



Submission to Lawful Authority Due Process for Objections

*Living in the Image of God
Module 03 Session 08*

Banking Blessings Ministry
San Antonio, Texas
USA



Living in the Image of God

- God creates every person to represent him in interactions with others
- Be for others what God would be for them if he lived with us in human form
- He provides resources for people to perform the responsibilities and blesses those that do
- Program seeks to understand the meaning, resources, and human responsibilities and benefits of *Living in the Image of God*

bankingblessing.org



What We Will Learn

- Part 2 of 3 on submission to lawful authority
- Understanding Christ interactions regarding temple tax
- He chose to pay the tax despite recognizing possible grounds for objection
- Objection must conform to due process in obedience to lawful authority
- Examples from Saul-Jonathan-Israel interactions during a military campaign

bankingblessing.org



What We Will Learn cont'd

- Interactions among Saul, Jonathan, and Israel illustrate due process for objections against authority
- Examples of objections against king's order
- One did not conform to due process and led to prosecution of the objector
- The other conformed to due process and resulted in overruling an order of the king
- Discuss due process based on the events

bankingblessing.org



Objection by Jonathan

- Jonathan disobeyed king's order against eating during pursuit of Philistines
- He was not aware of the order
- Also, he criticized the king publicly after he became aware of the king's order
- Did not conform to due process for objection
- God turned away from Israel as a result
- 1 Samuel 14:24–30 and 37

bankingblessing.org



1 Samuel 14 (NIV)

24 Now the Israelites were in distress that day, because Saul had bound the people under an oath, saying, "Cursed be anyone who eats food before evening comes, before I have avenged myself on my enemies!" So none of the troops tasted food.

25 The entire army entered the woods, and there was honey on the ground.

bankingblessing.org



26 When they went into the woods, they saw the honey oozing out; yet no one put his hand to his mouth, because they feared the oath.

27 But Jonathan had not heard that his father had bound the people with the oath, so he reached out the end of the staff that was in his hand and dipped it into the honeycomb. He raised his hand to his mouth, and his eyes brightened.

bankingblessing.org



28 Then one of the soldiers told him, “Your father bound the army under a strict oath, saying, ‘Cursed be anyone who eats food today!’ That is why the men are faint.”

29 Jonathan said, “My father has made trouble for the country. See how my eyes brightened when I tasted a little of this honey.

bankingblessing.org



30 How much better it would have been if the men had eaten today some of the plunder they took from their enemies. Would not the slaughter of the Philistines have been even greater?”

- Jonathan disobeyed king’s order not knowing about the order but criticized the king publicly after he was informed of the order
- Disobedience to authority and due process

bankingblessing.org



- God turned away from Israel
- Because Jonathan disobeyed an order of the king and criticized the king publicly
- His actions did not conform to due process

1 Samuel 14:37 So Saul asked God, “Shall I go down and pursue the Philistines? Will you give them into Israel’s hand?” But God did not answer him that day.

bankingblessing.org



- King’s investigation (prayer and lot-casting) determined Jonathan was the culprit
- Announced full punishment for Jonathan
- However, the people overruled the king
- By collective decision (due process)
“But the men said to Saul...” [1 Samuel 14:45]
- Jonathan was set free
- 1 Samuel 14:38, 39, and 45

bankingblessing.org



38 Saul therefore said, “Come here, all you who are leaders of the army, and let us find out what sin has been committed today.

39 As surely as the Lord who rescues Israel lives, even if the guilt lies with my son Jonathan, he must die.” But not one of them said a word.

bankingblessing.org



1 Samuel 14 (NIV)

45 But the men said to Saul, “Should Jonathan die—he who has brought about this great deliverance in Israel? Never! As surely as the Lord lives, not a hair of his head will fall to the ground, for he did this today with God’s help.” So the men rescued Jonathan, and he was not put to death.

- King overruled by collective decision of the people through their representatives

bankingblessing.org



Collective Decision

- Modern day forms of collective decision of the people
- Decision of the legislature
- Decision of the judiciary (court system)
- Specific authorities defined by rules and regulations
- Referendum or ballot initiative
- General protest by the people could be an input to a collective decision process

bankingblessing.org



What We Learned

- Due process for objections against lawful authority
- Understanding Christ submission to temple tax
- Objection should conform to due process in obedience to lawful authority
- Examples from interactions among Saul, Jonathan, and Israel during a military campaign

bankingblessing.org



What We Learned cont'd

- An objection did not conform to due process and resulted in prosecution of the objector
- An objection by collective decision of the people (conformed to due process) resulted in overruling the king
- Collective decision of the people in modern-day society: Decisions through legislature, judiciary, special authority, referendum or ballot initiative, or public protest

bankingblessing.org

Submission to Lawful Authority—Due Process for Objections

Living in the Image of God M03S08

Discussion of Christ teaching regarding the temple tax continues with interactions among Saul, Jonathan, and people of Israel; to understand that an objection against lawful authority must conform to due process. The interactions provide two examples of an objection against an order of the king. One did not conform to due process and led to prosecution of the objector. The other, an objection by collective decision of the people, resulted in overruling the king and illustrates due process by collective decision. In modern-day societies, a collective decision could be channeled through the legislature, judiciary, specially authorized persons, referendum or ballot initiative, or public protest.

This study is the second of a three-part series on submission to lawful authority: based on Christ teaching regarding the temple tax. As we discuss in the first part, he chose to pay the tax despite recognizing possible grounds for objection. Our discussion in this study focuses on understanding that an objection must conform to due process in obedience to lawful authority. We discuss examples from interactions among King Saul, his son and second-in-command Jonathan, and the people of Israel. The interactions occurred during a military campaign.

The interactions provide two examples of an objection against an order of the king. One example did not conform to due process and led to prosecution of the objector. In contrast, the other example shows that an objection by a collective decision of the people resulted in overruling the king and, thus, illustrates that a collective decision of the people conforms to due process.

Also, we identify several forms of collective decision of the people in a modern-day society: such as a decision of the legislature, judiciary (or court system), specially authorized persons such as tax collectors, referendum or ballot initiative, or public protest.

Objection by Jonathan

As second in command under King Saul, Jonathan had initiated a battle against the Philistines [1 Samuel 14:1]: “One day Jonathan son of Saul said to his young armor-bearer, ‘Come, let’s go over to the Philistine outpost on the other side.’ But he did not tell his father.” He was successful in the early stages of the battle and subsequently led Israel in pursuit of the enemy through the day [1 Samuel 14:14–15]: “In that first attack Jonathan and his armor-bearer killed some twenty men in an area of about half an acre. Then panic struck the whole army—those in the camp and field, and those in the outposts and raiding parties—and the ground shook. It was a panic sent by God.”

The Israelites pursued the Philistines through the day. The soldiers were hungry and faint later in the day. However, they refrained from eating, not even honey that was abundant everywhere, because they were prohibited from eating, by an order of the king [1 Samuel 14:24]: “Now the Israelites were in distress that day, because Saul had bound the people under an oath, saying, ‘Cursed be anyone who eats food before evening comes, before I have avenged myself on my enemies!’ So none of the troops tasted food.”

Jonathan was unaware of the king’s order against eating during the pursuit of the Philistines and ate some of the honey [1 Samuel 14:26–27]: “When they went into the woods, they saw the

honey oozing out; yet no one put his hand to his mouth, because they feared the oath. But Jonathan had not heard that his father had bound the people with the oath, so he reached out the end of the staff that was in his hand and dipped it into the honeycomb. He raised his hand to his mouth, and his eyes brightened.”

One of the soldiers informed Jonathan that his father had bound the people with an oath against eating. He was not happy with the order and criticized the king publicly for giving such an order [1 Samuel 14:29]: “Jonathan said, ‘My father has made trouble for the country. See how my eyes brightened when I tasted a little of this honey.’”

Prosecution for Disobedience

Thus, Jonathan disobeyed the king’s order not knowing about the order and criticized the king publicly after he was informed of the order. His actions amounted to disobedience against lawful authority and did not conform to due process, because his authority did not include disobeying an order of the king or criticizing the king. As a result, God turned away from Israel [1 Samuel 14:37]: “So Saul asked God, ‘Shall I go down and pursue the Philistines? Will you give them into Israel’s hand?’ But God did not answer him that day.”

The king investigated by prayer and lot and determined that an action by Jonathan was the reason God turned away from Israel. He announced that Jonathan will be put to death as punishment [1 Samuel 14:39]: “‘As surely as the Lord who rescues Israel lives, even if the guilt lies with my son Jonathan, he must die.’ But not one of them said a word.” That is, Jonathan was prosecuted and pronounced guilty because he objected to the king’s order without conforming to due process.

King’s Ruling Overturned

After the king pronounced Jonathan guilty, the people’s representatives selected by the king decided to overrule the king [1 Samuel 14:45]: “But the men said to Saul, ‘Should Jonathan die—he who has brought about this great deliverance in Israel? Never! As surely as the Lord lives, not a hair of his head will fall to the ground, for he did this today with God’s help.’ So the men rescued Jonathan, and he was not put to death.”

Their decision to overrule the king represented a collective decision of the people (“But the men said to Saul...”), because they were duly appointed as representatives of the people [1 Samuel 14:38]: “Saul therefore said, ‘Come here, all you who are leaders of the army, and let us find out what sin has been committed today.’” Therefore, their decision conformed to due process and was a basis for overturning the king’s ruling. Thus, the king was overruled by a collective decision of the people and Jonathan was set free.

Collective Decision in Modern-Day Societies

A collective decision of the people can be accomplished in several ways in a modern-day society, such as the following: decision of the legislature; the judiciary (or court system); specific authorities established by rules and regulations, such as tax-collectors; and referendum or ballot initiatives. Additionally, a general protest by the people could provide input to a collective decision process.

Summary of What We Learned

Discussion of Christ teaching regarding the temple tax continued with interactions among Saul, Jonathan, and people of Israel; to understand that an objection against lawful authority must conform to due process.

The interactions provide two examples of an objection against an order of the king. One did not conform to due process and led to prosecution of the objector. The other, an objection by collective decision of the people, resulted in overruling the king and illustrates due process by collective decision.

In modern-day societies, a collective decision could be channeled through the legislature, judiciary, specially authorized persons, referendum or ballot initiative, or public protest.