

Biblical Examination of the Declaration of Independence

Declaration of Liberty vs. Declaration of Independence Part 19

The Perfect Law of Liberty

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

The law of Yahweh² is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of Yahweh is sure, making wise the simple. The *statutes* of Yahweh are right, rejoicing the heart: the *commandment* of Yahweh is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of Yahweh is clean, enduring for ever: the *judgments* of Yahweh are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward. (Psalm 19:7-11)

The Declaration Speaks for Itself

Paragraph #2, Sentences 6-7

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

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

Grievances #13 & 20

He [Britain's King George III] has combined with others [members of England's Parliament] to subject us to ... their Acts of pretended Legislation:... For abolishing the *free System of English Laws* in a neighboring [Canadian] Province, establishing therein an *Arbitrary government*, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies.

When we examine the Declaration of Independence by the Bible and its flawless law system, two phrases in this grievance jump off the page: 1) "free System of English Laws" and 2) "Arbitrary government."

Bogus Comparisons

Thomas Jefferson is *allegedly* contrasting these two forms of government. However, there is no such thing as a free system of law independent of Yahweh's triune law of liberty.³ Consequently, both forms of government were arbitrary.

Jefferson did not have the Bible's law in mind. If he had, he would have unequivocally identified it as such—*just like you would have had you been in his place*. Consequently, Jefferson's assertion regarding a

“free system of English law” was bogus—just more swelling words of vanity, boasts of liberty when there was no real liberty at all.

That said, there’s no reason not to believe the American colonials’ rule of “law” was more free than the “absolute rule” King George was imposing upon them. However, more free—*the very best you can ever hope for under arbitrary man-made government*—is not the same as free. More free is the same as less enslaved:

[People often claim] ... that we are the most free nation on earth. While this may or may not be true, most people have never considered this possibility: If all of the other nations were under 100% totalitarian dictatorships, and the United States of America was only under a 95% totalitarian dictatorship, it could still be said that “America is the most free nation on earth.”⁴

Foolish Comparisons

To make such comparisons between man-made governments is foolish:

[W]hen they measure themselves by themselves, and compare themselves with themselves, they are without understanding. (2 Corinthians 10:12)

The same applies to Republicans comparing themselves with Democrats.

It’s inconsequential how one finite civil leader compares to another finite civil leader, or how one man-made government compares to another man-made government, which only serves to divert people’s attention from the real issue. The only thing that matters is how we compare to Yahweh’s expectations for us.

Whenever we choose one man-made surrogate—whether man or government—over another man-made surrogate, it results, at best, in the lesser of two evils. Sometimes, the worst of the worst. And always the evil of two lessers.

Suppose it [the Constitutional Republic] be the best government on earth, does that prove its own goodness, or only the badness of all other governments?⁵

Government Oppression

For Jefferson to contrast one form of government oppression with what allegedly was a worse form of government oppression only demonstrates government oppression, regardless how it’s packaged. Nothing is accomplished by grumbling and complaining about government tyranny—aka the Declaration’s Grievances against George’s government—if you’re only going to replace it with another form of government tyranny.

Part of Jefferson’s complaint in Grievance #2 was that King George was replacing “the free system of English laws” with “arbitrary government.” The Franklin Wordmaster Thesaurus provides two lists of synonyms for “arbitrary.” The first list begins with “capricious.” The second list includes “despotic” and “tyrannical.”

Arbitrary Government

Despotism and tyranny are two of the inevitable consequences of capricious man-made government. Case in point: the Constitutional Republic, which was established upon arbitrary man-made edicts.⁶ And where

does America find herself today as a result? Ruled by despotic government, at the behest of unbiblical tyrants.

Arbitrary government is what Habakkuk 1:7 depicts regarding the Chaldeans whose authority and justice originated with themselves, invariably resulting in despotism and tyranny. Arbitrary government is what's also depicted in the Constitution's Preamble.⁷ It's also how John Adams described the original states' Constitutions:

It will never be pretended that any persons employed in that service [the establishment of the states' Constitutions] had interviews with the gods, or were in any degree under the inspiration of Heaven ... it will forever be acknowledged that these governments were contrived merely by the use of reason and the senses.... Thirteen governments [of the original states] thus founded on the natural authority of the people alone.⁸

With this admission in mind, consider again the Treaty with Tripoli, of Barbary:

[T]he government of the United States of America [aka the Constitutional Republic] is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion.... (Treaty with Tripoli, of Barbary, Article 11)

This Treaty (which became part of the supreme law of the land, per Article 6⁹) was unanimously approved by the United States Fifth Congress and signed by none other than President John Adams.

If the Constitutional Republic isn't Christian and/or biblical, *what is it?* At best, it's non-Christian. At worst, it's anti-Christian. Regardless, it's as arbitrary, capricious, despotic, and tyrannical as was Great Britain's government against which the American colonials were rebelling. In fact, it's become multiplied times worse than King George's arbitrary government.

Grievances #13 & 21

He [Britain's King George III] has combined with others [members of England's Parliament] to subject us to ... their Acts of pretended Legislation:... For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments.

This is essentially a reiteration of previous grievances already considered. It specifically refers to the alteration of the Massachusetts Charter regarding King George making their judges subservient to the Crown rather than answerable to the colonials themselves.

This is but more evidence that the Declaration's signatories were not working from a biblical paradigm. Whether the colonials' judges were answering to King George or to the people in general—whether to one, a few, or to many—it's a humanistic government of, by, and for the people, juxtaposed with a biblical government of, by, and for God:

And he [King Jehoshaphat] set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judah, city by city, and said to the judges, Take heed what ye do: for *ye judge not for man, but for Yahweh*, who is with you in the judgment.... And he charged them, saying, *Thus shall ye do in the fear of Yahweh*, faithfully, and with a perfect heart. (2 Chronicles 19:5-9)

What a stark contrast with both the judges under King George's jurisdiction, those appointed by the colonials, and those empowered by the Constitution.¹⁰

Had King Jehoshaphat been a wicked King, he would have most likely done as King George was accused of doing, instructing his judges to rule according to his dictates. Or, at the very least, he would have charged them to represent the people of his kingdom, as with the American colonials. Either way, it

would have amounted to an arbitrary despotic government in rebellion to Yahweh, His Kingdom, and His law.

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

Stay Tuned for Part 20.

Related posts:

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

[“Biblical Examination of the Declaration of Independence, Pts. 1-12”](#) (Articles)

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

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

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

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

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

End Notes

1. All scripture is quoted from the King James Version unless otherwise noted.
2. YHWH, the English transliteration of the Tetragrammaton, is most often pronounced Yahweh. It is the principal Hebrew name of the God of the Bible and was inspired to appear nearly 7,000 times in the Old Testament. It was unlawfully deleted by the English translators. In obedience to the Third Commandment and the scriptures that charge us to proclaim, swear by, praise, extol, call upon, bless, glorify, and hold fast to His *name*, I have chosen to memorialize His name, per Exodus 3:15, in this article.

For a more thorough explanation concerning important reasons for using the sacred name of God, see [*Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy God in vain*](#), the third in a series of ten free online books on each of the Ten Commandments and their respective statutes and judgments.

3. For more on how the Bible’s triune and integral moral law (the Ten Commandments and their respective statutes and judgments) applies and should be implemented today as the law of the land, see [*Law and Kingdom: Their Relevance Under the New Covenant*](#).

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

4. James Bruggeman, epilogue to *Christian Duty Under Corrupt Government: A Revolutionary Commentary of Romans 13:1-7*, by Ted R. Weiland, 2nd ed. (Scottsbluff, NE: Bible Law vs. The United States Constitution, 2006, 2nd ed.).

5. Lysander Spooner, No Treason, No. VI, *The Constitution of No Authority*, <http://praxeology.net/LS-NT-6.htm#>
6. See [*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*](#), in which every Article and Amendment is examined by the Bible.
7. [Chapter 3](#) “The Preamble: We the People vs. Yahweh” of [*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*](#).
8. John Adams, *The Works of John Adams*, 10 vols. (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company, 1865) vol. 4, pp. 292-93
9. [Chapter 9](#) “Article 6: The Supreme Law of the Land” of [*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*](#).
10. [Chapter 6](#) “Article 3: Judicial Usurpation” of [*Bible Law vs. the United States Constitution: The Christian Perspective*](#).