

Watch Out When State Security Trumps God-Given Rights

1Samuel 22:6-10

By Phillip G. Kayser at DCC on 7-3-2011

Introduction

This month I received a very polite letter from Senator Ben Nelson. He was responding to concerns I had about violations of the Bill of Rights by federal agencies that have been seeking to enforce the Patriot Act. In his first two paragraphs he basically said that terrorism necessitates the Patriot Act. But here is what he said in the fourth paragraph:

I do share your serious concern regarding the effect increased national security could have on civil liberties. I believe there is a delicate balance to be achieved between liberty and security. Yet, this is not the first time in history our individual liberties have been challenged. Since our nation's birth more than 225 years ago, we have weathered events when **our national security seemed to demand some sacrifice of the rights we hold dear**. But now, more than ever, we find ourselves weighing the relative merits of the freedoms we have enjoyed in the past against the need for safety and security in our daily lives.

But I was especially fascinated by that phrase, “our national security seemed to demand some sacrifice of the rights we hold dear” and also his reference to the need to weigh “the relative merits of the freedoms we have enjoyed... against the need for safety and security.” Here are some questions that immediately came to my mind: Are these rights inalienable or are they revocable? And if they are revocable, when do we get them back? Are they God-given rights or government-granted privileges? If they are God-given, where does God allow for the retraction of what He has given? Is security more important than freedom? I think those questions should be self-answering. President Thomas Jefferson once said, “Those who surrender freedom for security will not have, nor do they deserve, either one.”

I've titled today's sermon, “Watch out When State Security Trumps God-Given Rights.” And the Patriot Act is not the only Federal issue in which individual rights are being abridged in the name of safety and stability. FEMA, OSHA, the EPA, and other agencies are increasingly stripping away freedom from citizens and in their place are offering safety and stability. Well – there is a certain degree of safety and stability in slavery, isn't there?

What king Saul illustrates in this chapter is exactly the same dynamic that countries have wrestled with for thousands of years. Back in 2006, the

Labor Leader of England, Tony Blair, was being interviewed by Matthew d'Ancona, for the Sunday Telegraph. And Blair said that he had been reading the story of Pilate in the Bible. He said, Pilate is...

the archetypal politician, caught on the horns of an age-old political dilemma... It is not always clear, even in retrospect, what is, in truth, right. Should we do what appears principled or what is politically expedient?"¹

In this chapter Saul was opting for what was politically expedient – at least what was politically expedient for the survival of *his* dynasty. And any time countries make state security trump God-given rights the country is by definition experiencing some measure of tyranny. And I say, “God-given,” because many so-called rights are not rights and so-called freedoms would be defined as slavery by the Bible. I’m not much of a fan of Rush Limbaugh, but I think he was correct when he said, “To constrict freedom in the interest of security is to slowly erode the very foundation on which the country is built.” I think he is right. And I want to look at the erosions of Israelite liberty in this chapter, because I think in many ways they parallel the erosion of our own liberties. Here are twelve points by which any country can be tested.

I. Constitutional patriots like David become the enemy, not Edomites like Doeg (v. 6a with 9ff)

Let’s begin at verse 6. “**When Saul heard that David and the men who were with him had been discovered ...**” So there have been spies out looking for David. And as soon as they find him, they report to Saul.

And here is the irony that this whole passage confronts us with – Saul treats David as the enemy who needs to be hunted down and he treats Doeg as the friend who needs to be financially rewarded. That’s weird. David is a constitutional patriot, whereas Doeg is an unconstitutional Edomite. How has this alien become more rewarded than David? David has been willing to lay down his life for Israel and even for Saul, whereas Doeg is a terrorist who kills 85 pastors later on in this chapter. Things are upside down here. But any time the demonic is involved, you can expect that to happen.

We should not be surprised when America rewards illegal aliens with more benefits than many citizens receive. We should not be surprised when America sends hundreds of billions of dollars to Saudi Arabia, or sides with Al Qaeda forces in Libya, or ends up on the wrong side of most conflicts

¹ As quoted in *The Telegraph*, February 8, 2006. See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3622912/Free-speech-Labour-cares-more-about-the-Muslim-vote.html> for documentation.

worldwide. It shouldn't surprise us. Apart from the wisdom and grace of God, bad decisions like this will be made. This is why David said, "**He who rules over men must be just ruling in the fear of God**" (2Sam. 23:3). It is God alone who can keep the downward slide into tyranny from happening.

But we need to watch out when the Doegs of the world are treated well and the Davids of the world are slandered. Some of you saw the MIAC report in Missouri in which patriots like Ron Paul, Bob Barr, and Tea Party people were profiled as dangerous right-wing extremists that law-enforcement agents should keep their eyes on. The report taught officers to view people with suspicion if they had "anger toward the Federal Reserve System," and yet the report conspicuously left out any references to Islamic terrorist cells in our country. There is the David/Doeg contrast. Apparently you can't speak against Islam in our country. Homosexuals are rewarded while homeschoolers are sometimes arrested. These irrational actions show that spiritual warfare prayer must be part of our strategy. This is more than flesh and blood irrationality. The irrationality of America has Satan written all over it.

II. Security of the administration becomes uppermost (v. 6b-8)

The second thing that we see in this passage is that the security of Saul's *administration* became uppermost, not the security of the *citizens*. Some people think that the security of the state is the same thing as the security of the citizens, but they are two different things. Verse 6 goes on to say, "**now Saul was staying in Gibeah under a tamarisk tree in Ramah, with his spear in his hand and all his servants standing about him.**" Three things to note here: Saul is the center not just in this verse, but in his whole speech. Eight times he uses the words "me" and "my" in two verses, and his self-centeredness can be seen in the phrase, "not one of you is sorry for me." For Saul, "It's all about me."

A second thing to notice is that this speaks of everyone as "his servants." This is repeated in verses 7, 8, and 9. He even calls David his servant. Everything is serving his administration rather than he serving the people.

The third thing that any Jew would notice is that Saul is up in Gibeah while Keilah in the south was being harassed. Since Judah was where David comes from, he wasn't quite as concerned about them. It is not the security of the people, but the security of his administration that he is most concerned

about. Who is afraid of David in this chapter? It certainly is not the people. It is Saul who is afraid of him.

And that is something we should evaluate America on too. Is the concern for security and stability really about the citizens, or is it for the perpetuation of the industrial-military complex that enriches the same corporations year after year to the tunes of billions of dollars in every war? Is it really for America's security that we are in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and a host of other countries? Forgive me if I am skeptical, but when a country tries to convince us that they are acting for our security, ask two questions: 1) What is the proof that America's geographical borders are being hurt by the people we are warring against, and 2) are there special interests that are benefitting from this war? Where does the money flow?

III. Cronyism becomes rampant (v. 7)

A third thing that we see in this passage is cronyism. Cronyism is giving favor to friends and loyal individuals at public expense. It could be giving them money, business opportunities, special legislative favors, or positions. Verse 7 says, **"...then Saul said to his servants who stood about him, 'Hear now, you Benjamites! Will the son of Jesse give every one of you fields and vineyards, and make you all captains of thousands and captains of hundreds?'"** The implication is that David would not. And Saul's understanding of David proved to be true. When he became king he did not prove to be a redistributionist like Saul was. Saul used politics to enrich his friends. Saul might have approved of America's massive Federal bailouts.

Three things to notice in that verse: First, his officers were all Benjamites – people from his tribe. That was a kind of favoritism. Second is the mention of the son of Jesse in connection with fields and vineyards. By this time some of these people have been rewarded by Saul with the confiscated fields and vineyards of Jesse, who has now fled the land. The third thing to notice is that *every one of the people* on the administration had benefited by both fields and positions. They were *all* compromised, and therefore didn't have a moral basis from which to oppose Saul's tyranny. To call what Saul did wrong would implicate them in the wrong. Saul says, **"every one of you,"** and **"make you all,"** implying that every one of them had benefited from cronyism. It pays to be in politics when you are in Saul's administration.

IV. Property is seen as a grant from government (v. 7b)

But of course that whole verse has a fourth problematic assumption in mind – the assumption that property is a feudal grant from the government. Saul was letting these guys live on their lands. He gave them their lands. And Saul was not letting Jesse, David’s father, live on his land. He might have had his own unique ways of rationalizing this socialistic assumption, but it is still very similar to the modern assumptions that underlie taxes, eminent domain, and licensing. For example, you might think that you own your land. But unless you are one of those very rare people who previously had allodial title in Nevada or Texas, it is doubtful that you fully own your property. Allodial ownership is absolute ownership of land as opposed to feudal ownership that is subject to some kind of relationship to a lord or a sovereign. In ancient Israel various kings tried to buck the allodial system, but with varying levels of success. And you can think of even wicked king Ahab who was frustrated when Naboth refused to relinquish his family’s absolute ownership of the land in 1 Kings 21. It was not a feudal ownership of land, but an allodial ownership.

If you have allodial ownership, your property cannot be taxed because taxation implies that the government has a feudal type relationship to the land. And if you don’t pay your taxes, the government can confiscate your land. All the way back in chapter 8 God had warned the people that Saul would try to gain this feudal control of the land. And so Rushdoony rightly points out that all property taxes are by definition theft. The ability to tax our property implies that the government has a vested interest in our property, and the ability to confiscate property reinforces that same assumption. We don’t have time to get into it, but this assumption lies at the bottom of many practices in virtually all dictatorships around the world.

Older statesmen understood this and resisted the idea that the civil government could own, have an interest in, or could tax your property. Daniel Webster said, “An unlimited power to tax involves, necessarily, the power to destroy.” He lived from 1782-1852. Let me contrast that with a more recent opinion – that of Supreme Court Justice, Lewis F. Powell, who died in 1998. He said, “[The] power to tax is virtually without limitation.” If this is true, then America has been in a sad state of affairs for most of the past century. In a Supreme Court decision that I read from 1931, in *Coolidge V. Long*, Owen J. Roberts said, “A state’s power to tax property is plenary.” The word “plenary” means full, complete, reaching to every part. So we speak of plenary inspiration because every letter of Scripture is inspired. But when the power to tax is plenary, it means that the state can tax anything it

wants to tax. Some of you businessmen have all your tools taxed by the government and the use of those tools. But the state claims a plenary power to tax everything. In case you think that must be an exaggeration, let me read you the full paragraph from that Supreme Court decision:

A state's power to tax property is plenary. The power to tax it as a whole necessarily embraces the power to tax any of its incidents, or the use or enjoyment of them -- provided only that the taxable occasion does not antedate the taxing statute so as to render it invalid because retroactive. If the property itself may constitutionally be taxed, obviously it is competent to tax the use of it, *Billings v. United States*, 232 U. S. 261; 3 U. S. 370; *Nicol v. Ames*, 173 U. S. 509; or the gift of it, *Bromley v. McCaughn*, @ 280 U. S. 124. And, if the gift of it may be taxed, it is difficult to see upon what constitutional grounds the power to tax the receipt of it, whether as the result of inheritance or otherwise, may be denied to a state, whatever name may be given the tax, and even though the right to receive it, as distinguished from its actual receipt at a future date, antedated the statute.²

The Supreme Court was basically saying that the state can tax anything it jolly well pleases. I've got another Supreme Court opinion that said,

The power to tax is the one great power upon which the whole national fabric is based. It is as necessary to the existence and prosperity of a nation as is the air he breathes to the natural man. It is not only the power to destroy, but it is also the power to keep alive.³

What are the implications of this? Rushdoony says that this position virtually deifies the state. So some of these statisticians have had the audacity of speaking of taxation as stewardship. Think about that. We all believe that we are stewards to God because the earth is the Lords and the fullness thereof. But these theoreticians say that we are stewards to the state – which means that the earth is the state's and the fullness thereof. In arguing against Fletcher on this point, Herbert Schlossberg says,

His position makes sense only if the state is the lord who is the real owner of everything. The offering formula prayer, 'We give thee but thine own,' is a declaration that the steward is only rendering to God what he already possesses legally. The steward is declaring recognition of his stewardship and affirming that his relationship with God is a steward to a lord. But to say that taxation is stewardship is to affirm that the state is the lord to which everything has the status

² United States Supreme Court, *Coolidge v Long*, 282, US 582 (1931), as posted in <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=282&invol=582>.

³ Justice Rufus W. Peckham delivered this opinion in *Nicol V. Ames*. Google Books – United States Supreme Court Reports, Volumes 171-174, p. 791 (original pagination, p. 515).

of property. The citizen is transformed thus into a servant, supplicant, worshipper.⁴

And we shall see shortly that Saul saw everyone as his servant rather than seeing himself as a servant to the people. According to the Bible the state does not own everything, may not tax everything, has very limited jurisdiction, and is in rebellion against God when it oversteps those jurisdictions. You can judge the degree of liberty in a country by its philosophy of property. It's a key critical point, yet most Christians overlook it. They just assume that the state has the right to do that. They are content to be feudal vassals.

V. Patriotism is redefined as loyalty to a man (v. 8a)

The fifth thing that we see in this passage is that patriotism was redefined by Saul as loyalty to him. Verse 8 begins, “**All of you have conspired against me...**” Now wait a minute. Isn't “conspired” a rather strong word to use for men who have never dared to say a word against Saul. But you see, from Saul's perspective, if these servants are not constantly doing everything that he wants (and he is shortly going to text them on this), Saul considers it conspiracy or the lack of patriotism. They don't say a word, and for good reason. Their necks could be on the line. Thomas Jefferson said, “When the people fear the government there is tyranny.” Any time fear of our own government is greater than fear of criminals, we are a nation in trouble. Obviously many nations are more troubled than ours, but these are simply points by which you can judge the relative tyranny that exists in any given nation.

VI. The language related to civics becomes redefined (v. 8a)

Of course, Saul's ridiculous redefinition of the term “conspiracy” is a common ploy of tyrants as well. I have read through some of the speeches of communist leaders, Fascist leaders, and leaders in our own country, and it is fascinating to see the clever ways that language has been redefined to marginalize anyone that might be considered a threat to the status quo. Spin-doctors in the media will label Tea Party advocates as racists. It doesn't matter if there is no evidence of racism, the very use of that label will make some people not want to be associated with the Tea Party. So they are successful. The media has cleverly used the term “Fundamentalist” to label Arab terrorists, and then will apply the term to Bible believers in the same essay. It's a misuse of the term. If you want to read a fun analysis of this

⁴ Herbert Schlossberg, *Idols for Destruction: Christian Faith and its Confrontation with American Society* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publications, 1983), pp. 187-188.

psychological warfare with words, read some of George Orwell's writings. But liberals today have become masters of it.

You might be considered a conspiratorialist (if you believe that the Federal Reserve should be audited), or "Right Wing Extremist" (if you believe that we should return to the original intent of the constitution), or Anti-Choice (if you are prolife), or Homophobic (if you hold to Biblical values). And of course, they soften their sins by dignifying Sodomites as gays, lechers as free speech advocates, baby-murderers as women's rights advocates, etc. The more you understand the psychological warfare used by tyrants in redefining terms, the less you will be manipulated by those words.

VII. Spying on citizens becomes common (v. 8b)

The seventh thing I see in this passage is Saul's full approval of spying on anyone and everyone - except for himself, of course. Verse 8 goes on to say, "**and there is no one who reveals to me that my son has made a covenant with the son of Jesse; and there is not one of you who is sorry for me or reveals to me that my son has stirred up my servant against me, to lie in wait, as it is this day.**" He wants everyone spying on everyone, including on his son Jonathan. Even these soldiers had a hard time doing that. But citizens are constantly being monitored by governments today. You have perhaps heard of the Sigard technology being used in England to not only monitor but to analyze potentially anti-social conversations and immediately on the fly be able to tip off store-owners, security guards, and police. Or perhaps you are familiar with the Data Retention Directive of the European Parliament. According to a Washington Post article, America now has the most sophisticated surveillance, data storage, and data analysis of American citizens in its entire history. These are all signs that state and national government is becoming more an issue about protecting the state than it is about serving the people. It's the people who are being monitored, which implies what? It implies that it is the people who are feared. The citizens are treated as the potential enemy. Now I should hasten to say that just one of these twelve points by itself is not conclusive evidence that our country is heading into trouble, but I would hazard to say that when there are a majority of these signs true of America, it is likely becoming the kind of government that Saul had - a government rejected by God.

VIII. Failure to get on board is interpreted ominously (v. 8a,c,d)

The eighth thing that I see in this passage is that Saul interprets any failure to quickly get on board with his program as being ominous. It is

ludicrous for him to broad-brush-paint these people with the statement, “**all of you have conspired against me,**” or to suggest that Jonathan was staging a coup, or to suggest that Jonathan was trying to kill him (which is what “**to lie in wait**” means), or to suggest that they were all complicit in Jonathan and David’s rebellion if they didn’t quickly give him some information. This is paranoia. Saul projects his own ominous attitudes onto everyone else.

And governments that have been involved in back-room deals, surreptitious removal of liberties, paying off agencies, or other criminal behaviors will tend to have a suspicion that everybody else is just as unethical as they are. Their own ungodly behavior breeds paranoia. I have studied a few of the petty dictators in Africa and South America, and this tendency can be seen in all of them. This is the Saul syndrome – they can start off pretty good, and yet progressively take on more and more of these twelve indicators of tyranny. Lord willing, next week we will look at a few more indicators related to the first two amendments. But for now lets move on to the ninth point.

IX. The issue of who is being served gets inverted (v. 8c with 6-10; Luke 22:24-30)

The ninth thing that should be examined is the issue of who is getting served. Typically the further away from God a government becomes the more the Biblical concept of leadership gets inverted. Christ said, “**The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and those who exercise authority over them are called ‘benefactors.’ But not so among you; on the contrary, he who is greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he who governs as he who serves.**” When we have servant leadership, we see ourselves as being servants of God and servants of others. We sacrifice ourselves for the benefit of others. But the Gentile kings that Jesus referred to did the exact opposite. They sacrificed others for their own interests (which we see Saul doing) and they wanted everyone to serve them. Yet despite their self-serving character, they have the audacity of wanting to be called benefactors. They wanted to be thought of as generous. Their propaganda is that “we are doing it for the people.” Saul thinks of himself as being a very generous benefactor in verse 7, giving those who are loyal to him all kinds of benefits. “I’m doing this for your good.” This was proto-socialism; redistribution of wealth. Tyrants think that is being generous, but you can hardly call theft generosity. And socialism is theft. Saul did not give these people money out of his *own* pocket. *That* would be generous. Instead, he gave the lands and vineyards of others. The reality was that he was a tyrant who did not think of himself as a servant of the people.

Saul refers to David as “**my servant**,” and is outraged that David can thwart his will. His thought is, “David’s whole existence is to serve me.” And no one was exempt. Even Jonathan’s loyalty is questioned by Saul when his son did the constitutionally right thing. Later when Saul’s servants refuse to kill the priests, he gets very upset. But just sticking to verses 6-10, I don’t think that it is by accident that every single reference to servanthood is a reference to serving Saul or being servants of Saul. This is in such stark contrast to the Biblical language that I don’t think it is by accident. The greatest civil magistrate in the Old Testament, Moses, is said to be the servant of God twenty-one times. And since he was a servant of God first and foremost, he became a servant of the people par excellence. In Numbers 16:15 Moses said, “**I have not taken one donkey from them, nor have I hurt one of them.**” He didn’t even take pay, let alone retirement. He laid down his life for his people. Now I am not opposed to paying people well when they serve in the civil government. I think the Bible allows for that. My only point is to analyze to what degree a candidate has a servant’s heart.

How are most people in our Federal Government matching up to this list of twelve indicators so far? Not very good. But you know, a more important question is, “How do we match up to God’s word in our leadership?” Do we have servant hearts? We can’t point the finger at our officers without realizing that we have three fingers pointing back at us.

X. Machiavellian manipulation replaces statesmanship (v. 7-8)

There is a tenth principle by which we can evaluate political leaders, and that is the degree to which manipulation replaces statesmanship. When statesmen rule a nation there can still be differences of opinion, but those differences are allowed and/or ironed out through open dialogue. In contrast, Nicolo Machiaveli, the Florentine political thinker of the sixteenth century, mapped out a philosophy and handbook of how politicians should engage in politics. It’s a fascinating work. And that philosophy advocated cunning, deceit, manipulation, and use of arbitrary power. Of course, he was only systematizing what he believed had been most successful down through the centuries. Politics is basically Machiavellian manipulation. That is modern politics in a nutshell.

Commentators have noted the incredible manipulation being used in verses 7-8. Take a look at those verses. Saul says that they owe him for the political favors he has given. He gives the hope of more favors that are possible. He assures them that these will all be stripped away by David if

David gets into power. He downplays the significance of David by referring to him as “the son of Jesse,” and of course Jesse was a nobody. He makes a veiled threat in the first part of verse 8, whines in the second part, pictures himself as a victim in the third, and implies that extraordinary measures are needed because his very life is in danger in the last part of verse 8. But not a shred of this was based on reality. It was propaganda. It was a masterful piece of Machiavellian manipulation.

And of course, the power brokers of today are just as clever. If anyone tries to call Congress back to constitutional expenditures, people will try to make him out as an ogre intent on taking away food from babies, mothers, and the aged. If he cooperates he is promised a position on a prestigious committee. If he doesn't, there can always be veiled threats of being sidelined, or even of their career being sunk. We have many examples of guilt by association used today just as Saul did when he called David the “son of Jesse.” The guilt by association today may be the term “racist,” or “right-wing-extremist,” but it is still manipulation, not dealing with issues.

Of course, we could spend all day criticizing modern politicians for their duplicity in this, but it is very important that we avoid the same thing in our arguments with others. This past Wednesday one of you rightly observed that some people think they have won an argument when they have gotten the other person to stop arguing. That's a pretty bad assumption. The reality often is that people give up trying to dialogue with Machiavellians. It's a no-win situation. And Machiavellians exist in families, churches, and in civil governments. Pray that Christians would abandon all such methods and would trust the Lord to win with the *truth*, not with manipulation; not with power-lays. We want statesmanship, not politics.

XI. Decisions are weighed by political advancement (v. 9-10)

The eleventh thing that we see is illustrated in the life of Doeg in verses 9-10. His decision to speak is not weighed by godly standards, methods, or goals. He wants political advancement. That's what the political game is all about. You faithfully pay your dues to those who are in power and you get promoted. Let's start reading at verse 9.

1 Samuel 22:9 Then answered Doeg the Edomite, who was set over the servants of Saul, ...

Let's just stop there for a moment. Do you notice anything odd about that statement? “**Then answered Doeg the Edomite, who was set over the servants of Saul, ...**” Doeg has had a huge advancement. Look at chapter 21:7 and see what his position was there. It says,

Now a certain man of the servants of Saul was there that day, detained before the LORD. And his name was Doeg, an Edomite, the chief of the herdsmen who belonged to Saul.

In chapter 21 Doeg is only in charge of the people who are herding cattle. In chapter 22 Doeg has already been promoted to be over all of the servants of Saul – the very servants who are gathered around Saul. Something has happened between then and now. And that something is probably that Doeg had already told this plus a lot more to Saul. This is not the first time that Saul has heard this information. Which means that Saul has been using this setup to try to find out who is loyal to him and who is not. He doesn't need new information. Verse 6 says that he had already discovered where David was – probably from Doeg. He's playing this charade to see who is loyal and who is not. But this is an amazing thing – that a non-citizen is now second-in-command under Saul. I think you can draw your own applications for today.

Anyway, that is just as a side note. The main thing is that Doeg has already been promoted and is willing to kill all the priests in the rest of the chapter to get more promotion. Let me keep reading in 1 Samuel 22:9.

...and said, "I saw the son of Jesse going to Nob, to Ahimelech the son of Ahitub.

1 Samuel 22:10 And he inquired of the LORD for him, gave him provisions, and gave him the sword of Goliath the Philistine."

Doeg could claim that everything he said was true. But his goal for speaking this truth was to get David into trouble and to get himself into Saul's good graces. How many actions are taken behind closed doors for political advancement like Doeg had already done with Saul? And how many actions are done in public simply to be able to further advance their political career? With some people we may never know, but it is ever a temptation.

XII. Everything becomes subservient to the state (vv. 11-19 – to be continued)

When the state becomes all, everything begins to become subservient to the state, which is point number XII. We will look at verses 11-19 next week, and see how all of America's first and second amendment rights were completely stripped away by Saul in the next few verses. We won't get into those issues today.

Conclusion

But I think that if you evaluate our local, state, and federal governments just on the basis of the twelve principles that we have already

covered, our nation is in desperate need of prayer. Pray that our nation would repent and that a Davidic kind of minimalism would be restored to civil government at every level from city to national governments. But pray also that family and church governments would be restored to godly submission to king Jesus. A simple revival in the church will not be enough to change such systemic problems as we see in America. The election of a constitutional president will not be enough to change such systemic problems as we see in America. Judging from history, and based upon the testimony of the Word of God, I believe we will need a thoroughgoing Reformation that changes the worldview thinking and acting of Christians everywhere before the evils of this chapter will be reversed. Pray and work for such a Reformation. Amen.

Watch Out When State Security Trumps God-Given Rights

1Samuel 22:6-10

By Phillip G. Kayser at DCC on 7-3-2011

Introduction

- I. Constitutional patriots like David become the enemy, not Edomites like Doeg (v. 6a with 9ff)
- II. Security of the administration becomes uppermost (v. 6b)
- III. Cronyism becomes rampant (v. 7)
- IV. Property is seen as a grant from government (v. 7b)
- V. Patriotism is redefined as loyalty to a man (v. 8a)
- VI. The language related to civics becomes redefined (v. 8a)
- VII. Spying on citizens becomes common (v. 8b)
- VIII. Failure to get on board is interpreted ominously (v. 8a,c,d)
- IX. The issue of who is being served gets inverted (v. 8c with 6-10; Luke 22:24-30)
- X. Machiavellian manipulation replaces statesmanship (v. 7-8)
- XI. Decisions are weighed by political advancement (v. 9-10)
- XII. Everything becomes subservient to the state (vv. 11-19 – to be continued)

Conclusion

