

The American Revolution and War of Independence was not a Rebellion

By Gray W. Clark

Forward: The United States of America was not born in revolution, and those who promote rebellion against authority and cite the War of Independence (1775-1781) in support of such resistance will do well to take another look at the historical times in which this nation was forged. The word "revolution" has no place in the history that gave birth to the United States of America. The Israelite people who made up the original thirteen colonies were under the cover of the King of England. Original jurisdiction of America was under Almighty God and his servant, the King of England. Charters granted from the King of England provided for the lawful cover under which the original colonies were founded.

The King of England, by his own choice, made the decision to remove the thirteen colonies from his cover of authority, protection, and jurisdiction. Abandoned by their protector, the King of England, the Colonies had no obligation to submit to the English Parliament. Having been abandoned by the King of England, the Colonies had no option left but to establish themselves a new cover, a lawful shield of government formerly provided for them by the King. Every step leading to the founding of a new governmental authority was one of lawful action by the colonial legislatures established under authority of the King of England. He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us. - Declaration of Independence

All too often, uninformed people, many of them with little or no background in history, build their rebellious acts against the government from what they believe to be the rebellion of 1776, wherein our American Israelite founding fathers led a successful rebellion or revolution against the King of England. This kind of thinking permeates much of the religious literature coming off the printing presses in the remnant today. Our children deserve much better than this. They deserve the truth, and the truth is that America was not born in rebellion and revolution.

God blessed and prospered America as a nation because our founding fathers, being Christian, followed a very lawful and Christian road to secure our freedom in the War of Independence. May Jesus Christ bless and prosper the Israelites of this generation who seek to be Christian and who will take the time to properly instruct their children in the truth of our country's history. It is high time that we root out the spirit of rebellion that so often is manifested in the preaching and teaching of the religious journals of our generation. Our children should be taught to walk under the cover of authority in the home, the church, and the government. Protests and appeals against ungodly authorities should be made and every resource should be exhausted to protest sin in government and in leadership in the home, the church, and the state. Under no condition should Christians promote rebellion in the home, church, and state. I pray that the following treatise, written by Mr. Gray Clark, graduate of the University of Maryland and an ordained minister in the Church of Israel, will help to document the truth that America was born in lawful authority and not in rebellion.

Pastor Dan Gayman

The Birthing of America

Gray W. Clark

Why is it important to reexamine, in a Christian publication, the founding of America? Because the prevailing view of the birth of America is stilted. This stilted view has led Christians into rebellion. Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft (11 Samuel 15:23) which is always judged by God.

The hoax of the American Revolution is that it was not a series of rebellious acts by the colonists against the Crown of England. Modern textbooks are advancing the hoax with statements such as: "The Declaration was a revolutionary document in the sense that it justified a revolution already begun." This is a quote from a typical college textbook. This period of history is being misconstrued in school textbooks to influence thinking to rebellion and revolution.

When the Christian hears "revolution today", he thinks in terms of "Communist Revolution" and equates this with the "American Revolution". False equation. There was no Communist-style revolution to Birth America. Textbooks further teach that our forefathers wanted to break from the cover of the Crown and be separate. They, therefore, revolted to bring forth their desires, a new nation. Such teachings are not the best interpretation of facts.

Revolution and rebellion are harmful states of mind. Christians need to learn that America did not want to be independent of England; it was forced upon her. Before 1776, she made numerous Godly appeals to the Crown for reconciliation to her pre-1763 relationship with England, but without success. Actually, England declared war upon America and granted her independence on 22 December 1775.

The key period of history is from 1763 to the unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America in Congress, July 4, 1776. These events led to the Birth of America. Significant events occurred beginning with the Sugar Act of 5 April 1764 between Parliament, the King of England, and the Colonial Assemblies and Congress, that need to be better understood.

Some people say history is what the writer says it is. That is, the interpretation of facts is based upon the presupposition of the historian. The presupposition of most historians, as has already been illustrated by textbook example, is that America was founded in rebellion. This article opposes the rebellion view of America's birthing. The textbook teaching has, in many cases, and will, in others, make revolutionaries of us all. Perhaps this is the plan of the enemies of Christendom. Since World War II, there has been great emphasis upon promoting the American Revolution as a rebellion. Even a well known Kingdom-Israel publication recently supported this view; the editor wrote, "Perhaps it is time for the Second American Revolution."

I disagree. I believe that the colonists did not revolt (in terms of today's definition), but reacted to the Prohibitory Act of 22 December 1775. This Act forced the writing of the Unanimous Declaration of 4 July 1776. The Prohibitory Act is the key act of this historical period, yet only 10% of the history books

written since World War II mention the act. None give its implications. Do you know of this Act? You will soon learn of it.

Were there no Prohibitory Act, there would be some justification to defend an American rebellion; but with it, none. Since, in fact, our Christian forefathers did not rebel against the King of England, Christians can no longer use our founding fathers as an example and excuse to rebel today. Rebellion is a dangerous attitude and response to any action. It is condemned by the Word of God: "An evil man seeketh only rebellion: therefore a cruel messenger shall be sent against him" (Pro. 17:11).

It is important to remove the curse of misapplying what our forefathers did during the Revolutionary War era. These words of Solomon come to mind: "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he." (Pro. 23:7). When Christians hold in their heart the deceptive teaching of "revolution/rebellion", the implication upon personal lives is obvious.

Case in point: Do you know anyone who has committed rebellious acts against civil government using the excuse that "We owe it to our forefathers?" The question is, "What do we owe to our forefathers?" Do Christians owe "rebellion/revolution" or "responsibility/Godly appeals"? Charles M. Andrews knew the value of an accurate view of history when he wrote over 50 years ago in his *Colonial Background of the American Revolution*: "A nation's attitude toward its own history is like a window into its soul, and the men and women of such a nation cannot be expected to meet the great obligations of the present if they refuse to exhibit honesty, charity, open-mindedness, and a free and growing intelligence toward the past that has made them what they are?"

This article addresses two main thoughts: America was born under responsibility and Godly appeals. Governments born in rebellion die.

America Born Under Responsibility and Godly Appeals

The understanding of the founding of the great American nation centers around, first, the relationship between the colonies, the King of England, and Parliament and, second, the Prohibitory Act, 22 December 1775.

The Charters

Charters were contracts between proprietors and companies and the King of England. Parliament was not a party to these contracts or charters. The charters granted the founder executive, legislative and judicial authority. The King had only restraining authority. David Ramsey writes in his *Prelude to the American Revolution, 1765-1775*: "They (founders) looked upon their charters as a voluntary compact, between their sovereign and themselves, by which they were bound neither to be subject to, nor seek protection from any other prince: nor to make any laws repugnant to those of England: but did not consider them as inferring an obligation of obedience to a parliament, in which they were unrepresented."² As an example of many possible examples, the Charter of Maryland given to Lord

Baltimore in June, 1632, and his heirs contains this clause: "free, full and absolute Power...to ordain, Make, and Enact LAWS of what kind soever, according to their sound Discretion."³

Colonial America was self-governed people. The Encyclopedia Britannica says: "The Crown delegated rights of settlement and subordinate rights of government to proprietors...The patentees governed the colonists, and the Crown only interfered at intervals to adjust matters."⁴ As an example of the independence the Colonial Assemblies had of internal British control, only 5% of the thousands of laws colonial legislatures passed between 1691 and 1763 were vetoed by Britain.⁵

Parliament Interferes

After the ending of the French and Indian War in 1763, Great Britain was left with a large debt. From this point, serious interference by Parliament into the lives of colonists began. Parliament passed a series of famous acts beginning with The Sugar Act (5 April 1764) and ending with the Prohibitory Act (22 December 1775) to raise money to pay war debts and to control the Colonial Assemblies. The Colonial Assemblies resisted Parliament on grounds that the Charters did not grant her legislative power over them. Additionally, the colonists were not represented in Parliament, hence the cry "taxation without representation." The leaders in the colonies understood the Colonial Assemblies to be the lawmakers of the colonists and Parliament her counterpart of the English people. Parliament and the Assemblies were co-equal. Both legislatures reported to the King representing their separate peoples. Parliament was outside the colonial relationship with the King per Charters. The relationship of each colony to the King was one of allegiance to him in exchange for his protection. A drawing will help illustrate the relationship of the King, Parliament and Assemblies.

Protector	King (Crown)
-----------	--------------

Legislatures	Colonial Assemblies	Parliament
--------------	---------------------	------------

People	Colonists	Englishmen
--------	-----------	------------

Realm	America
-------	---------

Reconciliation Attempts, Rebuked

During the ensuing years of 1763 to 1776, the colonists made several attempts of reconciliation. They desired to retain their independence that existed prior to 1763, being free of internal British control. They were not striving to gain independence, but to preserve it. Parliament was attempting to erode it by usurping the legislative authority of Assemblies. After the war had begun on 19 April 1775 (Lexington and Concord), the Continental Congress voted to make one last effort to reconcile with England. The outcome of this vote was the Olive Branch Petition (8 July 1775). It was a petition to express loyalty to the King and seek a change of heart by England. In quoting from a portion of the Petition, does it sound of an attitude of rebellion and revolution? This was a Godly appeal.

That your faithful subject on this continent request...that the wished for opportunity would soon be restored to them, of evincing the sincerity of their professions by every testimony of devotion becoming the most dutiful subjects and the most affectionate colonists.⁶

This was the final colonial attempt to appeal to the King to return to the pre-1763 days of independence. The King refused to respond to this Petition.

On 6 July 1775, the Continental Congress issued the Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms. The Continental Congress felt that it was necessary to state why the colonies were taking up arms against England. Notice in the following quote from that Declaration that the delegates did NOT desire to separate from England. This indicates a responsible act of self-defense.

We have not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain, and establishing independent states. We fight not for glory or for conquest. We exhibit to mankind the remarkable spectacle of a people attached by unprovoked enemies.⁷

Revolution Defined

Revolution meant in 1775 "motion backward", a return to a prior position. The colonists desired to return to their independent position of 1763 as granted by the Charters. Webster's 1828 Dictionary says of revolution: "Motion of any thing which brings it to the same point or state; as the revolution of a day." The colonists were attempting something unique. To preserve a government, not overthrow it. The meaning today is not one of preservation, but replacement in a violent way. Webster's New World Dictionary (1976) says of revolution: "overthrow of a government, form of government, or social system by those governed and usually by forceful means, with another government or system taking its place." This definition adequately explains the French Revolution, the Communist Revolution in Russia (1917), and many others. But the American Revolution, often equated with these, should not be. It had different methods and different results. Our Revolution resulted in the same people being in power before and after the War. Unique. There were no blood baths and "reigns of terror." Unique again. Our forefathers drove the announced enemy (per Prohibitory Act) from this soil, and a new nation was born. Nothing more; nothing less.

Quoting from the authors of *The Revolution Myth* (p. 90):

"Irving Kristol observes that 'a successful revolution is best accomplished by a people who do not really want it at all, but find themselves reluctantly making it. The American Revolution was exactly such a reluctant revolution.' In fact, it could be argued that there was no revolution at all.⁸

Prohibitory Act

Parliament's response to colonial resistance was the passage of the Prohibitory Act on 22 December 1775. This Act is the key move taken by England to force the Declaration of Independence. On 26 October 1775 George III proposed in a speech to Parliament to remove the colonists from his protection and treat them as foreign enemies. The King's views were carried forth in Parliament by Lord North, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Thomas Walpole, a member of the House of Commons, expressed this view of the Act: "It begins with a formal indiscriminant declaration of war against the inhabitants of thirteen colonies."⁹

David Hartley, another member of Parliament, comments, "An inflexible majority in the Parliament have now declared all America to be an independent hostile state."¹⁰

Proof that this Act set America free from the king's protection negating her requirement to remain loyal to him, is the hiring of mercenaries (Hessians) by England to fight colonists. Mercenaries were used in the 18th century only for the purpose of engaging enemies of a nation. They were not used to put down civil unrest. The Prohibitory Act transferred the colonists from citizens to enemies of Great Britain. Remember that all of this took place seven months prior to 4 July 1776.

Colonial reaction to the Prohibitory Act will convince the concerned reader that America was outside the protection of the King and announced an enemy of England:

John Adams: "It is a complete Dismemberment of the British Empire. It throws thirteen colonies out of the Royal Protection, levels all distinctions, and makes us independent in spite of our supplications and entreaties."¹¹

Samuel Adams: "The King has thrown us out of his protection."¹²

Edmond Quincy points out that it is a maxim of common law according to William Blackstone that upon the duties of kings; that, when protection ceaseth, allegiance ceaseth to be the duty of the subject.¹³

The Passage of the Prohibitory Act meant that the colonies were free of English rule as of 22 December, and the subsequent Declaration of Independence was announcing that independence. It states in the Declaration: "He (King George) has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us." The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America in Congress, 4 July 1776 (Declaration of Independence), was announcing that which had already happened months ago. This Declaration gave reasons why reconciliation with Britain would not be possible. Quoting from the Notes of Proceeding: "That the question was not whether, by a declaration of independence, we should make ourselves what we are not; but whether we should declare a fact which already exists. That as to the people or parliament of England, we had always been independent of them...That as for the King, we had been bound to him by allegiance, but that this bond was dissolved by his assent to the late act (Prohibitory) of Parliament, by which he declares us out of his protection, by his levying way on us, a fact which had long ago proved us out of his protection; it being a certain position in law that allegiance and protection are reciprocal, the one ceasing when the other is withdrawn."¹⁴

Governments Born in Rebellion Die

The Scriptures confirm the preceding historical study, that being, America was born under authority and not in rebellion. The same principle judges nations as man. Sin brings judgment from God. When man sins, as in the case of King Saul, God took the kingdom from him. When nations sin, as in the case of Israel and her idolatry, God judges her to divorcement. The United States of America is viewed by Biblically knowledgeable people as the prophecy of Manasseh fulfilled. Christians can now take comfort

that God did not use rebellion to Birth America but delivered her within the framework of Scripture. A brief study of the governments of Biblical Israel will ice this truth.

Government by Judges

During the formation of Israel as a nation, God used Judges to deliver Israel from the hand of those that spoiled them (Judges 2:16). The typical pattern was this: Israel would sin as a people, and God would bring an enemy to judge Israel: this pressure caused Israel to cry for deliverance, and God would respond to her repentance by sending a Judge to defeat the enemy and restore rest to the land.

In every case Yahweh appointed the Judge. After the Judge defeated the enemies of Israel, there was rest (i.e., Judges 3:11). Peace and rest were blessings. Judges were both civil and military leaders. They were under the authority of Yahweh.

But on one occasion there was rebellion to gain rulership of Israel. After the death of Gideon, Abimelech conspired to make himself king. A king was not a Judge, therefore, unlawful. God always appointed the Judge, but Abimelech rebelled against this and killed 70 brothers to become king by trickery. This story is recorded in Judges 9. It should be read for full understanding. Abimelech sought an unauthorized and unscriptural goal. He was consequently judged by Yahweh and those who conspired with him. God sent an evil spirit to divide between him and the men of Shechem. Civil war came. Abimelech was slain at Thebez by a woman who cast a piece of millstone breaking his skull. This judgment upon Abimelech was God's answer to his rebellious actions (Judges 9:56). This administration, the only one born in rebellion/revolution, had to cope with insurrection, plots, and enjoyed no rest. He died in violence. The Judges were blessed; however, Abimelech was not. Rebellion is not blessed. If America was founded in rebellion, why was not George Washington judged as Abimelech?

Government by Kings

When Yahweh granted Israel rulership by kingship, he established the control of their appointment by direct calling. Saul, David and Jeroboam were called. If God did not make a special calling upon someone, then the throne went to the heir upon death of the king. Solomon and others are examples. All who have studied the reign of the kings know that many were evil. But, some were good. David, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah were good kings. No good king gained the throne outside God's order. But, and this is the point, any king who did murder and rebel to become king brought forth only evil administrations. They were judged. Examples follow:

Athaliah destroys royal seed to become queen of Judah. The rightful heir, Joash was spared. Athaliah's six-year reign was one of Baal worship. God Judged her to death. (Study II Kings 11). The rightful heir, Joash, ruled right, though not perfect.

Shallum, Menahem, Pekah, and Hoshea killed to become king. Zacharian, king of Israel, was killed by Shallurn, who became king.

Shallum was killed by Menahem, Mehakem was killed by Pekah and Pekah was killed by Hoshea. All these rebellious men were classed by God as having done evil (11 Kings 15:24). The Act of Shallum was a

conspiracy (11 King 15:15). The only good administrations were those that grew out of order. If American was born in rebellion, why wasn't President Washington judged as these men?

Conclusion

I hope that this brief article is sufficient to establish that grounds to justify personal rebellious acts against government are not defensible by actions of our Founding Fathers. Yahweh did not Bless revolution in Biblical Israel, so why would He now? Christians are encouraged to thoroughly understand America's Birth. Should you desire to know more, you may obtain a copy of The Revolution Myth and the tape The Birthing of America from the Church of Israel. The book contains an abridged copy of the Prohibitory Act as well as many important points not covered in this article.

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

Is your heart now free of the curse of the Hoax of the American Revolution? It should be.

"Go and sin no more" (John 8:11).

Write for additional booklets, cassette tapes and videos available at the CHURCH OF ISRAEL Missionary and Literature Room, P.O. Box 62-B3, Schell City, MO 64782

Notes:

1. J. Murry Murdoch, THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION: SYMPOSIUM OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. (Vallecito, CA JCR), p. 74. Available from Christian Heritage Bookstore, Route 1, Box 62B3, Schell City, MO 64783.
2. Verna M. Hall, THE CHRISTIAN HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. (San Francisco, CA. FACE), P. 429.
3. Gene Fisher & Glen Chambers, THE REVOLUTION MYTH. (Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1981), p. 3.
4. "Development of Imperial Control, 1606-1760", Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th Edition, Vol. 27, p. 668.
5. Hofsadler, Miller, Aaron, THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 148.
6. Op. cit., Fisher & Chambers, p. 34.
7. Ibid., p. 35.
8. Ibid., p. 90.
9. Ibid., p. 41.

10. Ibid., p. 42.

11. Ibid., p. 49.

12. Ibid., p. 73.

13. Idem.

14. Ibid., p. 50.