra for medicine, you eat out less. You don’t just go into debt. That’s sheer folly.
11. Don’t blindly believe the stories the media tells about people. Remember Dan Rather who blindly parroted a false story about Bush, because Dan never did any research? Remember how the talking heads in the media mocked Reagan and said he was clueless, but later when his journals were released we found out that not only was he shrewd but he had a total grasp of constitutional issues? These were all totally made up. The media is supposed to investigate and dig out the truth *after* they’ve researched it. But they don’t, because they have an agenda. So don’t be

- manipulated. There are a lot more lies and half-truths in the media today, especially since they have no moral values themselves except their agenda. They lie knowingly. For evidence of this see Bernard Goldberg's book, *Bias: A CBS Insider Exposes How the Media Distort the News*, Regnery Publishing 2001. By the way, Bernie is a liberal, so you *are* getting an inside view.
12. Do not vote to give any powers to a "good" person or administration that you would not want a "bad" person to have. Any power you give to a president that you like will be a power that a president that you don't like, will also have. Remember that all men have a sin nature and eventually one will be elected who will use that power that you gave good men, for evil.
 13. Vote for Christians or Jews who have a *voting* record that coincides with the moral heart of God not the charity heart of God, because justice, not charity is the job of government. However, it is of great value to watch what each person has *personally* done charitably in their own lives. It is a true test of the character of a man to see how he proposes to take and use *your* money for good works but refuses to use his *own*.
 14. Remember, and this is ever so important: We all know fakers, and hypocrites. Anybody and I mean, *anybody* can use "Christianese" and sound like a Christian. What you have to do is look at their *Worldview*. Do they have a Christian/Godly Worldview? How do they view the world? How do they live their lives? Do they speak the words but not live the life? Do they really believe? It will be obvious in their lives. Many politicians are very good at using Christian language and terms, but a simple survey of their past actions usually reveals that they do not really believe what God-fearing Orthodox, Evangelicals, Catholics and Jews believe. They did not have a Godly Worldview. As a result, when they take office they immediately appoint anti-Christian individuals and take actions that were immoral and unbiblical. Do not presume that a man will govern any differently than what he truly believes.
 15. Look to see if they fail any of the litmus tests i.e. are they:
 - a. Pro-abortion or pro-choice; pro-homosexuality or heterosexual immorality in any of its guises
 - b. Pro-socialism or pro-income redistribution or pro handouts vs. Tough Love
 - c. Multi-cultural to the point of hating America: While they should respect other cultures, do they believe in preserving the American culture and its Judeo-Christian traditions or are they at the core anti-American and anti-Jew or anti-Christian? Remember I'm an immigrant saying this. I came to America because it *was* America. I don't want it to become India or Sudan or even Switzerland.
 - d. Anti-founder: Do they despise our founders? Do they even believe America was founded by Christians who believed in the Moral Law (even if they are Jewish)? If they don't, then they are a threat to the traditions and future of America as a great nation. This includes the English language. Again, remember that I'm saying this as someone of East Indian origin born and brought up in Africa and the Middle East. I've lived in other countries, some that have split over or are killing each other based on cultural divides defined by language. You *don't* want to emulate them.
 - e. Anti-History: Do they try to rewrite the history of this nation's foundation?
 - f. Have they cheated on their wives and have not genuinely repented?
 16. Do not vote for any person who will *not* vote his own conscience, or who cannot articulate the difference between a democracy and a republic and why a democracy is so dangerous.
 17. Remember the sin nature of man and tough love. Do not vote for anything that allows people to indulge their sin nature without consequences– be it laziness,

sexual immorality, or whatever. True love will be strong and stern and move people out of dependency on the Government and handouts.

18. Remember that biblically, the purpose of government is not to redistribute wealth but to protect citizens from evil people and provide justice. There is no way to biblically support socialism, you can biblically support your own donations, but you can never biblically support the concept of forcing others to donate. So never vote for government handouts in any form. If you see starving people, take up a voluntary donation or work with existing organizations. Do not subsidize a bond or raise taxes on others.
19. Do not vote or support any politician who has ever added “earmarks” into a proposed budget, even if they helped your state financially. That politician has stolen from other people to pay you. This is not just.
20. Make sure they believe that it’s the Church’s place and the voluntary giving of kind individuals to provide goods to those who are unable to get those for themselves, not the governments’.
21. Make sure they love the Constitution of the United States, and will protect it and observe it. Do not vote for anyone who does not understand how the Constitution is to be interpreted or why it is “living” through amendments not through unelected judges.
22. Make sure they are proud to be an American and love this country. This is obvious. Governments are created to preserve the nation. Any election of a person who would destroy the nation will hurt us all and violates the very reason we created that government to begin with. Don’t vote for anyone who wants to equalize or diminish America in *any* way.
23. Make sure they are for smaller government and for reducing the size of government and giving more power to the states and individuals.
24. Make sure they are not past members of any sort of socialist party. Unless they’ve publically recanted all their stances, explained why they changed their mind and you see evidence that they have written and legislated in a different way since then.
25. Make sure you know whom their friends are and what their friends believe. Remember the old proverb? A man is known by the company he keeps.
26. Always be willing to vote for the lesser of the evils. Remember that as Christians we know that there are no perfect men. Thus if Billy Graham was running against Hitler and you vote for Billy, you’d still be voting for the lesser of two evils because Billy is not Jesus. But what if our favorite person is running, yet has no chance of winning? What if a vote for him or her would allow a worser of two evils into office. In such cases, we should always vote for the least evil that can win. Do not be fooled into thinking we are just called to do the right symbolic thing and let God figure out the rest. God requires us to use logic at all times.
27. And finally and most importantly, do they understand what the primary moral code of our republic is? Do they believe it is the Judeo-Christian moral code as documented in the Bible? Do they know what Natural Law is?

May I be so bold as to suggest that you copy and paste this list on your refrigerator every election season? If you want an easy to print and email version, that is being updated regularly go to

www.JesusIsInvolvedInPolitics.com/HowThenShallWeVote.pdf

PAGES SKIPPED....

August 15, 1789.

Mr. Sylvester [of New York] had some doubts...He feared it [the First Amendment] might be thought to have a tendency to abolish religion altogether...

Mr. Gerry [of Massachusetts] said it would read better if it was that "no religious doctrine shall be established by law."...

Mr. [James] Madison [of Virginia] said he apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that "Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law."...[T]he State[s]...seemed to entertain an opinion that under the clause of the Constitution...it enabled them [Congress] to make laws of such a nature as might...establish a national religion; to prevent these effects he presumed the amendment was intended...

Mr. Madison thought if the word "National" was inserted before religion, it would satisfy the minds of honorable gentlemen...He thought if the word "national" was introduced, it would point the amendment directly to the object it was intended to prevent.

First Amendment Debate, Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Gales & Seaton, 1834, Vol. I pp. 757-759, August 15, 1789)

Appendix I: What Can Churches Do Legally? & Other Questions

W

e've all heard of the "requirement" that church and government be separated. Most of us believe that the Constitution says somewhere that the Church must not be involved in politics. A successful businesswoman I know who claims to be a Christian⁷⁷, has even said, "It is morally wrong for a church to accept tax deductions and then ever make any sort of political commentary or moral condemnation of any law."

I hope this book has answered the silliness of the idea that the Church should not be involved politically. the Church cannot fail to be involved. It would be *immoral*, heartless and wicked for the Church *not* to be involved. the Church must be the conscience of the state.

Now let's see if it is *Constitutional* or legal for the Church to be involved politically. Jefferson, wrote the phrase:

"building a wall of separation between Church and State."

This phrase was used by a Supreme Court Justice in 1963 to halt prayer in schools. Since that time (and here is a great example of how laws change hearts), a majority of people think that the government and the Church cannot and should not mix. If we knew our history, however, we would realize that the First Amendment was a restriction on the federal government. It was never a restriction on the states and it

⁷⁷ I say "claims" because I grilled her once and it was revealed that her beliefs were really Universalistic.

PAGES SKIPPED....

Legality alone is no guide for a moral people. There are many things in this world that have been, or are, legal but clearly immoral. Slavery was legal. Did that make it moral? South Africa's apartheid, Nazi persecution of Jews, and Stalinist and Maoist purges were all legal, but did that make them moral?

Walter Williams⁷⁸

All [laws], however, may be arranged in two different classes. 1) Divine. 2) Human... But it should always be remembered that this law, natural or revealed, made for men or for nations, flows from the same Divine source: it is the law of God.... Human law must rest its authority ultimately upon the authority of that law which is Divine.

James Wilson, a signer of the Constitution and U.S. Supreme Court Justice⁷⁹

To instance in the case of murder: this is expressly forbidden by the Divine... If any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it we are bound to transgress that human law... But, with regard to matters that are... not commanded or forbidden by those superior laws such, for instance, as exporting of wool into foreign countries; here the... legislature has scope and opportunity to interpose.

Sir William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England^{80,81}

Appendix III: How Then Shall We Legislate?

W

e have to legislate morality. We've proven that over and over in this book. In addition, if we care about justice and our grandchildren we have to have laws based on God's moral values.

But how do we do that? Do we legislate from the Bible or from the Koran or some other religious document? Should we come at it from the other side and abandon all religion, appeal to only secular humanism? Do we legislate every single moral value and create a totalitarian state? Let's look at these.

What is the primary moral code of our republic?

As we have logically and carefully proven, the primary moral code of our re-

⁷⁸ <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1195301/posts>

⁷⁹ James Wilson, *The Works of the Honorable James Wilson*, Bird Wilson, editor (Philadelphia: Lorenzo Press, 1804), Vol. I, pp. 103-105, "Of the General Principles of Law and Obligation." As quoted by Dave Barton at www.wallbuilders.com/resources/search/detail.php?ResourceID=4

⁸⁰ Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (Philadelphia: Robert Bell, 1771), Vol. I, pp. 42.

⁸¹ Earlier revisions of this book had a quote purportedly from George Washington or John Adams that said "The government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion." This was a line supposedly in the Treaty of Tripoli but was written by neither Adams nor Washington and it was only signed by Adams. Yet, both Adams and Washington's numerous other quotes indicate however that they did not believe this. See www.eadshome.com/JohnAdams.htm and christianity.about.com/od/independenceday/a/foundingfathers.htm. This casts doubt on if they indeed shared this conviction or intended to convey it. It was probably added by a local ambassador.

public *must* be the fixed Laws of Nature and Nature's God. God's immutable, transcendent moral law. There is no way to budge on this. It's logical and rational and can't be changed for cultural or social reasons. It cannot be changed due to precedence. The source for this law is the Judeo-Christian Bible. The portions of the Ten Commandments that deal with man's interaction with man comprise much of this foundational code. Unsurprisingly though, this moral code is shared on numerous (though not all) of its points by many people and cultures today and in past history. The influence today is due to the compelling nature of the Law and the work of Christian philosophers over time; *and* the very painful experience of history (the "Discovered Law") when nations and cultures have abandoned these laws. In addition, the Bible says the law is written in our hearts, so many people hold these values without realizing the source. Even some atheists like Bertrand Russell see value in the Judeo-Christian law and many other atheists believe in the unalienable rights of human beings. However we must not sleep as there are many movements today to strip certain individuals of rights or to give animals the same rights as humans or worse, to reduce humans to the value of animals.

But what about the lesser laws, the ones that our representatives are allowed to legislate? How do we come up with these laws?

Though we see that the primary moral law cannot be changed, there seems to be leeway on the lesser laws. The ones that our founder James Wilson said in the quote above was "Human Law," or as Blackstone says in the laws about "the exporting of wool." Let us spend some time understanding how to legislate these "lesser" laws.

Option 1. We should legislate these Human Laws *directly* from the Bible.

It may shock some readers (especially skeptics) to learn that I do *not* think we should be legislating these lesser laws *directly* from the Bible. Wait a minute! Am I contradicting myself? Didn't I say earlier that we should use the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God? Didn't I say the "Authority" can be proven to be the God of the Bible? I did indeed but here's the problem: it's not constitutional and it's dangerous.

I don't think there is a constitutional or biblical case for legislating these Human Laws *directly* from the Bible. And there is no logical or constitutional basis to legislate the Ceremonial, Civil or Judicial laws from the Bible, though they are useful as advisories. Nor is there any validity to be legislating those laws that were directed *not* to the government but to one of the other three groups i.e. the Church, the family, or the individual.

The Theocracy

Remember too, that the United States is *not* a theocracy, and we don't ever want it to be one. We have seen what can happen under a man directed theocracy, such as during the Spanish Inquisition, and worse. Many people, who came to America in the beginning, came fleeing religious persecution. They would no more want to be ruled by a Baptist theocracy than you or even most Baptists would. As we said earlier, we don't want a Christian Government, we want Christians in Government. Yet even when Christians legislate through religion, you can get twisted excesses.

We need a layer in between (that's *layer*, not lawyer), to protect both Christians *and* non-Christians from Theocrats. But this does not mean Christians should *not* be politically active. They should be very active because they are in tune with the

PAGES SKIPPED....

40 DAYS

TOWARDS A MORE GODLY NATION

*WHY ONLY CHURCHES CAN LEAD THE WAY
TO A
HAPPIER, HEALTHIER, SAFER, &
MUTUALLY PROSPEROUS AMERICA*

*SMALL GROUP
STUDY GUIDE*

NEIL MAMMEN

**RATIONAL FREE PRESS
AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION**

40 Days Towards A More Godly Nation

STUDY GUIDE

Introduction:

Welcome to the 40 Days Towards A More Godly Nation Study Guide. It's our hope to use this guide to teach those in the church critical concepts that every American should grasp so they may protect their children's future **and allow the US as a nation to continue to fulfill the Great Commission.**

These questions are provided merely as a suggestion to keep the discussion and learning moving. If you as a leader feel you can create more effective questions from the materials in the book, we encourage you to do so.

Guidelines to Bible Study:

When we study the Bible we are not at liberty to interpret what the Bible means to us. Why is this? Because the Bible is a history book, user's manual, a law book and a love letter all rolled into one. None of those functions depends on your view of the matter; they all depend on the Biblical Author's view of the matter as well as the facts that were relevant when the events described occur.

So don't ever ask "What does this passage mean to me?" Instead ask, "What was the author of this scripture passage trying to communicate to me?"

Where it applies to you would be how you can take what the author of the passages describes and apply the principles that are taught to your situation.

When dealing with a non-Biblical author and book like the book under study here, the same questions should be asked. What did the author intend to convey. However, the reader is also expected to ask themselves: Is this objectively true? Has the author made a mistake? Be wary to guard yourself from error.

If you want some guidance on starting a new group or leading your group, may we suggest this resources:

www.toolsformentoring.com/small-group/how-to.html

and

www.SmallGroups.com

Scope

This Study Guide is designed for 7 meetings with the first one being a simple potluck.

At the end of the 7 week session the group should evaluate if they wish to continue for another session and decide if they wish to expand the group, split the group into two, change the focus of the group to an Underwater Basket Weaving ministry, switch to a different book or end the meetings. If the group would like to study the topics in much finer detail may we recommend the book *Jesus Is Involved In Politics! Why aren't you? Why isn't your church?* Details are provided at the end of this study guide.

The General Format

There are various types of study groups. In some groups, people are diligent to read the assigned portions of the books ahead of time, in others, members may never get around to reading the assigned portions. This guide is designed to work even when people have not read the book. We do that by breaking the study into five sections, one of which (Section B) is a review time. The Review Time consists of a 20 minute video that covers some of the fundamental premises of the last weeks' readings.

The four Sections are:

A. IceBreaker

Everybody gets one minute to respond to a personal question. This is not a time to discuss but mainly to listen.

B. Review:

Watch the Video which summarizes parts of the reading material.

C. Discussion:

This is the foundation of the study. These questions are deep and intense and you may find folks disagreeing with the responses. This is perfectly fine, however as a leader do try to keep the disagreements one of intellect and not of emotions. Do remember too that there are wrong answers and leaders are expected to gently lead the group in the right direction. Asking questions that lead there are probably better than dictating answers. Leaders, keep the discussion flowing and ask probing questions. There are probably going to be more questions here than you may have time to answer. That's fine; it's not critical that you get through every question. Feel free to skip some and feel free to resurrect a particularly interesting question that you were unable to cover next week if you feel that it would be a fun topic. If you think of a better question feel free to add it or substitute it in.

D. Prayer for our Nation and Leaders

Pick certain leaders in our nation and certain critical issues and pray that God's Moral Will *will* come to pass.

E. Food and Fellowship

As in most small groups gather around the food and take some time at the end to get to know each other.

Goals

The goals of this book study are the following:

- 1.To learn how God has assigned the two different roles of government and the Church.**
- 2.To be able to teach others these concepts in a casual and interesting way.
- 3.To turn America back to the heart of God.
- 4.To preserve this great nation as a safe haven for our children and as a financial resource to spread the Gospel through missions.

Feel free to add your additional goals to this.

Week Zero

Meet and have a Potluck or BBQ

The discussion leader or someone they assign should call around and organize a potluck or BBQ for this first meeting. Do plan for child care if needed. Usually you can recruit some older teens to babysit and share the costs amongst just those who have kids, based on the number of kids they have.

The purpose of Week Zero is for everyone to meet and spend some time getting to know each other.

IceBreaker

After everyone has their food in hand, go around the group and introduce yourselves.

In your introduction answer the following questions:

1. Name,
2. Information about your family (married, kids etc)
3. Favorite food.
4. Least Favorite food
5. Where did you grow up?
6. Would you go back there? Why or why not?

When everyone is done, spend some time talking about the following:

1. What are your biggest fears about the situation in our nation?
2. Knowing what you know about the book, what would you like to learn in this Bible Study?

When you get home, if you plan to read at night, Day One's reading could start tonight. If you plan to read during the day, then Day One's reading could start tomorrow.

If you miss a day's reading, it's better to continue where you left off, rather than skipping any of the days as most of the concepts build on each other.

Our Group

On this page write the names, email address and contact phone numbers for the folks in your group.

But Jesus didn't get involved in politics. He didn't try to change the Roman laws. He said, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's and give to God what is God's." If Jesus didn't do it, then we shouldn't.
College Coed

Week One

Introduction

Session One covers the following chapters in the book

- Day 1 The Consequences of Inactivity*
- Day 2 Jesus Was Involved in Politics!*
- Day 3 What Happens When God Judges A Nation?*
- Day 4 Our Godly Constitution and Declaration of Independence*
- Day 5 Who Gives Us Our Rights?*
- Day 6 What are God Given Rights anyway?*
- Day 7 What then is the Purpose of Governments?*

IceBreaker *(please limit your answers to about 1 min each).*

Go around the group and answer the following question: *If you could wake up tomorrow in some political position anywhere in the world, what would you want it to be and what would you try to do with that power? Be as specific as you can. Do not feel that it has to be some immensely powerful position.*

Review: DVD 20 mins

Break: *Take a short break, have some refreshments*

Discussion Section: 60 mins.

The Discussion Section will take a varying amount of time to complete. Do let people bring up other questions that relate to the topic that maybe on their minds.

1. Could your Christian kids and grandchildren be subjected to a season of trials in the United States? What if someone suggests that this will be good for the Church? What effect will it have on the funding of missions? Is an Islamic type persecution of Christians something you want your kids to go through?

2. What could stop this slide into intolerance for Christians?
3. Who is Caesar for citizens of the USA? Do you all agree? Who is our governing authority?
4. Romans 13 says we are to submit to authorities because they are put there by God? What if the authorities were commanding that you kill babies? What if they were commanding that you not pray or that you subsidize the killing of innocents? Are there examples in the Bible when men of God disobeyed the authorities?
5. Is Jesus involved in politics today? Are there laws that grieve the Holy Spirit?
6. What is the job of Government according to the Declaration of Independence? Have we gone too far today? Why or why not?
7. What is the difference between Rights and Goods? Is healthcare a right? What happens if you assign goods as rights?
8. If you loved your neighbors what sort of laws would you want to see enacted? Should we care about Godly laws? Why or why not?
9. Other questions: If you have time, feel free to raise or discuss other questions or points you read in the book or relate to the topics discussed in the book.

Prayer:

Pick two leaders of the US and 3 issues that you think are the most important to address. Pray for God's Moral Will to pass in those circumstances and for those leaders to be used to do that. God's Moral Will is understood to be those things that obey his Moral Laws.

Food and Fellowship:

While you share food, make sure you understand what is happening in each other's lives.

As you leave today, ask yourself: How can I fit some of these concepts into a casual conversation with friends, family, fellow Christians and co-workers?

Week Two

Laws

Week Two covers the following chapters in the book

Day 8 Obvious Connections: Politics plus Lawmakers equal Laws

Day 9 Why is Interpreting the Law so Important?

Day 10 But You Can't Legislate Morality?

Day 11 But The Church Should Stay Out Of Politics! Besides, Christian Involvement In Politics Always Fails!

Day 12 The United States Is A Republic, Not A Democracy

Day 13 But Laws Don't Change Hearts

Day 14 It's Wrong To Force Your Moral Values On Others! Suicide Statements!

IceBreaker (*please limit your answers to about 1 min each*).

Go around the group and answer the following question: *Can you think of one law or rule that you had in your home that you hated while growing up but now really respect? Why did you change your mind?*

Review: DVD 20 mins

Break: *Take a short break, have some refreshments*

Discussion Section: 60 mins.

The Discussion Section will take a varying amount of time to complete. Do let people bring up other questions that relate to the topic that maybe on their minds.

1. Who makes the laws of our nation? Who executes them? What is the role of our judges? Is their job to make laws? What happens if they do?
2. Is it right to say that the constitution and the laws are perpetual contracts? What could happen to a nation that allows unelected lifetime tenured individuals to violate and arbitrarily change pre-existing contracts?

3. Why were the Founders so much against democracies? Why are democracies dangerous? What is the United States? Are there any weaknesses in the US system?
4. Why are the laws in other countries not relevant to the US Constitution or our existing laws?
5. What is the purpose of liberal colleges who give out PhDs in subjects like “The effect of Legislation on Cultural Values”. Do laws change hearts? Why or why not?
6. What is wrong with someone saying: It’s wrong to force your moral values on others?
7. What about when people say: There is no Absolute Truth? How do you respond to them?
8. Other questions: If you have time, feel free to raise or discuss other questions or points you read in the book or relate to the topics discussed in the book.

Prayer:

Pray for the President of our Nation. Pray for Christ to make Himself known to him.

Food and Fellowship:

While you share food, make sure you understand what is happening in each other’s lives.

As you leave today, ask yourself: How can I fit some of these concepts into a casual conversation with friends, family, fellow Christians and co-workers?

Week Three

Moral Values

Week Three covers the following chapters in the book

Day 15 Where Do Our Moral Values Come From? What Is The Source Of Our Republic's Law?

Day 16 How can God exist when there is so much evil in the world?

Day 17 How can God exist when there is so much evil in the world? Part II

Day 18 Why The Law Was Given: Introduction

Day 19 Why The Law Was Given: Is God Capricious? Is God Good?

Day 20 Why The Law Was Given: Do We Need To Follow All Those Laws About Pork Or Stoning People?

Day 21 But What About The Sermon On The Mount?

IceBreaker (please limit your answers to about 1 min each).

Go around the group and answer the following question: *Why do you think most non-Christians think God's moral laws listed in the Bible are oppressive?*

Review: DVD 20 mins

Break: Take a short break, have some refreshments

Discussion Section: 60 mins.

The Discussion Section will take a varying amount of time to complete. Do let people bring up other questions that relate to the topic that maybe on their minds.

1. Why can't Objective Moral Values come from the Masses? DNA? Or random accidents of nature? What two things are required for a value to become an objective moral value?
2. Can atheists be moral?
3. Are God's laws applicable to non-believers? Why or why not?
4. If God's laws are for our protection, would it be loving to let our nation legislate laws that are contrary to God's laws?
5. What's the best way to show that God must be good?
6. Should bad laws be something pastors are concerned about?
7. What are the four types of Laws? Which ones concern us?
8. Do all commandments apply evenly to all situations and

groups? What four types of audiences did Christ give commandments to?

9. Other questions: If you have time, feel free to raise or discuss other questions or points you read in the book or relate to the topics discussed in the book.

Prayer:

Pick two leaders of the US and 3 issues that you think are the most important to address. Pray for God's Moral Will to pass in those circumstances and for those leaders to be used to do that. God's Moral Will is understood to be those things that obey his Moral Laws.

Food and Fellowship:

While you share food, make sure you understand what is happening in each other's lives.

As you leave today, ask yourself: How can I fit some of these concepts into a casual conversation with friends, family, fellow Christians and co-workers?

Week Four

The Terrible Consequences of Sexual Sins

Week Four covers the following chapters in the book

Day 22 Why The Law Was Given: Why The Emphasis On Sexual Sins? Part I

Day 23 Why The Law Was Given: Why The Emphasis On Sexual Sins? Part II

Day 24 Why The Law Was Given: Other Sexual Sins

Day 25 Why The Law Was Given: Other Marriage Issues

Day 26 But We Shouldn't Just Impose Our Laws Blindly On Others

Day 27 The Consequences Of Bad Laws: A Quick Summary & Why We Must Elect Moral Conservatives: The Long Elevator Pitch

Day 28 But The Church Needs To Focus On Starving Kids And Not On Same-Sex Marriage Or Abortion!

IceBreaker (please limit your answers to about 1 min each).

Go around the group and answer the following question: *In your reading, did you learn any new facts? Which ones? What surprised you the most about the consequences of sexual sins?*

Review: DVD 20 mins

Break: Take a short break, have some refreshments

Discussion Section: 60 mins.

The Discussion Section will take a varying amount of time to complete. Do let people bring up other questions that relate to the topic that maybe on their minds. If you run out of questions feel free to talk about other things that people felt were important to understand.

Note: It's worth being able to do speak about many of the facts we learned about in this week's readings from memory, as it will allow you to communicate this wisdom to others winsomely.

1. Does it make sense that God would warn us exceedingly more about some sins verses others?
2. How do the consequences of sexual sins compare to the consequences of other sins?
3. Why does God hate divorce?

4. Are those in bad marriages stuck forever? Isn't divorce beneficial for women who are just not satisfied in their marriage? How about children?
5. Can you articulate why Polygamy or Polyandry can destroy a society?
6. Why is trying to find *just* a fiscal solution to our nation's problems almost a waste of time? Can you explain this to someone by yourself? It's very powerful if you can.
7. How do we respond to people who say we should be feeding the poor, not judging their sexual habits?
8. What happens if we try to blindly force our morals on others? Do we have to do that nowadays?
9. Other questions: If you have time, feel free to raise or discuss other questions or points you read in the book or relate to the topics discussed in the book.

Prayer:

Pray for organizations like the American Family Association and Family Research Council. Pray that God would bless them and use them greatly to strengthen America. Pray that God would lead us to become a more Godly Nation.

Food and Fellowship:

While you share food, make sure you understand what is happening in each other's lives.

As you leave today, ask yourself: How can I fit some of these concepts into a casual conversation with friends, family, fellow Christians and co-workers?

Week Five

Is Jesus a Socialist?

Week Five covers the following chapters in the book

Day 29 What Would Jesus Do?

Day 30 But The Church Isn't Focusing On Social Issues At All, We Are Lacking In Compassion

Day 31 Is Jesus A Socialist? Part I

Day 32 Is Jesus A Socialist? Part II

Day 33 Is Jesus A Socialist? Part III

Day 34 The Tragic Consequences Of Welfare

Day 35 Politics And Christians Of History

IceBreaker (please limit your answers to about 1 min each).

Go around the group and answer the following question: *Do you have a Christian Hero who was active politically? Why did you pick him or her?*

Review: DVD 20 mins

Break: Take a short break, have some refreshments

Discussion Section: 60 mins.

The Discussion Section will take a varying amount of time to complete. Do let people bring up other questions that relate to the topic that maybe on their minds. If you run out of questions feel free to talk about other things that people felt were important to understand.

1. What was the role of the prophets in the Bible? Did most of them spend their time prophesying? If not what did they spend most of their time doing?
2. Who really cares? Is the Church lacking in compassion? (Not to ever suggest that we can't do more). What does your church do as far as compassion ministries?
3. Is/was Jesus a socialist?
4. What is the fundamental view of man under socialism? Does this match the view of man's nature according to the Bible? What happens if you misunderstand the nature of mankind in

governing? How did our Declaration of Independence view man's nature?

5. Who did Jesus say was to take care of the poor? Why not the government?
6. We've been working on improving the lot of the poor for over 80 years and have spent a few trillion dollars on it. Are there less poor now than there used to be? So if we are not improving things the way we've doing it for the last 80 years what should be done?
7. Is Welfare more loving or less loving? How do we articulate this to those who care about the poor?
8. Is the Church TODAY able to take care of the poor? How did we get to this horrible uncompassionate place? How do we get back to where we are able without creating more suffering?
9. Is the Church conceptually able to take care of the poor better? How or why/why not?
10. What can you do about this? What can you church? Are fixing the laws part of the solution?
11. Other questions: If you have time, feel free to raise or discuss other questions or points you read in the book or relate to the topics discussed in the book.

Prayer:

Pray that America will turn itself back to God. Pray that God would not send His wrath upon our nation, though we well deserve it. Pray for an end to abortion. Pray that God would open up the eyes of the nation and those caught in the grip of homosexuality. Pray that they will realize the damages of the homosexual lifestyle and allow us to minister to them in love.

Food and Fellowship:

While you share food, make sure you understand what is happening in each other's lives.

As you leave today, ask yourself: How can I fit some of these concepts into a casual conversation with friends, family, fellow Christians and co-workers?

Week Six

Where do we go from Here?

Week Six covers the following chapters in the book

Day 36 But You Will Turn People Away From The Gospel!

Day 37 How Then Shall We Vote?

Day 38 Can A Christian Be A Single-Issue Voter?

Day 39 The Call To Action: What Pastors, Christians And The Church Can Do Right Now!

Day 40 Conclusion: We Can Win This Battle

IceBreaker (please limit your answers to about 1 min each).

Go around the group and answer the following question: *How have these last 40 days changed your view of Government and your part in it?*

Review: DVD 20 mins

Break: Take a short break, have some refreshments

Discussion Section: 60 mins.

The Discussion Section will take a varying amount of time to complete. Do let people bring up other questions that relate to the topic that maybe on their minds. If you run out of questions feel free to talk about other things that people felt were important to understand.

1. Did people fear that the message about freeing the slaves would turn people away from the gospel? What is the role of the Church and the pastor?
2. Is voting something that we should leave our Biblical Values out of? If not then which of our Biblical Values do we carry with us to the ballot box?
3. Should Christians be involved in Politics? How would you articulate this to fellow believers?
4. What is the connection between loving your neighbor and your involvement in politics?
5. Can you be a single issue voter? Why is it usually never a single issue?

6. If Billy Graham was running against Hitler for office, should you vote for the lesser of evils? How do you determine that?
7. Go over the ideas suggested on Day 39. *The Call To Action: What Pastors, Christians And The Church Can Do Right Now!* What can you as an individual do? What can you as a Church do? How can you make it happen as a group?
8. Are we doomed as a nation?
9. What should your group's next step be?

Prayer:

Pray that God convicts Christians all over the US to get involved in keeping America safe for spreading the Gospel. Pray for your church, your group and your role in this.

Fellowship:

This week sit down as you eat and talk about what you can do to spread what you have learned these last few weeks to others. What can you do in your church to register voters, to advice folks on how to vote and to educate Christians?

Discuss too if you want to do a more in depth study of this material. If you have folks who want to be able to teach this material to others and influence large groups of people, go to www.JesusIsInvolvedInPolitics.com for the first of three 10 week study guides on the original book by Neil Mammen: *Jesus Is Involved In Politics! Why aren't You? Why isn't Your Church?* While the material in this new book is similar, the study will train you in great detail on the concepts we briefly covered in these last few weeks.

PAGES SKIPPED....

About the Author

Neil Mammen, a non-hyphenated first generation American immigrant is an Engineer during the day and an Apologist at night. As an engineer, he spends his time architecting and designing networking & video delivery systems, computer chips, boards, and FPGAs with **TentmakerSystems.com** and other US and international engineering companies. Neil was born in Ghana and grew up in Sudan and Yemen. He came to the US at the age of 18 and earned his BSEE in Computer and Electrical Engineering at the age of 20. He earned his MSEE in Solid State Physics and Computer Engineering at 22. Neil has co-founded four startup companies in Silicon Valley. He has about 20 issued and pending patents in areas varying from Networking, Traffic Shaping, and Packet Processing to LED Local Dimming TV methodologies.

In his free time, Neil teaches Apologetics. He is the founder of **NoBlindFaith.com**, an Apologetics and Evangelization ministry focused on training everyday people to use apologetics in evangelization without awkwardness. Apologetics is the investigation and defense of the truth of Christianity using facts, reason, science, history, archeology, and philosophy. Neil speaks at various venues and Apologetics and Missions Conferences around the U.S. teaching Apologetics, Theology and the defense of Christianity as a Rational and Logical Faith. Neil has been featured on: NPR debating Eric Rothschild of the ACLU and Eugenie Scott at the Commonwealth Club; KFAX Radio (with Stand for Truth Ministries speaking about Stem Cell Research); and on numerous radio shows including the Lars Larson Show and the American Family Radio with Frank Turek. He is on the board of the Values Advocacy Council and has spoken at local churches for the Family Research Council.

Some of Neil's blogs can be found at **CrossExamined.org**.

The story of Caroline Lois Mammen's earthly life can be read at **www.NeilMammen.WordPress.com**

Neil can be scheduled as a teacher/speaker anywhere in the world. Topics include Apologetics, Theology and Christian engagement in Politics.

speaking@NoBlindFaith.com

Invite the author to speak at your Church, Special Event or Rally

Neil's messages not only reflect professional and Scriptural integrity, but his sense of humor adds the well rounded touch that keeps our congregation anticipating his next visit or series.

David Underwood, Senior Pastor, Liberty Ridge Church

Neil has a gift that spans all age groups. This is because I can name none that exceed Neil's preparedness when he takes the pulpit. Neil has sound Doctrine and Theology. His style is relevant yet it remains biblically sound. You can expect dynamic visuals and creatively enhanced teaching that pulls each hearer in!

Chuck Aruta, Senior Pastor, New Beginnings Church

Neil is both dynamic and exciting to listen to. He is able to captivate an audience of any age from Jr. High to adults! Neil has a unique ability to take deep and sometimes complicated spiritual truths and communicates them in a relevant way. He speaks both to the mind and the heart. Not only can I speak to his ability as a speaker, I can also speak of his character (and his love of gadgets). Neil lives his life with integrity and his love for God is evident. He is generous, hospitable and faithful, both in his relationships with people as well as with God.

Adam Miller, Youth Pastor, West Gate Church

I love Neil's passion to communicate truths that matter. Whether he is speaking of the rationality of the Christian worldview, or the mandate for Christians to engage culture with a broad and winsome presence in all fields and vocations, whether speaking to students or adults, his thought is clear, his presentation entertaining and compelling, and his authentic and whole-hearted commitment obvious to all who interact with his prophetic message.

Jeff Reed, Senior Pastor, Hillside Covenant Church

Neil is a committed follower of Jesus Christ and an enthusiastic, gifted communicator. He is a wide reader and a keen discerner of culture. He knows the contemporary, as well as the historic challenges to the Truth of God's revelation found in the written word and the Living Word, Jesus Christ. He knows how to expose the lie and to expound God's Truth in a convincing, winsome way. Neil is articulate and courageous in presenting his convictions and he helps others to follow his example. I recommend him as a speaker for church services, seminars, and retreats.

Galen Call, Senior Pastor,

Los Gatos Christian Church/Venture Christian Church

To invite the author to speak at your church or group send an email to
speaking@NoBlindFaith.com