

Deconstructing the C o l l i s e u m

R e f o r m a t i o n . . . Without Tarrying For Any

Leveraging the Free Exercise Clause¹

Newsletter 4

This *Newsletter 3* is about how we do not need man's approval to say that we do not need man's approval; that is, we must abandon Establishment Clause jurisprudence and leverage the Free Exercise Clause. Then we can fulfill our biblical duty of fully incorporating Jesus Christ into education. This Newsletter – mainly its title – connotes Robert Browne's apologetic to the Church of England's voluntary subjugation to the civil government; Mr. Browne's transition from mere Puritan to Separatist.

God is sovereign. God is the ultimate authority. God is *the government*. God delegates authority to the earthly governments of family government², church government³, and civil government,⁴ resulting in each government having their own jurisdiction (lawful authority). All government rests on Jesus' shoulders.⁵ The civil government has jurisdiction over only acts, while God maintains jurisdiction over the heart and mind. Since the civil government does not have jurisdiction over the heart and mind they have no right⁶ to keep a civil government school system. The force of law behind their school system is unbiblical.

Despite how the civil government has no jurisdiction over the heart and mind, debates about the inherently man-centered (humanist) civil government school system focus on how to reform the system (salt and light issue) or whether to send a child to a civil government school (delegation issue). But debating those issues means unnecessarily conceding a false premise. To illustrate the point, consider these questions:

1. Is abortion a state issue or federal issue?
2. What is your opinion of same-sex marriage?
3. Should the government raise taxes for their school system?

Each question fails to bring glory to God because each presupposes the false premise of man's authority. In relying on what I call the "federalist argument" question one presupposes that man can take innocent life. Question two bypasses the issue of homosexuality and therefore assumes its propriety.

Question three presupposes man's authority in a number of ways. The first is by its use of the word *government*. As mentioned, Jesus is *the government* and government is a function of authority; thus, calling civil government *the government* improperly equates civil government with *the authority*. That is, civil government does not reign over family government or church government, so calling civil government *the government* improperly exalts civil government above the family government and church government – *and to god-like status*.

Another way question three presupposes man's authority relates to each human's heart and mind. To argue the propriety of the civil government school system's existence based on the absence of an express New Testament provision prohibiting such a system, presupposes man's authority. This is because within that argument is included the *default* that jurisdiction over the heart and mind belongs to man, and it is God's burden to assert otherwise via an express assertion to us. But the default is that jurisdiction over the heart and mind is God's; for that reason an express prohibition is unnecessary. Besides, God's earthly delegation to the civil government to promote good and punish evildoers (in Romans 13) is in itself a limiting principle. God never gave the civil government jurisdiction over the heart and mind; hence the school system's *mere existence* is unbiblical.⁷

The final way question three presupposes man's authority relates to freedom. There are two versions of freedom: bondage to sin and liberty in Christ. The former relies on physical power; the latter spiritual power. The civil government school system relies on the physical power to tax. Asking whether the civil government should raise taxes for a school system is akin to asking whether the civil government should use the force of law. And when the civil government uses force to levy perpetual taxes on private property, it converts that private property into rental property.⁸ The taxes *must* be paid, otherwise the civil government dispossesses the True Owner. As a result, the property owner owes his property stewardship duty to man via the civil

government. Instead of the default God owns everything and we steward to Him, man (via the civil government) owns everything and we steward to man. Property taxes presuppose man's authority.

For some the evangelical roadmap means civil government school system reformation. The bare truth is that civil government schools cannot be reformed, for lack of jurisdiction. Put another way, the problem is not that humanists operate civil government schools; the problem is that civil government schools *exist*. In this regard attempts to reform civil government schools are done in vain, as the false premise of man's authority is assumed, always producing the wrong type of freedom.

Additionally, for some the evangelical roadmap means defending First Amendment Establishment Clause attacks on Christianity. Generally Establishment Clause attacks on Christianity unfold this way: what civil government forum rights remain are expressed in a civil government school, triggering an Establishment Clause lawsuit. We defend the lawsuit. Best case scenario: we win the lawsuit, but the Supreme Court's twisted Establishment Clause jurisprudence continues as a citizen limitation instead of a civil government limitation, and the best possible result is mitigating further erosion of the current legal landscape. What else could result from the watershed of *nine* liberal Supreme Court Justices who hold – via the *Lemon* test – that God the *Spirit* must be God the *Secular*? *To its core the lawsuit carries for man's approval.*

This is why we must abandon the Establishment Clause in favor of the Free Exercise Clause, which allows us to directly worship God: prayer is allowed. At hand is boundless prayer; that is, private forums have no prayer limits. Unlike civil government forums, there is no need to concern ourselves with traditional public forum, limited or designated public forum, or nonpublic forum. Alas, via the Free Exercise Clause we can have ***reformation without tarrying for any.***

The Free Exercise Clause cannot redeem, but it does facilitate that which does redeem – God's Spirit; God's Spirit causes internal liberty, causing those with it to externalize that liberty. For example, America's Framers were possessed internal liberty; as a result the U.S. Constitution facilitates external liberty. For sure, internal liberty and external liberty are interdependent. The more internal liberty there is the more it is to be externalized, facilitating more internal liberty. On the other hand, the less external liberty there is, the more difficult it is to evangelize, restricting internal liberty. Like a ratchet this will continue: the less external liberty there is the harder it will be to evangelize. The harder it will be to evangelize, the less internal liberty there will be. The ratchet will only get tighter.⁹

There is a way to loosen the ratchet. There is a way to reform without tarrying for any. There is a way to increase internal liberty without the immediate need for more external liberty: the Free Exercise Clause. Since we have external liberty via the Free Exercise Clause we must utilize it to promote internal liberty. Establishment Clause defense has done absolutely nothing to advance internal liberty, the gospel of Jesus Christ. Nothing.

As mentioned, there is a popular assertion to first reform the civil government school system; but popularity does not equal propriety. Something that should not exist cannot be reformed. Nevertheless, if the civil government school system could be reformed there is no need to reform it for the sake of Christianity. This is because we have immediate access to external liberty in the Free Exercise Clause. The external liberty must be leveraged to spread the gospel: *By using the freedoms we already have we can have reformation without tarrying for any.*

Those same people who argue we must first reform the civil government school system propose making family and church government education so strong that humanists flock to it. Family government and church government education is already healthy and well-established. It isn't that humanists are not attracted to *good* education, it is that they do not like our definition of *good*: Jesus Christ. Evidence confirms family government and church government education is best. Humanists just don't like the evidence.

Excitingly, the Free Exercise Clause is ahead of the curve – it precludes squandering resources on undoing thirteen years of humanist indoctrination. It treats the disease (the civil government's inherent humanism) and not the symptoms (humanist public policy). The Clause negates the necessity of expending resources first on unteaching the various humanist ideologies. Moreover, *no legal action* is required to leverage the Free Exercise Clause, and no legislation must be enacted, since family government and church government education is possible in all fifty states.

The Free Exercise Clause facilitates an offensive approach; that is, merely living out the Christian faith, without having to convince Establishment Clause gatekeepers (like judges, legislators, school principals and teachers) of the God-given right to Christ-centered education. This is the spirit of *we do not need man's approval to say that we do not need man's approval.* Under the Free Exercise Clause we exercise Christ-centered education that includes teaching how liberty, logic, uniformity of nature (and creation), mathematics, music, meaning,

morality, ethics, epistemology, justice, and sports are all a function of Christ. Leveraging the Free Exercise Clause facilitates *prayer* in the classroom!

Leveraging the Free Exercise Clause means abandoning tarrying for man's approval – abandoning gatekeepers – in favor of tarrying for *God's* approval. In practice it means reallocating Establishment Clause resources to Free Exercise Clause leverage: promoting and funding family government and church government education scholarships, teaching the public how the civil government lacks education jurisdiction, and encouraging civil government school abolition instead of reformation.¹⁰ The Free Exercise Clause facilitates Christ-centered education – and prayer. Under the Free Exercise Clause we already have prayer in school; we can already espouse creationism in school; we already have Christ. So why subject ourselves to unnecessary gatekeepers under Establishment Clause jurisprudence?

This is our last stand. The Commerce Clause is no longer about free trade between the states; it is a means to eliminating the states. The Tax & Spend Clause permits unlimited federal regulation, as long as there is an attached tax. And the Establishment Clause simultaneously prohibits Christianity and mandates humanism.

We must turn from the Establishment Clause and utilize the Free Exercise Clause, our last chance to promote internal liberty; it can make the Establishment Clause irrelevant. The alternative is to continue petitioning man and his fallible opinions; however *we do not need man's approval to say that we do not need man's approval*. We can have *reformation without tarrying for any*.

PRIVATE < PRAYER

¹ Establishment Clause jurisprudence mandates God demote Himself from God the Spirit to God the Secular.

² **Family government:** Genesis 1:26-30; 2:24; 9:1-3, 7. Deuteronomy 11:18-21. Proverb 13:24. Ephesians 5:22-31; 6:14.

³ **Church government:** Deuteronomy 14:28-29. Matthew 18:15-17; 28:19-20. Romans 12:4-8. 1 Corinthians 5; 6:1-5. Ephesians 4:11-13. James 1:27.

⁴ **Civil government** (Punish evildoers): Genesis 9:6. Exodus 21:22-25. Deuteronomy 25:1-3. Romans 13:3-4. 1 Peter 2:14. (Deter/redress harm): Exodus 21:16-25; 22:1-5. Deuteronomy 1:13-18. Numbers 5:1-4. Romans 13:3-4. 1 Peter 2:14.

⁵ Isaiah 9:6; John 1.

⁶ A right is defined as a duty owed to God.

⁷ Because the civil government has no jurisdiction over the heart and mind, they have the burden of justifying how they compel a child's civil government school attendance. Importantly, the burden is *not* on the family and church governments to justify dismantling the civil government school system, even if that means some children will be immediately unattended to. The family and church governments must tend to these children.

⁸ http://www.doe.virginia.gov/statistics_reports/index.shtml shows \$13,587,856,673 in (Virginia) civil government school expenditures as of April 2, 2010. The same data note 1,200,765.22 average daily attendances, meaning that 6,800,258.78 adults burdened the civil government schools expenditures. On average this was \$1,998.14 each adult "owed" to the civil government. Census data is from <http://www.coopercenter.org/demographics> (September 30, 2012).

⁹ We need a Supervening Cause to break this negative cycle.

¹⁰ Civil government school system abolition negates the delegation issue.