

Manhattan --- Declaration.org

A Study Guide for

The Manhattan Declaration: A Call of Christian Conscience

Released November 20, 2009

Copyright 2009 Charles Colson, Robert George, Timothy George www.manhattandeclaration.org

Rev. Joel F. Hoyer
January, 2010

A Study Guide for
The Manhattan Declaration: A Call of Christian Conscience
Released November 20, 2009

Rev. Joel F. Hoyer January, 2010

PREAMBLE (page 1)

In the midst of a modern media which regularly paints Christianity as an extremist religion responsible for the crusades and other atrocities, how does it make you feel to know that you stand on the shoulders of Christians who have in every age worked to preserve and protect the lives and dignity of all human beings? (Check out Hebrews 11 for another such list)

The Preamble lists various evils that were entrenched in different societies at different times (*infanticide, slavery, totalitarian rule, repression of the rights of women and minorities*), and shows how Christianity was instrumental in changing these practices by changing the hearts and minds of the people. What are some entrenched societal evils that exist today that Christians should be working to overturn? Some on the horizon?

What do you think the writers mean by “the Gospel of costly grace”?

What underlying message(s) does the preamble seem to be giving to our society?

What does it say about our society today that the writers thought it necessary to tell people that Christians can make a profound contribution to the public good?

Manhattan Declaration: A Call of Christian Conscience

Released November 20, 2009

Preamble

Christians are heirs of a 2,000-year tradition of proclaiming God's word, seeking justice in our societies, resisting tyranny, and reaching out with compassion to the poor, oppressed and suffering.

While fully acknowledging the imperfections and shortcomings of Christian institutions and communities in all ages, we claim the heritage of those Christians who defended innocent life by rescuing discarded babies from trash heaps in Roman cities and publicly denouncing the Empire's sanctioning of infanticide. We remember with reverence those believers who sacrificed their lives by remaining in Roman cities to tend the sick and dying during the plagues, and who died bravely in the coliseums rather than deny their Lord.

After the barbarian tribes overran Europe, Christian monasteries preserved not only the Bible but also the literature and art of Western culture. It was Christians who combated the evil of slavery: Papal edicts in the 16th and 17th centuries decried the practice of slavery and first excommunicated anyone involved in the slave trade; evangelical Christians in England, led by John Wesley and William Wilberforce, put an end to the slave trade in that country. Christians under Wilberforce's leadership also formed hundreds of societies for helping the poor, the imprisoned, and child laborers chained to machines.

In Europe, Christians challenged the divine claims of kings and successfully fought to establish the rule of law and balance of governmental powers, which made modern democracy possible. And in America, Christian women stood at the vanguard of the suffrage movement. The great civil rights crusades of the 1950s and 60s were led by Christians claiming the Scriptures and asserting the glory of the image of God in every human being regardless of race, religion, age or class.

This same devotion to human dignity has led Christians in recent decades to work to end the dehumanizing scourge of human trafficking and sexual slavery, bring compassionate care to AIDS sufferers in Africa, and assist in a myriad of other human rights causes – from providing clean water in developing nations to providing homes for tens of thousands of children orphaned by war, disease and gender discrimination.

Like those who have gone before us in the faith, Christians today are called to proclaim the Gospel of costly grace, to protect the intrinsic dignity of the human person and to stand for the common good. In being true to its own calling, the call to discipleship, the church through service to others can make a profound contribution to the public good.

Copyright 2009 Charles Colson, Robert George, Timothy George www.manhattandeclaration.org

DECLARATION (page 2)

The writers have been criticized for the religious groups that they did not include in this declaration, but who might also share these views. Nevertheless, what do you find particularly encouraging about the cooperation of the Christian groups mentioned?

Talk about the advantages and possible drawbacks of drawing up a statement like this “*as individuals, not on behalf of our organizations*”.

The declaration mentions the “*whole scope of Christian moral concern*”, but decides to focus on only three: “*the sanctity of human life, the dignity of marriage as a union of husband and wife, and the freedom of conscience and religion*”. Why do you think they chose to focus on these three? Are there other moral concerns you would have liked to see addressed?

The concluding paragraph on p. 2 borrows language from Paul to Timothy, that it is our duty to proclaim the Gospel “*both in season and out of season.*” (2 Timothy 4:2) What do you think that phrase means in it’s context? Do you think proclaiming the gospel is currently “in season” or “out of season”?

Do you think Christians today are very good at “*embracing our obligation*” to speak and act in defense of these truths? Why/why not?

Declaration

We, as Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelical Christians, have gathered, beginning in New York on September 28, 2009, to make the following declaration, which we sign as individuals, not on behalf of our organizations, but speaking to and from our communities. We act together in obedience to the one true God, the triune God of holiness and love, who has laid total claim on our lives and by that claim calls us with believers in all ages and all nations to seek and defend the good of all who bear his image. We set forth this declaration in light of the truth that is grounded in Holy Scripture, in natural human reason (which is itself, in our view, the gift of a beneficent God), and in the very nature of the human person. We call upon all people of goodwill, believers and non-believers alike, to consider carefully and reflect critically on the issues we here address as we, with St. Paul, commend this appeal to everyone's conscience in the sight of God.

While the whole scope of Christian moral concern, including a special concern for the poor and vulnerable, claims our attention, we are especially troubled that in our nation today the lives of the unborn, the disabled, and the elderly are severely threatened; that the institution of marriage, already buffeted by promiscuity, infidelity and divorce, is in jeopardy of being redefined to accommodate fashionable ideologies; that freedom of religion and the rights of conscience are gravely jeopardized by those who would use the instruments of coercion to compel persons of faith to compromise their deepest convictions.

Because the sanctity of human life, the dignity of marriage as a union of husband and wife, and the freedom of conscience and religion are foundational principles of justice and the common good, we are compelled by our Christian faith to speak and act in their defense. In this declaration we affirm: 1) the profound, inherent, and equal dignity of every human being as a creature fashioned in the very image of God, possessing inherent rights of equal dignity and life; 2) marriage as a conjugal union of man and woman, ordained by God from the creation, and historically understood by believers and non-believers alike, to be the most basic institution in society and; 3) religious liberty, which is grounded in the character of God, the example of Christ, and the inherent freedom and dignity of human beings created in the divine image.

We are Christians who have joined together across historic lines of ecclesial differences to affirm our right—and, more importantly, to embrace our obligation—to speak and act in defense of these truths. We pledge to each other, and to our fellow believers, that no power on earth, be it cultural or political, will intimidate us into silence or acquiescence. It is our duty to proclaim the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ in its fullness, both in season and out of season. May God help us not to fail in that duty.

LIFE (pp. 3-4)

“So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.” (Gen 1:27 NIV)

“The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy; I have come that they may have life, and have it to the full.” (John 10:10 NIV)

In what ways do you think we would see our culture change if Genesis 1:27 would become the prevailing view of the origin of man?

Consider the terms “pro-choice” and “pro-life” according to John 10:10.

In what state is a pregnant woman according to God (Genesis 16:11; Luke 1:31)?

This portion of the declaration *“calls on officials in our country, elected and appointed, to protect and serve every member of our society, including the most marginalized, voiceless, and vulnerable among us.”* How much hope do you have that our government officials will be listening to this document?

As of 1/18/10, 398,794 people have electronically signed the Manhattan declaration. Would they listen more carefully if it was signed by 5 million? 10 million? 50 million?

The declaration points out (p.3) that *“The president says that he wants to reduce the ‘need’ for abortion... but he has also pledged to make abortion more easily and widely available by eliminating laws prohibiting government funding, requiring waiting periods for women seeking abortions, and parental notification for abortions performed on minors.”*

To document:

January 22, 2009 – President Obama struck down the “Mexico City” policy that said any organization receiving family planning funds from the US government cannot offer abortions or abortion counseling.

March 9, 2009 – President Obama signed an executive order forcing taxpayer funding of embryonic stem cell research.

May 8, 2009 – President Obama’s budget eliminated all federal funding for Abstinence only education.

Dec. 7, 2009 – President Obama met with Senate Democrats in a closed door session and told them to support the Harry Reid sponsored Health Care bill that included massive abortion funding and could force insurance companies to cover abortions with taxpayer’s premiums.

Does the president’s walk match his talk?

Again on page 3, the declaration gets personal with the statement: *“The President and many in Congress favor the expansion of embryo-research to include the taxpayer funding of so-called “therapeutic cloning”.* This issue got **very** personal for us in Michigan with the passage of Proposition 2 in 2008, which allowed research to be done on human embryos in our State. Former President Bill Clinton also endorsed Proposal 2 and helped to raise money for the campaign to pass it. Oddly, Clinton called the measure *“pro-life, pro-health, pro-science and definitely pro-Michigan.”* He added, *“It's not a fight between Republicans and Democrats, not a fight between the Left and the Right, and it's certainly not a fight between pro-life and pro-choice.”*

How do you think that people can in any way define research that kills a living human embryo as “pro-life”?

Life

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. Genesis 1:27

I have come that they may have life, and have it to the full. John 10:10

Although public sentiment has moved in a pro-life direction, we note with sadness that pro-abortion ideology prevails today in our government. Many in the present administration want to make abortions legal at any stage of fetal development, and want to provide abortions at taxpayer expense. Majorities in both houses of Congress hold pro-abortion views. The Supreme Court, whose infamous 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade* stripped the unborn of legal protection, continues to treat elective abortion as a fundamental constitutional right, though it has upheld as constitutionally permissible some limited restrictions on abortion. The President says that he wants to reduce the “need” for abortion—a commendable goal. But he has also pledged to make abortion more easily and widely available by eliminating laws prohibiting government funding, requiring waiting periods for women seeking abortions, and parental notification for abortions performed on minors. The elimination of these important and effective pro-life laws cannot reasonably be expected to do other than significantly increase the number of elective abortions by which the lives of countless children are snuffed out prior to birth. Our commitment to the sanctity of life is not a matter of partisan loyalty, for we recognize that in the thirty-six years since *Roe v. Wade*, elected officials and appointees of both major political parties have been complicit in giving legal sanction to what Pope John Paul II described as “the culture of death.” We call on all officials in our country, elected and appointed, to protect and serve every member of our society, including the most marginalized, voiceless, and vulnerable among us.

A culture of death inevitably cheapens life in all its stages and conditions by promoting the belief that lives that are imperfect, immature or inconvenient are discardable. As predicted by many prescient persons, the cheapening of life that began with abortion has now metastasized. For example, human embryo-destructive research and its public funding are promoted in the name of science and in the cause of developing treatments and cures for diseases and injuries. The President and many in Congress favor the expansion of embryo-research to include the taxpayer funding of so-called “therapeutic cloning.” This would result in the industrial mass production of human embryos to be killed for the purpose of producing genetically customized stem cell lines and tissues. At the other end of life, an increasingly powerful movement to promote assisted suicide and “voluntary” euthanasia threatens the lives of vulnerable elderly and disabled persons. Eugenic notions such as the doctrine of *lebensunwertes Leben* (“life unworthy of life”) were first advanced in the 1920s by intellectuals in the elite salons of America and Europe. Long buried in ignominy after the horrors of the mid-20th century, they have returned from the grave. The only difference is that now the doctrines of the eugenicists are dressed up in the language of “liberty,” “autonomy,” and “choice.”

We will be united and untiring in our efforts to roll back the license to kill that began with the abandonment of the unborn to abortion. We will work, as we have always worked, to bring assistance, comfort, and care to pregnant women in need and to those who have been victimized by abortion, even as we stand resolutely against the corrupt and degrading notion that it can somehow be in the best interests of women to submit to the deliberate killing of their unborn

Copyright 2009 Charles Colson, Robert George, Timothy George

Can you fully support the statement on page 4 that “*A truly prophetic Christian witness will insistently call on those who have been entrusted with temporal power to fulfill the first responsibility of government: to protect the weak and vulnerable against violent attack, and to do so with no favoritism, partiality, or discrimination.*”?

(Consider Proverbs 31:8-9 here)

Why do you think no William Wilberforce has yet arisen among United States politicians to speak forcefully and eloquently and persistently on behalf of life? Could you see a time/situation where that could happen here all the way to the overturning of Roe v. Wade?

In that same paragraph on p. 4, the Declaration states that “*We must be willing to defend, even at risk and cost to ourselves and our institutions, the lives of our brothers and sisters at every stage of development and in every condition.*”

There are teeth to that statement. How do you see this playing out in our society today?

MARRIAGE (pp. 4-7)

“*The man said, ‘This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called ‘woman,’ for she was taken out of man.’ For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and they will become one flesh.*” (Genesis 2:23-24 NIV)

“*This is a profound mystery—but I am talking about Christ and the church. However, each one of you also must love his wife as he loves himself, and the wife must respect her husband.*” (Eph 5:32-33 NIV)

How does the fact that God created Eve from Adam’s side contribute to the understanding of the “one flesh” union of a man and a woman in marriage?

In quoting this Genesis 2 passage, Jesus put the emphasis on “the two”, a man and his wife, being united. “For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh” (Matthew 19:5; also Paul in Ephesians 5:31). Knowing that Jesus completely embraced the Genesis foundation of marriage defined as one man and woman, could you gracefully accept any other definition from your society?

The battle doesn’t yet rage in this area, but how does this passage also address the issue of polygamy?

Some refer to the polygamous relationships of some of the bible patriarchs as a testimony that the Bible is o.k. with polygamy and/or homosexual marriage. What is wrong with this thinking?

children. Our message is, and ever shall be, that the just, humane, and truly Christian answer to problem pregnancies is for all of us to love and care for mother and child alike.

A truly prophetic Christian witness will insistently call on those who have been entrusted with temporal power to fulfill the first responsibility of government: to protect the weak and vulnerable against violent attack, and to do so with no favoritism, partiality, or discrimination. The Bible enjoins us to defend those who cannot defend themselves, to speak for those who cannot themselves speak. And so we defend and speak for the unborn, the disabled, and the dependent. What the Bible and the light of reason make clear, we must make clear. We must be willing to defend, even at risk and cost to ourselves and our institutions, the lives of our brothers and sisters at every stage of development and in every condition.

Our concern is not confined to our own nation. Around the globe, we are witnessing cases of genocide and “ethnic cleansing,” the failure to assist those who are suffering as innocent victims of war, the neglect and abuse of children, the exploitation of vulnerable laborers, the sexual trafficking of girls and young women, the abandonment of the aged, racial oppression and discrimination, the persecution of believers of all faiths, and the failure to take steps necessary to halt the spread of preventable diseases like AIDS. We see these travesties as flowing from the same loss of the sense of the dignity of the human person and the sanctity of human life that drives the abortion industry and the movements for assisted suicide, euthanasia, and human cloning for biomedical research. And so ours is, as it must be, a truly consistent ethic of love and life for all humans in all circumstances.

Marriage

The man said, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, for she was taken out of man." For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and they will become one flesh. Genesis 2:23-24

This is a profound mystery—but I am talking about Christ and the church. However, each one of you also must love his wife as he loves himself, and the wife must respect her husband. Ephesians 5:32-33

In Scripture, the creation of man and woman, and their one-flesh union as husband and wife, is the crowning achievement of God’s creation. In the transmission of life and the nurturing of children, men and women joined as spouses are given the great honor of being partners with God Himself. Marriage then, is the first institution of human society—indeed it is the institution on which all other human institutions have their foundation. In the Christian tradition we refer to marriage as “holy matrimony” to signal the fact that it is an institution ordained by God, and blessed by Christ in his participation at a wedding in Cana of Galilee. In the Bible, God Himself blesses and holds marriage in the highest esteem.

Vast human experience confirms that marriage is the original and most important institution for sustaining the health, education, and welfare of all persons in a society. Where marriage is honored, and where there is a flourishing marriage culture, everyone benefits—the spouses themselves, their children, the communities and societies in which they live. Where the marriage culture begins to erode, social pathologies of every sort quickly manifest themselves.

Copyright 2009 Charles Colson, Robert George, Timothy George www.manhattandeclaration.org

In the second paragraph on p. 5, the declaration says that Christians “*remained silent about social practices that undermine the dignity of marriage.*” To the extent that you agree with this assessment, why do you think Christians have remained silent? In what ways can we effectively speak to society?

Paragraph four on p. 5 mentions the “*false and destructive belief that marriage is all about romance and other adult satisfactions...*” Give examples of how this plays out in our culture. In what way(s) is this belief “destructive?”

The last paragraph on p. 5 is a pretty good summary of the old adage, “Love the sinner, hate the sin” when it comes to homosexuality and “*polyamorous conduct and relationships.*” It’s worded in compassionate terms, but do you think there is any way the homosexual community will see this as a compassionate statement?

That last paragraph on p. 5 also contains the statement: “*Our rejection of sin, though resolute, must never become the rejection of sinners.*” Do you think you personally have always maintained that distinction? What might help you to do so?

Unfortunately, we have witnessed over the course of the past several decades a serious erosion of the marriage culture in our own country. Perhaps the most telling—and alarming—indicator is the out-of-wedlock birth rate. Less than fifty years ago, it was under 5 percent. Today it is over 40 percent. Our society—and particularly its poorest and most vulnerable sectors, where the out-of-wedlock birth rate is much higher even than the national average—is paying a huge price in delinquency, drug abuse, crime, incarceration, hopelessness, and despair. Other indicators are widespread non-marital sexual cohabitation and a devastatingly high rate of divorce.

We confess with sadness that Christians and our institutions have too often scandalously failed to uphold the institution of marriage and to model for the world the true meaning of marriage. Insofar as we have too easily embraced the culture of divorce and remained silent about social practices that undermine the dignity of marriage we repent, and call upon all Christians to do the same.

To strengthen families, we must stop glamorizing promiscuity and infidelity and restore among our people a sense of the profound beauty, mystery, and holiness of faithful marital love. We must reform ill-advised policies that contribute to the weakening of the institution of marriage, including the discredited idea of unilateral divorce. We must work in the legal, cultural, and religious domains to instill in young people a sound understanding of what marriage is, what it requires, and why it is worth the commitment and sacrifices that faithful spouses make.

The impulse to redefine marriage in order to recognize same-sex and multiple partner relationships is a symptom, rather than the cause, of the erosion of the marriage culture. It reflects a loss of understanding of the meaning of marriage as embodied in our civil and religious law and in the philosophical tradition that contributed to shaping the law. Yet it is critical that the impulse be resisted, for yielding to it would mean abandoning the possibility of restoring a sound understanding of marriage and, with it, the hope of rebuilding a healthy marriage culture. It would lock into place the false and destructive belief that marriage is all about romance and other adult satisfactions, and not, in any intrinsic way, about procreation and the unique character and value of acts and relationships whose meaning is shaped by their aptness for the generation, promotion and protection of life. In spousal communion and the rearing of children (who, as gifts of God, are the fruit of their parents' marital love), we discover the profound reasons for and benefits of the marriage covenant.

We acknowledge that there are those who are disposed towards homosexual and polyamorous conduct and relationships, just as there are those who are disposed towards other forms of immoral conduct. We have compassion for those so disposed; we respect them as human beings possessing profound, inherent, and equal dignity; and we pay tribute to the men and women who strive, often with little assistance, to resist the temptation to yield to desires that they, no less than we, regard as wayward. We stand with them, even when they falter. We, no less than they, are sinners who have fallen short of God's intention for our lives. We, no less than they, are in constant need of God's patience, love and forgiveness. We call on the entire Christian community to resist sexual immorality, and at the same time refrain from disdainful condemnation of those who yield to it. Our rejection of sin, though resolute, must never become the rejection of sinners. For every sinner, regardless of the sin, is loved by God, who seeks not our destruction but rather the conversion of our hearts. Jesus calls all who wander from the path

The next paragraph on top of p. 6 dares to touch on the physical differences between same sex and polyamorous relationships, and sex between a man and a woman (connecting it with the “behavioral conditions of procreation.”) Why do you think the physical aspects of same sex – sexual relationships are not usually talked about openly in these types of discussions?

Why would homosexual marriage open the door to polygamy and legalizing even potentially incestuous marriage?

How would the “rights” of heterosexual parents be at risk if homosexual marriage became the law of the land?

of virtue to “a more excellent way.” As his disciples we will reach out in love to assist all who hear the call and wish to answer it.

We further acknowledge that there are sincere people who disagree with us, and with the teaching of the Bible and Christian tradition, on questions of sexual morality and the nature of marriage. Some who enter into same-sex and polyamorous relationships no doubt regard their unions as truly marital. They fail to understand, however, that marriage is made possible by the sexual complementarity of man and woman, and that the comprehensive, multi-level sharing of life that marriage includes includes bodily unity of the sort that unites husband and wife biologically as one. This is because the body is no mere extrinsic instrument of the human person, but truly part of the personal reality of the human being. Human beings are not merely centers of consciousness or emotion, or minds, or spirits, inhabiting non-personal bodies. The human person is a dynamic unity of body, mind, and spirit. Marriage is what one man and one woman establish when, forsaking all others and pledging lifelong commitment, they found a sharing of life at every level of being—the biological, the emotional, the dispositional, the rational, the spiritual—on a commitment that is sealed, completed and actualized by loving sexual intercourse in which the spouses become one flesh, not in some merely metaphorical sense, but by fulfilling together the behavioral conditions of procreation. That is why in the Christian tradition, and historically in Western law, consummated marriages are not dissoluble or annulable on the ground of infertility, even though the nature of the marital relationship is shaped and structured by its intrinsic orientation to the great good of procreation.

We understand that many of our fellow citizens, including some Christians, believe that the historic definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman is a denial of equality or civil rights. They wonder what to say in reply to the argument that asserts that no harm would be done to them or to anyone if the law of the community were to confer upon two men or two women who are living together in a sexual partnership the status of being “married.” It would not, after all, affect their own marriages, would it? On inspection, however, the argument that laws governing one kind of marriage will not affect another cannot stand. Were it to prove anything, it would prove far too much: the assumption that the legal status of one set of marriage relationships affects no other would not only argue for same sex partnerships; it could be asserted with equal validity for polyamorous partnerships, polygamous households, even adult brothers, sisters, or brothers and sisters living in incestuous relationships. Should these, as a matter of equality or civil rights, be recognized as lawful marriages, and would they have no effects on other relationships? No. The truth is that marriage is not something abstract or neutral that the law may legitimately define and re-define to please those who are powerful and influential.

No one has a civil right to have a non-marital relationship treated as a marriage. Marriage is an objective reality—a covenantal union of husband and wife—that it is the duty of the law to recognize and support for the sake of justice and the common good. If it fails to do so, genuine social harms follow. First, the religious liberty of those for whom this is a matter of conscience is jeopardized. Second, the rights of parents are abused as family life and sex education programs in schools are used to teach children that an enlightened understanding recognizes as “marriages” sexual partnerships that many parents believe are intrinsically nonmarital and immoral. Third, the common good of civil society is damaged when the law itself,

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY (pp. 7-9)

The Spirit of the Sovereign LORD is on me, because the LORD has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners. (Isaiah 61:1)

Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's. (Matthew 22:21)

What kind of “freedom” do you see being proclaimed in the Isaiah 61:1 verse?

What did Jesus mean in the context of Matthew 22:21?

The declaration alludes to the beginning of another “declaration”, in which the founders of our country proclaimed that all men are “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” In what ways are these “unalienable rights”? Can we appeal to those rights if we are just the products of evolution and do not have a Creator?

The last paragraph on p. 7 points out a dilemma about “rights.” Is it possible to create a society where everybody in it gets the “rights” they ask for without trampling on the rights of others?

in its critical pedagogical function, becomes a tool for eroding a sound understanding of marriage on which the flourishing of the marriage culture in any society vitally depends. Sadly, we are today far from having a thriving marriage culture. But if we are to begin the critically important process of reforming our laws and mores to rebuild such a culture, the last thing we can afford to do is to re-define marriage in such a way as to embody in our laws a false proclamation about what marriage is.

And so it is out of *love* (not “animus”) and prudent *concern for the common good* (not “prejudice”), that we pledge to labor ceaselessly to preserve the legal definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman and to rebuild the marriage culture. How could we, as Christians, do otherwise? The Bible teaches us that marriage is a central part of God’s creation covenant. Indeed, the union of husband and wife mirrors the bond between Christ and his church. And so just as Christ was willing, out of love, to give Himself up for the church in a complete sacrifice, we are willing, lovingly, to make whatever sacrifices are required of us for the sake of the inestimable treasure that is marriage.

Religious Liberty

The Spirit of the Sovereign LORD is on me, because the LORD has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners. Isaiah 61:1

Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's. Matthew 22:21

The struggle for religious liberty across the centuries has been long and arduous. Religious liberty is not a novel idea or recent development, but is grounded in the character of God Himself, the God who is most fully known in the life and work of Jesus Christ. Determined to follow Jesus faithfully in life and death, the early Christians appealed to the manner in which the Incarnation had taken place: “Did God send Christ, as some suppose, as a tyrant brandishing fear and terror? Not so, but in gentleness and meekness..., for compulsion is no attribute of God” (Epistle to Diognetus 7.3-4). Thus the right to religious freedom has its foundation in the example of Christ Himself and in the very dignity of the human person created in the image of God—a dignity, as our founders proclaimed, inherent in every human, and knowable by all in the exercise of right reason.

Christians confess that God alone is Lord of the conscience. Immunity from religious coercion is the cornerstone of an unconstrained conscience. No one should be compelled to embrace any religion against his will, nor should persons of faith be forbidden to worship God according to the dictates of conscience or to express freely and publicly their deeply held religious convictions. What is true for individuals applies to religious communities as well.

It is ironic that those who today assert a right to kill the unborn, aged and disabled and also a right to engage in immoral sexual practices, and even a right to have relationships integrated around these practices be recognized and blessed by law—such persons claiming these “rights” are very often in the vanguard of those who would trample upon the freedom of others to express their religious and moral commitments to the sanctity of life and to the dignity of marriage as the conjugal union of husband and wife.

Copyright 2009 Charles Colson, Robert George, Timothy George www.manhattandeclaration.org

The Declaration references Christian charities deciding to close rather than be forced to place children with homosexual parents. Whose “rights” are taken away under those circumstances?

In what way(s) can you see our church eventually having to make similar hard choices, or suffer for our beliefs?

Do you see the church as an “*essential buffer against the overweening authority of the state*” (2nd paragraph, p. 8)?

What do you like best about the concluding paragraph of the declaration?
What if anything, makes you uncomfortable?

Are you ready, like Martin Luther and Martin Luther King Jr., to go to jail rather than compromise your Christian faith? At what point must we be ready to do this?

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In the declaration portion of the document on p. 2, the writers “call upon all people of goodwill, believers and non-believers...” That’s a pretty wide audience. But do you think that the document was meant more for some portions of that audience than others? For instance, consider the following groups:

Conservative Christians
Liberal Christians

Non-Christian society
The governing authorities

How effective do you think this declaration will be in changing the hearts and minds of these different groups?

We see this, for example, in the effort to weaken or eliminate conscience clauses, and therefore to compel pro-life institutions (including religiously affiliated hospitals and clinics), and pro-life physicians, surgeons, nurses, and other health care professionals, to refer for abortions and, in certain cases, even to perform or participate in abortions. We see it in the use of antidiscrimination statutes to force religious institutions, businesses, and service providers of various sorts to comply with activities they judge to be deeply immoral or go out of business. After the judicial imposition of “same-sex marriage” in Massachusetts, for example, Catholic Charities chose with great reluctance to end its century-long work of helping to place orphaned children in good homes rather than comply with a legal mandate that it place children in same-sex households in violation of Catholic moral teaching. In New Jersey, after the establishment of a quasi-marital “civil unions” scheme, a Methodist institution was stripped of its tax exempt status when it declined, as a matter of religious conscience, to permit a facility it owned and operated to be used for ceremonies blessing homosexual unions. In Canada and some European nations, Christian clergy have been prosecuted for preaching Biblical norms against the practice of homosexuality. New hate-crime laws in America raise the specter of the same practice here.

In recent decades a growing body of case law has paralleled the decline in respect for religious values in the media, the academy and political leadership, resulting in restrictions on the free exercise of religion. We view this as an ominous development, not only because of its threat to the individual liberty guaranteed to every person, regardless of his or her faith, but because the trend also threatens the common welfare and the culture of freedom on which our system of republican government is founded. Restrictions on the freedom of conscience or the ability to hire people of one’s own faith or conscientious moral convictions for religious institutions, for example, undermines the viability of the intermediate structures of society, the essential buffer against the overweening authority of the state, resulting in the soft despotism Tocqueville so prophetically warned of.* Disintegration of civil society is a prelude to tyranny.

As Christians, we take seriously the Biblical admonition to respect and obey those in authority. We believe in law and in the rule of law. We recognize the duty to comply with laws whether we happen to like them or not, unless the laws are gravely unjust or require those subject to them to do something unjust or otherwise immoral. The biblical purpose of law is to preserve order and serve justice and the common good; yet laws that are unjust—and especially laws that purport to compel citizens to do what is unjust—undermine the common good, rather than serve it.

Going back to the earliest days of the church, Christians have refused to compromise their proclamation of the gospel. In Acts 4, Peter and John were ordered to stop preaching. Their answer was, “Judge for yourselves whether it is right in God's sight to obey you rather than God. For we cannot help speaking about what we have seen and heard.” Through the centuries, Christianity has taught that civil disobedience is not only permitted, but sometimes required. There is no more eloquent defense of the rights and duties of religious conscience than the one offered by Martin Luther King, Jr., in his *Letter from a Birmingham Jail*. Writing from an

* Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. II, Book 4

Take a brief look at what bloggers are saying about the Manhattan Declaration and discuss:

John says:

“If Jesus somehow appeared on the streets of Manhattan would he be recognized by any of these self-”righteous” dudes? Would Jesus be recognized or welcome at the offices of First Things? Would Jesus sign or otherwise endorse this Declaration? I think not. In my opinion these heavy weight humourless dudes represent EXACTLY the same establishment ecclesiastical mind-set that demanded that Jesus be executed 2000 years ago. They should all be locked up in a room together with copious amounts of Laughing Gas.”

Ars Artium says:

I can understand that those who do not consider Hebrew and Christian Scripture as authoritative in any particular way will not find the Manhattan Declaration authoritative either. If I am correct, it was not intended to convince unbelievers that the faith is true. The purpose of the Declaration was to (1) set forth Christian belief and (2) defend the constitutional right of Christians to believe and act in accordance with it. The reason the statement needed to be made is that individual Christians and Church charitable organizations are in danger of being forced under penalty of law to act against conscience or forfeit their participation in public life.

John says:

Oh good....the same tired comments used to justify laws against inter-racial marriage, slavery, and all other ignorant, hateful, bigotry throughout history. This group of people are nothing but bigots hiding behind Christianity...while being nothing like Christ. I know now that i get to pick and choose the scripture in the bible i WANT to follow, while ignoring the scripture i dont like (i.e. polygamy, incest, not eating shrimp or lobster, stoning my neighbor, never eating pork or bacon). This group of people are pathetic and sad.

rustle says:

It will be interesting to watch to see if this move does anything or instead simply becomes one more demonstration of how the larger community increasingly moves away from any strongly held religious beliefs. Will individuals simply resign rather than compromise their faith or will they litigate to compel the government to fund their hospitals and institutions? Is a Christian cardiologist expected to refuse to practice in a hospital that performs abortions in another wing? Will physicians refuse to take reimbursement payments from insurance companies that extend benefits to same sex partners? Or will the financial cost be so great that only a small minority makes any real sacrifice?

Rev. Paul T. McCain says:

I signed this excellent statement today, and share my fellow Lutheran's, James Neuchterlein, disappointment that Lutheran leaders were not sought out to sign this statement. I whole-heartedly oppose the Papacy and the errors of Orthodoxy and American Evangelicalism, and I heartily embrace this statement and am please to add my name to it. When the house is on fire, one grabs buckets of water from whomever and wherever one cans.

What do you think was the main purpose of the document?

Where do you see the document doing the most good?

What are some concerns that might keep you from signing a document like this?

What motivations might lead you to sign?

What are some consequences you might see in your life from signing?

explicitly Christian perspective, and citing Christian writers such as Augustine and Aquinas, King taught that just laws elevate and ennoble human beings because they are rooted in the moral law whose ultimate source is God Himself. Unjust laws degrade human beings. Inasmuch as they can claim no authority beyond sheer human will, they lack any power to bind in conscience. King's willingness to go to jail, rather than comply with legal injustice, was exemplary and inspiring.

Because we honor justice and the common good, we will not comply with any edict that purports to compel our institutions to participate in abortions, embryo-destructive research, assisted suicide and euthanasia, or any other anti-life act; nor will we bend to any rule purporting to force us to bless immoral sexual partnerships, treat them as marriages or the equivalent, or refrain from proclaiming the truth, as we know it, about morality and immorality and marriage and the family. We will fully and ungrudgingly render to Caesar what is Caesar's. But under no circumstances will we render to Caesar what is God's.

#

Drafting Committee

Robert George Professor, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence, Princeton University

Timothy George Professor, Beeson Divinity School, Samford University

Chuck Colson Founder, the Chuck Colson Center for Christian Worldview (Lansdowne, VA)