

When the Revolutionary War broke out in 1776, many Americans were ready to stand up and fight for their freedoms. After all, they had been resisting British taxation and enforcement thereof for more than a decade. But not all Americans were in favor of war in order to solve their problems. In fact, there were some groups of devout Christians who would rather die than take the sword. In particular among these were the Quakers and those we know as the Anabaptists (Amish, Mennonites, Brethren, etc.). These Christians went against the grain of the dominant thinking patterns of their day. Moreover, they paid a high price for it. In the process of refusing to resist evil, these peace-loving Christians were met with severe persecution from their patriotic neighbors. In the process of defending what they believed were their freedoms by divine right, the Colonists, in their treatment of these Christians, tyrannically deprived their peaceful neighbors of some of those necessary freedoms in order to gain their own.

To briefly introduce the Anabaptists, these were a group of devout Christians dating back to the period of the Reformation in Europe. Unlike the Reformers, who were only willing to go as far as the state would allow them on matters pertaining to religion (such as infant baptism, nonresistance, etc.), they were willing to take only the Bible as their limit for faith and practice. Some of their early leaders were men such as Conrad Grebel, Felix Manz, Michael Sattler, etc. Eventually they took on names such as the Amish, Mennonites, Schwenkfelders, Brethren, etc., depending on their origins. Unfortunately, they have not always been able to live as one large religious body, and have had a lot of schisms since their spread throughout Europe and America. For their unique views and refusal to conform, they were persecuted by Catholics and Protestants alike in some of the most violent forms of persecution in the history of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

The Quakers, on the other hand, owe their origins to a man named George Fox, who lived in England during and after the English Civil War. He was raised an Anglican like everyone else, but eventually came to emphasize following the “inner light” within (believing it came directly from God) and preached a revolutionary message with the same depth as the Anabaptists, except that physical sacraments such as baptism and the Lord's Supper were disregarded in favor of a teaching on the inner reality of these two things (namely, baptism of the Holy Spirit and real participation in Christ's body and blood). They were persecuted much in England also for their beliefs, and eventually came to settle in Pennsylvania.<sup>2</sup>

What these various groups had in common was a firm belief that Jesus's teachings on nonresistance were to be applied exactly as they were written. Jesus taught “Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any

man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.”<sup>3</sup> They all believed that this teaching of Jesus did not merely apply to personal conflict but also applied to times of war. To these Christians, there was never an acceptable time to take the life of another human being on their part, even if the government ordered them to do it. Not only that, but Europe had experienced many wars from the time of Constantine through the Reformation era on down to the time in which this generation of Christians lived who had settled in the American Colonies. Many of those wars had seen professing Christians fighting and killing one another. These people wanted no part of killing anyone, but especially not their fellow Christians. This would be a betrayal to their Lord in their eyes.<sup>4</sup>

When these non-resistant Christians finally settled in the Thirteen Colonies, they lived in Pennsylvania. At a time when most of the Colonies followed the European pattern of having a state church, Pennsylvania was among those who did not officially have a state church, but allowed for a little more religious freedom than their Protestant neighbors in other Colonies. William Penn, himself a Quaker, had acquired the charter for the land from King Charles II as payment of a debt owed to Penn's father.<sup>5</sup> Penn, in the charter, made religious freedom the first priority in the provisions he named. Penn was a firm believer that only one's relationship with God determined one's standing with Him, and so it was not for the state to decide how one should worship God<sup>6</sup>. It was because of this that the Quakers and Anabaptists of Pennsylvania enjoyed a quiet life free from persecution from state churches to which they did not desire to convert. It is noteworthy also that it was not just members of what we now know today as the “Peace Churches” that came to Pennsylvania but also Catholics and Protestants were allowed as well. This “Holy Experiment” as Penn called it<sup>7</sup>, was among the only Colonies where religion was diverse and there was no established state church. The others were Rhode Island<sup>8</sup>, whose founder, Roger Williams, was a refugee from the Puritan/Congregationalist Massachusetts Bay Colony seeking freedom to practice a more Separatist form of Christianity, and New York<sup>9</sup>, founded by the Dutch, and, had no dominant religion, allowing for a broad array of religious beliefs. Unfortunately, this did not mean that New York was a land where religious revival was likely. Robert Middlekauff, in his book, *The Glorious Cause*, notes that “The Great Awakening largely left New York cold. There were small revivals in Manhattan and Staten Island, but elsewhere revival failed.”<sup>10</sup> Maryland was restrictive in the sense that it adhered to principles that were biblically-inspired, but a more diversity of expressions of Christianity was allowed and its

laws resonated in some form with those seeking to establish a Christian colony.<sup>11</sup> But in Pennsylvania, religion was not only dominant but very diverse.

King George III had allowed the Pennsylvania colony to continue as it was, just as Charles II had before him. So, these persecuted Christians were able to find a safe refuge from all of the European nations that had persecuted them since their founding. For once they had a land in which they could express their religious beliefs without fear of being hunted and/or executed by the government in the brutal fashion that they had been in Europe. The government of Pennsylvania itself was run by non-resistant Quakers, which helped the settlers to even more appreciate the freedoms they enjoyed. All of this, however, was going to change almost overnight.

In the eighteenth century, the American colonies became fed up with Great Britain's desire to enforce payment of taxes. Protests against the taxes could take on a violent shape. As time progressed, no resolution seemed to be in sight. The horrible chain of events ultimately culminated in America declaring its independence from Great Britain on July 4, 1776. The cause given in the Declaration of Independence for why they felt it necessary to separate from Britain and form their own government is telling.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,--That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.”<sup>12</sup>

It was widely believed in the Colonies that Great Britain violated each and every one of the above-mentioned rights of humanity. So, they felt they were not only justified in breaking off from England, but in forming a new government that would uphold these rights. But whether or not the revolutionaries would practice what they preached would be determined by the violent conflict that lay ahead.

The peaceful Anabaptists and Quakers of Pennsylvania would soon find their whole world about to change amidst the growing chaos. As war erupted throughout the Colonies, the peaceful residents of Pennsylvania found themselves caught in the storm. Bercot notes that “on the eve of the Revolution, the kingdom Christians in Pennsylvania...were generally content with the British government. Like everyone else, they preferred not to have any extra taxes...as committed Christians, their 'yes' meant 'yes' and that was that! (Matthew 5:37). They had signed a solemn declaration of loyalty to the King of England, and they were not about to go back on

their word.”<sup>13</sup> The revolutionaries had already proven themselves intolerant of any political opposition to their cause<sup>14</sup>, and were ready to crush any and all opposition, even if said opposition meant no harm to the revolutionaries themselves.

As noted above, peace-loving Christians were not the only residents of Pennsylvania. Others, to review, came from the very nations who had established state churches, including Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, etc. Pennsylvania's policy of religious toleration provided for this, and each side had to struggle for political power in the colony. While political squabbles between the non-resistant Quakers and the Protestants who were not opposed to war raged over the years prior to the American Revolution, each side maintained its particular religious beliefs, even if no compromise between the two sides was reached.<sup>15</sup> Even if they did not agree with each other, they maintained enough civility not to go to war prior to the American Revolution. However, with the outbreak of the War, a political shift occurred in the government of Pennsylvania. A new revolutionary government composed of various types of Protestants rapidly took over Pennsylvania and established a host of new wartime laws which put all of the conscientious objectors in a very trying position, as it would be a fiery test for all of their dearly held religious convictions.

These laws required people who had otherwise been loyal to George III to compromise that loyalty. Among other things was a conscription (which carried with it a heavy fine for refusing to enlist)<sup>16</sup>. As if this was not bad enough, the revolutionary government required an oath of allegiance from all residents of Pennsylvania, which read:

“I, , do swear (or affirm) that I renounce and refuse all allegiance to George III, king of Great Britain, his heirs and successors; and that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a free and independent State, and that I will not at any time, do or cause to be done any matter or thing that will be prejudicial, or injurious to the freedom and independence thereof;....as declared by Congress, and also, that I will discover and make known to some justice of the peace of said State all treasons or traitorous conspiracies which I now know or hereafter shall know to be formed against this or any of the United States of America.”<sup>17</sup>

This directly went against the religious convictions of the Quakers and Anabaptists, who believed firmly that Jesus had forbade any and all swearing of oaths. Even if there was a provision in the oath to allow for affirmation rather than swearing, these people had more than just opposition to oath-swearing to stand behind when refusing to take this oath.

For one thing, ever since King Charles II had been on the British throne, these Christians had enjoyed freedom from European persecution, and, as noted by Bercot, had no reason to take up arms against a government that had done them no wrong whatsoever<sup>18</sup>. Even though it had

not been completely without conflict, they did not have to face execution for their religious beliefs. They always knew, though, that one day their resolute convictions would be put to the test in an outbreak of war. “As the flames of war mount higher and higher, no man can tell whether the Cross and persecution of the defenseless Christians will not soon come, and it is, therefore, of supreme importance to prepare ourselves for such circumstances with patience and resignation, and to use all available means that can encourage steadfastness and strengthen faith.”<sup>19</sup> Already they had willingly suffered the loss of all things when necessary during the French and Indian War (Seven Years' War) two decades earlier. These committed Christians were going to follow Jesus as they understood what that meant even if that meant paying the ultimate price. Their convictions were not just ideals to talk about during times of peace, but to be followed in any and all circumstances no matter what.

So, also, in addition to nonresistance, they forsook all swearing of oaths. As Jesus said, their yes meant yes and their no meant no.<sup>20</sup> So, no matter what happened, their word was so reliable, that an oath was simply unnecessary and should be treated as such. Yet still, as noted above, even if this new revolutionary government was insisting absolute loyalty to their cause against Great Britain, they saw no justifiable reason, for conscience's sake both in matters pertaining to their religion as well as their not regarding Britain as an enemy, to take this oath. But the oath had a yet darker side still, as it carried with it an even heavier punishment for not taking it that would prove devastating to conscientious Christians.

As noted by Bender, this oath gave all residents of Pennsylvania a clear choice of life or death. “Those not taking the oath were declared incapable of serving on juries, suing for debts, voting or holding office, buying or selling lands, tenements or hereditaments, and possessing arms. Every one travelling outside his own city or country without having taken the oath was to be clapped in jail till he took it.”<sup>21</sup> So, the revolutionaries, who earlier claimed that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were the freedoms they were fighting to establish a new government for, they were more than willing to take these freedoms away from those who would not declare their utmost allegiance to them, either by swearing a renunciatory oath and submitting to military conscription. One refusing to take the oath could be restricted from buying or selling land, defending their rights in court, voting for their representatives, or having any kind of weapons. Now, some of these freedoms were not ones that were of the character of the Anabaptists to take on (such as suing for debt), but others were freedoms they thoroughly enjoyed. But in addition to the principles on which the Anabaptists firmly stood, they also were unwilling to take the oath because of how closely it resembled the mark of the beast as described in the book of

Revelation.<sup>22</sup> They were not only not willing to compromise on matters of their religious convictions about Jesus's teachings, but in addition they also did not want to seemingly sell their souls either. This oath seemed clear enough to them that to take it would be to sell their souls and surrender everything which for a long time they had stood firmly for.

What is noteworthy here is the Declaration of Independence's statement about the nature of King George III as a monarch. "The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States."<sup>23</sup> Yet, how is what the revolutionaries did to the Anabaptists and Quakers different from that accusation? Is it not tyrannical to take away someone's basic rights in the name of defending freedom? Most people today would give a unanimous 'yes' answer to that question. However, the revolutionaries somehow did not see the inconsistency of what they did in Pennsylvania with what they gave their approval to at the signing of the Declaration of Independence. They had an agenda, and those who failed to comply would be regarded as mortal enemies to the cause, despite never having taken up arms against anyone, friend or foe.

The punishments offered to those who refused to cooperate took on many cruel forms. It is important to note, however, before discussing the punishments that the Quakers and Anabaptists endured, that the domination of the Colonies by supporters of the Revolution and the subsequent persecution of those opposed to it did not just take shape in religious persecution. Even Christians who were not opposed to war, but who were still loyal in some form to Great Britain, were the targets of merciless abuse by the revolutionaries. For example, the Sons of Liberty regularly employed mob violence to silence all opposition to the cause of the Revolution, whether against the tax collectors for the Stamp Act of 1765 or against people who were simply not opposed to King George III.<sup>24</sup> The Loyalists, who were not opposed to war for any sort of religious convictions, but saw no reason to go against George III, Parliament, etc., also were persecuted.<sup>25</sup> To be loyal to Great Britain came at a serious price. Some of these Loyalists paid the price with all that they had as a result of their refusal to betray their King. One in particular, Grace Growden Galloway, was evicted from her home in Philadelphia simply because her husband had been a Loyalist who escaped Pennsylvania.<sup>26</sup> The revolutionaries also fought some of the major battles of the War for Independence against the Loyalists, who, naturally, sided with Great Britain. As Bercot notes, even after the end of the War, the Loyalists still could not count on all being forgiven and just being able to come home peacefully without any retaliation from their victorious neighbors, and were actually regarded in a more negative light even than the losing nation they supported.<sup>27</sup> The losers of this conflict had to bear the heavy weight of their

losses, and the victors had a message that was clearly designed to ensure that no further opposition would be raised.

While this was certainly not the end of America's conflicts with Great Britain, one had to question just how free from tyranny America really was if this is how the citizens would treat those who would not pledge their undying loyalty and giving their unconditional agreement to everything the dominant political power wanted. As their neighbors who shared similar hesitations to them, the Quakers and Anabaptists soon found themselves the latest victims of the American Revolution. Refusing to sign the oath, as noted earlier, may as well have said that death would be the sentence. In fact, John L. Ruth, in his book, *'Twas Seeding Time*, notes that some people were executed for their stance, and this in spite of the fact that numerous residents begged and pleaded on their behalf to their fellow Christians running the government to consider the implications of their deaths. One of these in particular, Ruth notes, was an elderly Quaker.<sup>28</sup> But what would prompt those who claimed to follow Jesus to execute innocent people? The answer lies in the mentality of the new government. Pennsylvania also was home to plenty of Loyalists and others who supported the British, and these were the people who the revolutionaries felt had to be hunted down as a threat to the Thirteen Colonies and their security. So, "in the quest for revenge on such people suspicion sometimes ranked as proof, and the innocent were occasionally victimized."<sup>29</sup> So, during the Revolution, if a person had not given and continued to demonstrate his absolute loyalty to the Thirteen Colonies, it was a sure guarantee that the government was going to make a public example out of him/her, and exercise whatever means of brutality they could to get their point across. One active politician in Pennsylvania who was not opposed to the targeting of Loyalists, urged the government to only prosecute active Loyalists and allow these non-resistant Christians to have state-provided relief from having to submit to the draft of the revolutionary government, but it was all to no avail.<sup>30</sup>

To those who were not killed, it meant a very trying existence during the War. As noted earlier, speaking against the Revolution or the actions of the colonists was generally retaliated against. In Pennsylvania, the press had an anti-War voice in the form of Christopher Sauer II, a Brethren bishop and printer who was the son of a printer of the same name. Leroy Beachy, in his detailed history of the Amish entitled *Unser Leit*, details what happened to Sauer as a result of his being very outspoken against the Revolutionary War and subsequent refusal to take the Oath. Already the revolutionary government was on the hunt for possible Loyalists in Pennsylvania. Sauer's anti-war preaching led him to be targeted by the government, and when he refused to take the oath, "the prisoner suffered indignities, among them the removal of his 'remarkable and

full-grown beard.' On another occasion, American soldiers stripped him of his clothes, then redressed him in tattered army uniforms."<sup>31</sup> Beachy continues the chilling story of Sauer's humiliation by noting that he lost all that he had to the government<sup>32</sup>, including printed copies of a German Bible that he had made accessible to his people, some parts of which were used as ammunition for the colonial army<sup>33</sup>. This using a religious text for ammunition was not unheard of either, as the Anabaptist retelling of all of their martyrdoms, known as the *Martyr's Mirror*, was also used as ammunition at one point.<sup>34</sup> One might wonder how committed Christians could use the Bible of all things as ammunition for weaponry. Then again, one might also be able to answer this when taking what patriotism could mean to anyone to the extreme that the revolutionaries in Pennsylvania obviously reached in their desire to win the war and secure an independent America. Either way, it cannot be ignored.

Other innocent Christians on the receiving end also had whatever property they had that could be useful confiscated by the government, were thrown into prison, or even made exiles from the colony they once called home.<sup>35</sup> In some of these noteworthy cases, little to no care or concern was shown to those who would suffer starvation because they would have no means within their home to provide for their own.

"From some of them all the provisions were taken and not even a morsel of bread left them for their children.' Since all their iron stoves were taken from them, though fastened to the floors, 'they are deprived of every means of keeping their children warm in the approaching winter, especially at nights, being obliged to sleep on the floor without any beds.'<sup>36</sup>

These were the words of a petition by Eve Yoder and Esther Bachman, two wives of imprisoned farmers, who attempted to get the Pennsylvania Assembly to put a stop to this cruelty. As Ruth notes, the Pennsylvania Assembly, to their credit, did look into the matter, but the reparations they made were a small fraction of the losses that these poor Christians incurred.<sup>37</sup> Others, fleeing the onslaught, went into exile in the wilderness.<sup>38</sup>

Pennsylvania was not alone in this tragic shift into persecution. As noted by Richard K. MacMaster and his colleagues in their book, *Conscience in Crisis*, "shifting some of the cost of war onto the shoulders of those who would not bear arms proved so popular a measure that other colonies followed Pennsylvania's example."<sup>39</sup> MacMaster then goes on to detail how all of the colonies began to follow suit. By now, several of them had allowed the Anabaptists and Quakers freedom from having to go against their consciences by serving in the military, but these states began changing their course and fining the Anabaptists for refusing to serve.<sup>40</sup> This was proving to be just as trying a war for these lovers of peace if not more trying than any of the past ones they had faced either in Europe or North America.



While persecution of the Anabaptists and Quakers in Pennsylvania by the revolutionaries did not continue after the war, and the government at least made an attempt at making reparations, this horrible chain of events no doubt set a precedent that America continued to follow after the War, even if not in its entirety. Though America has yet to see Christians executed simply for professing Christianity by their fellow countrymen, Christians have not been without suffering in the wars that followed the American Revolution, up to and including that to the death. During the United States Civil War, President Lincoln followed the practice of initiating a draft that required a large sum of money in order to avoid service, and even declared martial law to stop protests against his measures that turned ugly, resulting in many a night's misery for those wrongly arrested on grounds of mere suspicion.<sup>41</sup> In World War I, conscientious objectors were treated with as much shaming as possible. Many were sent to the worst of prisons, and were cruelly mistreated there as if they had committed a gross act of treason. "One of the cruelest instances of mistreatment occurred when an objector in Alcatraz was transferred to Leavenworth and later died. He had refused to wear a military uniform and was given no other clothing option. In the damp and chilly cell, he contracted pneumonia, received no medical care, and died. For his refusal to compromise his beliefs, the Army sent his body home in a military uniform."<sup>42</sup>

In World War II, it is said that "one out of every six men in U.S. prisons during World War II was a draft resister...War resisters found themselves behind bars for up to six years. Some were even held up to two years after the war ended."<sup>43</sup> While the typical lessons taught in school place great emphasis on the incredible victory won by the soldiers who fought, and sometimes even died on behalf of citizens of the United States of America, those seeking to be faithful to Jesus's teaching on nonresistance fought their own battles while on the receiving end of much cruel mistreatment for their refusal to take a patriotic stance and go against their convictions.

It was Jesus who said "he who is not with me is against me".<sup>44</sup> However, the precedent America has always followed since the beginning, taking after all other nations before it that expected Christians to fight to protect the country's interests, is similar to the call of Jesus. It is either the citizens have to cooperate regardless of what bothers their consciences, or they face the penalty for their refusal, which was guaranteed to be harsh. For those following the teaching of nonresistance, it was a clear choice between two sides, both of which called for absolute allegiance or heavy consequences. For the Quakers and Anabaptists, the choice was to obey Jesus's teaching, no matter what suffering that would entail.

It is with great irony that the Bill of Rights makes provision for freedom of religion when its country has a long history of mistreating those who hold to religious beliefs that are radically

different. Even secular philosophers such as William James have noted the futility of attempting to force one's particular viewpoint on another. "If the mystical truth that comes to a man proves to be a force that he can live by, what right have we of the majority to order him to live in another way? We can throw him into a prison or a madhouse—but we cannot change his mind..."<sup>45</sup>. James here attempts to reason from a more secular viewpoint of why people should not attempt to force others out of their convictions into what constitutes status quo. "Prisons and madhouses" seem to be the last stronghold society has for those holding different religious beliefs than the mainstream. It is the closest the world can get to changing someone's mind from what has already been resolutely determined to be believed in/carried out/etc. at all costs, even if death were the result of success in getting the message across or failure to uphold one's convictions that he had been taught and had lived with no regret for all of his life, seeing no reason to compromise now.

The treatment of non-resistant Christians during the Revolutionary War sheds a dark light on American history from its beginnings. As stated above, America unfortunately continued to follow similar patterns to those of the Revolution when dealing with people who would not cooperate and sign their utmost loyalty over to their country as opposed to a literal application of Jesus's teachings. It makes one wonder which direction America will go in the future, as the world gets darker and darker. Today, the tragic persecutions of the Revolutionary War era are "considered unimportant or marginal by historians of the Revolution."<sup>46</sup> In the world today, there is rarely ever such thing as an unbiased viewpoint when it comes to facts. Much gets written as a means to an end, often to persuade another to join to the other one's viewpoint/agenda. The way the American Revolution has been written about in standard history books, much of the glory of the war and all of the important people fighting in it gets acknowledged and lauded while the victims of it either gets brushed aside and, if fortunate enough to be noticed, is only noticed by those interested in the preservation of facts, particularly from the point of view of one of the losing sides (or one of the sides with a cultural interest). While this may not uphold the ultimately virtuous image the average citizen would have of his/her nation and its Founding Fathers, it is at least getting the plain truth out in an unbiased fashion for all the world to see, no matter how heavy the cost to bear or how negative a picture it paints of something that most of one's life has been glorified in every way.

In conclusion, the Colonists won much with the Revolutionary War. The new nation was now independent of Great Britain and, though its beginnings were humble, everyone on the winning side could now regroup and determine what must be done from here. It would ultimately

take the remainder of the 1780s to realize what would need to be the makeup of their Constitution. But for the freedoms they fought for, one had to wonder, how much freedom were they willing to guarantee others? After all, during the War, some people had been deprived of their basic freedoms, the very ones defended in the Declaration of Independence. In the process of fighting for freedom, the Colonists failed to ensure that everyone would get that freedom, and were very selective about how they would carry out their desires for freedom. Anything other than absolute loyalty to the cause of the Revolution meant being turned against by the government, and at that, the very one that only a century earlier had guaranteed freedom for those seeking refuge. In Pennsylvania, freedom was supposed to be the freedom to practice one's religious beliefs, and to think and speak what one wanted as long as it was not disorderly. However, freedom was, at best, in practice limited to the freedom to believe in and live out whatever cause or set of beliefs one wanted to, as long as they had some way to justify involvement in the revolt against Great Britain and the establishment of a new government by the revolutionaries, who were bent on getting their way. In the end, those who suffered could tell the story from their point of view of where following Jesus fit into the cause of the Revolution, and what it would take to do so in as hostile an environment as one like wartime America, where opposition to what the country was doing, even in the most subtle form, was easily a qualifying factor in being handed severe punishments, up to and including death.

### Works Cited/Referenced

- Beachy, Leroy. Unser Leit: The Story of the Amish. Goodly Heritage Books: Millersburg, 2011.
- Bender, Wilbur J. "Pacifism Among the Mennonites, Amish Mennonites and Schwenkfelders to 1783".  
*Mennonite Quarterly Review*, 1927.
- Bercot, David W. In God We Don't Trust. Scroll Publishing Company: Amberson, 2011.
- Bercot, David W. The Kingdom that Turned the World Upside Down. Scroll Publishing Company:  
Tyler, 2003.
- Bercot, David W. "The Treatment of Kingdom Christians During the Revolution". Audio Lecture,  
Scroll Publishing Company: Amberson, 2010.
- Estep, William R. The Anabaptist Story. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.
- Hirst, Margaret E. and Rufus M. Jones. The Quakers in Peace and War. Kessinger Publications: 2010.
- James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature.  
Electronic Edition.
- Jefferson, Thomas, et. al. The Declaration of Independence: A Transcription. [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html), accessed October 7, 2014.
- Keene, Jennifer, et. al. Visions of America: A History of the United States, vol. 1, Pearson Education,  
Inc.: Boston, 2013.
- MacMaster, Richard K. et. al. Conscience in Crisis. Herald Press: Scottsdale, 1979. Goodly Heritage Books: Millersburg, 2011.
- "Maryland Toleration Act". <http://www.christianity.com/church/history/timeline/1601-1700/maryland-toleration-act-11630122.html>, accessed October 9, 2014.
- Middlekauff, Robert. The Glorious Cause. Oxford University Press: 1982, Electronic Edition  
"New York Colony". <http://www.landofthebrave.info/new-york-colony.htm>, 2014, accessed October 8, 2014.
- "Oath of Allegiance". <http://templin.rootsweb.ancestry.com/oath.htm>, accessed October 7, 2014.
- Penn, William. A Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers. Harrison and  
Crosfield, 1834. Electronic Edition.
- Penn, William, et. al. Pennsylvania Charter of Priveleges.  
<http://www.ushistory.org/documents/charter.htm>, accessed October 7, 2014.
- Quinn, James A. The End of the Holy Experiment. Gwynedd Friends Meeting, 2011.  
<http://www.gwyneddmeeting.org/history/holyexperiment.html>, accessed October 7, 2014.
- "Rhode Island". <http://www.history.com/topics/us-states/rhode-island>, accessed October 8, 2014.
- Ruth, John L. 'Twas Seeding Time. Herald Press: Scottsdale, 1976.
- "The Good War and those who Refused to Fight it." PBS, <http://www.pbs.org/itvs/thegoodwar/bars.html>, accessed October 9, 2014.
- Thomas, Isaiah. The History of Printing in America. Weathervane Books: New York, 2011.

“World War I: The CO Problem”. <http://civilianpublicservice.org/storybegins/krehbiel/world-war-1>, accessed October 9, 2014.

#### Endnotes

1For more information on the Anabaptists, see William R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, 1995, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

2For more information about the Quakers, see William Penn, *A Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers*, Harrison and Crosfield, 1834, Electronic Edition; David W. Bercot, *The Kingdom that Turned the World Upside Down*, ch. 33 “The Kingdom Banner Arises Anew”, Tyler: Scroll Publishing Company, 2003.

3Matthew 5:38-42 (KJV)

4For more information on this subject, see David W. Bercot, *The Kingdom that Turned the World Upside Down*, Tyler: Scroll Publishing Company, 2003.

5David W. Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, Amberson: Scroll Publishing, 2011, Kindle Electronic Edition: Paragraph 1, Location 1108.

6William Penn, et. al. “Pennsylvania Charter of Priveleges”, <http://www.ushistory.org/documents/charter.htm>, par. 6-7

7James A. Quinn, “The End of the Holy Experiment”, *Gwynedd Friends Meeting*, 2011, <http://www.gwyneddmeeting.org/history/holyexperiment.html>, par. 2-3

8“Rhode Island”, <http://www.history.com/topics/us-states/rhode-island>, History Channel Website

9“New York Colony”, 2014, <http://www.landofthebrave.info/new-york-colony.htm>

10Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause*, Oxford University Press, Inc., 1982, Electronic Edition, Page 48.

11“Maryland Toleration Act”, <http://www.christianity.com/church/church-history/timeline/1601-1700/maryland-toleration-act-11630122.html>.

12Thomas Jefferson, et. al., “The Declaration of Independence: A Transcription, 1776, [http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html), par. 2

13Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, Location 3392.

14Bercot, *ibid.*, Location 3369, 3379.

15Wilbur J. Bender, “Pacifism Among the Mennonites, Amish Mennonites and Schwenkfelders to 1783”, Part I, *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, 1927, p. 22-35

16Bender, Part II, p. 21-27

17“Oath of Allegiance”, <http://templin.rootsweb.com/oath.htm> , par. 16

18Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, Location 3419.

19 Margaret E. Hirst and Jones, Rufus M., *The Quakers in Peace and War*, Kessinger Publishing, 2010, p. 50; quoted in Bender, Wilbur J., “Pacifism among the Mennonites, Amish Mennonites and Schwenkfelders to 1783,” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, 1927, p. 32-33.

20See Matthew 5:33-37.

21Bender p. 27-28.

22David W. Bercot, “The Treatment of Kingdom Christians during the American Revolution”, Audio Teaching, Scroll Publishing Company: Amberson, 2010.

23“Declaration of Independence”, par. 2

24Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, “Descent into Lawlessness”, “How Do You Reason with a Mob?”, “Persecuting those who Trusted in God”

25Bercot, *Ibid.*, “Loyalists and Black Slaves”

26Jennifer Keene, et. al., *Visions of America: A History of the United States*, vol. 1, Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., 2013, p. 113

27Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, Location 3684.

28John L. Ruth, *'Twas Seeding Time*, Scottdale: Herald Press, 1976, p. 167.

29*Ibid.*

30Richard K. MacMaster, et. al. *Conscience in Crisis*, Scottdale: Herald Press, 1979, p. 429.

31Leroy Beachy, *Unser Leit...The Story of the Amish*, Millersburg: Goodly Heritage Books, 2011, vol. 1, p. 339.

32*Ibid.*, p. 340.

33Isaiah Thomas, *The History of Printing in America*, New York: Weathervane Books, 2011, p. 411-412; Quoted in Beachy, Leroy, *Unser Leit*, p. 340.

34Bender, part I, p. 33; Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, Location 3474

35Ruth 167-173.

36Ibid., 172.

37Ibid., 172-173.

38Bercot, *In God We Don't Trust*, Location 3464.

39MacMaster 224.

40Ibid., 224-225.

41Keene 389-391.

42“World War I: The CO Problem”, *The Civilian Public Service Story: Living Peace in a Time of War*, <http://civilianpublicservice.org/storybegins/krehbiel/world-war-1>, par. 5

43“*The Good War and Those who Refused to Fight it*”, PBS, <http://www.pbs.org/itvs/thegoodwar/bars.html>, par. 1

44Matthew 12:30

45William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*, Electronic Edition, p. 178.

46Ruth 7.