

1 LIMITED REVIEW OF A FEW PARTS OF TIMOTHY BALDWIN'S "ROMANS 13: THE TRUE MEANING OF SUBMISSION"

PG	REFERENCE	BALDWIN INTERPRETATION	BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION (in my opinion)
64	Rm 13:1, 4. The powers that be are ordained of God. ... He is the minister of God to thee for good.	"God's ordination of government is narrowly defined as one which is 'a minister of God to thee.'	Not so. Rm 13:1, "[ALL] the powers THAT EXIST are ordained of God." If Baldwin claims evil powers aren't really powers, that would mean no evil governments exist, since they wouldn't really be governments, but even Baldwin doesn't claim there are no evil powers or governments.
74	Rm 13:4. He is the minister of God to thee for good.	"Only governments which properly execute ... protection, happiness and peace are ministers of God."	Not so. Rm 13:1-4, "Be subject to THE higher authorities [THE higher authorities, not just the good higher authorities], because there exists no authority but OF God [even evil authorities only exist only because God allows them to]. The powers THAT BE [not that ought to be, or merely claim to be] are ordained of God. ... He is the minister of God to thee for good [ideally, the purpose and way it ought to be]. ... He bears not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God." If a government ruler has the power of life, death, and imprisonment, i.e. the sword, that ruler is in a position of minister, i.e. servant, to God. He has authority because he is under authority [God > Ruler > Ruled], even if he performs that service badly, and will be judged for performing that service badly. Lu 7:8. I also am a man set UNDER authority [the emperor], having soldiers under ME, and I say to one, Go, and he goes; and to another, Come, and he comes.
<p>That isn't to say you should give unlimited obedience even to 'good' governments. It doesn't you shouldn't drive some amount over the stated speed limit as is generally expected for safe driving. And your duty to your family is greater than your duty to your country. So hide your guns if the government tries to confiscate them if you think it would be better for your family and you're willing to risk the potential consequences of getting caught. But Baldwin is wrong saying evil governments are illegitimate or that they have to merit our obedience. Our obedience should never be unlimited; but it should always be unconditional, not based on how well the one in authority performs. We obey the office, not the man; and we render obedience to the office, in order to obey God who says to obey authority [but always limited except for our obedience to God].</p>			
<p>David's government was legitimate over Absalom's, not because it was good and Absalom's was bad, but because God supernaturally appointed David, not Absalom, just like God supernaturally appointed Saul's evil government. Saul even had the priests slain. 1 Sam 22:18-19, The king [Saul] said to Doeg, ... Fall upon the priests. And Doeg ... slew on that day 85 persons that wore a linen ephod. And Nob, the city of the priests, smote he with the edge of the sword, both men and women, children and babies, and oxen, and asses, and sheep, with the edge of the sword. Nevertheless, David recognized Saul's rightful authority until Saul died. 1 Sam 26:11, The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth my hand against the Lord's anointed [Saul].</p>			
<p>And though God doesn't supernaturally announce specific rulers via prophets even in Israel nowadays, Absalom and his government was clearly the rebel and revolutionary government, not David's preexisting government that fled into exile. But that was an issue between one government and another, and the people only had a choice of which of the two to support. Private citizens are not to decide if they will submit to the one government they're under based on whether it 'merits' their submission as Baldwin teaches.</p>			
124	Rm 13:6-7 ⁶ For this cause pay 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	" <i>For this cause do we pay tribute.</i> " ... Our submission is based upon the	Baldwin wrongly connects the 'for this cause' of verse 6, back to verse 4, "He is the minister of God to you for <u>good</u> ," instead of to verse 5, "you must be subject for <u>conscience</u> sake," which in turn is based on verse 1 ff. that "the powers that be are ordained of <u>God</u> ." Our conscience to God requires us to obey even bad rulers God puts over us as

2 LIMITED REVIEW OF A FEW PARTS OF TIMOTHY BALDWIN'S "ROMANS 13: THE TRUE MEANING OF SUBMISSION"

	whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.	merit of the higher powers."	obedience to God who put them over us. If you think God would only allow the best of men to become rulers, when was the last time that happened?
126	1 Cor 11:14. Doesn't even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?	"If nature teaches it is wrong for a man to have long hair, how much more does nature teach us that ... robbery is robbery, regardless of the position of those robbing? Burlamaqui, 'We may lawfully oppose [with] force violence.'"	Natural Law is a philosophical concept of humanist philosophers, whereas we go by the Bible, which by its supernatural nature, contradicts natural man. 1 Cor 2:14. The natural man receives not the things of the Spirit of God, ... neither can he know them. <u>Wikipedia</u> on Natural Law: Modern natural law theories took shape in the Age of Enlightenment [1715-1789]. ... It was used in challenging the theory of the divine right of kings, and became an alternative justification for the establishment of a social contract. <u>Wikipedia</u> on Age of Enlightenment: The Enlightenment has its roots in a European intellectual and scholarly movement known as Renaissance humanism. ... European historians traditionally date its beginning with the death of Louis XIV of France in 1715 and its end with the 1789 outbreak of the French Revolution. ... The ideas of the Enlightenment undermined the authority of the monarchy and the Catholic Church and paved the way for the political revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries. A variety of 19th-century movements, including liberalism, communism, and neoclassicism, trace their intellectual heritage to the Enlightenment.
126-127		"The doctrine of unconditional submission to whoever claims power ... requires ... God himself to bow [his knees] to the so-called higher power, ... inexplicable nonsense."	Baldwin often deals dishonestly with the alternative to his view. He frequently sets up nonsense straw man arguments to refute. It's not the one 'claiming' power that has power, but the ones actually having power. Rm 13:1, "The powers the BE [not "that claim to be"] are ordained of God. God is in control and limits even what Satan may do.
127		"When God has commanded <i>hupotasso</i> in different areas of life, it is impossible that unconditional submission would be required in each instance, ... man to God, wives to husbands, church members to pastors, younger to older, servants to masters, and children to parents."	Baldwin confuses 'unconditional' with 'unlimited.' Biblical submission is unconditional, but not unlimited. A pastor has unconditional authority because of his position, not conditional because of his merit. But even the best pastor's authority is limited to things like when and where the church should meet or who may teach, but never over what doctrine each person must believe in their heart. ERV version, 1 Pet 2:18, "Slaves, be willing to serve your masters. Do this with all respect. You should obey the masters who are good and kind, and you should obey the masters who are bad." Would you really teach your kids they should only obey you if, in their opinion, you were making a correct decision? They shouldn't rob a bank or hurt someone because you tell them to, but they should obey even when you're wrong about things that aren't explicitly sin.
131-132	Acts 25:10. Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as you very well know. 11 For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto		"After being arrested by his higher powers [how can Baldwin call them higher powers if he thinks 'there is no power except from God, the powers that <u>exist</u> are ordained of God' means evil powers aren't really powers], and upon their desire to execute him [actually they desired
			This looks exactly the opposite to me. Paul is working within the Roman law which allowed appeals to a higher court. Paul still rendered honor to Festus, and Rome, and Roman law when he appealed. He's not

3 LIMITED REVIEW OF A FEW PARTS OF TIMOTHY BALDWIN'S "ROMANS 13: THE TRUE MEANING OF SUBMISSION"

	<p>them. I appeal unto Caesar. ... 16 To whom I answered, It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him.</p>	<p>to send him to a trial in Jerusalem though the result would still be Paul's death], Paul does not unconditionally submit to this power, nor does he render 'honor to whom honor is (not) due.'"</p>	<p>sending secret messages to the apostles and believers to form militias to try to overthrow the government by force.</p>
<p>132-133</p>	<p>"On another occasion, Paul rebukes a Jewish high priest/higher power in Acts 23:1-3 [re] ... hitting Paul on the mouth. Paul '<u>seditionously</u>' establishes during the inquisition that the higher powers were acting contrary to ... natural ... law. ...</p> <p>The <u>rebellion</u> the Apostles and disciples exhibited singularly exhibits a God-given right which could be exercised collectively by the people at large to overthrow evil government."</p>	<p>Paul said he didn't realize the one who commanded him to be struck was the high priest.</p> <p>The apostles didn't commit even a single act of 'rebellion.' They continued to recognize the authority of the evil behaving Sanhedrin as legitimate, and continued to obey on every issue except the vital one God explicitly commanded them to do otherwise in the great commission of Mt 28. "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken to you more than unto God, you judge. 20 For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." When they were released, they went back and prayed for boldness, willing to suffer the consequences for an issue worth dying for. They didn't organize an underground rebel movement to try to overthrow the existing government by force.</p>	
	<p>Based on the above, I think it would have been appropriate for a person to try to execute Hitler, because the duty to protect life is greater than the duty to obey government.</p> <p>As for the American Revolution, when Britain tried to raise money from its American colonies to help repay its debt from the French and Indian War, or for whatever reason directly or indirectly, by the Molasses Act (1733), Sugar Act (1764), Stamp Act (1765), and the Tea Act (1773), I think it would have been wrong for the colonists to resist violently, and except for some protestors at isolated protests like at the Boston Massacre (1770), they restricted their reactions to non-violent efforts. And as to "no taxation without representation," that was an Englishman's right, but not a biblical right, like under King David etc. But when Britain passed laws like the Massachusetts Government Act (1774) eliminating local government which Massachusetts had some degree of since 1691, and which led to the First Continental Congress (1774), that's a more difficult issue since it seems similar to an act of war. But even then I think they should have paid for the damage of the Tea Party and endured having Britain appoint more of their government officers. But eventually, for selfish reasons, the ungodly among the colonists would have rebelled as they did, simply because they could as they got stronger and more wealthy.</p> <p>1774 Wikipedia Intolerable Acts: The Boston Port Act was the first of the laws passed in 1774 in response to the Boston Tea Party. It closed the port of Boston until the colonists paid for the destroyed tea and the king was satisfied that order had been restored.</p> <p>1773 Wikipedia Boston Tea Party: Benjamin Franklin stated that the East India Company should be paid for the destroyed tea, all ninety thousand pounds (which, at two shillings per pound, came to £9,000 [2014, approx. \$1.7 million US]). Robert Murray, a New York merchant, went to Lord North with three other merchants and offered to pay for the losses, but the offer was turned down.</p> <p>1778 Wikipedia Massachusetts Government Act: [British] Parliament repealed the act in 1778 as part of attempts to reach a diplomatic end to the ongoing American Revolutionary War.</p>		