

## THE PRAYER OF AGREEMENT *Part One: A Unified Nation*

*By Rev. Christine Meier*

In order for us to understand the intensity for, and benefits of the prayer of agreement, I need to dispel a few misconceptions. The first is that it means we all have to agree on everything we each do and believe. The second is that the benefits of this prayer of agreement are only for Christians or that only Christians can participate in agreeing. To be sure, there are spiritual aspects of the prayer of agreement which only confirmed saints can benefit from as well as participate in. Which, of course, leads me to another misconception, and that is that you have to be perfect or dead in order to be a saint! The New Testament writers all referred to the churches and one another as saints. This is because the true definition of a saint is a person who accepts Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior and is willing to allow the Holy Spirit entry into all aspects of their lives, so that they may live their lives according to God's plans and purposes for them. Now, the plain reality is that not all people who claim Christ live that way; and certainly, those who refuse Christ do not wish to live that way. The misconception is that we have to agree on these issues in order to see unity or experience a unified nation.

In 'part one' of our discussion, we will review how it was that America could unify around an idea which had its foundations rooted and grounded in the Bible, and yet become a unified nation which did not necessarily agree on every aspect of religion or politics or economics. In fact, my new book, "70 Years of American Captivity: The Polity of God, The Birth of a Nation and The Betrayal of Government" reviews the entirety of that history. You can get it here on this site or Amazon or any of your other favorite online outlets. In this first part of our discussion this month we will not necessarily parse out verse and Scripture, yet we will see the foundations of the Bible revealed. Those foundations are the same ones that started this nation. That specific foundation is covenant. As time went on in America, the covenant went from a very religious one to a very non-sectarian, and in some cases, even secular one. Although, I would caution anyone reading this not to define *secular* as it is defined today. If we defined and viewed *secular* as it was received in let's say 1650, we would see something very different. The concept back then when talking about a secular governing document would mean not to name God or make an oath to God or Jesus because to do so would, in their theological understanding, be committing a sin by taking the Lord's name in vain.

(Matthew 5:34-37) Because God was not named, the document was called “secular” as opposed to “regular.”

That leads us to another misconception many folks have; that somehow the atheists started non-sectarian or secular government. In the colonies, the religious started them by forming the same church documents that ruled and governed the churches, and fitted them for governance outside of the church. As time went on, state governments did so as well. In a case like Rhode Island, for example, they were extremely religious, but felt to make it as a part of their governing agreement containing an oath, otherwise understood as a covenant, with the Lord’s name as the covenant-holder, was to take His holy name in vain. This is how non-sectarian or secular governmental documents were formed in this country.

Now that we have a few misconceptions out of the way, let’s look at some other history. One stark difference between our nation now and what we saw even a mere 60 years ago, is how we treated and acted toward one another. Going all the way back to the Revolutionary War days, we viewed one another as brothers and sisters. Of course, you always had the miscreants and hoodlums who refused such understanding. That’s because it’s easier to rob and corrupt isolated people, with no neighbors or families looking out for their interests. In contrast to the ideas of thieves, the basics of who we were as citizens gave us a thought of family. This national mantra had to do with several philosophies. The first was the early Puritan understanding of Christian brotherhood, or the understanding of covenant-holders, one to another with God as overseer. The second was fostered from the previous as brothers-in-arms during the Revolutionary War. The last had to do with the meaning of the word *Federal*. The word *Federal* comes from a Latin word meaning “covenant.” From the earliest Puritan days, before the Federal government came into existence, covenantal thought literally governed the towns and villages up and down part of the eastern seaboard. It was built into the very fundamental foundations of their governance. The basic necessity of this was for survival. “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,” was derived from Matthew 7:12 and Luke 6:31, as well as some Old Testament principles. Later this understanding of self-governance formed a key role in the science of nature and nature’s God, which we see described in our Declaration of Independence.

There has always been a long standing argument concerning how much of this attitude came with the Puritans, and how much came from other religious groups as they settled and mingled with the Puritans and other Englishmen in the colonies. These Puritans brought what I call “covenant understanding on steroids” to the New World as a form of government. As part of the foundational rule of the

aristocracy and nobility, the English viewed one another as brothers also. Quite often there was a familial connection to whatever king was on the throne at the time. There was also a carry-over understanding from feudal times of land ownership and nobility rule. This is how England formed her government. The aristocratic noblemen were usually large landowners. They gave land for the towns to flourish and thrive. Farmers leased farms and made arrangements with the noblemen concerning the production of the land and how much would be given to the farmers in consideration for their work. Obviously, the feudal way of life was bitter and harsh. Over time, a more capitalistic form of economics in government became infused with the monarchical way of life. Even then, this left very little room for dissension in either religion or politics, or as was often the case, both. That's because in much of the world, church and state were one.

But American thinking became very different, almost immediately. We see some of the difference with the colonial government in Jamestown, but the real break and clear-cut evidence is seen with the Puritans. The Puritans who sailed to the New World had a very different view of what government should look like. Students of today are totally shocked to find how religious early colonial governments of America were. Some were theocratic in form and nature; some were more non-sectarian, like those in New York. Read this quote from John Robinson, pastor of the Pilgrims:

“Lastly, whereas you are to become a body politic, using amongst yourselves civil government, and are not furnished with any persons of special eminency above the rest to be chosen by you into office of government, let your wisdom and godliness appear, not only in choosing such persons as do entirely love, and will promote the common good, but also in yielding unto them all due honour and obedience in their lawful administrations...”<sup>1</sup>

The idea that men without special aristocracy, elitism or noble birth could and should govern themselves for the common good of all, started with these Puritans who birthed our form of government, and stayed with their descendants throughout the writing of our Federal documents, well over a century later. That idea of covenant and brotherhood extended over 150 years later, even as they were deliberating whether to form a militia which could be used to defend themselves against an ever hostile England. Patrick Henry makes these observations during that debate:

---

<sup>1</sup> John Robinson, *The Works of John Robinson, Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers, with a Memoir and Annotations by Robert Ashton*, 3 Vols (London: John Snow, 1851). Vol. 1. In the public domain. I (roman numeral 50)

“And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which the gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the House.” (*The House of Burgesses*) “Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss.” (*Remember that Jesus was betrayed with a kiss.*) “Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petitions comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort.”<sup>2</sup>

I’ve often read many statements like this throughout my study of American history. In my reasoning they are revealing, for if you had no covenant, no agreement of brotherly respect and love in Christian grace, why would you expect to have hope of reconciliation? There would and should be no expectation of brotherly love. In modern times, we have let our individualism revert to selfishness by refusing to understand the difference between what is a true form of freedom, and that of a lie, used exclusively by progressive-socialists to promote a “feeling” of liberty, without the true intent of freedom. What do I mean by that and why would progressive-socialists do so? What I refer to is similar to a pastor’s preaching. Quite frequently, pastors like to get down to the nitty-gritty of where people live. This is to help, protect and warn folks what potential dangers can be revealed in everyday life. It is simply a form of covenant-keeping. Your pastor will have to spiritually stand before the Lord on the day of judgment and explain why you did or did not follow the Lord’s command. Now, let me be clear and state this: if your pastor or other church leader and teacher did everything to share Jesus and biblical truth with you, but you refused the truth, then the Lord will reward them at the Judgment Seat of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:10; Revelation 22:12) and your lack of obedience will also receive judgment at the same time. If on the other hand, your church leader refused to provide you with proper biblical truth, their reward will not be given and judgment will be meted out at the same Judgment Seat of Christ.

This is another misconception. We think because we have accepted Christ, everything we do is “covered by the blood.” Not everything we do or say as

---

<sup>2</sup> <[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/patrick.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/patrick.asp)> Public domain. All copies of this speech are not from the pen of Henry himself. They are garnered from the memory of those in attendance and reconstructed in a biography by William Wirt of Patrick Henry published in 1817. Site © 2008 Lillian Goldman Law Library, New Haven, CT. Accessed 3/2/16

Christians is Christlike or God's idea. Our sin and eternal standing has been dealt with at the cross so we do not experience the White Throne Judgment. (Revelation 20:11-15) What we do or don't do for our Lord will still receive scrutiny. That final place of examination is the Judgment Seat of Christ. This is why it is so critical to live by and through the Holy Spirit, as Paul exhorted us to in his epistles. This is why it is so critical to live each day for Jesus. If we try to do this in our flesh by just being "good" people, we will fail. But if we live and listen to the Holy Spirit's direction each day, we will be on an adventure with Him. Sure, we will blow it sometimes. That's why we have an advocate with the Father (Jesus), so that when we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness (1 John 1:9).

This is religious for sure, but let me share with you the idea and utility of when these practices found their way into secular applications. In other words, the nuts and bolts of how we live as a nation. I don't have the space in this article to prove to you that our press (news media) was started with Christian principles and applications. Let's just say that somewhere along the history line, our press became what we understand as filled with modern-day secularism. Yet even then, the ideas of Christian brotherhood filled their ranks. This philosophy was seen in that they were suppose to be non-sectarian and tell the truth at all costs, even by exposing the lies. Secularly, our press is suppose to tell the truth concerning what is really going on within various factions within a society. This will tell the rest of society where there is the potential to create problems for everyone else (do unto others). When the press refuses to do so because it is politically incorrect, we then can be sold a lie. When the press uses that practice to lie about the political motives of those practicing 'politically correct dialog' in contrast to telling the plain truth, progressive-socialism then becomes communism. The populace has no idea what factions of our society are dangerous and they, in turn, then spout the same lies as the press or the military or the political parties or whatever other outlet picks up the practice. Why would progressive-socialists do so? Well, to hide the true intent of their desires. Those desires are to steal the nation's wealth and freedoms through unnecessary laws, ordinances, rules and regulations. This is why the religious and press are given specialized First Amendment rights, because they are suppose to excel in exposing the truth.

Let me share with you a quote from Daniel Webster, conservative lawyer and recurrent senator from Massachusetts (first elected 1822 and 1827-1841) as well as Secretary of State under three presidents (William Henry Harrison, John Tyler and Millard Fillmore). Let's see what was important to statesmen from long ago, even a former Secretary of State, in keeping our republic and its citizens safe:

“And let us remember that it is only religion, and morals, and knowledge, that can make men respectable and happy under any form of government. Let us hold fast the great truth that communities are responsible, as well as individuals, and that without unspotted purity of public faith, without sacred public principle, fidelity, and honor, no mere forms of government, no machinery of laws, can give dignity to political society. In our day and generation let us seek to raise and improve the moral sentiment, so that we may look, not for a degraded, but for an elevated and improved, future.”<sup>3</sup>

Look at what we have running for president now as a former Secretary of State, and what has been proven as lies and criminal pay-for-play activity, and the remarks and actions of a Secretary of State from long ago. The difference is astounding. Yet there is a very clear line that can be drawn as a direct result of what has affected our thinking now and what affected our thinking from yesteryear. We were strong back then because we were united around an idea of non-sectarian covenant: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. If you are a citizen and you want a strong nation and protection for your people, you don't sell them out to the highest bidder for your own benefit, as has been proven with a current presidential candidate.<sup>4</sup> The only remnant left of an understanding here of Christian fidelity to covenant among citizens is the fact that this candidate used a “charity” or “foundation” as the vehicle through which this pay-for-play scheme was functioning. This is how sad and bereft of life our nation has become.

Some of the blame for our national unrest must be laid at the feet of the church. We allowed “them” to stop us from teaching the spiritual benefits of non-sectarian covenant. This is where the rubber meets the road in our schools and our nation's leaders. When pastors allow themselves to become muzzled by refusing to preach the practical applicability of biblical principles in national everyday life, national everyday government and national everyday economics, a nation does not receive the truth of even a non-sectarian covenant, never mind a religious one. That attitude is a “luxury” we can no longer allow to go on. That's because what was

---

<sup>3</sup> Benjamin Franklin Morris. “Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States, Developed in the Official and Historical Annals of the Republic.” (Introduction by Byron Sunderland, Washington, D.C., April 16, 1863) Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 628 & 630 Chestnut St., Cincinnati: Rickey & Carroll, 1864. 277. In the public domain.

<sup>4</sup> <<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/09/15/damage-control-ex-official-claims-clinton-allies-scrubbed-benghazi-documents-in/>> accessed 4/5/16; <<http://www.breitbart.com/clinton-cash-movie/>> accessed 9/11/16

important then, is not so very different from what's important now. I hope we can begin to see why the idea and need for covenant, even a non-sectarian covenant is even greater. Imagine, if you will, if Americans were taught the written and legal understanding of non-sectarian covenant clearly seen in all three of our Federal documents, called our governing compact. You would have no criminals, because they wouldn't want to be robbed, raped or murdered so they wouldn't do it to someone else. You have no terrorists because they wouldn't want to be blown up or have their throats slit, so they wouldn't do it to someone else.

There are those who can rightfully say that there will always be criminals, mentally ill miscreants and terrorists. They are not wrong in that analysis, especially when you have supposed religions beaoning heavenly bliss with 72 virgins after the participants savagely murder and pillage. If Americans today were taught the same way early Americans were taught in school, we would have far fewer in numbers of hoodlums than we have now. A government's primary job is safety for all its citizens, and fewer numbers of reprobates makes it much easier to deal with the depraved. America has many enemies within and without our nation. In order for the early settlers to survive when the wolves were at the door, something had to keep them as a cohesive unit. They may have had a huge gulf between their belief systems, but they understood the need for both religious and non-sectarian covenant agreements. Those agreements could sustain the unity of the colonies when nothing else could. It could help them spot the lies of the proverbial "wolves in sheep's clothing" trying to divide and conquer a country. It was the driving force behind their ability to win a war against a far superior force in numbers and equipment. Let's learn how to spot the lies of the modern day press, presbytery, professors and politicians so that we may also look for what former Secretary of State Daniel Webster said was "an elevated and improved future." All of our lives depend upon it. Log on next month for part two in this series.