

**Review: Patrick Matrisciana, *Dual Citizenship-The Christian and Politics*,  
Hemet, CA, Jeremiah Books, 1995**

A condensed and challenging view of the Christian and politics. Two choices are put, not without some fallacy. On the one hand is the Christian who rejects completely any involvement in secular government and limits activity to prayer. The other has him taking responsibility for the government of the country while still maintaining an active prayer life for the authorities.

The later chapters have more emphasis on the scriptures and the Christian's mandate, also past saints such as Bonhoeffer and Niemoller who stood up to tyranny. This follows from many well-known quotations, but from men which add power to the work's conclusion.

As an aside the author seems to believe the foundation of the U.S.A. is Christian, yet there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary, that the roots are Masonic and Jesuitical<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless at face value many of the quotations produced on the Founding Fathers views and the Constitution could be interpreted as Christian, e.g., on p. 22 (sixth) U.S. President John Quincy Adams is quoted that the greatness of the American Revolution was its bonding together of civil government and Christian principles.

In chapter one James Garfield, 20<sup>th</sup> U.S. President, in 1877 is quoted as identifying the linkage between the moral and spiritual fibre of the people and its leadership, whether good or evil. The fragility of good government is evident as in a single generation change may come. Those appealing to God-ordained powers in a fatalistic way have a narrow view of scripture and forget cases where prophets rebuked kings in the Old (e.g. Elisha) and New testament (e.g. John). A weakness of this example is these men of God did not specifically hold worldly positions of office, rather in their capacity as Christians attempted to influence ungodly rulers. Other examples of Joseph, Daniel and Esther would be more relevant.

A 'falling' away over the last hundred years is highlighted. The author

---

<sup>1</sup>See *Hidden Faith of Our Founding Fathers*, Adullam Films, 2010  
diagnoses the symptoms (e.g. retreat into church cocoons of correctness

away from the world's pollution) but seems lost as to the root causes, viz., counter-Reformation Jesuit higher criticism and another Jesuit enterprise courtesy of Pierre de Tielhard - Darwin's idea of evolution. These twin prongs destroyed belief in absolute authority in the Bible from Genesis, bleeding into moral relativism and post-modernism philosophies. Resulting physical evils are described, e.g. AIDS, wars, abortion, etc.

The cliché of separation of Church and State is mentioned whereby a rule (i.e. the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights) to prevent the tyranny of state religion (e.g. Roman Catholicism) whilst maintaining freedom of conscience *in a predominantly Christian nation* is changed, into one where the State becomes the substitute religion and any and all vestiges of Christianity must be purged from society.

Writings of one Fisher Ames and then Vice-President John Adams are quoted to demonstrate correct *context* of the First Amendment. Ames drafted the wording, he advocated Bible teaching as the core curriculum for schooling. Adams stated the *Christian* religion was superior to all others and this Bill of Rights was wholly inadequate to an immoral and irreligious people.

America's first president, George Washington [a Freemason] questioned whether a secure society is even possible without religion, given it is a precursor to *maintaining* morality.

An interesting point is made regarding Jesus' parable of the tribute money in Matthew 22.21, that dual *responsibility* rather than dual *separation* is taught. A past U.S. Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story interpreted the First Amendment's purpose as to exclude rivalry between Christian sects and in no way advocate Judaism, Mohammedanism or any other [inferior] religion. Finally, the first official act of Congress was to open in prayer!

The 1776 Declaration of Independence [a.k.a. Illuminati Day], listed twenty-eight grievances against King James and formed the basis for the principle of impeachment, i.e. the political removal process of a tyrannical ruler. Benjamin Franklin's [a Freemason] quote is relevant, "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." The moral lesson is Christians should at least take up the pen and speak out *against* wicked rulers for their wickedness.

The number of Biblical examples where holy men delivered judgment to

kings is quite convincing, i.e. Moses and Pharaoh, Elijah and King Ahab and his Queen Jezebel, Jonah and Nineveh, and Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar. Although only the Assyrian King of Nineveh and Nebuchadnezzar actually repented God still held each one accountable for their actions.

In this tradition Christians should not hesitate even in the face of great evil from taking a stand.<sup>2</sup>

A case study of President Bill Clinton is made of a leader committing sexual deviancy and other immoral behaviour. Exploits before and after becoming Governor of Arkansas include: wrote he loathed the military, admitted to smoking drugs, supported communist causes, channeled taxpayer funds to Hillary Clinton's business associates, pardoned a friend Dan Lasater for dealing cocaine to minors, consorted with criminals, destroyed incriminating evidence and attempted bribery.

He also changed I Corinthians 2.9 in his acceptance speech for Democratic Party Nominee at the Democratic Convention, this demonstrates he was not a Christian.

After becoming President he appointed over thirty sodomites to high Cabinet positions, supporting their sexualised teaching of school children about sodomy, forced the military to accept homosexuality, invaded Haiti, legislated for open access to abortion clinics and promoted OBE (Outcomes Based Education) which dissolves absolute standards in favour of multicultural gobbledygook (via an ironically named program '**Goals 2000**').

The double standards and myopia of people is pointed out, whereby such behaviours amongst close associates would never be tolerated, yet those in positions of power are simply ignored or at worst praised (e.g. Australian's response to Kevin Rudd's visit to a New York strip joint).

The often quoted passages in Romans 1 and I Peter 2 to support total submission are analysed in context. Two conclusions are evident:

---

<sup>2</sup>Proverbs 25.26: “A righteous man falling down before the wicked *is as a troubled fountain and a corrupt spring.*”

government *in general* is God-ordained authority ('self-evident' truth); and rulers are to be obeyed only if the pre-requisite of them not being a terror to good works is met. Prayer for *individual* rulers (whether good or evil) is always required. As no Christian would submit to the devil which certainly holds great power ordained by God, so they should never acquiesce to wicked rulers. To navigate each situation requires the leading of the Holy Ghost, especially if violence is required (e.g. Hitler and the Third Reich, or Stalin's Communism).

Christians who take a stand are often attacked from other 'Christians' who take exception to any form of judgment, choosing instead to preach tolerance and love. This is justly labeled an *antigospel* (see Edward Heinke's work) with which the sinner's conscience is stroked and wicked

leaders are left to get away with crimes against their subjects. Judgment is especially warranted when a leader proclaims Christianity as their religion, for then they bring the Church and Gospel into disrepute.

Attempts to divorce a person's morality and ethics from their performance as leaders are also a smokescreen. Jesus teaching on fruit-bearing trees is plain enough – if a leader brings forth bad fruit it is out of a polluted soul.