

**The Waldron Spheres;
The Doctrine of Division and Sphere Multiplication
By Donald Perry**

**A review of:
We Must Obey God, by Samuel E. Waldron
A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith, The Civil Magistrate**

Sam Waldron is author of A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith and Baptist Roots in America. He also is a pastor of the Reformed Baptist Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

4/4/2021

1. Preface:
2. Method of Complaint:
3. Matter of Complaint:
4. Default Psychological and Spiritual Humanism:
5. Romans 13:
6. Romans 13 is the exemplification of national Israel not Caesar:
7. Prohibited Means: Physical War with the State:
8. Prohibited Means: Physical War with the State in Waldron's Agreed Perspective:
9. Possible Reasons For War with the State:
10. Possible Reasons For Physical War, Waldron's response is to block this:
11. Justifiable Means of Physical War:
12. Justifiable Means of Physical War with State, Waldron Rejects this Perspective:
13. Justifiable Means of Spiritual War Against a Tyrannical State:
14. Justifiable Means of Spiritual War Against a Tyrannical State, Waldron's Disparaging Perspective:
15. Notes:

1. Preface:

Confessions: This work does not find fault with the London Baptist Confession of 1689, Chapter 24:1-3 as the dynamic equivalence of Romans 13, but it does have a problem with Waldron's modern exposition of it. In fact, it can be argued that the confessions disprove of Waldron's position, see section 8, 9. Justifiable Means. More on this point of confessional disregard has been made in the book Biblical Civil Government Vs. The Beast by Greg Price.
http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLS/bibcg_gp.htm

False Teachers: Waldron uses a false teacher Dr. Norman Geisler to drive home his point at the end of his book, Geisler refuses to listen to correction even after he takes the Bible or other writers out of context. The problem with false teachers is they can talk but they will not listen. As Jesus said they have ears, but they cannot hear. James White says Geisler appears to be okay when he co-authors, but whenever he writes alone, he goes off the deep end.

Overcomer Mentality: Waldron does not have much of anything to say on how or why the Church must disciple or rule the nations according to Scripture. His sphere theory prohibits this, add to this the dread of papacy types p. 347 ME 1989 and kings as god's p. 6 WMOG and it makes the idea of exploring this topic impossible.

Unscriptural: Waldron uses Scriptures to show how as men we should behave under government, but Waldron's book is devoid of anything Spiritual on how the kingdom of God will, by the Holy Spirit and the cross, live in or overcome the world. The work is written to the natural principles of mankind, devoid of the life-giving Spirit of God that believers partake of in the Kingdom of God.

There is more problems with Waldron's book in what it does not say than what it affirms. John 6:63 *"It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I speak to you are spirit, and they are life."*

The view expressed here depends on the view one has on the Lordship and commands of Christ, His way, His ability, His plan. If a Christian is wholly committed to Christ, then Waldron's theory on Romans 13 needs to be read differently: The church is not the problem, Rome is. The state is the one on the hotseat answering the questions not the church wherever their obedience is fulfilled. 2 Cor. 10: *"Now I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, who in presence am base among you, but being absent am bold toward you: 2But I beseech you, that I may not be bold when I am present with that confidence, wherewith I think to be bold against some, which think of us as if we walked according to the flesh. 3For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: 4(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) 5Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; 6And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled."* James R. Edwards, Romans, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 304–309. Edwards adds that Paul wrote *"not as a Sadducee who lived from the advantages of the state, not as a Zealot who lived to overthrow the state, not as a Pharisee who divorced religion from the state, not as a Roman citizen for whom the state was an end in itself. Paul wrote as a free man in Christ"* (308).

Method of Complaint:

London Baptist Confession 1689 21:2 *"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his word, or not contained in it. So that to believe such doctrines, or obey such commands out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also. (James 4:12; Romans 14:4; Acts 4:19, 29; 1 Corinthians 7:23; Matthew 15:9; Colossians 2:20, 22, 23; 1 Corinthians 3:5; 2 Corinthians 1:24)"*

The Scriptures are written in such a way that conversation between Scholars is needed to come to or keep a right answer. Therefore, to say the golden rule is *"If you do not agree leave."* is not talking on Scriptural terms. And if indeed you are correct, then you are to be as one of the overcomers in Rev. 1-3. Christians are to "rebuke" and "exhort", that all may come together and agree on Scriptural terms not to divide the church but to bring it together under God; this being one of the very key things for church in the first place and not to merely agree for the sake of agreeing. The Westminster confession is a testimony to the fact that people do not easily agree, it takes work to agree, and this work is not sin as some would have it who wish to lord it over others. Christians should not seek to usurp their elders who have the rule over them and seek to create divisions in the church. But people do not grow without making mistakes, and rulers are not to be obeyed when they are wrong. Paul said in 1 Cor. 11:19 *"For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."* Or as Albert Martin said in his church membership series, if you see a book Christianity Made Simple, don't waste your time on it, because it's not that simple.

The love of the brethren is the second foundation of Christendom. However, it should not be used as a tool to divide Christians from the truth to become mature, which can come at a cost. This over emphasis of love is what cults do to stop people from thinking, learning and growing, to become self-sufficient. The church members and hierarchy can become afraid of growing Christians becoming empowered by the Holy Spirit to do the work of God, to wrongly create unity around the lowest common denominator rather than Christ [7.].

But Jesus said: *"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. 33But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. 34Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. 35For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. 36And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. 37He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. 38And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. 39He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."*

2 Timothy 3:13-17 *13 But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived. 14 But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; 15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*

2 Timothy 2:15 *“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”*

Hebrews 5:12-14 *For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which [be] the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk [is] unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, [even] those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.*

Matter of Complaint London Baptist Confession:

London Baptist Confession 20:3 *“The revelation of the gospel unto sinners, made in divers times and by sundry parts, with the addition of promises and precepts for the obedience required therein, as to the nations and persons to whom it is granted, is merely of the sovereign will and good pleasure of God; not being annexed by virtue of any promise to the due improvement of men's natural abilities, by virtue of common light received without it, which none ever did make, or can do so; and therefore in all ages, the preaching of the gospel has been granted unto persons and nations, as to the extent or straitening of it, in great variety, according to the counsel of the will of God. (Psalms 147:20; Acts 16:7; Romans 1:18-32)”*

London Baptist Confession 24:2 *“It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate when called there unto; in the management whereof, as they ought especially to maintain justice and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each kingdom and commonwealth, so for that end they may lawfully now, under the New Testament wage war upon just and necessary occasions. (2 Samuel 23:3; Psalms 82:3, 4; Luke 3:14)”*

Default Psychological and Spiritual Humanism

In this study you will learn that the Waldron view produces the following unique impossible-difficult psychological or actual Scriptural problems of disengagement [6.] in family-church-government doctrine:

TO THE CHURCH FROM THE BELIVER:

- A. The sphere split theory leads to the confusion to respect and identify the church as the fountainhead for Law in all areas of life. The inability to study to know and to pray correctly together for the end of problems in the world, to partake of and become the subject of attacks by satanic devices, such as fake cures engineered by the pharmaceutical industry.
- B. Confusion in the life of the family to identify their role in being a guiding role for the church.

TO THE BELIVER FROM THE CHURCH:

- C. The impossibility for the church to take an effective and leading role in shepherding its congregation away from wicked medical advice designed to generate narrow cures for greater profits rather than inexpensive wide range effective cures through keeping up with the history and religious view of the pharmaceutical industry. The inability to pray correctly, the church will pray that things outside the church sphere presuming that they are controlled by God's good sovereignty when in fact they are controlled by no one, the shepherd has left the flock to the wolves. Psalm 10 is a perfect example of why you can not trust other spheres to

be good when God says they are bad. The church acts liberal and humanistic through the sphere theory while preaching the opposite.

- D. The impossibility for the church to take a leading role in shepherding its congregation away from wicked financial problems with the government or business.
- E. The difficulty in the church to set an example to its congregation for unity and to be Christ like rather than demonstrate different means of division. The separate sphere view will inevitably result in opportunities and license for the church to walk in the disunity of the flesh rather than the Spirit of God.
- F. The sphere theory leads by example, whose word will eat as doth a canker to the dividing into multiple individual spheres and dissociative disorder.

TO THE CHURCH FROM THE GOVERNMENT:

- G. The impossibility for government to identify the church as the fountainhead for holy and righteous authority and laws, to supplant their worldly mindset, 2 Chronicles 9:1-8.

TO THE GOVERNMENT FROM THE CHURCH:

- H. The impossibility for the church to identify its necessary role in warning the governmental departments and its people to repent concerning bad decisions, such as in the medical field, parenting, unrighteous litigations. See the example of Jonah and John Baptist, see Dan. 2.

TO THE HEATHEN FROM THE CHURCH:

- I. The difficulty for the church to identify its necessary role in warning the people of the nations concerning worldly thinking in the similar way it should warn the nations.

2. Romans 13:

Romans 13 *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. 2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. 3 For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: 4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. 5 Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. 6 For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. 7 Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour. 8 Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. 9 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.*

3. Romans 13 is the exemplification of national Israel not Caesar.

Romans 13 proves that the perfected model for the nation is OT Israel not Caesar by means of verses 2, 4 where Civil magistracy is recognized and acknowledged to be "the ordinance of God" and "the minister of God to thee for good" not only by means of institution, and verses 8-11 which state: "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. 9 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not

bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 10 Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. 11 And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.” The state cannot come up with the law of God on its own, nor should it be implied that the state or Caesar can by his wicked law produce an obedience to what is perfectly righteous. Romans 13 is a model that exemplifies the church, not even a sphere that has been influenced by the church, though that is obviously the result of Romans 13. To say that Romans 13 exemplifies God’s law by wicked nations would be the same as to assume that one could join a false religion in order to learn the truth about justice and righteousness. Romans 13 does not exemplify what Waldron says it should, he is looking at Romans 13 outside of the Spiritual implications made by Paul in a purely naturalistic worldly sense.

The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), acknowledged by many to be the most precise and faithful creed of orthodox Christianity, specifically states that only "lawful" civil power is not to be resisted as "the ordinance of God." Thus, it follows (from not just one reformed theologian, but from this entire assembly of reformed divines who met over a period of five years) that since only "lawful" civil power is "the ordinance of God", then only "lawful" civil magistracy is to be submitted to for conscience sake, and honored as "the minister of God to thee for good." The reformed divines of the Westminster Assembly manifestly acknowledged a necessary distinction between lawful and unlawful magistracy.

“And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. 29”

4. Prohibited Means: Physical War with the State:

What is to be established in Romans 13 within the context of the whole of Scripture is that Christians are not to war with their Government on their terms, and this is understood through the following verses:

2 Cor. 10:3 *“For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; 4 (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) 5 Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; 6 And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.”*

Ephesians 6:5ff *“Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; [6] Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; [7] With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: [8] Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. [9] And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening; knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him. [10] Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. [11] Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. [12] For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. [13] Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. [14] Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; [15] And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; [16] Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. [17] And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: [18] Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; [19] And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, [20] For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.”*

Daniel 2:44 *“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. [45] Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.”*

1 Cor. 15:24 *“Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. [25] For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. [26] The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. [27] For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.”*

Therefore, to the extent that we use physical force over and against intellectual force i.e. through the Holy Spirit, to the same extent will we not have success. By this means is to have victories; the witness of Christ and Him crucified must outweigh any kind of physical Roman type force, especially in the minds of the people. As Samuel E Waldron said in his book *A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith* 5th Edition p. 347 *“The fact is that swords are not good weapons (they are in fact very bad weapons) for the purpose of moulding or ruling men’s consciences.”*

The first thing is that the Gospel is designed to change people’s minds and hearts, not change the number of their physical options. Forcing your will on others will backfire, not only when they as a dog return to their own vomit, but like as when a spirit that is cast out of man, it brings back seven more spirits more wicked than the first, Luke 11:24ff.

Jesus said: Matt. 7:6 *“Do not give what is holy to the dogs; nor cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you in pieces.”* So therefore, if Christians wish to oppose sin, they are better off doing so legally where the unbelievers are the ones using force. But the Bible shows that even in this case we should avoid this type of a situation. Rather we should pray and use discernment when intervening in the lives of unbelievers, that will affect and influence the best good. 2 Thessalonians 3:1-2 says *“Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you: And that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not faith.”* Being unreasonable is the way of the unbeliever, how could using force ever be a reasonable solution?

Jesus said in Luke 6:39 *“12 Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying? 13 But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. 14 Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.”* The wicked wish to abort their offspring, and this is characteristic of their way, so to intervene in a physical way will as a general rule do more harm than good. This is because there are many times where God is bringing judgment on the wicked by the wicked. It is not necessarily the will of God to stop the wicked from killing each other or their own seed. See Psalm 21:7-10 for example:

“For the king trusteth in the LORD, and through the mercy of the most High he shall not be moved. Thine hand shall find out all thine enemies: thy right hand shall find out those that hate thee. Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the LORD shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them. Their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth, and their seed from among the children of men.”

5. Prohibited Means: Physical War with the State in Waldron’s Agreed Perspective:

As Samuel E Waldron said in his book *A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith* 5th Edition p. 347 *“The fact is that swords are not good weapons (they are in fact very bad weapons) for the purpose of moulding or ruling men’s consciences.”*

Waldron says in *We Must Obey God* quoting Calvin p. 8 *“Long ago John Calvin caught the essence of Paul’s teaching. The crucial issue is not our duty to submit “a magistrate who truly answers to his title, who is a father to his country.” But our duty to wicked magistrates in whom their subjects “discover no appearance of the image of God.”*

6. Possible Reasons For War with the State:

There is a limit to what Christians can comply with. Jesus inferred that Pontius Pilate had the greater sin for seeking Caesars good over Christ. So, this would mean that a Roman Soldier cannot execute the just and innocent without incurring sin. Working for government does not mean that you are without sin when you carry out their sinful commands because of Romans 13. This may be a reason to fight against government, to save the innocent. . Proverbs 24:11-12 maybe a reason: *“If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; 12If thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his works?”*

7. Possible Reasons For Physical War, Waldron’s response is to block this:

Waldron agrees that we should not comply with orders that violate the Scriptures at a kings command. However, it appears that Waldron believes that as long as you are in the sphere of the Divine laws of Government as a soldier one is not responsible for his own actions, no reason to revolt from under orders. But I do not think working for government means that you are without sin when you carry out their sinful commands because of Romans 13. Waldon leaves that idea out in his quote of Luke 3:14 page 339 A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith. This would mean that you could take part in Herod’s slaughter in Matt. 2:18 and be innocent. In this case there is no grounds for revolt in Waldron’s view.

Waldron blocks Proverbs 24:11-12 rescue, that it only applies to kings. However, that is not necessarily the case when typically, a king only expresses the sins of the people under him as we see in the OT.

8. Justifiable Means of Physical War:

Biblical exceptions to the said rule of Romans 13 found in the full context of Scripture:

2 Kings 11:14 “and Athaliah rent her clothes, and cried, Treason, Treason.”

Joshua 6:25 “And Joshua spared Rahab the harlot, her father’s household, and all that she had. So she dwells in Israel to this day, because she hid the messengers whom Joshua sent to spy out Jericho.”

2 Kings 9:1-7 “And Elisha the prophet called one of the children of the prophets, ... look out there Jehu the son of Jehoshaphat the son of Nimshi, ... Then take the box of oil, and pour it on his head, and say, Thus saith the Lord, I have anointed thee king over Israel. Then open the door, and flee, and tarry not... 7 And thou shalt smite the house of Ahab thy master, that I may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of the Lord, at the hand of Jezebel.”

Rescuing Involuntary Martyrs. All things considered, it appears that using the Gospel and educating the government maybe more advantageous than physically blocking a door. There can at times be a need for it. Contrary to Waldron, Proverbs 24:11-12 may apply to the people and not merely the king. The king or the government is required to keep God’s law, but when they fail to follow the Law of God the sin rests on the people, not merely those in the vocation of governor or king. This is why the sins of David with counting the people of Israel etc. fell on the people and many died. The people should have been committing similar sins, of not trusting in God. A king in the OT was often a mirror image of the people he represented. Governmental sin is not merely a governmental responsibility, the citizens are directly involved as well, and God’s judgments prove that to be the case. The church is also implicated because judgment starts for this at the House of God.

9. Justifiable Means of Physical War with State, Waldron Rejects this Perspective:

The Waldron view does not foresee magistrates being removed from office by the influence and disobedience of the church in usurping authority, p. 13 *“to seize such functions is blatant sin.”* Page 344

“There is no example of authorized revolution against established civil authority in the Bible.” He does not mention that there may be Biblical exceptions to the rule of Romans 13 found in the full context of Scripture as we have seen above.

But Waldron’s position is in conflict with the London Baptist Confession which says: *“Christians ...magistrate ...may lawfully now, under the New Testament wage war upon just and necessary occasions.”* This would be the same as to say Christian magistrates can only wage war only under the authority of Scripture. The Waldron-Calvin model allows for war upon unnecessary occasions by the wording of *“The crucial issue is not our duty to submit ‘a magistrate who truly answers to his title, who is a father to his country. ‘But our duty to wicked magistrates in whom their subjects ‘discover no appearance of the image of God.’ ”* p. 9. When that be the case, then *“upon just and necessary occasions”* the Christian according to the London Baptist Confession must defect from the state, become a trader, and wage war against his former wicked magistrate from the opposing sphere of government that he *“may lawfully now, under the New Testament wage war upon just and necessary occasions.”* But regardless of Waldron’s quote, the LBC shows that war is waged under Scriptural just and necessary occasions, which allows for an *“authorized revolution against established civil authority”*, as also seen in 2 Kings 11:14.

10. Justifiable Means of Spiritual War Against a Tyrannical State:

New Jerusalem: The ideal authority of the seven churches of the New Jerusalem is revealed in history as the center of divine authority, not a human authority, not the family authority, not the government authority. Acts 17:30 *“And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:”* Acts 4:23ff *And being let go, they went to their own companions and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said to them. 24 So when they heard that, they raised their voice to God with one accord and said: ‘Lord, You are God, who made heaven and earth and the sea, and all that is in them, 25 who by the mouth of Your servant David have said: ‘Why did the nations rage, And the people plot vain things? 26 The kings of the earth took their stand, And the rulers were gathered together Against the Lord and against His Christ.”* These verses suggest more than the “may”-and-“must” comply in the Waldron theory. [4.]

See the verses below:

Psalm 47:3 He shall subdue the people under us, and the nations under our feet.

Dan.7:14 And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

Matt. 16:18 And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Rev. 2:26-29 And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father. And I will give him the morning star. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

Rev. 21:24-26 And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.

The Biblical focus should be on the church telling the world that Christ is King and that they must submit through their discipleship, not an actual church as it should be in its present daily affairs under the governmental laws of Romans 13.---The actual church should try to follow Laws of the

state that at times that do not always represent the ideal victorious goal and model of perfect government---here I am referring to the proper direction of how the church should disciple the nations by word, example and martyrdom, and not on their terms. The pen is mightier than the sword, how much more so when it is the Word of God..

11. Justifiable Means of Spiritual War Against a Tyrannical State, Waldron's Disparaging Perspective:

Waldron offers little for Christians, in what they should or can do in opposition to the state, rather foremost they are to remain "tame" (pg. 141) and obedient to the king and at the most non-compliant, and possibly defensive but never offensive. Waldron intends that Christians can protest, but never to do so unlawfully. The sin of trespass, sitting on abortion mill steps (thou shalt not steel) is a greater sin than doing nothing. All is at peace between the church and her the king.

Waldron's view on Luke 3:14 (see page 339 of A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith) is explained as that as long as you are in the sphere of the Divine laws of Government, a soldier is free of guilt as long as he is following orders. If that is the case, then if one is a member of the state it may follow that he should obey the state rather than try and reform it. Luke 20:25 (and Romans 13:6) regarding the command to pay taxes as used by Waldron on p. 12 WMOG "implies" says him, that it does not require us to sin. Although we are required to give them tax, it does not necessarily prove we can take this a step further, that we can give silent affirmation to everything the money is used for and be without sin.----In other words, this does not negate the Law of Proverbs 24:11,12.

Waldron's view is that the president is to be honored as a king, and that there is no Scriptural ground for any other view. A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Page 337 *"The Bible does not teach social contract theory which many of us were taught in high school. According to Romans 13:1,2 the Roman emperors were divinely ordained rulers even though they did not derive their authority from 'the consent of the governed'. The theory that says that we obey our rules, because ultimately they obey us is neither true, nor biblical."* Pg. 347 *"Nehemiah 9:37 speaks of the fact that civil authority rules men's bodies. The implication seems clearly to be that civil authority is not intended to rule men's souls or consciences."*

Waldron has demonstrated that there is no such thing as Christian-Government such as we have seen in the United States, that its formation was a failure in conforming to Scripture. Because Romans 13 was written in the time of "Caligula, Claudius and Nero!" (p. 343) whatever fits that mold best is the perfect archetype. Many nations today follow the American model by presidential ballot. But the members of any nations that have Waldronites can blame them as the chief cause for the election of any despot. Waldron's interpretations of Romans 13 do not comport with the rest of the Scriptures as a means to an end such as *"Your kingdom come. Your will be done On earth as it is in heaven."* Matthew 6:10. Romans 13 is referring to the perfect idea, more so than to simply accepting actual government, and this can be argued from the text.---There is obvious tension between the ten commandments in verse 9 and the higher powers of verses 1-8.

Hermeneutical principle of the analogy of Scripture

With regard to interpreting Paul's statements in Romans 13, John Murray wisely cautions, It is, however characteristic of the apostle to be absolute in his terms when dealing with a particular obligation. At the same time, on the analogy of his own teaching elsewhere or on the analogy of Scripture, we are compelled to take account of exceptions to the absolute terms in which an obligation is affirmed.¹³⁹ More pointedly, Oscar Cullmann affirms, Few sayings in the New Testament have suffered as much misuse as this one [i.e., Ro 13:1]. . . . The fountainhead of all false biblical interpretation and of all heresy is invariably the isolation and the absolutizing of one single passage. This applies most especially to the interpretation of Romans 13:1ff.¹⁴⁰

Staley E. Porter, "Romans 13:1-7 as Pauline Political Rhetoric," *Filología Neotestamentaria* 3 (6; 1990), 117f; cited by Colin G. Kruse, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, PNTC, 499 (bold added). "The important implication is that unjust authorities are not due the obedience of which Paul speaks, but

rather are outside these boundaries of necessary obedience. Rather than being a text which calls for submissive obedience, Romans 13:1–7 is a text which only demands obedience to what is right, never to what is wrong.”

Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 687 (p. 669 of 2018 ed.) (bold added). “This text is misunderstood if it is taken out of context and used as an absolute word so that Christians uncritically comply with the state, no matter what is being demanded. Here we have a general exhortation that delineates what is usually the case: people should normally obey ruling authorities. The text is not intended as a full-blown treatise on the relationship of believers to the state. It is a general exhortation setting forth the typical obligations one has to civil authorities. Indeed, Paul envisions a situation in which the governing authority carries out its task by punishing evildoers and rewarding those who do what is good. . . . Nor is there any evidence that Paul writes because Jewish nationalism was rising in Rome and he wanted to stem it (rightly Keck 2005: 324).”

William Hendriksen, *Exposition of Paul’s Epistle to the Romans*, NTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1981), 434. “The apostle is thinking of the ruler who is performing his duty of preserving order, approving good behavior, and punishing evil. In that case he who opposes the authority is, indeed, resisting the divine ordinance. . . . The apostle is not establishing a universally valid principle that opposing the authority and disobeying a command issued by a civil magistrate is always wrong.”

Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Romans and Galatians*, 245–248 (bold added). “By placing every civil government under the triune God, he [i.e., Paul] radically altered the nature of politics. Paul not only places civil government under God, but he implicitly and surely requires that civil government to comply with God’s law. We obey Caesar as God’s servant, not as a sovereign. Every kind of authority and every civil government lives in God’s world under God’s government. When the state abuses God’s law and enslaves people unjustly, or kills them without cause, God will enslave and kill that state. The doctrine of the divine right of kings has its echo in too many commentaries which call for passive obedience. Since in v. 19 [i.e., Ro 12:19] Paul tells us that vengeance belongs to God, it can only be exercised by the state under God, by delegation, according to God’s law. Since God’s vengeance has reference to God’s law, no state has the freedom to create its own law and use coercion to enforce it.”

James R. Edwards, *Romans*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 304–309. Edwards adds that Paul wrote “not as a Sadducee who lived from the advantages of the state, not as a Zealot who lived to overthrow the state, not as a Pharisee who divorced religion from the state, not as a Roman citizen for whom the state was an end in itself. Paul wrote as a free man in Christ” (308). “Paul is speaking of human government in terms of an ideal. This is apparent from the general terminology of the passage. By ‘ideal’ we need not imagine a state of perfection, but simply what government ought to be, which according to Paul, is an ordered civil structure ordained by God to reward good and punish evil. Obedience to rulers apart from (or against) conscience is idolatry. It [government] must reflect the divine order of honoring good and punishing evil. His [Paul’s] formulation implies an unmistakable if unspoken corollary: when a state wholly perverts the ideal (by promoting evil and persecuting good, for example) it can no longer be regarded as God’s servant, and it cannot take the submission of its citizens for granted. The Christian’s higher allegiance to God and good releases him or her from the claims of an idolatrous regime. It is ‘God’s servant’ who bears the sword, and this excludes all arbitrary and indiscriminate uses of power apart from the cause of justice.”

Paul J. Achtemeier, *Romans*, Interpretation, 203–205. “Those governing authorities cannot claim for themselves divine prerogatives. A government that claims for itself the total and absolute devotion which a creature can give only to its Creator, ceases in the moment it makes that claim to be an agent of divine order, or a divine servant. It has become instead an idolatrous opponent of the living God. Governments that claim for themselves divine prerogatives are hence no longer the kind of governments of which Paul speaks in this chapter. The early Christian reaction to that kind of

government can be seen in Revelation 17:1–19:10. . . . That government no longer functions as a servant of God and is therefore no longer to be obeyed as such.”

Archibald T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, 6 vols. (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1931), 4:407. (Robertson’s term “revolution” needs qualification.) “Paul is not arguing for the divine right of kings. . . . Nor does he oppose here revolution for a change of government.”

Augustine, “On Romans 72,” in P.F. Landes, ed., *Augustine of Romans* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 41, 43; cited in *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament, vol. 6 Romans*, ed. Gerald Bray, 325. “If anyone thinks that he ought to submit to the point where he accepts that someone who is his superior in temporal affairs should have authority even over his faith, he falls into an even greater error.”

The first example is offered by Paul J. Achtemeier, *Romans, Interpretation* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1985), 203f. The second example is cited by John R.W. Stott, *The Message of Romans: God’s Good News for the World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 341f. Hitler was opposed by Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the Confessing Church in Germany, but the vast majority of professing Christians supported Hitler. Two classic examples of such “misuse” were: German Christians asserting that Christians owed allegiance to Adolph Hitler (citing Luther’s interpretation of Romans 13); and a former president of the Republic of South Africa (P.W. Botha) reading Romans 13 to justify unequivocal support of the Nationalist Government’s apartheid policy.¹⁴¹

Robert Jewett, *Romans, Hermeneia*, 790. “It would have been viewed as thoroughly subversive. That the Roman authorities were appointed by the God and Father of Jesus Christ turns the entire Roman civic cult on its head, exposing its suppression of the truth.”

Divide and Conquer, Splitting the New Jerusalem:

Calvin wrote in his commentary on Jude “1. *Jude the servant of Jesus Christ. He calls himself the servant of Christ, not as the name applies to all the godly, but with respect to his apostleship; for they were deemed peculiarly the servants of Christ, who had some public office committed to them.*” Calvin is gravely mistaken and not a little, Christ is only Lord of slaves, those who are not His slaves are none of His. Too many chapters to quote. Jesus Christ is Lord of all. So please keep in mind that Calvin was not always clear on the subject of Lordship as we read his quotes.

From *Institutes of the Christian Religion: Volume 1:35* we read: “*Those therefore, on whom he bestows these titles, he illuminates with a ray of divine splendor, to render them all honorable in their respective stations.*” In the ultimate sense, there are not three separate spheres of authority; When the Church is obedient to the Word of God there is only one sphere of authority passed down from Christ who is Priest and King, to the apostles, to the church, to the people. This model is seen in the New Jerusalem in Revelation 22. Galatians 5:22-23 “*But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, 23 Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.*” The church is to disciple (Matthew 28:18-20) and take power over the nations Revelation 2:26 by the spiritual sword of the Word of God and martyrdom. The church is to warn the people and the state and tell them what to do and what not to do the same way Jonah did. If the church will not take authority to make an influence for God’s law in all places, God will judge the church by whatever they ignore.

Divide and Conquer through a Deceptive Positive Worldview: The Serpent rephrases his lie; “*There is no fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Actually, there is no garden either. In fact we are now in another world separated from this world, we live in outer space on a free floating planet.*”

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is a warning of **sinful-righteous authorities** we find outside the New Jerusalem. The warnings of Psalm 10 warn of **world conspiracies with mixed intentions**, to save or kill the poor. The way Satan works is he gives the world the good mixed up with bad tree, once you know this then you can understand that not all the trees in the Garden are good for food. This is something the world is blind to; they suppose that all the trees are good as they say so. Some ways of government are good and some are evil, the church must address that.

Adam tended the trees of a literal garden; he did not merely tend a garden of ideas within his own sphere separated from the church-world tension as spoken of throughout the book of Revelation.

Divided Free Floating Planets

Are the king, church and family only responsible to answer to their own spheres? Waldron explains that this is the case in his Papism excuse on page 347 “[T]he reformed tradition beginning with Calvin himself, has always rejected these systems and taught that the church and state possess separate spheres of authority delegated directly to them from God, not mediated to them from the other. This system is clearly the biblical one, since God has ordained different governments in, and different tasks for, church and state (Matthew 22:21).”

Waldron has no top down or even a bottom up chain of authority between his spheres, because says he, they all have different kinds of authority, We Must Obey God p. 11. I do not believe Waldron can easily prove this consistently and coherently is the case with the examples he has thus far provided. I am saying that there is a chain of divine authority and influence, that is found in the purpose of repentance, sanctification, and conversion, made into law passed down from the New Jerusalem. This is covered in 2 Corinthians 10:3ff. This is not covered in A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith by Samuel E Waldron:

Page 141 “This, of course, does not mean that imprecatory prayers are never appropriate. It does mean that our basic attitude toward our rulers as expressed in our prayers is to be supportive.”

Page 141 “Note that there is no precedent of a Christian displaying a belligerent, rebellious attitude toward civil authority in the Bible. Peter’s response in Acts 4:19 is remarkably tame, when it is compared with the belligerence of certain segments of professing Christianity in our day.”

But, note Acts 4:5 in context: “...[T]heir rulers, and elders, and scribes, 6 And Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, were gathered together at Jerusalem. ... 18 So they called them and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. 19 But Peter and John answered and said to them, “Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you more than to God, you judge. 20 For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” 21 So when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding no way of punishing them, because of the people, since they all glorified God for what had been done. Peter did the very opposite of what he was instructed to do, “tame” is the wrong word for the Apostles. They turned the world upside down and were all martyred, with the exception of John according to history.

All human authority is divided divine authority

Is there any resemblance of a chain of authority? Waldron states that; though Christians should abide peacefully under Wicked magistrates, they “*must be disobeyed*” (p. 11) when their laws or orders are evil. The answer is yes, but that is an oversimplification of the Waldron theory. Waldron’s answer to that kind of question is: “Unfortunately, the teaching of the Bible is not that simple.” [2.]. Note carefully that Waldron’s answer is not in the affirmative, nor does he remove the dilemma, and this is because of his strict sphere authority worldview. Waldron’s answer is that we must submit to “*not just one universal sphere of human authority*”, but differing laws; “*All human authority is delegated, divine authority*”. In the Waldron view there can be human-authority-church and divine-authority-government, and they do not have the same kind of laws. Before Law the foremost concern is “*jurisdiction*” [3.] to separate self-contained spheres.

Pg. 12, 5 Family, church, government as divinely delegated: “*their divinely delineated spheres of authority.*” “*All human authority is delegated, divine authority.*”

Pg. 12,13 Family, church, government as human authority: “*...human authority. This is pointedly illustrated where two authorities conflict.... Suppose that civil authorities ...*”

No one is being required to violate the law of God by our government.

Page 22 “b. *When human authority requires the violation of God’s law, then it must be disobeyed. ... Pharaoh commanded the Hebrews mid-wives to kill babies (Exodus 1:15-21) Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were ordered to bow down to King Nebuchadnezzar’s Idol (Daniel 3). ... In each situation the subordinate was placed in a situation where a personal decision to obey or disobey was necessary. ... In the case of Operation Rescue, however, no one is being required to violate the law of God by our government.*” This is not entirely true, Waldron makes this claim because of his stand on verses such as Luke 3:14 and Luke 20:25, that bad government

laws are government responsibility, and that every president is to be treated as if he were a king because of Romans 13:1,2.

But on the flip side, what about being required to challenge or influence the laws of the king because the law of God? This is what John the Baptist and Jonah did. When government license abortion clinics have their operations run with tax dollars, they break the Law of God. This in turn brings blood guilt upon the people of the nation, especially in the United States because we change government policy by vote, which in turn may bring blood guilt on the church. Especially if they ignorantly vote for abortion rights or don't vote at all.

State Disconnect:

Note that Waldron has put "*divine authority*" in conflict and made a disconnect between the church, the state and the congregation. Waldron has successfully created a model only for a disconnect between church, state, and people in separate spheres of self-governing power. The church is now cut off from governing the nations (Matt. 28:19), cut off from shepherding the flock of God in how they interact with government and medical tyranny (Matt. 10:12) and cut off from God who will judge them for following this false teaching. (2 Peter 2:1).

Waldron argues that human authority (church, state, family spheres) "*may*" p. 12 or "*must*" p. 10 obey depending on "*God's Law*" p. 10. But if this is true, that there are indeed three separate spheres of authority then how does the state or individual family members of the congregation determine when they "*may*" or "*must*" obey the Law without the church teaching them the 10 commandments? Waldron's answer is that civil authority and law is not accountable to the church but yet it is also divine, and it may also trump God's Law as the Church knows it in the 10 commandments. In this case, civil authority is not in need of the influence of the church to disciple the nations, to teach it the Laws of God, that is that it can make its own laws without the Church, and then the Church must recognize the nation as a source for Divine Law. Waldron says "... *Certain peculiar strategies and tactics of Operation Rescue are illegal and violate the laws of our government. Here I refer to the Operation Rescue's practice of blocking entrances of abortion clinics. [It is unlikely that] "... the so-called "necessity" defense will not generally or finally be admitted in the courts of our country. ... And therefore, Operation Rescue are wasting a lot of ink and time.*" P. 20 ... *until God has bestowed authority on us in a given sphere, we may not claim it or exercise it. ... to seize such functions is blatant sin.*", p. 12. Rather, the correct Biblical model is that the church is to make it its intention to seize all authority by preaching. God judges the world through the preaching of the Gospel and separates the wheat from the tares, and the faithful remain (Rev. 2:2-5, 2:27; Luke 17:35-37). Waldron is inferring an inappropriate means of NOT seizing authority in the church, government, and family spheres.

Family Disconnect:

The Waldron model suggests a disconnect between the church and its members. "*This clearly means that no human authority may claim for itself what we owe to another human authority. This is pointedly illustrated where two authorities conflict.*", p. 12. Rather, the correct view is as follows: [1.] The authority of the church trickles down through the preaching, fellowship, and teaching, down into the hearts of the people. In this way the church has the authority and people act on what has been explained to them within the life of the congregation. There is no such thing as free will in the sense that people typically make choices outside of their world view. Are church members required to obey the Pastor? Waldron argues that there are different spheres of authority between the family and the church. However, this theory has yet to be substantiated as Waldron can only demonstrate irrelevant arguments. See his examples below p. 12.

Suppose that a pastor commands a Christian teenager to attend a Christian high school, and offers her a scholarship to do so, but the teen's parents oppose this plan and want her to attend another high school. Further suppose that attending either high school would not violate Scripture. Whom shall she obey? ... God gave the task of educating children to parents not to pastors.

Waldron is using questionable situations where there may be a perceived conflict of interest (underage girls being offered gifts in exchange for enrollment into unfamiliar territory by adult males in authority). This is a red herring. And if anyone should subconsciously suppose that human traffic

and thwarting a personal example of tyrannical law should have anything in common with this subject, they don't. The legitimate question is, can churches educate the congregation as to what to and what not to do as it agrees with the Word of God, including Sunday sermons from the pulpit? Yes or No? If the answer is Yes, then Waldron's bubble pops and his family/church sphere disappears. If the answer is No, then people need to rethink Christianity. Each Waldron sphere must foremost be defined as a world that is made to stand alone without any gravitational interference from other worlds, because if not so Waldron's bubble immediately pops. Note Waldron's next example on p 13 below:

Let me illustrate this in another way. Suppose that a pastor commands a young lady to marry a certain young man and that she would be violating no command of the Bible if she did so. Is she sinning to disregard pastoral command in this instance? No! The pastor has exceeded his jurisdiction. She may disobey him.

The correct question is as follows: Can a Biblical Christian church be instructive in the Word of God, especially in Sunday services, enough so as to teach young ladies what kind of men that they should and should not marry, and who would be most qualified and why; with the end result that they must obey their upbringing, 2 Timothy 3:15-17, Proverbs 3:1; 6:20; 22:6. Regular gathering together with the saints and being saturated in the Word of God will eliminate even the need for such questions in the first place. Children should already know the answers, but if not, it is not without the church that they will have the correct answer. The church has exhaustive resources, if it cannot there is something wrong with the church. The idea that a single pastor alone with an underage girl would be the determining factor for finding church-family equality is out of the question. Rather, the Bible indicates that older women in the church are the appropriate resource for who should be used in this situation, Titus 2:3-5. Inappropriate arguments do not prove appropriate solutions.

Baby Disconnect:

Waldron closes his book with quotes from Dr. Norman Geisler on pg. 28. Geisler has claimed to be a moderate Calvinist saying he rejects hyper Calvinism because he is not a 5 point Calvinist and believes in free will and Divine Sovereignty. He has been deceptive in the past acting within the church and has no interest in holding the same views as are found in Scripture, keeping Scripture in context. Geisler twists Scripture ad nauseam, by default he asserts that salvation is not a divine act but an act of human free will. Geisler continually misrepresents James White in Chosen But Free, and the only corrections made in the next edition were made by the publisher where Geisler had invented strawman arguments after the publisher was informed by White. On page 27 WMOB Geisler's argument is that Christians have no right to interfere with the rights of women or government, the baby of Operation Rescue is absent in the argument. The problem that those who believe in abortion have is that they cannot see the baby, that they have misrepresented the world we live in; when a woman gets pregnant in this world there are instantly now two people not one. My body my choice is a reflection of this twisted misunderstanding, not being able to identify that when a woman gets pregnant there are in fact two people not one. Geisler can identify the woman's rights, Geisler can identify the Government's rights, but he cannot allow the personhood of the baby to even appear in the argument. And this is the closing argument that Waldron needs to use to drive home the point of his book because every sphere must remain separated.

Worlds Succumbing to Bad Gravity:

Waldron has cut off any logical reasoning why or how the church can have victory and overcome (Daniel 2:45, 1 Corinthians 15:25) or disciple the nations, Matt. 28:19. In the Waldron model the nations disciple the church, Waldron's plan is to comply. There is no vision in Waldron's work for a world effecting political, evangelical, medical, trafficking, or criminal reform in the Biblical sense, they are on their own under the sovereignty of God left to succumb to the 2nd law of thermodynamics. If there is to be reform it is all up to God, this echo's the reasoning of the *"wicked and lazy servant"* in Matt. 25:24 *"Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not straved:"*. The Waldron plan has zero influence, they have no chance of *"Turning the world upside down"*, Acts 17:6. It

is hard to imagine a world that needs to martyr Christians in the Waldron worldview, Rev. 11:10.
The nations are subject only to their own gravity. Matthew 5:13 *“Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.”*

12. Notes:

1. This argument would be better suited to try and prove Waldron's previous comment that simply "... we have no obligation to do so. We may obey, or we may disobey." rather than "...no human authority may claim for itself what we owe to another human authority." But rather than law Waldron is talking about "jurisdiction". It is important to remember the difference to correctly understand Waldron's theory on spheres.
2. **Affirmative**, on page 10-11 he writes: "*When human authority requires the violation of God's law, then it must be disobeyed. This is the manifest meaning of Peter's statements in Acts 4:19,20 and 5:29. We must be careful to assure ourselves from the Scriptures that a divine precept is at stake. Too many in our day mistake their own feelings, impulses, and opinions for the law of God. Where, however, a biblical command will be violated, disobedience is demanded.* "
- Negative**, in his following sentence: *Some believe that the rule we have just stated composes the only ground upon which we may disobey human authority. It would, indeed, be much simpler if the exposition could simply stop here and say that this is the only ground for disobeying human authority. Unfortunately, the teaching of the Bible is not that simple. We must proceed to a third truth and another rule which justifies disobedience to human authority. There is not just one universal sphere of human authority. ... The civil authority ...is not the only authority", p. 10-11 "All human authority is delegated, divine authority.", p. 5. "*This clearly means that no human authority may claim for itself what we owe to another human authority. This is pointedly illustrated where two authorities conflict.*", p. 12 "God does not give the same authority to everyone. ... until God has bestowed authority on us in a given sphere, we may not claim it or exercise it. ... to seize such functions is blatant sin.", p. 12.*
3. Law is not foremost the determining factor in obedience, rather it is submission within "jurisdiction" pg. 12 and what defines jurisdiction is human authority. Waldron's view is that authority is not founded by the church, "*God alone has universal authority over every sphere of human life.*" p.15. If God truly has authority then His applied or spoken Law through his people under the direction of the 7 churches (as a type), not "human authority", is the only legitimate factor in authority.
4. We Must Obey God is based on Acts 4:19ff which reads: *17 But so that it spreads no further among the people, let us severely threaten them, that from now on they speak to no man in this name." 18 So they called them and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. 19But Peter and John answered and said to them, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you more than to God, you judge. 20 For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." 21 So when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding no way of punishing them, because of the people, since they all glorified God for what had been done. 22 For the man was over forty years old on whom this miracle of healing had been performed. 23 And being let go, they went to their own companions and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said to them. 24 So when they heard that, they raised their voice to God with one accord and said: "Lord, You are God, who made heaven and earth and the sea, and all that is in them, 25 who [c]by the mouth of Your servant David have said: 'Why did the nations rage, And the people plot vain things? 26 The kings of the earth took their stand, And the rulers were gathered together Against the Lord and against His Christ.'* " If Waldron has the correct Biblical model then why didn't Peter obey the "Kings", "Rulers" and "Nations", and simply conclude that they should follow their Divine Authority and do as they were told: "*So they called them and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus*"? What they did instead was the opposite of what they were told to do, and started an insurrection against the idea of Roman government who worshiped their Caesars as Gods, they started an insurrection against the heart of Rome, the Caesar worship cult. And they did so because "*God alone has universal authority over every sphere of human life.*" p. 11, but he delegated that authority through the one sphere of the human authority called the church and this day Peter. We need to be able to recognize when the

church has authority, and to what extent. [5.] The fact that they do not use a literal sword is irrelevant, the fact that they use power differently is irrelevant. If that was always the case, that there is a determining factor for spheres by the means of identifying different worlds of use, then why were so many Christians martyred by Rome, and what do we read in 2 Timothy 3:12 “...all who desire to live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution.”? There is a State Church connection here. The church does not need a sword to govern the nations. Eventually and in this way the church could begin to Christianize Rome, the church began taking over Rome here at this point in Acts 4. I am not here talking about the Church governing Rome in a mechanical fashion as with the Catholic church, I am talking about having an influence so as to change perspectives from Caesar Worship toward OT NT Law. The Waldron model has a reversal of the Biblical model here.

5. Waldron writes on page 1 concerning Acts 4: *“First, notice that the duty to obey God rather than men is rooted in the reality that God’s authority has priority over human authority. Peter said, “We must obey God rather than men. We cannot have proper views on the subject of conscientious disobedience unless we understand clearly that the authority which we must disobey as a matter of conscience before God is human authority which requires of us something contrary to God’s will.”* Rather, it is vital that we understand how the church has authority, we cannot have a proper view on the subject of obedience or disobedience until we are able to recognize that the church has authority. Is Peter talking inside the sphere of Church, and if so how? If and when he is talking from the church to a nation, there would be authority. The way this authority is established in the church is by the means of church fellowship in the Scriptures (argument brings orthodoxy) and the willingness to make Jesus Lord of all. In the Waldron church sphere Peter would only be telling the nation what he cannot do, not what he can do; to do to them as a judge if he is an overcomer (2 Cor. 10:6, Rev. 2:26), not what they must do or what they must not do. But because Peter cannot take authority in the Waldron view, there is no divine church-nation authority.
6. Sphere-disengagement could result in adopting a similar view regarding family and church relationships. In other words, if it can be proven that there are three spheres, this may give way to the view that there are as many spheres as there are people. This kind of thinking would lead some people to suppose they could divorce their wives, or be absentee fathers without so much sin because of the Waldron sphere doctrine.
7. This ideal can lead to a kind of thinking where might makes right and survival of the fittest, even in all areas of life. Rather it should be the ideal that the strong help the weak to stand on their own two feet. To even stand on their shoulders and encourage them. An example of a wrong kind of thinking is exhibited in the cults, such as the Jehovah witnesses. When someone does not know the answer, they simply refer them to their elders—in this way they remain **deceived or immature**, unable to find the truth---unless of course their elders convert to true Christianity.