

A man was thinking and he realized ...

one of the reasons life is so hard is because ...

there is a lack of justice. Why is this so?

How did we come to the place where justice seems to be the exception and not the rule?

Why There Is No Justice:  
The Corruption Of Law

By

Job S. Friend

## Attribution Page

Copyright 2013 by:

Christian Thinkers Publishing  
C/O Barnabas Ministries  
P.O. Box 3393  
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48333  
USA

Creative Commons License granted: CC BY-NC-ND

Explanation of Creative Commons License grant:

CC: Please refer to [creativecommons.org](http://creativecommons.org)

By: The user must acknowledge the author and copyright holder as follows:

Author: Job S. Friend

Copyright holder:

Christian Thinkers Publishing  
C/O Barnabas Ministries  
P.O. Box 3393  
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48333  
USA

NC: The user may not use this book for commercial purposes. However, the user may place a downloadable copy of this complete book onto a website for free downloading even though the website itself has banner and other ads. In other words there must be no charge for this book itself.

ND: The creative commons license grant only allows the user to use the original unmodified work. The user may not make a derivative from the original work, or any part of it. In other words, fair use quoting is allowed, but the user may not transform this book, or any part of it, into a derivative work.

## **Table Of Contents**

Introduction	1
Natural Rights As A Key To Life	3
The Purpose Of Law	35
The Purpose Of Government	48
Divine Law	68
Tribalism	107
The Role Of A King – Past & Future	116
The Corruption Of Law	134
Summary & Concluding Remarks	168

To The Peaceful

## **Introduction**

Shortly after the creation of man families joined themselves together into tribes and this ultimately led to the formation of kingdoms and governments. Part of the motivation was probably for defensive purposes. Men were afraid to be alone and so grouped together for safety sake. And part of the motivation was likely related to satisfying a sense of belonging.

The interest in religion, and man's place in the universe, led to competing religious belief systems and this ultimately led to the formation of religious organizations. Men adopted or established religions hoping to secure the "favor of the gods" in this life and also to secure a promise of eternal life due to "correct" religious beliefs, practices, and/or membership.

Unfortunately, in many cases, the forming of kingdoms and governments, religions and religious organizations, was also a vain attempt to seek safety in a collective and/or to evade the responsibility for having to make one's own life decisions and then to live with the consequences. Perhaps even more unfortunate, there has been an almost constant attempt to ignore or evade the laws that govern the

universe. Any such attempt to ignore or evade the laws that govern the universe ultimately proves itself futile – with disastrous negative consequences. Some of those disastrous negative consequences have been the systematic production of societal conflict, a lack of justice, a lack of harmony and social cooperation, and war. The piper has been and will be paid.

The two Jehovahs (God the Father and Jesus Christ, hereinafter sometimes referred to as God,) made men free. They had to in order to develop character in us. And they gave us dominion over the earth, not each other. The freedom they gave us also makes us responsible for our choices. The main purpose of this book is to survey the purpose of law, the purpose of government, and explain how both have been corrupted. A further purpose of this book is to include an explanation of natural rights and why their recognition is necessary. Natural rights, good law, and good government are necessary in order for justice, social harmony, social cooperation, and peace to prevail – without which abundant life is not possible.

The information from the pages that follow was gleaned from personal life experience and learning, the Bible, and from logical reasoning.

As a housekeeping point, the scriptural references, herein, are from the King James Version, KJV, Modern King James Version, MKJV, or New Living Translation, NLT, unless denoted otherwise. Any emphasis, in the scriptural or other quotations, is mine throughout this book.

As an additional important note, I have chosen to write the pages that follow mainly in a conversational style. Having said that, let's get started. I offer for your serious consideration and hopeful edification what I have learned below.

## **Natural Rights As A Key To Life**

For hundreds of years there has been much discussion about the **natural rights** of life, liberty, and property. To some men, they are God-given. To other men, they are a part of **natural law**, i.e., the laws of nature. To other men they are both God-given and part of natural law. And some men deny that man has natural rights, or that there even are laws of nature. Unfortunately, the men that reject natural rights

usually do so because natural rights act as a check on state power. Many times the rejection of natural rights is coupled with a belief in the concept of an “organic state” – a state that plans out, structures, and manages the lives of its citizens. Those believing in the mythical and metaphysical power of an organic state allow for some citizens to be, what amounts to, human fuel used to stoke the fires that keep the organic state alive. As your author has shown in another book, *Economic Fallacies Versus Rational Thought*, anyone who believes that central planners can use an organic state apparatus to actually plan intelligently is wrong. Central planners will not have the information to do so. As a result they will waste both human lives and a society’s capital trying.

Interestingly enough, the Founding Fathers of America believed that natural rights were both God-given and were also a part of natural law. This can be known from a careful reading of the first portion of the Declaration Of Independence [emphasis mine throughout].

“When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers

of the earth, the separate and equal station to which **the laws of nature** and **of nature's God** entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, [which your author will discuss below], that all men are created equal, that they are **endowed by their Creator** with certain unalienable rights, that among these are **life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness** [the "pursuit of happiness" was known to mean private **property** at the time]. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It is clear from reading the above that America's Founding Fathers believed in a God who gave men rights and that these rights of life, liberty, and property were unalienable and absolutely true. It is also clear that they believed these rights were self-evident and formed a part of natural law (the laws of nature). Whether the individuals involved were Deists, who believed that a Creator God created the universe with laws and then retired from the scene like a watchmaker making a watch and

then winding the watch, or whether some of the individuals believed in a personal Creator God, with which human beings can have contact is not relevant to our discussion at hand. That can be debated at another time and place and already has been. What is relevant to the discussion at hand is: Were America's Founding Fathers correct in their delineation of natural rights in the Declaration of Independence? Can natural rights be established by reference to the Bible and/or by reason according to the laws of nature, i.e., according to natural law?

Your author believes that, properly understood, there can be no conflict with natural law and the Bible because **both** natural law and the Bible were given by a personal Creator God to allow human beings two different ways to know how to order their lives. St. Thomas Aquinas would probably say the same thing as his categories of "divine law," aka the Bible and "natural law," aka the laws of nature discoverable by human reason, both form part of what he calls "eternal law," aka the laws and knowledge the Creator God had available when planning for and creating the entire universe and everything in it. It stands to reason that the Creator God would not allow a contradiction by saying something in divine law that

contradicted natural law, i.e., what reason showed man via the understanding that man can gain from discovering and using the laws of nature. The religions of the world could have avoided a lot of embarrassment and grief if they would have used reason and natural law to function as a check on their doctrines.

An "a priori" axiom is a premise that can be reasoned from to establish and make plain further truth. It can be considered a basic fact subsumed from all facts. It is innately true. Any attempt to deny its trueness would require its use in an attempt to deny it, which would be a logical contradiction and an invalid argument. The invalid argument can then be rejected, ergo once again establishing the trueness of the "a priori" axiom that was challenged. Because it is an axiom that is innately true according to and coming from the laws of nature some writers and thinkers will refer to it as a "self-evident" axiom. They refer to it as self-evident because some will grasp this innately true fact on their own, by their own realization. Others will apprehend or comprehend its truth once it is called to their attention. Either way, the axiom is innately true and meaningful to human beings once realized or comprehended. The "a priori" axiom is not a tautology (something that is true

by definition only and does not really teach us anything about the real world). It is not a synthetic proposition requiring ongoing and never-ending empirical testing – which can never absolutely establish any truth. It comes from a comprehension of the empirical world as it really is, because it is a basic fact subsumed from all facts. And it is a fact that is true in all cases without fail and without the need for any further empirical analysis. It is a self-evident innately true fact that can be reasoned from with absolute certainty of its truth.

In using reason to understand the laws of nature man identifies entities according to their defining characteristics. When man successfully IDs an entity (some object or thing) we have new knowledge (id-entity, aka identity). The identification of new entities also gives us knowledge of cause and effect as we see how different entities interact with each other, how they grow to maturity, if alive, etc. Man, the rational being, can learn a lot just by using his own mind.

Aristotle's famous three laws of identification are: 1) a thing is itself, i.e.,  $A = A$ ; 2) the law of non-contradiction, i.e., A cannot be A and non-A at the same time; and 3) the law of the

excluded middle, i.e., something is either A, or it is not A. These three paraphrased laws, above, actually help clarify truth for us, even though they may seem very simple. For example, man has been categorized, correctly so, as being the rational animal, or the rational being. The word "man" is a category of identification and it includes and means all men. In other words, if someone is in the category of "man" they have the defining characteristics of what it means to be a man, including being rational (thinking), and they are the mammal Homo sapiens, i.e., Man = Man. This has very important implications because man, the rational being, has certain properties that caused him to be categorized as the rational animal, i.e., men think. All men think. That is one of the important reasons why they are categorized as a man in the first place. We shall see why this is so important later. Thinking man builds fires and cooks food, wears clothes, uses language to communicate, develops technologies and art, and many other things that other animals do not do. Man is unique on this earth.

Life is better than death. Only the living can value anything. Only the living can think. Any man wanting to attempt to challenge the fact that "life is better than death" would have to be

alive in order to make the challenge. Their using life in order to try to establish that death is better than life would be an invalid argument that can be rejected. If they really thought death was better than life they would have already killed themselves and would not be alive to make their challenge. Life wins. Life being better than death is a self-evident a priori fact of nature for rational beings, i.e., it is an axiom. The Bible corroborates this in various places, e.g., by promising eternal life in I Corinthians 15 and very specifically in Deuteronomy 30:19:

“I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: **therefore choose life**, that both thou and thy seed may live:”  
Deuteronomy 30:19, KJV

Choosing life means to recognize that life is better than death and this realization (axiom) now has implications for how mankind should structure their lives in order to live. This is because choosing life also means choosing the things that are necessary for life. Only the living can gain, experience, and appreciate values. Only the living can grow in character - the moral and intellectual virtues. And only the living can be productive, experience

relationships, and all of the other joys of being alive. And only the living can think. And we are man, the thinking being. But, for now, let us move on to liberty.

Liberty is a requirement of every man. Man has been correctly classified, according to the laws of nature, as the rational being. Every man has to have liberty in order to think, or he could not fit into the category of being a man in the first place because man is the thinking being. **This ability to think requires liberty.** No one else can control a man's thoughts, or the controlled man would not be thinking for himself, which is to say he would not be thinking at all – he would be the equivalent of a ventriloquist's puppet. All men are men. All men think because to be a man means to be a thinking being. To fit into the category of a rational being a man must have the ability to think and the ability to think requires the liberty to think. **Ergo man must have liberty.** For anyone to challenge that men must have liberty in order to think, the challenger must be free to challenge. How would the challenger have the liberty to challenge, but other men not have liberty, when all men are men? The challenger would be exposed as a hypocrite or wannabe elitist who wants natural rights for himself, but

not for other men. His argument, using liberty in an attempt to deny liberty, can be rejected. Liberty is a self-evident a priori fact of nature for rational beings, i.e., **it is an axiom.**

This required liberty goes farther than just the liberty to think, however, because a man also has to take action in order to stay alive. Thinking, by itself, is not enough to keep a man alive. Man has to remain true to principle and axiom number one, which is, that life is better than death. And because man does not live in a thought world, but in a real world, each man needs the ability to use property, e.g., food in order to stay alive. In other words, each man needs not only the ability to think, he also needs the ability to take action. The necessity to take action and the ability to take action also entails the need for liberty. He needs this liberty in order to take the steps that are necessary for him to sustain his life. It does a man no good to only think about eating a piece of fruit. The man also has to have the liberty to take the corresponding action to obtain the piece of fruit and to eat it. Each man, then, needs liberty in order to think and to take action in order to sustain his life. Liberty then is a requirement, according to the laws of nature, for all men. Liberty is a part of natural law for all men. It is

the right of all men to conform to the requirements of their own nature in order to stay alive, i.e., to possess liberty as a right in order to be able to think and to take action. Liberty is then a self-evident a priori natural right according to the laws of nature for men.

Big problems, of course, have come about from governments, tribes, religions, nobility classes, etc., attempting to deny that men possess liberty as a natural right according to natural laws. There are always men who want to rule over others and to deny the ruled their freedom. Whenever and wherever this happens that society loses out because the quality of the people declines, productivity declines, and the offending society ultimately declines. When men are not free to think and to take action automatic penalties for the violation of natural laws commence and those penalties will be paid.

If someone (a man) wants to attempt to deny that liberty is a natural right for all men, in accordance with natural law, then we have to ask a few questions. How is it that the challenger, the arguing man, is free to make an argument? Where did he, a man, get his freedom to argue? You have to think in order to argue and you also have to be able to take the

action of arguing. If he, the arguing man, has the liberty to think and take action, how is it that he has liberty but other men do not? All men are men. If one man has the liberty to think and to take action all others do as well. The obvious answer is that he is using liberty in an attempt to invalidate liberty as an axiom. Hence his argument is invalid and can be rejected. Liberty stands.

As the arrogance of some men knows no boundaries, I guess an arguing man could argue that there are different categories of men, e.g., there are supermen and regular men. And he could continue his argument that he, being a superman, should have liberty while regular men should not have liberty. In other words he would try to re-categorize mankind into supermen and regular men. If he had objective evidence for this categorization then we would have to listen to his argument. Even so, he would be making several important mistakes - each of which would render his new argument invalid. First, he would not be able to present any objectively verifiable evidence because none exists. Without evidence he is simply an irrational mystic who wants to rule over others. And without any objectively verifiable evidence there is no reason for any suggested re-

categorization of mankind. Second, even if the superman argument were true it would not prove the point that regular men be denied liberty. This is because, as the very definition of a regular man is "the thinking being," even the regular category of man would require that regular men have the right to think and to take action because it is inherent in men that they have this right in order to sustain their lives according to the laws of nature. That is why even "regular man" is classified, correctly so, as the thinking being.

The mystic wannabe ruler could also attempt to categorize himself as a regular man requiring liberty to think and to take action, but what you and I would consider regular men were really somehow sub-human and therefore not really entitled to the liberty to think and to take action. This would be just another arrogant iteration of the superman argument above with no objectively verifiable evidence to back it up. I suppose the assertion would be that most men don't think clearly, or make mistakes, or whatever. It would be a desperate argument not realizing that the requirement to be categorized man, the thinking being, does not require perfection in thinking - just that man can

think. And to be able to think requires liberty. Again, liberty stands.

The very first chapter of the Bible gives man permission to have dominion over the earth. This implies that men should have both liberty and property in that God said that man should have dominion over the animals and things of the earth, but not over each other.

“And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them [man] have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.” Genesis 1:26, KJV

The right to property also turns out to be an a priori axiom for all men. The most important property right is the right of each man to self-ownership. The right to property starts with self-ownership. Someone attempting to dispute the property right of self-ownership for others has some big problems to overcome. He would need to be free to make an argument and he would also need to own himself so as to be able to make the argument. Let's say the arguer is man #2 attempting to tell man #1 that man #1 does not own himself, that man #1 has no

property right over himself. To make the below questions easier to ask and comment on, let's further say that man #2 is asserting ownership over man #1. Man #1 would clearly be entitled to ask, "If I do not own me, who does?" And, "How did my supposed owner obtain title to me?" And man #1 would be entitled to ask for the proof of how his supposed owner (man #2) got title to him (man #1). No matter what man #2 answered he could not sustain his argument through the key follow-up question that man #1 would surely ask. And that key follow-up question would be: "How did the supposed owner of me obtain title to himself in order to be able to take the action that got him (man #2) supposed title over me (man #1)?" Because both are men, according to the laws of nature, both have the same properties. Man = Man. If man #2 owns himself and can therefore take action in obtaining property, man #1, also a man, owns himself, too. Man #2 has then used the a priori axiom of the property right of self-ownership, in an attempt to deny its validity. The argument is invalid and can be rejected. A man owns himself and this is the first and most important property right for each man. This is also why, in a free society, even a poor man owns some property, i.e., himself.

It makes no difference if man #2 is asserting ownership of man #1 on his own behalf, or on behalf of a collective group of men – whether this collective group of men be a tribe, a government, or whatever. This is because a collective group of men is a group of individual men. To form the collective, the individuals composing it would each have had to have the right of self-ownership and the right of liberty in order to think and to take the action of forming the collective. Again, the a priori axiom would have been used in an attempt to deny it. Trying to argue from the point of view of a collective is an attempt to kick the can down the road, to no avail. Their argument is invalid and can be rejected. Men are men. All men are men. Each of us has the natural right of self-ownership. The fact that some men choose to use their natural rights to form a collective does not give their collective, once formed, a “super-right” to trump the natural rights of other individuals. All collectives are made up of men. Again, all men are men.

As a man, in terms of property rights, to own one’s self is not enough. One must also obtain and use other forms of property in order to stay alive, e.g., one must eat and that requires the obtaining and eating of food.

Many others have opined, e.g., John Locke, that a man obtains the rights to additional property (other than himself) from being the first to mix his productive labor with property in the commons (property that has not yet been properly appropriated for private usage). Your author concurs. This is the fairest way because the first man to put property into actually productive use should be the rightful private owner. He thought of it and took the action to make a then non-useful piece of property now useful. Of course, all or nearly all property is potentially useful, but until a man actually mixes his own labor with it, it is unused – in a state of nature, as it were. An easy to understand example is a sculptor who makes a sculpture from some raw materials he found in nature. The sculptor, as producer, clearly owns the sculpture. Who else would own it, a non-producer of the sculpture? The answer clearly is, “Of course not.” Someone who differed would have to put forth a more just and logical reason for differing. Your author has not yet heard of a logical and just reason for a dissenting counter-argument. The fact that the previously unused property was in the commons is prima facie evidence that no one else had the smarts or the initiative to be the first to take the

action to bring the property into productive use. Once someone thought of and took the action to make previously unproductive property productive, they became the first and rightful sole owner of this newly acquired and now private property. They successfully mixed their brains, their labor, and their personality with the previously unowned property and now it is theirs by right. This doctrine of how previously unowned property in the commons becomes private property is known as **the doctrine of original appropriation**.

Once property is productively utilized, i.e., made private, it can be utilized in three basic ways by the new owner. First, he can use it himself for his own needs or wants. Second, he can gift it, or leave it, via bequest, to others of his choosing. Or, third, he can trade it for something else he needs or wants.

The initial natural right of self-ownership is the foremost property right. And when man uses his natural right of self-ownership and his natural right of liberty of thought and action to obtain additional property from the commons in order to sustain his primary natural right of life he is acting as a man must act. He is acting according to the laws of nature, i.e., he is acting

in accordance with natural law. A man must acquire and use property in order to stay alive and he has the deduced right to private property to be able to do so.

Man's natural rights of life and liberty have also now been shown to include the deduced right to acquire and use property (privately). The Declaration of Independence phrase, "pursuit of happiness," was a reference to private property. And it implied that you have your life, your liberty, and you are free to use both, plus your initiative and energy, to go forward and obtain as much other kinds of property as you think will give you happiness.

In short, life, liberty, and property are self-evident or deduced natural rights each and every man has due to the fact that he is a man. All men have them because, according to the law of identity, aka a thing is itself - all men are men. They are natural rights deriving from the laws of nature. They are discoverable by men using reason, i.e., their minds. And, throughout the Bible, God concurs. I believe this is one of the reasons for the passages, in Romans 1 and Romans 2 below, where God intimated that truth can be known about him and about

creation, including ethical behavior, by men discovering and observing natural laws:

“since what may be known about God is plain to them [men], because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities - his eternal power and divine nature - have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made [being understandable from nature], so that men are without excuse. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools” Romans 1:19-22, NIV

“For when the [non-Israelite] nations, who do not have the [written divine] Law, do by nature the things of the Law, these, not having the Law, are a law unto themselves; who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and the thoughts between one another accusing or even excusing one another,” Romans 2:14, 15, MKJV

When a good friend of mine went into officer training, for the military, one of the first things he was asked was, “Do you have a problem with

either killing people or destroying property?" The reason he was asked was very clearly told to him. And that reason was, "Killing people and destroying property is what we do in the military. We kill the enemy and destroy his property so he does not have the ability to make war against us." In olden times, when the surviving losers of war were enslaved, your author is guessing some ancient general would have expanded the question, asked of my friend, to: "Do you have a problem killing men, enslaving them, or destroying property?" "No. Good, because that is what we do here."

War, throughout history, caused death, slavery, and the destruction of property. Human interactions resulting in friction and conflict break social harmony. And the lack of social harmony can, if not resolved, ultimately lead to war. And your author thought about war as he was thinking about natural law and natural rights. And your author realized that war is the extreme opposite of social harmony and peace. And my thinking helped me to realize why war is so very detrimental to human beings. Please take a look at the chart below to see what I realized, when I thought about the opposite, or difference, between war and peace (social harmony). Read the left hand side "War"

column all the way down first and then note each entry's opposite notation in the right hand side "Social Harmony" column.

War leads to:		Social Harmony leads to:
Death		Life
Slavery		Liberty
Property destruction		Property
		aka the Natural Rights

The importance of social harmony is revealed in the genius of the Creator God. First, the Creator God told us, throughout the Bible, to live in peace and social harmony, e.g., to love your neighbor as yourself. Even the way that the Creator God phrased it below speaks to social harmony. Notice it only took him five key words to get the job done.

"Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt **love thy neighbour as thyself**: I am the LORD." Leviticus 19:18, KJV

Second, he put the natural rights of man into the laws of nature in such a way that men could discover the laws of social harmony by simply using our reasoning ability. Man, after all, is the rational being. No man wants to have his life taken from him, or to be enslaved (or partially enslaved), or to have some of his property stolen or destroyed. It turns out that “loving your neighbor as yourself” is the same as respecting other men as men, and therefore respecting their God-given and natural rights of life, liberty, and property. And when all men actually respect each other’s natural rights then there will finally be social harmony, peace, and prosperity.

Quoting from Murray Rothbard’s excellent book, *Economic Thought Before Adam Smith*:

“But the most important contribution of Stoic thought [an ancient Greek school of philosophy] was in ethical, political and legal philosophy, for it was the Stoics who first developed and systematized, especially in the legal sphere, the concept and the philosophy of natural law. ... For the Socratics, the city-state [polis], not the individual, was the locus of human virtue. But the destruction or subjugation of the Greek polis

after Aristotle freed the thought of the Stoics from its admixture with politics. The Stoics were therefore free to use their reason to set forth a doctrine of natural law focusing not on the polis but on each individual, and not on each state but on all states everywhere. In short, in the hands of the Stoics, natural law became absolute and universal, transcending political barriers or fleeting limitations of time and place. Law and ethics, the principles of justice, became trans-cultural and trans-national, applying to all human beings everywhere. And since every man possesses the faculty of reason, he can employ right reason to understand the truths of the natural law. The important implication for politics is that the natural law, the just and proper moral law discovered by man's right reason, can and should be used to engage in a moral critique of the positive man-made laws of any state or polis. For the first time, positive law became continually subject to a transcendent critique based on the universal and eternal nature of man."

The Stoics added to man's knowledge by clarifying the answer to four important questions. First: Does natural law apply to the polis (government) or individuals? They correctly answered that natural law applies to

individuals AND to any societies or governments that individuals choose to form. Second: To whom does natural law apply? The correct answer is to all men because all men are men. Third, Where does natural law apply? The correct answer is everywhere. And fourth: When does natural law apply? The correct answer is at all times. Natural law was now known to be applicable in all places and at all times to all individuals – AND to any and all governments and societies individuals choose to form. Further, natural law and natural rights can be used to judge the ethical validity of man-made positive laws and governments. Natural law, right reason in accord with nature, can be used as a check against kings, religions, judges, parliaments, statutory and regulatory man-made laws, tribal customs, etc. Men are valuable. We are not to be a sacrificial animal; we are to be a rational animal (being). All of us have natural rights.

The Stoics influenced, not only ancient Greek thought, they also influenced Roman thought and laws, mainly through Marcus Cicero, the great Roman statesman, jurist, and orator. And through Roman thought and laws, the Stoics influenced the development of Western Civilization. Rothbard quotes Cicero:

“There is a true law, right reason, agreeable to nature, known to all men, constant and eternal, which calls to duty by its precepts, deters from evil by its prohibition ... This law cannot be departed from without guilt ... Nor is there one law at Rome and another at Athens, one thing now and another afterward; but the same law, unchanging and eternal, binds all races of man and all times; and there is one common, as it were, master and ruler - God, the author, promulgator and mover of this law. Whoever does not obey it departs from [his true] self, contemns the nature of man and inflicts upon himself the greatest penalties ...”

The English jurist, legal historian and teacher, Sir William Blackstone, astutely pointed out that without private property rights no one could take their coat off without running the risk that someone else would come along and put it on and then walk away. The same thing held for exiting a tent. Someone else would come along and enter your tent and thereby you would lose your tent. And the same thing held for sowing and caring for agricultural crops. If there were no property rights others would come along at harvest time and eat the crops. In such a society, without recognized property

rights, no one would go to the trouble of constructing a tent or making a coat or growing food. All, or nearly all, would starve, suffer, and die. Private property, per Blackstone, via original appropriation, is a principle of natural justice. The right to leave private property to one's heirs, to Blackstone, prevents the confusion that would occur upon the formerly private property reverting to the commons upon death of the current owner. When two men own different kinds of private property and the private property becomes, in the eyes of one man, more or less valuable than in the eyes of a second man, trades of property for property occur. All of these things, per Blackstone, are in accordance with natural law.

Natural laws can be discovered, but not created. Rothbard points out in his, *The Ethics Of Liberty* that, per Aquinas, good is to be done and promoted. Evil is to be avoided. Moral conduct is conduct in accord with right reason. In other words there is an objective good for man and reason can discover it and reason can also discover the means for the attainment of what is good. For a Thomist philosopher, [someone who largely agrees with St. Thomas Aquinas re natural and divine law], the moral law is a special case of the general principle that

all finite things move toward their ends by the development of their potentialities.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Supreme Court Judge, stated, regarding private property: "first possession gives the acquirer not only possession, but also a title good against all the world."

Rothbard has a nice section on natural law in the first 26 pages of his, *The Ethics Of Liberty*. Quoting from his book:

"It is indeed puzzling that so many modern philosophers should sniff at the very term 'nature' as an injection of mysticism and the supernatural. An apple, let fall, will drop to the ground; this we all observe and acknowledge to be in the nature of the apple (as well as the world in general). Two atoms of hydrogen combined with one of oxygen will yield one molecule of water - behavior that is uniquely in the nature of hydrogen, oxygen, and water. There is nothing arcane or mystical about such observations. Why then cavil [make petty or unnecessary objections] at the concept of 'nature'? The world, in fact, consists of a myriad number of observable things, or entities. This is surely an observable fact. Since the world does

not consist of one homogenous thing or entity alone, it follows that each one of these different things possesses differing attributes, otherwise they would all be the same thing. But if A, B, C, etc., have different attributes, it follows immediately that they have different natures. It also follows that when these various things meet and interact, a specifically delimitable and definable result will occur. In short, specific, delimitable causes will have specific, delimitable effects. The observable behavior of each of these entities is the law of their natures, and this law includes what happens as a result of the interactions. The complex that we may build up of these laws may be termed the structure of natural law. What is 'mystical' about that?

In the field of purely physical laws, this concept will usually differ from modern positivistic terminology only on high philosophical levels; applied to man, however, the concept is far more controversial. And yet, if apples and stones and roses each have their specific natures, is man the only entity, the only being, that cannot have one? And if man does have a nature, why cannot it, too, be open to rational observation and reflection? If all things have natures, then surely man's nature is open

to inspection; the current brusque rejection of the concept of the nature of man is therefore arbitrary ...

One common, flip criticism by opponents of natural law is: who is to establish the alleged truths about man? **The answer is not who but what: man's reason.** Man's reason is objective, i.e., it can be employed by all men to yield truths about the world. To ask what is man's nature is to invite the answer. Go thou and study and find out! ..."

Ludwig von Mises, the great Austrian economist, did not like two things about natural law, but both have answers. The first thing he did not like was the ongoing conflict between reason and the dogmas of the church. A classic example of this is the Catholic Church making Galileo recant his new theory of the earth orbiting the sun, instead of vice versa. However, this is a failure of one religion at one point in time. To Mises, rationality has to prevail in any conflict or apparent conflict. Fair enough. Properly understood, there is no conflict between divine revelation and the laws of nature. There cannot be as both came from the same source, the Creator God. If a man or a religion does not understand something, then

that particular problem is with that man or that religion. If there appears to be a conflict between, e.g., the Bible and science, or the Bible and reason, men are either thinking at the wrong level, or something is missing, aka we do not have all the facts. Your author will discuss this in more detail in the Divine Law section of this book, which comes later. For now, the two Jehovahs are the two most rational beings in the universe. And if one of man's religious systems advocates the violation of man's natural rights it is wrong and hurts its practitioners.

Mises second objection to natural law was the misconception, by some, that natural law means that all men are equal in the biological sense. Of course this is clearly false. After all, some men are taller than others, smarter than others, etc. Mises pointed out, in correcting this misconception, that there are sound arguments for equality of men – if by that you mean all men should be equal before the law. Your author concurs and adds: This is because all men are men (not biological equals), but all men are men in that all men have the natural rights of life, liberty, and property and the need (which Mises would clearly agree with) to think and take action to sustain their precious lives on the earth.

While pointing out the two objections above, Mises did give natural law credit for some important developments concerning the social sciences. Quoting from his book, *Theory And History*, those natural law contributions are, as follows:

“Yet it would be a serious blunder to ignore the fact that all the varieties of the doctrine contained a sound idea which could neither be compromised by connection with untenable vagaries nor discredited by any criticism. Long before the Classical economists discovered that a regularity in the sequence of phenomena prevails in the field of human action, the champions of natural law were dimly aware of this inescapable fact. From the bewildering diversity of doctrines presented under the rubric [category] of natural law there finally emerged a set of theorems, which no caviling [petty and unnecessary objections] can ever invalidate. There is first the idea that a nature-given order of things exists to which man must adjust his actions if he wants to succeed. Second: the only means available to man for the cognizance of this order is thinking and reasoning, and no existing social institution is exempt from being examined and appraised by discursive

reasoning. Third: there is no standard available for appraising any mode of acting either of individuals or of groups of individuals but that of the effects produced by such action. ...”

This section is long enough and probably too long, but without natural law and natural rights to act as a check on governments, religions, and tribes, man ends up in a world of hurt, which is where he finds himself today. Leave it to Rothbard to come up with a closing brilliant quote concerning natural law, this time, from a gibe by Etienne Gilson: “The natural law always buries its undertakers.”

## **The Purpose Of Law**

Once one understands that “life is better than death” is the most important fundamental principle, then a lot of other principles fall into place. The most disastrous event that can befall man is war. The causes of war must be avoided because war causes death, severe life-degrading injuries, slavery, and property destruction. War is catastrophic to man. When men fight against men it is, in effect, a civil war from the macro perspective – no matter who is fighting. Satan would like mankind to fight such a civil war. The Creator God would like man to be reconciled to

each other and to him, in other words, for there to be peace and social harmony. To be reconciled to the Creator God is important for man because each individual man/woman is God's workmanship. If we are busy fighting with each other, or fighting against God, we are thwarting God's purpose for us. We are not developing the intellectual and moral virtues, as we should.

"For **we are His workmanship**, created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God has before ordained that we should walk in them."  
Ephesians 2:10, MKJV

When Jesus Christ appeared to the early church persecutor, Saul, important information was revealed as to exactly why Jesus recruited Saul (who became the Apostle Paul):

"And all of us falling to the ground, I heard a voice speaking to me and saying in the Hebrew dialect, Saul, Saul, why do you persecute Me? It is hard for you to kick against the goads. And I said, Who are you, lord? And He said, I am Jesus whom you persecute. But rise and stand on your feet, **for I have appeared to you for this purpose**, to make you a minister and a witness both of what you saw, and in what I

shall appear to you; delivering you from the people and the nations, to whom I now send you in order to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light, and from the authority of Satan to God, so that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified by faith in Me.”  
Acts 26:14-18, MKJV

The Bible clearly states that Jesus recruited Saul to become Paul in order to help open men’s eyes so they would turn away darkness to light and from Satan’s authority to God’s authority so they can be forgiven of their sins and receive an inheritance of eternal life (1 Corinthians 15). In other words, **Paul’s job was a ministry of reconciliation.**

Without reconciliation there cannot be social harmony. Without social harmony there cannot be social cooperation and peace. Without peace there will eventually be war. And war kills.

In a prophecy of what will happen to the earth, before Jesus Christ returns (Revelation 19), all of Psalm 2 is directed toward giving mankind a chance to reconcile with the Son (Jesus Christ). The two Jehovahs do not want to have to punish the people of the earth, but

they will if they have to. The reader can read all of Psalm 2 to get the whole story, but we will excerpt a few verses below:

“And now be wise, O kings; be instructed, O judges of the earth. Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and you perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled in but a little time. Blessed are all who put their trust in Him.”  
Psalms 2:10-12, MKJV

Jesus Christ came to the earth on a divine rescue mission where he wants mankind to be reconciled to him. After his death and resurrection, he recruited Paul to offer a ministry of reconciliation. The message of reconciliation is throughout the entire Bible.

“And all things are of God, **who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given to us the ministry of reconciliation;**” 2 Corinthians 5:18, MKJV

The purpose of societal law is to secure and encourage social harmony, social cooperation, and peace. This is because social harmony, social cooperation, and peace are necessary for life, including flourishing life. As a means

toward social harmony and peace each man's natural rights to life, liberty, and property must be respected. This means by all others. Of course, there will always be bad men, or men who do bad things. The person who does something bad needs to be dealt with – usually by force. Your author says, "usually by force," because men who do wrong are not being rational, so you cannot just reason with them. It would be nice if you could, but, for the time being, you cannot. The men who do wrong are working against themselves and against society in both the short and long run. If they were reasoned, sensible, rational people they would not have initiated force or fraud against someone else and/or they would have kept their contracts. Initiating force or fraud against another and not honoring your contracts are the main ways that societal peace is breached. The result is an injured, aggrieved victim, whose natural rights have somehow been violated. It actually is not that difficult to understand the core principles involved. Richard Maybury is the author of *Whatever Happened To Justice?* He summarized the core principles well, in only 16 words, in what he called:

"The Two Laws.

Do all you have agreed to do.

Do not encroach on other persons or their property.”

If men and societies abided by the above two laws there would be a universal respect for man’s natural rights and there would be societal harmony, cooperation, and peace. The greatly increased production of houses, food, clothing, and all of the other necessities and good things of life would be unprecedented and more men could live and live well on the earth. Even children and bad men could understand the need to respect each other’s natural rights, but some men do not want to understand.

“Evil people don’t understand justice, but those who follow the LORD understand completely.” Proverbs 28:5, NLT

The two Jehovahs did Maybury one better by getting the core principles down to only five words, “love your neighbor as yourself,” (Leviticus 19:18), but this evidently is not enough information for some people. Expanding, “love your neighbor as yourself,” to Maybury’s two laws, 16 words, is enough information for a rational, honest, socially aware

person to understand. There really is no excuse for not being a good person, which goes back to the Romans 1 and Romans 2 references and quotes in the first section of this book.

“Do for others what you would like them to do for you. This is a summary of all that is taught in the law and the prophets.”  
Matthew 7:12, NLT

Further discussion of divine laws and fideism will be in a later section of this book.

When the peace is breached, and social harmony is disrupted, there needs to be a proportional, timely, and sensible restitution to the injured party. In short, there is a need for justice. Justice is indispensable to righting the wrong, as best as possible. Justice can pave the way toward a possible future reconciliation, which would restore social harmony, social cooperation, and peace. In this case peace between individuals, but in the larger sense the peace of society itself. The reason that the restitution needs to be proportional is because if it is over the top then the original offender now feels like they, too, are also a victim. Your author believes the below verse is speaking of proportionality in restitution and not in regards

to poking each other's eyes out. And also that it is restitution in a judicial setting, not in regards to a personal vendetta.

" ... And he shall pay as the judges say And if any injury occurs, then you shall give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." Exodus 21:22-25, MKJV

Telling the truth in a legal situation is also important in order to determine the facts of what really happened and why. Honesty and proportionate restitution are both necessary. And impartiality is obviously part of what it means to be honest.

"But this is what you must do: Tell the truth to each other. Render verdicts in your courts that are just and that lead to peace."  
Zechariah 8:16, NLT

"Justice will rule in the wilderness and righteousness in the fertile field. And this righteousness will bring peace. Quietness and confidence will fill the land forever. My people will live in safety, quietly at home [with their natural rights intact]. They will be at rest."  
Isaiah 32:16-18, NLT

“How terrible it will be for you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! For you are careful to tithe even the tiniest part of your income, **but you ignore the important things of the law** - justice, mercy, and faith. You should tithe, yes, but you should not leave undone the more important things.”  
Matthew 23:23, NLT

To summarize where we are so far, justice is important for the victim to feel like the encroachment upon them, resulting in their injuries, has been as adequately addressed as is possible. The violation/encroachment of their natural rights has been recognized and there is going to be proportionate restitution to the extent possible. This leaves open the door to the violator, having been publicly exposed to society, family, and friends as the bad guy, coming to his senses and apologizing. While not easy, hopefully the victim could actually forgive the offender. The offender still has to pay, if they can. The forgiveness could be very difficult and if not immediately possible, hopefully time would heal the wound and it would ultimately be possible. Your author wrote a book entitled: *The Mathew 18 Paradox: Solved* explaining that Mathew 18 is all about forgiveness and

reconciliation. At any rate, justice is necessary to re-establish social harmony, which is necessary for there to be social cooperation and peace. Without peace, almost everyone's natural rights will be violated and there will be death, maiming, slavery, and property destruction on a grand scale and a civil war of man versus man making life unlivable, even for those not killed in the war. At the highest level the purpose of law is to enable and further social harmony, social cooperation, peace, and flourishing happy life. Justice is necessary in all these regards.

Sometimes philosophers argue about whether justice is a means to an end, or whether justice is a constitutive (intrinsic) requirement for social harmony, social cooperation, and the best possible life. Both are true so why set up a false dichotomy and argue about it? Justice is a necessary step toward restoring social harmony, social cooperation, and peace. And justice is constitutively intrinsic to the very nature of social harmony, social cooperation, peace, the formation of society, and to the happy, flourishing life that results. So why argue about whether justice is a consequential means to an end, or an intrinsic constitutive part of that end? In either case

justice is necessary and therefore, an important purpose of law in its own right.

The violation of someone's natural rights means that a loss has occurred and someone will have to pay. If it is not the offender, then it will be the victim. Justice would dictate putting the loss, as nearly as possible, back onto the head of the offender. This is a core principle of what law could be, but is not. Nowadays the emphasis on law enforcement and the legal system is on punishment and/or deterrence. And neither of these two things makes the victim whole. Proportionate restitution should be the emphasis and if there is speedy proportionate restitution, which is publicized, the offender will be effectively punished and other potential offenders will be on notice that crime does not pay in that locale. In short, there will be justice.

The recognition of the necessity of loving your neighbor as yourself, i.e., respecting each other's natural rights is not a difficult thing to teach or understand. If natural rights were respected by men and governments, then each person could have a private physical space which would also be their moral space to

develop and grow into the unique individual only they can become.

As Ludwig von Mises, the great Austrian economist remarked, (in so many words): "There is no social theory of violence." And as Ayn Rand, the philosopher and novelist might add, (in so many words): "No man can claim the moral right to a contradiction. He cannot deny natural rights to others while claiming them for himself. He cannot claim the right to violate a right."

Because there are bad men who do bad things there is the need for a societal legal system to deal with the bad guys. The purpose of government is covered in the next section of this book, so your author will not get into it in this section. Frederic Bastiat, the 19<sup>th</sup> Century political economist, wrote a fantastic book entitled, *The Law*, which your author recommends reading. In his book, Bastiat explained law as: "the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense." The collective organization is based on individual right and it is the substitution of a common force for individual forces. Further, he explained that life, liberty, and property do not exist because man made laws. Man made laws in

order to secure and protect these three gifts from God. Ergo, life, liberty, and property precede all human legislation and are superior to it. Further, Bastiat astutely summarized: **"The law is organized justice."** (Or, it should be.) Further, Bastiat correctly taught that law is a negative concept, i.e., the purpose of law is to prevent injustice from reigning.

"Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil."  
Ecclesiastes 8:11, MKJV

Natural rights are individual rights. And because one of those derived individual natural rights is the right to contract man can form associations of all kinds, for business, culture, education, etc. These numerous and varying associations, in essence, form a society where social cooperation occurs. Historically, one of the great tragedies of natural law thought was Aristotle and the ancient Greeks, knowing that man was not only a rational, but also a social being, making the illegitimate and illogical leap of identifying "society" with "the state." This is not only unnecessary, but also dangerous. In truth, any state or government formed must also respect its citizens' natural rights – which

will be the subject of the next section of this book.

## **The Purpose Of Government**

It is difficult to write about the subject of law because it is ancient and there are so many types of law. For example, Roman civil law influenced Europe and Western civilization, but it is beyond the scope of this short book. St. Thomas Aquinas characterized types of law into the following groupings:

**Eternal law** is the top grouping and includes everything that God knows. Aquinas would not have known, or likely acknowledged there are two Jehovahs, but your author maintains it. Eternal law is everything the two Jehovahs know, which is more than they have revealed through **divine law** and **natural law**.

**Divine law** is what is revealed in the Bible, the word of God.

**Natural law** consists of the laws and principles discoverable and knowable by man by way of man using reason. These natural laws are universal and true and the first section of this book goes over natural law as it pertains to the

subject matter of this book. Natural rights are a subset of natural law and are also discoverable by man using reason. Natural law entails discovering and doing the good and avoiding the evil. Discovering natural laws means man using his mind to correctly identify things, learning cause and effect, and making sure our conclusions conform to reality, i.e., to the nature of things as they are.

**Human law.** Your author believes Aquinas would maintain that correct human laws would have to conform to and be subject to divine law and natural law. Correctly understood valid human law is divine and natural law applied by impartial judges (law scientists) to societies. It is discovered and declared law, not created law. It is an ordinance of reason for the common good made and enforced by a judge, ruler, or government. Aquinas believed that people were not bound to obey laws made by humans that conflicted with natural law. Your author contends that most human laws (positive or statutory laws) do not conform to divine law, or to natural law, and they do not respect natural rights. These corruptions of human law will be the subject of a later section of this book. Attempts at a more correct human law, aka common or scientific law, along with the

purpose of government, are largely the main subject of this section of the book.

Murray Rothbard, economist, historian, and ethicist outlines the different ways that man-made positive laws can be established in his book, *The Ethics Of Liberty*:

“The natural law is, in essence, a profoundly ‘radical’ ethic, for it holds the existing status quo, which might grossly violate natural law, up to the unsparing and unyielding light of reason. In the realm of politics or State action, the natural law presents man with a set of norms which may well be radically critical of existing positive law imposed by the State. At this point, we need only stress that the very existence of a natural law discoverable by reason is a potentially powerful threat to the status quo and a standing reproach to the reign of blindly traditional custom or the arbitrary will of the State apparatus.

In fact, the legal principles of any society can be established in three alternate ways: (a) by following the traditional custom of the tribe or community; (b) by obeying the arbitrary, ad hoc will of those who rule the State apparatus; or (c) by the use of man's reason in

discovering the natural law - in short, by slavish conformity to custom, by arbitrary whim, or by use of man's reason. These are essentially the only possible ways for establishing positive law. Here we may simply affirm that the latter method is at once the most appropriate for man at his most nobly and fully human, and the most potentially 'revolutionary' vis-à-vis any given status quo."

Your author would add, "(d) by reference to divine law," to the above listing by Rothbard. In the following sections of this book, not necessarily in order, your author will discuss: tribal law and custom, which is (a) above; man-made positive/statutory law, and the corruption of law by the state, which is (b) above; divine law, which is your author's (d) above; and this section, will expand upon (c) above – explaining some of man's efforts at scientifically and rationally establishing correct human law.

Rothbard went on to explain it was the ancient Greeks, specifically Plato and Aristotle, who thought there was no real difference between religion and morality and also no real difference between morality and politics and because there could only be one authority that the state was the supreme social moral agent.

The Stoics corrected this ancient Greek misconception. The Stoics understood that natural law applied to individuals and this correctly understood version of natural law and natural rights was revived in the modern era by the legal scholar Hugo Grotius and his followers, such as Cumberland and Pufendorf. Now it was possible to make politics a matter of principle and conscience. Rothbard observed "the reaction of the State to this theoretical development was horror." He then quotes the historian Lord Acton as follows:

"When Cumberland and Pufendorf unfolded the true significance of [Grotius's] doctrine, every settled authority, every triumphant interest recoiled aghast. ... It was manifest that all persons who had learned that political science is an affair of conscience rather than of might and expediency, must regard their adversaries as men without principle."

Now, with objective moral principles rooted in the nature of man, there would almost certainly be conflict with tribal custom and positive, man-made law. Any apologist for the state, who wanted to maintain "the ideal," and at the same time defend the state, would be embarrassed. And so they are.

So quoting again from Rothbard, for both Rothbard and for Lord Acton, "the individual, armed with natural law moral principles, is then in a firm position from which to criticize existing regimes and institutions, to hold them up to the strong and harsh light of reason."

The purpose of government is to secure the natural rights of the citizenry. Government is necessary because it is realized that there are bad men who do bad things and there is a need for the collective organization of the individual right of self-defense. Men with natural rights precede governments. Governments are formed to catch the bad guys, secure the peace, and adjudicate disputes among the citizenry. Government is a delegated agent and no agent, including government, has more authority than the principle from which they received the delegation of authority. The delegated authority is non-exclusive in the sense that each individual citizen retains the right to defend themselves and their property. Government authorities cannot be everywhere, at all times and places, and so the citizen must maintain his natural right of self-defense against all aggressors. Because there are bad guys who do bad things society needs a way to efficiently

deal with the bad guys – the guys who initiate force or fraud and/or who do not honor their contracts. **In essence, governments should function as glorified garbage men who take out the human trash.** It should be noted that your author is not saying that the men doing wrong things and disrupting society will always be human trash, just that they are themselves choosing to act in that way now – ergo the current classification. Men are made out of matter and can change for the better. Hopefully they will. Until then, there is the need for a small, efficient government to safeguard natural rights. The more corrupt the people the larger the need for government. When men finally decide to be righteous the need for government will diminish accordingly.

It has been noted in many writings and court cases that the people are, or should be, sovereign. But the sovereignty of the people is itself limited by: divine law, natural law, and natural rights. In other words the sovereignty of any of us is a limited, though wide-ranging, sovereignty. And the people cannot delegate what they do not possess. Ergo, the government, as agent, has no rights to aggress individual rights, nor does the government, as agent, suddenly find itself no longer under the

restrictions of both divine and natural laws. In other words, the people are limited and so are their agents.

The government does not have the right to initiate force or fraud against the citizenry any more than any individual has the right to initiate force or fraud against any other individual. In other words, natural rights are the means of subordinating society and government to moral law. As Ayn Rand said, in so many words: In the United States the government was forbidden to engage in the activities of criminals.

It is not that complicated for any individual, any religion, and any government to recognize the validity of Richard Maybury's two laws, quoted in the prior section, and repeated here:

"Do all you have agreed to do.

Do not encroach on other persons or their property."

In classifying any would be dissenters from the above two laws, if any individual would not agree with the above they would put themselves outside of society. If any religion did not agree to the above, they mark themselves as an anti-

social menace to the world. If any government does not agree to the above, they are the cause of a future war waiting to happen. The war could be external against another country, or an internal civil war. Agreeing to Maybury's formulation of the two laws would cut across religions, cut across cultures, cut across governments, and cut across all other human divides to enable a much higher level of social harmony, social cooperation, and peace.

Agreeing to the above would put civility back into human interaction. People could live in security of their lives, their liberty, and their property. People could trade with others safely as contracts would be honored. If someone did not have something they wanted, they could produce something of value and then trade what they produced with others in order to obtain what they wanted. It is not that complicated. Unfortunately, many men would rather try and find a way to plunder what others have produced. They want to shortcut the process. And, if those who believe in force or fraud (the bad men) think it is safer to, in essence, steal rather than work then they will steal rather than work. The job of the government is to put the error of these bad men back onto their own

head and to provide restitution to the victims, not to enable the plunder via the legal system.

As Frederic Bastiat detailed in his great book, *The Law*, there are only three choices:

1. The few plunder the many
2. Everybody plunders everybody
3. Nobody plunders anybody

Bastiat astutely pointed out that human law should make plunder more dangerous than labor and then it will stop. The solution to political fighting is to restrict the law to its proper place so there is nothing to fight about. Then there would be no “legal” plunder to fight about and the law would no longer be an instrument of injustice, but would instead revert back to its proper place. To Bastiat, the law’s proper place is the collective organization of the individual’s right to self-defense. Bastiat admonishes us to take a look at a law and see if it benefits one citizen, or group of citizens, at the expense of another by doing what the benefitting citizen could not do without committing a crime. If so, then abolish this law without delay. Your author concurs and this would reduce government back to its proper role of securing man’s individual natural rights.

Bastiat further pointed out that a great deal of human statutory legislation was an attempt to reform the base instincts of the masses. However, this statutory, positive law effectively substitutes the will of the legislature for the will of the people in their own private lives. This positive law, to Bastiat, was "might makes right" and arbitrary and unstable. Bastiat issued a challenge to these, also human, legislators which was: "... You who judge humanity to be so small! You who wish to reform everything! Why don't you reform yourselves? That task would be sufficient enough."

Ayn Rand said she wanted to know two questions about the legal system of any society: 1) Does the social system recognize individual rights? And, 2) Does the social system ban the initiation of force and fraud? And question number two would include banning the initiation of force and fraud by the social system (government) itself – which was the initial genius, since lost, of the founding of the United States of America.

Richard Maybury, in his excellent book, *Whatever Happened To Justice?*, pointed out that the common law of England, while not

perfect, discovered a lot of important legal principles and methods whereby the natural rights of men would be protected and contracts honored. The common law of England, though imperfect, had the following things going for it:

The judge was a law scientist, every bit as much of a scientist as a chemist or a physicist.

The judge's job was to discover and declare law, not to make law.

All men were to be equal before the law.

It was known that when force was initiated a loss occurred and someone would have to pay. Common law was an attempt to insure that the only person who pays is the person who broke the law.

The emphasis was on restitution to the victim, not on punishment or the reform of the criminal. If the criminal had to pay that was his punishment (along with the humiliation of being exposed). And when he had to make good, hopefully that would function as the impetus to help him see his way to reform (change).

If someone did not consent to be held to account for initiating force or fraud, or for not performing under a contract or, in effect, for thumbing their nose at the judge and common law, then the judge would declare such a one an outlaw. The outlaw was then outside the protection of law and anyone who found such a person could kill him like they would kill a wild animal. The outlaw, in effect, placed himself outside society and outside the protection of law.

There is no such thing as a lawless place. Law, like gravity, exists.

Precedents should not be overturned lightly. This was the doctrine of stare decisis. In other words what was right yesterday is right today.

The job of the court (the judge scientists) was to discover and apply natural laws and divine laws to the case at hand. The result was the common law.

No common law judge was so arrogant or stupid to believe when they had discovered a law that they had invented it. To them, it would be as preposterous as if a chemist announced he had invented a law of chemistry.

Natural laws cannot be repealed by good intentions or majority vote.

When God was instructing ancient Israel, the instruction given was similar to what common law came up with.

“You shall appoint judges and officers for yourself in all your gates which the LORD your God gives you, tribe by tribe. And they shall judge the people with righteous judgment.”  
Deuteronomy 16:18, MKJV

Some of the judicial and governmental protections for natural rights are known as due process, at least in England and America. Government authorities should follow due process so as to not violate their citizen's natural rights. Some of the due process protections and practices are listed below. There are entire books written about even small points of due process so the below list, in this short book, is general and certainly not complete. What the below list does is give the reader the basic idea that the court and/or a government cannot just do what it wants in wanton disregard of accepted procedure and to

thus unjustly deprive a citizen of their natural rights.

Every man should have his day in court.

Every man should have the benefit of general law and there will be equal administration of laws.

The court will proceed only upon proper notice.

Proper jurisdiction will be established.

The court will hear both sides and consider before any judgment is issued.

The court will be impartial. No bribery or favoritism.

The court will proceed, based on established rules, which do not violate natural rights. In other words, the court will proceed upon justice.

Due process applies to every interest or right an individual may assert and applies to all administrative procedures, court procedures, in short, any government or court actions directed toward an individual.

Sir William Blackstone, author, lawyer, and teacher, mentioned several ways that the “unwritten” common law decisions were recorded, i.e., actually written, it turns out. One place was in the written records of the court which actually rendering the decision. The second place was in books publishing reports of judge’s decisions. And the third place was in published treatises and law commentaries of various learned sages. Blackstone further observed and delineated the below concerning English common law:

The common laws receive their binding power and force of law by long and immemorial usage.

Judges are bound by oath to decide according to the laws of the land (which was primarily common law).

The continuity, certainty, and authority of common law are preserved by the concept of precedent (stare decisis).

Judges discover, i.e., determine law, solemnly declare it, and it becomes a permanent rule. The judge is a law finder, not a lawmaker.

Upon occasion, a judge may be forced to revise precedent. If a judge has to revise precedent, it is to save the law. The law that had to be revised is not considered "bad law." It was considered "not law." Established precedent must be followed unless the precedent in question was not according to reason, i.e., absurd, or unjust, or not according to divine law. What is not according to reason is not law because the law is supposed to be the perfection of reason. (Again, English common law was far from perfect, but with a scientific approach to discovering real law - law according to divine and natural law, the law could be improved over time and the individual and societal harm minimized. Physicists and chemists and biologists improve their understanding over time. Law is no different in this regard.)

Man has both reason and free will and is commanded to make use of both of these in the general regulation of his behavior.

Law is a science - which science is to distinguish the criterions of right and wrong.

Law is to be logical, just, peaceable, and true.

Blackstone regarded the sound maxims of the law of nature as the best and most authentic foundations of human laws.

Common law was noticed to the citizen by universal tradition and long practice.

Judges learned law by study, by being long accustomed to the judicial decisions of their predecessors, and from experience. Their decisions are supposed to be the distribution of common justice.

The principles for a custom to be admitted into the common law are: proof of the custom's existence, continuity of usage, peaceable, reasonable, certainty, compulsory, and customs must be consistent with each other.

Some of the principles of law, whose truth and validity are evident, are considered maxims of law. Entire books are written on selected maxims of law so it is impossible in this short book to list them all. However, some interesting maxims of law are as follows:

Law is the science of what is good and just.

Truth is the mother of justice.

Individual liberties are antecedent to (before) all government.

Tyranny is the exercise of power beyond right, which no one can have a right to.

An injury is extinguished by the forgiveness or reconciliation of the party injured.

Natural right has the same force among all men.

That which is against divine law is repugnant to society and is void.

Power should follow justice and not go before it.

An exception to the rule should not destroy the rule.

It is not lawful to do evil that good may come of it.

The contract makes the law.

The law requires certainty, not conjecture.

There is no disputing against a man denying principles.

Good men hate sin through love of virtue. Bad men hate sin through fear of punishment.

The last maxim points out part of the problem of statutory, or positive law. If laws are continuously created in an attempt to deal with the meanest, stupidest, most thoughtless, most inconsiderate, most unaware, and most cruel people there will be no end of positive laws. The bad people will ignore the laws, but the good people will have the cost and expense of complying with them, and the laws themselves will become a systematic devourer of human lives and capital.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. wrote that the law always starts out using the language of morality, but then proceeds to enunciating external standards of conduct because what it wants is external conformity to rules.

The main advantage of attempting to use scientific common law, instead of statutory positive law, was the use of principles and reason, instead of pages and pages of rules. Common law had the check and balance on it of being underneath both divine law and natural

law. It had the further check on it of the very clear purpose of the protection of natural rights.

As Richard Maybury would concede and point out, common law has basically been excised from human law these days. And that is a shame because now we have politically-inspired man-made laws which have nothing to do with the law as science. The common law of England and the common law of early America needed more time to be refined to the point where it actually protected the rights of all men equally, but that time has evidently run out.

### **Divine Law**

No book about law would be complete without at least some discussion concerning "divine law." Per Aquinas, divine law is what is revealed in the Bible, the word of God. Your author can live with this definition. This is obviously a very large topic, in and of itself, and your author is forced to somewhat pick and choose key points concerning divine law for this section of the book.

In looking at Hebrews 11, which is a partial listing of God's "Good Guy Hall of Fame," we can see God working with some men going back as

far back as Abel and Noah. They were before the flood. After the flood God had a special relationship with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And the hallmark "beginning" of God's relationship with a people was his Torah Story deliverance of the ancient Israelites from their Egyptian slavery, via Moses. And God's delivering of the Torah at Mount Sinai. Of course, some men knew about God's divine laws, prior to Mt. Sinai, e.g., Abraham. And those laws were structured in that there were statutes, e.g., even back then, prior to Moses.

"... because Abraham obeyed My voice and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws." Genesis 26:5, MKJV

Because Abraham believed God (Romans 4:16), and obeyed God (James 2:21), he thereby became the father of all who believe in Christ.

Unfortunately, for the most part, the Israelite descendents of Abraham did not do what Abraham did. God wanted Israel to be a special nation and for them to be a light to the world. They refused to obey God and did what they wanted. This resulted in the northern ten tribes ultimately being carried away captive by

the Assyrians, and Judah and Benjamin being carried away much later by the Babylonians (Ezekiel 23 and Psalm 78).

After Moses died, God used Joshua to largely conquer the Promised Land. After Joshua died there was a fairly lengthy period of the Judges. The normal pattern was along the lines of while the current judge lived the Israelites would largely obey God. When the judge died, the Israelites would forget about and disobey God and soon thereafter find themselves in captivity or tribute to a neighboring people. After a while they would cry out for deliverance and God would send a new judge to rescue the Israelites. It is interesting that a judge would provide leadership according to known laws of the land. There was no king and no large government structure - just a judge, known laws, and God. No doubt, if the Israelites had understood how well they had it, and had cooperated with God and the judges, they would have developed common law long before the English. And it would have no doubt been a much higher level and wiser form of common law. But the people kept clamoring for a king. This prompted Gideon, one of the more famous judges, to decline.

“And Gideon said to them, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you. The LORD shall rule over you.” Judges 8:23, MKJV

Eventually the Israelites rejected Samuel, another judge, for a king. God told Samuel that the Israelites had not rejected him, but God himself. And God warned that a human king would bring so many problems with him that the Israelites would rue the day. A later discussion in this book is devoted to the topic of what having a king has traditionally meant in law. For now, God’s warning was direct and unfortunately ignored.

“And they said to him, Behold, you are old, and your sons do not walk in your ways. Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But the thing was evil in the eyes of Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed to the LORD. And the LORD said to Samuel, Listen to the voice of the people in all that they say to you. For they have not rejected you, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even until this day - works with which they have forsaken Me and

served other gods - so they do also to you. And now listen to their voice. Only, you shall surely protest solemnly to them, and show them the kind of king who shall reign over them. And Samuel told all the words of the LORD to the people who asked a king of him. And he said, This will be the privilege of the king who shall reign over you. He shall take your sons and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and his horsemen. And they shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint commanders over thousands, and commanders over fifties, and some to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and make his weapons of war and weapons for his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be perfumers and cooks and bakers. And he will take your fields and your vineyards and your olive-yards, the best, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed and of your vineyards, and give it to his eunuchs and to his servants. And he will take your male slaves and your slave girls, and your finest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep, and you shall be his servants. And you shall cry out in that day because of your king whom you have chosen for yourselves, and the LORD will not answer you in that day. But the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel.

And they said, No, but we will have a king over us." 1 Samuel 8:5-19, MKJV

God originally gave divine laws to Israel, in a codified form, through Moses at Mount Sinai. And when the people came into the land they were to be judged by these known rules by a judge, or judges. If the people followed the rules it would go well with them and there would not be much work for the judge to do. If the people did not do well then there would be too much work for the judge(s) to do and it would not go well with them. The blessings and cursings associated with keeping or not keeping divine laws are elaborated in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. One of the more point blank curses is found in Leviticus 26:18: "... **those who hate you shall rule over you.**" All of the curses are terrible and it would have been much better for Israel to keep the divine laws and to not ask for a king.

The Israelites each got a portion of land to own, other than the Levites and priests. But the Levites received a tenth of the increase from the land and the priests received a tenth of what the Levites received (Numbers 18). And the Levites did receive some cities and a limited amount of land around those cities (Numbers 35). In

essence, the people received free land in exchange for giving a tenth of the increase to the Levites. And the people paid a small annual Tabernacle tax or Temple tax as the case may be (Exodus 30:13). God knows that taxes cost men their lives and he kept the burden small, and contingent on increase. Each Israelite further received a little bit more land than he normally would have because the Levites did not receive an allotment of land, other than their cities. And the Levites and priests provided Tabernacle services, counseling services, educational services, etc., as part of their receiving the tithe. The nation did not have a huge welfare system and corresponding costly bureaucracy to administer it. The family land likely functioned as the societal economic shock absorber. If an individual experienced hard times he could always return home to the family land and be taken care of. The nation did not have a standing army to be paid for. **The government was small and there were known rules.** Every seven years, in addition to ongoing training, the people were to have the law read to them at the fall feast. The citizenry knew what the rules were.

“And Moses commanded them, saying: At the end of seven years, at the set time of the

year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel has come to appear before the LORD your God in the place which He shall choose, you shall read this law before all Israel in their hearing.” Deuteronomy 31:10, 11, MKJV

Further, the ancient Israelites had the benefit of obtaining direct answers from God through the High Priest’s use of the Urim and Thummim (Exodus 28:30).

With all of these things going for them the Israelites failed. They were set up in the ancient trading crossroads between Asia, Africa, and Europe and were to be a nation on a hill, a light to the world, as it were. Their failure has hurt all mankind. Most of the world is tribal, which is a discussion for the next section of this book. If the people of the world could have seen the sustained success of Israel and learned what it meant to be ruled by honest and intelligent judges, using known laws, in a small government, blessed with divine favor – who is to say what would have happened? But Israel failed and got thrown off of the land.

Libraries full of books have been written about the Torah, Israel, God, and divine law.

Because the subject is so vast, in any discussion about divine laws one has to pick and choose what to mention and how to comment on it. With that in mind, all of the below are some hopefully pertinent thoughts pertaining to divine law.

One original thought that occurred to your author is the solution to the minarchist versus anarchist debates concerning the size and establishment of a government. The minarchist position is essentially that a government is necessary in order to secure the natural rights of the people, but such government should be kept small and contained by such methods as a written Constitution, independent judiciary, etc. Unfortunately, the government usually escapes its chains and starts abusing the citizenry. This leads some to the anarchist position. The anarchist position is NOT that there should be no government but that man can police his own needs through contractual societal associations without the need for a formal state apparatus. Both sides agree there are always going to be bad men doing bad things who have to be dealt with in order to secure societal peace. One possible suggestion for the anarchist idea to come to fruition is, instead of government as we know it, for insurance companies to not only

provide protection for theft and fire losses, etc., but to also provide policemen, firemen, and the courts. The minarchists criticize this as almost certainly setting up a future war between insurance companies who will want a monopoly in a given territory the same way that a government has a monopoly of force in a given territory today. While both sides agree there should be a minimal "government," how to set it up and operate it has been the subject of intense debate and an almost endless series of articles and books.

It occurred to your author that the solution to the problem as to how to set up and establish a small government with clearly known laws has been provided a long time ago via the divine laws as outlined in the Bible. In other words, the debate between the minarchists and the anarchists is taking place at the wrong level. Both minarchists and anarchists are usually believers in natural rights and they usually also believe in the doctrine of original appropriation in order to establish ownership of private property. Ergo, your author contends that the best solution to the problem is not to ignore divine law, but to learn from it, and to go up one level to solve the problem. By going up one level we learn that the two Jehovahs, (God the

Father and the being now known as Jesus Christ) created all things, i.e., the entire universe and thereby own all things (Ephesians 3:9 and other places). Ergo, as the original appropriator owner-operators of the universe in general and the earth in particular, they get to make the rules, which rules are also known as - the divine law. For those who believe in natural rights and original appropriation, this solves the minarchist versus anarchist debate. This solution is not trivial. It is important because it conforms to reality, truth, and logic.

“So says Jehovah God, He who created the heavens and stretched them out, spreading out the earth and its offspring; He who gives breath to the people on it and spirit to those who walk in it.” Isaiah 42:5, MKJV

In a prior book, *Intellectual Warfare: The Corruption Of Philosophy And Thought*, your author explained that the two Jehovahs had some limits and problems in communicating with mankind in general and with the Israelites in particular. And the limitations they faced have led to confusion and criticism regarding people’s understanding of the wisdom and also the fairness of divine law. There is no conflict between reason, justice, and divine law, but the

two Jehovahs have faced these numerous challenges in dealing with mankind and mankind's perception of them. For the reader's ease and benefit your author shall share a summary of those limitations and problems below:

1. Evil comes about because angels and men make bad choices, which bad consequences the chooser is responsible for – not the two Jehovahs.
2. There is a state of war in the universe and in a state of war communication and actions taken are outside normal.
3. Satan is the current "god of this world," (2 Corinthians 4:4), and he does innumerable malicious, hurtful acts toward mankind and then stands back and lets the two Jehovahs take the blame.
4. The two Jehovahs were forced to communicate within the context of a state of war and toward ignorant and uneducated people who used to be slaves. They were not then in a position to be able to teach at the same level they think at.

The limitations the two Jehovahs faced, along with the constant rebellion of the ancient Israelites, give critics of divine law what they

perceive as a field day. However, this criticism is at the critic's own peril. Even if the two Jehovah's were not rational and objective in their formulation and communication of the divine laws, which is not true, (see limitations above), the critics still have no place to hide. This is because the doctrine of original appropriation gives the two Jehovahs ownership and ultimate control, once completely asserted, over the entire universe and everything and everyone in it. So even if the two Jehovahs' divine law pronouncements were their own opinion, which is to say subjective, their divine laws, once made plain to mankind, become objective facts, i.e., rules for all of us to live by. **We are all guests in their universe.** If we want to be good guests we will follow the "house rules."

"For so says the LORD the Creator of the heavens, He is God, forming the earth and making it; He makes it stand, not creating it empty, but forming it to be inhabited. I am the LORD, and there is no other."  
Isaiah 45:18, MKJV

A further observation pertaining to divine law is that each man had private property as a gift from the two Jehovahs. This gave each

man what, Tibor Machan, the philosopher, would characterize as his own "moral space."

Contrasting with divine law, most other cultures wasted human lives building various monuments. Generally this occurred as kings, backed by priests, built these monuments and structures that are literally a waste of men's lives. Whether slaves built them or taxes paid for them all such monuments to grandeur have cost innumerable human lives. Per Ayn Rand, they are mausoleums in substance, if not in actuality. The two Jehovahs did not build monuments when dealing with the ancient Israelites. For example, when it came time to build the Tabernacle an offering was taken up from the people to build it. Those who were willing to contribute gave and the Tabernacle was built. No slaves or oppressive taxes were used to build it (Exodus 35).

A further observation concerning divine law is that the government was not taxing some men in order to dispense special favors to other men. There was not a wealth redistribution program where it becomes imperative to fight over control of the government because whoever wins the fight gets to confiscate the wealth of productive men and give it to the

politically favored. This grotesque violation of natural rights at the hand of government was not allowed for under divine law.

The word "Torah," properly understood, really means **instruction**. The Bible was about instruction on how to help mankind have a comprehensive view of life so they would come to think and act as the two Jehovahs, i.e., God. It is an honor for man to be made in the image and likeness of God (Genesis 1:26). The higher concept, however, is to not just look like God, but to develop his character, his mind, etc. The basic structure of divine law was the Ten Words, aka the Ten Commandments, as the core principles of the law. God also gave some judgments as an example and direction for the judges and elders to think in. God also gave some statues as a basic direction for human lawmakers to think in. Divine law is all about instruction for men to become holy, as God is holy (Leviticus 11:45, Mathew 5:48). Men were to learn the difference between the holy and the profane (Ezekiel 44:23). This was the role of the priests. And men were not to just learn what was holy. They were to live holy.

“For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life;” Proverbs 6:23, MKJV

“The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the LORD is sure, making the simple wise. The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandments of the LORD are pure, giving light to the eyes. The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether, more to be desired than gold, even much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. And Your servant is warned by them; in keeping them there is great reward.” Psalms 19:7-11, MKJV

Divine law (instruction) helps our lack of understanding and helps man know what to do so that he does not have to learn everything the hard way. Your author believes the two Jehovahs would have preferred to give mankind a few basic principles and then have mankind grow to be able to apply these principles to the various dynamic life situations we each find ourselves confronted with. Ultimately we were to learn to love God and to love our fellow man made in God’s image. Basically, these were God’s two main laws.

“Jesus said to him, You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.” Matthew 22:37-40, MKJV

Divine law could have been simpler if men were not so flawed in their thinking and actions. God’s two main laws, the principles found in Maybury’s two laws, and some wisdom, consideration for others, some long-term thinking, and common sense would have made for a much easier societal functioning and ergo the structuring of government. But it was not to be. The reader will please notice that Christ said the above two great divine laws were the hooks that all of the other divine laws were hung upon, as well as the prophetic teachings. There remain other divine laws to this day.

One of the legacies of bad and stupid men, doing bad things, is that laws end up getting passed to cover almost every conceivable situation. As one of your author’s friends pointed out to him, “It is not possible to structure a system, or manufacture a product so

as to be foolproof, because fools are so ingenious. They will always find a unique new way to mess things up that you could never anticipate in advance.” Further, human life is dynamic, not static. There are always new things happening creating new situations. Instead of the application of core principles to dynamic life, the law becomes volumes of static external-standard based rules. The legislators think they are doing us a favor by passing these rules, but these volumes of static external-standard based rules frustrate the citizenry. The good people, who are productive and peaceful people, who honor and respect each other’s natural rights, are stuck with a legal and court system that has a huge cost of compliance. The thoughtless or bad people just ignore the laws anyway. They don’t care or are oblivious to the damage they cause by their shortsighted actions.

Your author does not believe the two Jehovahs were so foolish as to place into divine laws static rules for a dynamic society. Any static external-standard based rules become, in essence, memorized rules of behavior. Over time the memorized rules of behavior become religious traditions. And any who obey such rules out of fear are, in effect, what the

philosopher Tibor Machan characterizes as basically "circus animals." Machan further adds, in so many words, "Moral engineering will not create good people." Or, as Ayn Rand would say, paraphrased by your author, "A value one is forced to accept is not a value to anyone!" The two Jehovahs wanted free and thinking men to understand core principles and to be able to apply them to the dynamic situations which life presents. They wanted men to learn how to love them as God and to love each other and the love for each other entails respecting each other's natural rights and honoring our contracts. Of course, obeying out of fear is better than nothing and perhaps a necessary first step for some men. But it is not the ideal.

At some point in time God had to stop writing the Bible, as it is a pretty long book already. It is said there are 613 laws in the Torah and that all these laws are therefore important. Your author wonders - if the Bible did not have a length limit (and if Moses kept on living) if there would be thousands of laws added to the 613. Mean, thoughtless, and stupid people create new ongoing difficulties and the response by most governments is to pass more laws. And one of the problems, e.g., when Jesus Christ was dealing with the Pharisees, is

that the Pharisees thought they had to perfectly keep the 613 laws, and they even added many additional oral law traditions of their own. The reason they thought keeping all of these laws was necessary, including their own additions, was probably in order to safeguard the remnant of Israelites who returned to the land (from the Babylonian captivity) from being thrown off of it again. The laws, in essence, multiplied to the hurt of the good people. The danger in the "too many laws" versus "core principles combined with good judgment" is that the law becomes more important than God's workmanship, the people. And God himself mentioned that he did not even want all of the laws he ended up giving.

"So says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: Put your burnt offerings to your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I did not speak to your fathers, nor command them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices. But I commanded them this thing, saying, Obey My voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be My people; and walk in all the ways that I have commanded you, so that it may be well with you. But they did not listen, nor bow their ear, but walked in their own plans, in the

stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward."  
Jeremiah 7:21-24, MKJV

Your author realizes that there might have been laws pertaining to sacrifices going all the way back to Abel and Cain (Genesis 4:5-6). And perhaps there was even a sacrifice offered, by God himself, for Adam and Eve due to their sin (Genesis 2:21). In the above Jeremiah 7 passage it seems to indicate that God was not going to instruct the Israelites regarding sacrifices, at least at that time, but then went ahead and gave those instructions, too.

**"For we are His workmanship,** created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God has before ordained that we should walk in them."  
Ephesians 2:10, MKJV

The role of the priests and Levites was to teach the people instruction in order to build up the people, God's workmanship. They were to teach the people the difference between the right and the wrong, the holy and the profane. The sacrificial laws, which were added, can confuse the situation. There is a danger the people can rely on physical rituals and memorized rules of behavior, aka the religious

traditions, instead of being converted and internally changing and learning how to apply core principles, using good judgment, to the dynamic changing circumstances of life. There is a danger the Levites and the priests will become like the Pharisees and put too much emphasis on the technical aspects of the laws. In other words, instead of teaching the people correctly, the priests could end up becoming **Metaphor Men**. This has to be guarded against.

As for the sacrificial system itself, it is beyond the scope of this book to go into detail regarding it. Your author is well aware that when the Kingdom of God comes to this earth, as prophesied in Ezekiel 40 – 48, there will be sacrifices involved – even though Jesus Christ, the perfect sacrifice and living perfect High Priest is on the earth ruling. Your author has a couple of thoughts regarding the physical sacrificial system being reinstated, which you, dear reader, can take or leave. First, people learn in different ways. About one-half of all people learn by perceiving new information concretely and then processing the information from there. And about one-half of the people learn by perceiving new information abstractly, via concepts. Of the population that learns

concretely, about one-half (i.e., one quarter of the total population) processes the information reflectively based on how they feel the new information affects them and those they care about. They are concrete perceptual feelers. To have to have an animal killed because they sinned might very well make quite a profound impact on such a person and help them to learn a deeper lesson than would otherwise be possible. The other one-half of the concrete perceptual learners (i.e., about one quarter of the total population) processes the new concrete information actively. The active participation of the concrete perceptual action-oriented learners might be the reason they have to select an animal for death, take it to the Temple, watch it be killed, and then perhaps eat part of it, depending on the sacrifice involved. To them these steps might very well drive home a lesson in a way that an abstract explanation could not. Even the two other quarters of the population, those who perceive information abstractly and then process it, either through reflection or action, can learn some things via participation in the sacrificing of animals. In other words, the two Jehovahs might not have originally preferred a sacrificial system, but realized it might be able to teach some lessons – especially to the concrete perceiving one-half of the

people. And sin costs so there is a financial and inconvenience aspect to the sacrificial system. And there is a repetition aspect of learning with a sacrificial system as well.

“But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again of sins every year.”  
Hebrews 10:3, MKJV

The sacrifices do not take away sins and do not convert people, but they might be a useful learning aid – at least to a large segment of the population. But, the priests and Levites must take care not to forget the main purpose of the two Jehovahs, which is people development (Ephesians 2:10). And they must take care not to devolve into only being glorified Metaphor Men.

“For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.”  
Hebrews 10:4, MKJV

Another very important aspect of divine law, which is sometimes overlooked, is the linking of truth and mercy throughout the scriptures. In dozens of places, throughout the Bible, truth and mercy appear in the same verse. For example:

“Justice and judgment are the foundation of Your throne; **mercy and truth** shall go before Your face.” Psalms 89:14, MKJV

“**Mercy and truth have met together;** righteousness and peace have kissed each other.” Psalms 85:10, MKJV

“But You, O God, are God full of pity, and gracious, long-suffering, **and rich in mercy and truth.**” Psalms 86:15, MKJV

“Hear the word of the LORD, sons of Israel. For the LORD has a quarrel with the people of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land.” Hosea 4:1, MKJV

Truth is necessary because there are absolute standards in both the natural and social sciences. And there are certainly absolute standards in ethics. Limited man may not be able to ascertain the absolute standard, e.g., the effort to reconcile gravity with the nuclear forces and the other laws of physics. How they fit together is not a mystery to God, only to man. There is truth. Man may not completely understand what the truth is and man does not

live up to ethical standards perfectly, but the truth of the standard exists. Man falling short is where mercy comes in. The two Jehovahs cannot lower the standard of correct ethics, but they can provide mercy as part of their plan. Hence, truth and mercy are necessarily linked. If they were not, we would all be dead (Romans 3:23 and Romans 6:23). And the two Jehovahs cannot change the laws of mathematics because someone thinks  $2 + 2 = 7$ . There are eternal, divine, and natural laws. And thankfully there is mercy.

In respect to truth and as regards their plans to ultimately convert Israel, the two Jehovahs do not change.

“For I am the LORD, I change not. Because of this you sons of Jacob are not destroyed.”  
Malachi 3:6, MKJV

“Jesus Christ the same yesterday and today and forever.” Hebrews 13:8, MKJV

One way the two Jehovahs do change is when a man repents and decides to change his life for the better.

“But if the wicked will turn from all his sins which he has committed, and keep all My statutes, and do justice and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die. All his transgressions that he has done, they shall not be mentioned to him; in his righteousness that he has done he shall live. Do I actually delight in the death of the wicked? says the Lord Jehovah. Is it not that he should turn from his ways and live?” Ezekiel 18:21-23, MKJV

A further way the two Jehovahs change is when men pray asking God for help for themselves or others.

“ ... The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous one avails much.” James 5:16, MKJV

And one further way that the two Jehovahs change is when their patience finally runs out and there is a judgment of men.

“And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment,” Hebrews 9:27, MKJV

Going back to mercy and grace, which is what the two Jehovahs prefer, after the sacrificial death and resurrection of Jesus Christ,

the Holy Spirit was given in a dramatic way on the Feast of Pentecost (Acts 2). But some men did have the Holy Spirit in what is known as Old Testament times (David, Abraham, Moses, etc.). There was always an element of grace, along with law, in the instruction of divine law. There had to be because all men have sinned, broken the law, and fallen short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23). And the wages of sin is eternal death (Romans 6:23).

“Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, **who prophesied of the grace** that should come unto you:” 1 Peter 1:10, KJV

Mordakhai Joseph, a Bible teacher and author, taught your author that the central question concerning divine law is: What administration do you want to live under? There are two choices. One choice is the physical administration. And the other choice is the spiritual administration.

Under the physical administration the lawbreaker personally pays the penalties for breaking the law (Leviticus 1-7 as an example). Under the spiritual administration Jesus Christ’s sacrifice pays for our sins (Hebrews 9:26). Also,

under the physical administration, you cannot keep the law perfectly (Romans 3:23), so you run the risk of eternal death (Romans 6:23). Under the spiritual administration Jesus Christ, through his Holy Spirit, lives inside of us and helps us live the right way (Galatians 2:20) and there is the sure promise of eternal life (1 Corinthians 15). Under the physical administration there are literal and numerous rules, memorized rules of behavior, (Exodus – Deuteronomy). Under the spiritual administration we are to learn general core principles and then to judge individual dynamic situations correctly. This does not mean believers will do this perfectly, only that they ought to (1 Corinthians 6). Further, under the physical administration, there is physical circumcision (Leviticus 12:3). Under the spiritual administration believers are to have their heart circumcised (Deuteronomy 10:16, Romans 2:29). And under the physical administration there is a human and sinful high priest who himself must sacrifice to even go before God (Leviticus 16). Under the spiritual administration we have a perfect High Priest, Jesus Christ, Hebrews 8-9). Under the physical administration animals were sacrificed due to sin (Leviticus 1-7). Under the spiritual administration Jesus Christ as High Priest and

perfect offering actually do accomplish what the physical sacrifices could not (Hebrews 10).

Israel's failure, under the Old Covenant, and their prophesied future success are found in both Jeremiah 31 and Hebrews 10.

“This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord; I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds I will write them,” Hebrews 10:16, MKJV

“Behold, the days come, says the LORD, that I will cut a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I cut with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which covenant of Mine they broke, although I was a husband to them, says the LORD; but this shall be the covenant that I will cut with the house of Israel: After those days, says the LORD, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And they shall no more teach each man his neighbor and each man his brother, saying, Know the LORD; for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, says the LORD. For I will

forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sins no more." Jeremiah 31:31-34, MKJV

The answer to the question, "Which administration do you want to live under?" is pretty clear, which is, the spiritual administration. Notice that the writing of the divine law in their inward parts is a reference to conversion to a thoughtful, holy person. Such a thoughtful and holy person does not need innumerable, static, external-standard rules of behavior. Such a person only needs a relatively few core principles and a thoughtful, caring, spiritual mind to apply them to the dynamic situations of life. That is what the two Jehovahs really wanted. The law, no matter how detailed, is always general, as compared to the particular dynamics of life. There will also be the need for good judgment taking into consideration core eternal principles.

Your author does want to point out that the divine laws, even under the physical administration, did have the benefit of **providing societal norms**. These societal norms made planning easier and allowed for some measure of security and peace. If the ancient Israelites, or any other man at any other time, refuses to think and be convinced by clear

and well-seasoned arguments concerning rational and objective ethical principles then all even the two Jehovahs can do is to leave them to the consequences of their actions – which will not be good consequences. It sort of comes down to rational persuasion or the hard knocks of life. No political system can establish universal rationality or universal morality by law or by force. It takes the willing participation of the contingent being with free will. Usually that willing participation comes after a traumatic life experience. Your author wishes it could be otherwise, but for most people it evidently is not to be otherwise.

Many religious people believe that what God wills is correct and man's duty is simply to listen to and then obey divine revelation. In other words man ought to obey God. This is man's ethical duty - end of story. Ethical principles can only be given to man by supernatural revelation. This is man's only way to know ethical or religious truth. This is what is known, philosophically speaking, as fideism. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary defines fideism as "reliance on faith rather than reason in pursuit of religious truth." There is, however, one big problem with fideism. It is not Biblical. And God himself would disagree with it. This is not to say that

man should not listen to divine law and to obey God. It is to say that the below passage in Romans 1, previously quoted earlier in this book, has God telling men they could have used their minds and discovered natural laws and known what to do – at least to some extent. In other words, man can use reason to learn ethical principles. The believers in fideism probably mean well. However, strictly understood, they are wrong.

“since what may be known about God is plain to them [men], because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities - his eternal power and divine nature - have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools” Romans 1:19-22, NIV

One big difference between the natural sciences and the social sciences is there is no choice as an element of causality in the natural sciences. Electrons do not choose to leave one atom and go to another. Gravity does not

decide to function as a force. A planet does not choose which sun to orbit. Men (and angels) choose. So does God. All these choices have consequences. As choices are made, other choices get made and the future unfolds in a linear fashion. Time is linear. The future is not predetermined. The future will occur based on choices that are made by those who are able to choose. The two Jehovahs gave free will to angels and men. Evidently one-third of the angels chose to rebel against them (Revelation 12:4-9). And man, from Adam on down, has also rebelled against them. The Israelites originally chose to cooperate with them, but then rebelled. Because the two Jehovahs gave angels and men a certain amount of freedom and also a certain amount of time even they, based on the choice they made, cannot force an angel's or a man's mind. This is why it is so important for men, in particular, and also the good angels, to cooperate with the two Jehovahs. Otherwise, we can frustrate their purposes for us and frustrate what they would actually like to accomplish - versus what they have had to settle for.

It is widely assumed that God (the two Jehovahs) is omniscient. And omnipotent. And sometimes it is also assumed that God is

omnipresent. Your author disagrees, at least pertaining to the sloppy way the “three Omni’s” are normally used.

If something is knowable then God knows it – if he chooses to. If something is not knowable then no one knows it, including God. For example, as previously mentioned above, the future is not yet written. The future depends on choices that God, angels, and men make. Since the future is not yet written, because all the choices that make up the future have not been made, no one knows the future. God does reserve the right to prophecy and to intervene using his free choice to cause an event to occur, but God does not force a man’s mind, or an angel’s mind. As regards the natural sciences, logic, mathematics, and other fields not involving choice, your author believes God knows all. Quoting from Wikipedia:

“There is a distinction between:

inherent omniscience - the ability to know anything that one chooses to know and can be known.

total omniscience - actually knowing everything that can be known.

Some modern Christian theologians argue that God's omniscience is inherent rather than total, and that God chooses to limit his omniscience in order to preserve the free will and dignity of his creatures." Your author agrees.

As regards omnipotence, Wikipedia nicely quotes author C.S. Lewis on the matter (from Lewis's *The Problem Of Pain*) [emphasis mine]:

"His Omnipotence means power to do all that is intrinsically possible, not to do the intrinsically impossible. You may attribute miracles to him, but not nonsense. This is no limit to his power. If you choose to say 'God can give a creature free will and at the same time withhold free will from it,' you have not succeeded in saying anything about God: meaningless combinations of words do not suddenly acquire meaning simply because we prefix to them the two other words 'God can.' ... It is no more possible for God than for the weakest of his creatures to carry out both of two mutually exclusive alternatives; not because his power meets an obstacle, but because nonsense remains nonsense even when we talk it about God."

Your author does not believe that God is omnipotent in terms of overriding a man's free

will. Ergo, a man can change, for the good or the bad (Ezekiel 18) and God will let the man choose. God cannot force men or angels to be moral and then turn around and maintain that we are anything much better than people-bots or angel-bots.

Omnipresence does not have much to do with this section of the book, but your author felt like including a brief discussion of it here, anyway, as it kind of goes with the first two "Omni's." Wikipedia defines it as follows:

"Omnipresence or ubiquity is the property of being present everywhere. This characteristic is most commonly used in a religious context, as most doctrines bestow the trait of omnipresence onto a superior, usually a deity commonly referred to as God by monotheists, as with God in Christianity. This idea differs from Pantheism, which identifies the universe and divinity; in divine omnipresence, the divine and universe are separate, but the divine is present everywhere ..."

Your author does not agree with omnipresence as it is sloppily used as God evidently has a spirit body (1 Corinthians 15:35-50, Genesis 1:26, and Revelation 1:14-15). Further, while

there is no doubt God can likely go anywhere at the speed of thought, he evidently has a place he resides (Revelation 4:2 and other places). Further, omnipresence gets difficult to explain or understand, e.g., if God is everywhere does that mean he is inside Satan?

The point of this discussion regarding omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence is this: It is important for men and angels to use their free will to cooperate with the two Jehovahs, i.e., God. Otherwise, even one little man can, for a time, literally frustrate the eternal God the same way a child can frustrate a parent. God gave us divine law as instruction in order to help us to learn to become like God so we can ultimately become holy and resurrected to eternal life (1 Corinthians 15) and to be able to live in a new heaven and new earth (Revelation 21 and other places). Is that such a bad thing?

To the extent that the Israelites did rebel and frustrate God he threw them off the land. As previously mentioned, the Israelites wanted a king and they wanted to order their lives like the nations. So God gave them laws that were not good for them, aka the laws the other non-Israelite nations came up with. In speaking

about the ancient Israelites and their children,  
God said:

“But their children, too, rebelled against me. They refused to keep my laws and follow my instructions, even though obeying them **would have given them life.** And they also violated my Sabbath days. So again I threatened to pour out my fury on them in the wilderness. Nevertheless, I withdrew my judgment against them to protect the honor of my name among the nations who had seen my power in bringing them out of Egypt. But I took a solemn oath against them while they were in the wilderness. I vowed I would scatter them among all the nations because they did not obey my laws. They scorned my instructions by violating my Sabbath days and longing for the idols of their ancestors. **I gave them over to worthless customs and laws that would not lead to life.** I let them pollute themselves with the very gifts I had given them, and I allowed them to give their firstborn children as offerings to their gods - so I might devastate them and show them that I alone am the LORD.”  
Ezekiel 20:21-26, NLT

## Tribalism

“Tribalism is the state of being organized in, or advocating for, a tribe or tribes. In terms of conformity, tribalism may also refer to a way of thinking or behaving in which people are more loyal to their tribe than to their friends, their country, or any other social group.

The social structure of a tribe can vary greatly from case to case, but, due to the small size of tribes, it is always a relatively simple role structure, with few (if any) significant social distinctions between individuals.

Tribalism implies the possession of a strong cultural or ethnic identity that separates one member of a group from the members of another group. It is a precondition for members of a tribe to possess a strong feeling of identity for a true tribal society to form. The distinction between these two definitions for tribalism is an important one because, while tribal society no longer strictly exists in the western world, tribalism, by this second definition, is arguably undiminished. ...” quoted from Wikipedia

One can argue about what tribalism means and entails. To someone educated in the West,

tribal practices and beliefs seem primitive. But, a large part of the world is tribal to this very day; hence the constant lack of trust and conflicts in various parts of the world. A hallmark point of a tribal mentality is that ethnic, cultural, language, geographic, or religious ties trump principles and reason. It is, quite literally, collective group membership over: individuals, principles, and rational thought. The tribe's way is right based on tradition, ethnicity, language, geographic location, intuitively received religious beliefs, etc. Rather than giving weighty consideration to universal natural laws, objective rational ethical principles, and personal dealings between individual men, tribal beliefs and practices rule. Tribal members, in essence, trade individual personal growth and development for safety through group membership.

The history of the world is filled with examples of inter-tribal warfare. Rationalizations for this include: fighting over scarce resources, attempting to settle border differences, payback for inter-tribal feuds, attempting to preserve language, culture, or religion, etc.

The core of the problem with tribal thinking is, many times, an anti-conceptual mentality involving significant errors in thinking. Not all tribes are guilty of all of the below, and this is not a book on anthropology. Nevertheless, since a lot of the world is tribal, it must be noted that some of the more important errors in tribal thinking are:

1. Believing that in any exchange there is a winner and a loser so it is important to try to get more than you give when trading.
2. A "might makes right" mentality where you must conquer before being conquered.
3. Wanting something for nothing so instead of producing what you can and trading for what you want, an attempt is made to just take what others have produced.
4. Not understanding there are natural laws and natural rights and that individual men and women are important in their own right. The tribal group, as a collective, is more important than the individual members. If deemed necessary by the tribal leaders, individual members become disposable, i.e., they can be human fuel for the tribal fire.
5. Being afraid of reality and not knowing how to deal with it. This comes out in various religious practices designed to attempt to

appease "the gods" is some strange or anti-human way.

6. Static thinking in the sense that change is likely to be viewed as an enemy.
7. Members of other tribes or groups cannot be trusted.
8. Outside ideas attempting to penetrate into the tribe cannot be trusted.

Nathaniel Branden, author and psychotherapist, evidently coined the term, "Witch Doctor," for the tribal religious leader and "Attila" for the tribal boss man. Ayn Rand popularized and made famous these characterizations of the two main anti-conceptual mentality leaders of most tribes. In the next paragraph your author paraphrases some of the characterization of the Witch Doctor. Then, in later paragraphs, your author provides a paraphrased characterization regarding Attila, along with further characterizations about the Witch Doctor.

The Witch Doctor has intuitive feelings and beliefs which, (more likely than not), are not in accord with reality. The Witch Doctor wants his feelings and beliefs to somehow trump reality. He uses induced or actual guilt over tribal members who then need special religious

ceremonies to be in good standing with both “the gods” and the tribe. The Witch Doctor helps the tribal leader, Attila, maintain order through spiritual control over tribal members. The Witch Doctor asserts superior supernatural guidance, vis-à-vis his fellow tribal members. The Witch Doctor is typically a concrete perceptual feeler, not an abstract conceptual thinker, hence the categorization of anti-conceptual mentality from Branden and Rand. The Witch Doctor tends to perceive information concretely and process it reflectively, i.e., how do they feel the new information will affect them and other tribal members. Truth tends to become whatever makes you feel better.

The Bible warns Gentile converts about not going back to strange tribal religious practices, which is worshipping gods that are not gods:

“But then, indeed, not knowing God, **you served as slaves to those not by nature being gods**. But now, knowing God, but rather are known by God, how do you turn again to the weak and beggarly elements to which you desire to slave anew?” Galatians 4:8, 9, MKJV

“For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the LORD made the heavens.”  
Psalms 96:5, MKJV

“They [the Israelites] did not destroy the nations as the LORD commanded them; but were mixed among the nations, and learned their works [and laws]. And they served their idols, which were a snare to them. Yea, **they sacrificed their sons and their daughters to demons**, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan; and the land was defiled with blood.”  
Psalms 106:34-38, MKJV

Characterizing Attila, he is the tribal leader. In all likelihood he is an action-oriented warrior-thug who will do whatever he considers necessary to maintain his rule and protect his tribe. Attila is a perceptual, concrete-bound, man of action. Concepts and theories are of no great use to him, hence his designation as having an anti-conceptual mentality. He perceives information concretely and then he will process that information by taking action and seeing what happens. If valuable individual men die it does not so much matter because death is part of life and the safety of the tribe

and his own personal rule are considered paramount. Truth is whatever works. If his actions offend other tribes and set the stage for the next war, so be it. The conceptual limitations of rational and objective ethics, natural rights, or long-term thinking do not much matter to him. He must take whatever action he considers necessary now in order to safeguard his own rule and his tribe. Attila thinks force and fraud and war are practical. If one of his plans goes wrong, he will just try something else to, once again, see what happens.

If tribe members will just “check their brain at the door” then Attila, supported by the Witch Doctor, will keep them safe. Traditions, in the form of memorized rules of behavior, are designed to maximize the well being of the tribe. A tribe member violates them at his/her own peril. Catch phrases and emotional slogans are utilized as an attempted substitute for thinking. However, all actions have consequences, even collective tribal actions. There is no escape from reason, responsibility, and reality – not even with a “tribe membership in good standing card.” The Witch Doctor’s faith (beliefs) is no match for reality and neither is Attila’s force.

Attila conquers and rules over those members of the tribal society, who have the brains, courage, work ethic, and ability to be productive. The Witch Doctor, as priest or philosopher, provides Attila with an intuitive rationalization for his actions and tribe members with a justification for their servitude to the tribal collective. Attila keeps the Witch Doctor safe from reality. The Witch Doctor delivers the people to Attila for slaughter, if necessary.

The Witch Doctor needs the tribe members to believe that he has a superior intuitive inner voice to "the higher reality" and the Witch Doctor needs the tribe members' obedience to his shamanisms. If he has to use deception or fraud to convince "the misguided," so be it. Attila needs men who take orders. He needs human cannon fodder. If a war is deemed necessary, even one waged against Attila's own people, so be it.

Tribalism, in whatever form, is a rebellion against reason and reality. Tribalism kills men made in God's image and has, for the moment, largely thwarted God's purpose in creating mankind. Most tribal members, though not physically dead yet, are lacking in the intellectual and moral virtues. They have been

trained to respond to catch phrases and emotional slogans, which inculcate loyalty to the tribe, instead of to truth and universally applicable right principles. An individual tribe member is expendable.

Those educated in the West can laugh at tribalism, but even most of Europe has always been tribal. And the ideological aspects of tribalism are to be found in Statism everywhere, which Statism is really tribalism writ large.

Your author learned of a lady member of a tribe who performed work at a small boutique hotel near the tribal land. Most of the tribe members did not have such a job earning cash. Unfortunately, for the lady with a job earning cash, the other tribe members knew what day she got paid. And they always had a lot of ideas about how her earnings should be allocated to help her fellow tribe members' wants and needs.

In any discussion about why there is a lack of justice, tribalism has to be discussed because most of the world is tribal – in mindset if not in actuality. Any collective mindset, which is anti-conceptual, in this case tribalism, is not likely to recognize or appreciate natural laws, natural rights, the purpose of law, the purpose of

government, etc. Tribal rules, unchecked by rational ethical principles and not necessarily tied to reality, are bound to hurt the individual tribe member's personal development – not to mention set the stage for inter-tribal wars that last for centuries.

### **The Role Of A King – Past & Future**

As previously mentioned, God originally wanted Israel to be ruled by a judge using known laws. When the people rejected Samuel, they were really rejecting God. And the people were asking to be governed like the other nations, who had kings. What the Israelites did not realize, or care about if they realized it, was that a king-headed government is a government that is set up for war and not for peace. But war shreds man's natural rights and destroys all of the things that enable life.

“And Samuel told all the words of the LORD to the people who asked a king of him. And he said, This will be the privilege of the king who shall reign over you. He shall take your sons and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and his horsemen. And they shall run before his chariots. **And he will appoint commanders over thousands, and commanders over**

**fifties, and some to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and make his weapons of war and weapons for his chariots."**

1 Samuel 8:10-12, MKJV

"And we shall be, also we, like all the nations, **so that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles."**

1 Samuel 8:20, MKJV

The above two scriptural excerpts are excellent prophecies of the type of society that kings rule over, which is a feudal society. A feudal society, headed by a king, is a society structured for war making, which is exactly what the above scriptures foretell. As a concrete example of this, your author below quotes one of the main authorities on English law, Sir William Blackstone, from his *Commentaries On The Laws Of England In Four Books, Volume 1*:

"Upon the Norman conquest **the feudal law** [feudal law] was introduced here [England] in all its rigour, the whole of which is built on a military plan. I shall not now enter into the particulars of that constitution, which belongs more properly to the next part of our commentaries; but shall only observe, that, in consequence thereof, all the lands in the

kingdom were divided into what were called knights' fees, in number above sixty thousand; and for every knight's fee a knight or soldier, miles, was bound to attend the king in his wars, for forty days in a year; in which space of time, before war was reduced to a science, the campaign was generally finished, and a kingdom either conquered or victorious. By this means the king had, without any expense, an army of sixty thousand men always ready at his command."

Of course, it is actually worse than the above because in a feudal society, set up for war, no one is ever really safe. If invading armies come to kill, enslave, burn cities, etc., in one country, it is only a matter of time before retaliation occurs in their country. Men's lives are literally wasted because an entire nation is set up for war making. It was a "kill before you are killed" and a "might makes right" and a "winners write the history" mentality. Perversely, war, which leads to death, was considered a way of life.

Blackstone went on to explain how the king could never be considered wrong, at law. If the king gave a charter (a government monopoly privilege) and the man or group receiving the charter failed, then the king was obviously a

victim of fraud. Ergo, hold the private party responsible, not the king. If it was obvious the king made a mistake, or abused his power, then since the king could not be wrong at law, Parliament would hold the king's advisors accountable for giving the king bad advice – as if the king was a child who could not have overridden the advice of his advisors.

Blackstone further gave a list of the king's revenues, which are astounding in their length and breadth - but beyond the scope of this book. Blackstone further expounded other king-favored legal rationalizations such as "the king owns the forests" because forests are deemed as waste grounds thus belonging to the king.

Blackstone pointed out that, in essence, the law of nations in our Western world was feudalism. Without understanding feudalism, one cannot understand the laws that regulate England's landed property. The land was allocated based on military conquest and was a conditional reward based on an oath of fealty (loyalty). The grand maxim of feudal tenure was that all lands were granted by the king and were therefore beholden to him, directly or indirectly.

Instead of using their minds and recognizing the natural rights of men, entire cultures and nations set themselves up to make war. Instead of producing something of value and trading for what you would like, but don't have, entire nations had a plunder mentality. And the average man ended up being fodder for all of this.

Reading Blackstone about kings and what this led to in terms of laws, etc., is eye opening. The scope of this short book precludes a detailed history of rationalizations for monarchy, such as Machiavelli's early political and ethical writings, *The Prince*, or arguments for "the divine right of kings," or detailed explanations of feudalism's workings. Your author will quote a few paragraphs from Murray Rothbard's, *Economic Thought Before Adam Smith*, pertaining to Machiavelli, in order to illustrate what kings were taught regarding maintaining the power of their kingdom.

"Niccolo Machiavelli was reviled throughout Europe during the sixteenth century and on into the next two centuries. He was considered to be someone unique in the history of the West, a conscious preacher of evil, a diabolic figure who

had unleashed the demons in the world of politics. The English used his given name as a synonym for the Devil, 'Old Nick'. ...”

“Well, which was Machiavelli, a teacher of evil or a value-free political scientist? Let us see. At first glance, *The Prince* was very much like other mirror-of-princes advice-books of the late fifteenth century humanists. The prince was supposed to seek virtu[e], or excellence, and was supposed to pursue honour, glory and fame in the development of such excellence. But within this traditional form, Machiavelli wrought a radical and drastic transformation, creating in this way a new paradigm for political theory. **For what Machiavelli did was to redefine the critical concept of virtu[e].** For the humanists, as for Christians and classical theorists alike, virtu[e], excellence, was the fulfilment of the traditional classical and Christian virtues: honesty, justice, benevolence, etc. For Old Nick, on the contrary, virtu[e] in the ruler or prince and for the late humanists, after all, it was only the prince who counted was, simply and terribly, as Professor Quentin Skinner puts it, 'any quality that helps a prince to keep his state.' In short, the overriding, if not the only goal for the prince was to maintain and extend his power, his rule over the state.

Keeping and expanding his power is the prince's goal, his virtue, and therefore any means necessary to achieve that goal becomes justified."

"Modern social scientists, in contrast, pride themselves on being realistic and value-free. But in this, ironically, they are far less realistic or perhaps less candid than their Florentine mentor. For, as Machiavelli knew full well, in taking on their role of adviser to the rulers of state, the 'value-free scientist' is willy-nilly, committing himself to the end, and therefore to the overriding morality, of strengthening the power of those rulers. In advocating public policy, if nowhere else, value-freedom is a snare and a delusion; Old Nick was either too honest or too much of a realist even to consider thinking otherwise.

Niccolo Machiavelli, therefore, was both the founder of modern political science and a notable preacher of evil. In casting out Christian or natural law morality [the two most important checks on government power], however, he did not presume to claim to be 'value-free' as do his modern followers; he knew full well that he was advocating the new morality of subordinating all other

considerations to power and to the reasons of state. Machiavelli was the philosopher and apologist par excellence for the untrammelled, unchecked power of the absolute state."

Your author quotes the below paragraph, out of Rothbard's order, so as to bring to an end this brief interlude on Machiavelli and how his line of state apologetics led to a further corruption of the kings of Europe and also contributed to the corruption of political science to this day.

"In all this, modern social science is a faithful follower of the wily Florentine opportunist. But in one important sense the two differ. For Niccolo Machiavelli never had the presumption - or the cunning - to claim to be a true scientist because he is 'value-free.' There is no pretend value-freedom in Old Nick. He has simply replaced the goals of Christian virtue by another contrasting set of moral principles: that of maintaining and expanding the power of the prince. As Skinner writes:

'it is often claimed that the originality of Machiavelli's argument. .. lies in the fact that he divorces politics from morality [i.e. value-free political science], and in consequence emphasises the 'autonomy of politics' ... [but]

the difference between Machiavelli and his contemporaries cannot adequately be characterized as a difference between a moral view of politics and a view of politics as divorced from morality. **The essential contrast is rather between two different moralities** - two rival and incompatible accounts of what ought ultimately to be done.”

Quoting Rothbard again:

“... But still the seductive nature of the new morality, of the justifying of evil means by the allegedly overriding end of maintaining and advancing state power, began to take hold among various writers. In Italy, a group of Machiavellians appeared during the sixteenth century, headed by Giovanni Botero (1540-1617), and his treatise of 1589, *The Reason of State*.”

“... While beginning by paying lip service to the importance of the prince's cleaving to justice, Botero quickly goes on to justify political prudence as crucial to all government, then defines the essence of prudence that 'in the decisions made by princes, interest will always override every other argument'; all other considerations, such as friendship, treaties or

other commitments must go by the board. The overall view of Botero is that a prince must be guided primarily by 'reason of state,' and that actions so guided 'cannot be considered in the light of ordinary reason.' **The morality and justification for actions of the prince is diametrically opposed to the principles that must guide the ordinary citizen."**

After Machiavelli redefined morality and Botero and other intellectual followers came along, many further author-philosophers came forth with additional and various rationalizations for kings having absolute power. They, of course, all wanted to obtain a position of status, such as king's advisor, for themselves. For example, a man named Jean Bodin taught law at the University of Toulouse in France, and taught the rationalization that, from Rothbard:

"Since the sovereign is the maker or creator of the [positive] law, he must therefore be above that law, which applies only to his subjects and not to himself. The sovereign, then, is a person whose will creates order out of formlessness and chaos."

To your author it almost sounds like Satan, using a human king, wants to pass positive

statutory laws, without regard to divine law, without regard to natural law, based on a new morality, in order to keep men from exercising their natural rights, particularly the right to be free. Man, being free, is chaos to Satan, in your author's opinion. Satan hates what God did in creating man and wants to control this perceived chaos by any means available.

Scot, Adam Blackwood provided a further rationalization for the absolute power of a king. Rothbard explains: "The will of the prince, for Blackwood, becomes just virtually by definition." Blackwood denounced natural law. Per Rothbard, Blackwood also pushed forward the king's rights to tax:

"It was, indeed, Adam Blackwood who uniquely and radically reached the clarity of consistency on the ruler's right to tax. For if property rights are important, and the king has the absolute right to tax or otherwise seize private property at will, then this must mean that [Rothbard quotes from William Farr Church in single quotes] 'All lands were originally held by the king and were granted by him to others ... And the granting of fiefs by the king was but a partial transfer; all lands owed tribute to him and remained subject to his authority.' In short,

in an odd version of the state of nature, only the king had original or continuing property rights; all other seeming property rights are simply allowances by the king, temporary possessions that are regulatable by the king and revocable by him at any time.”

And Rothbard explains the “divine right of kings” as follows:

“Jean Bodin's exaltation of sovereignty struck French political thought like a thunderclap; here at last was a way to justify and expand the ever-increasing powers of the Crown. In particular, the new view was adopted and subtly transformed by writers who were far more absolutist, in practice, than was Bodin himself. The one element that Bodin's veneration of sovereignty lacked was the Protestant notion of divine sanction; for to Bodin absolute sovereignty was simply a fact of nature. Other politiques, however, soon added the missing ingredient, since they had long been accustomed to think of rule as by divine right. The idea of the king's rule being commanded by God was a familiar one in the sixteenth century; none, however, had extended kingly rule to the notion of absolute sovereignty created by Bodin.

The most important immediate follower of Bodin was Pierre Gregoire, in his *De republica* (1578). The king, for Gregoire, was God's appointed vicar in the temporal sphere, and his rule was under the constant influence of God's will. The king's command was therefore equivalent to God's, and was equally owed absolute obedience by his subjects. 'The prince is the image of God, in power and in authority,' wrote Gregoire."

The abuse of kings and their advisors is beyond dispute and a matter of the historical record. There are always going to be Attila the Huns who want to exert rule over the masses – promising everything, but doing whatever is necessary to consolidate and keep their power. And there are always going to be Witch Doctors and/or philosophers who want to be around the throne of power, grabbing onto whatever status, wealth, and power they can – while providing evil rationalizations for state power. And neither Attila, as king, nor the Witch Doctor, as his philosopher apologist want to be held to be limited by either divine law or natural law. What to do? Redefine morality and virtue and go from there. Thank you, Machiavelli and friends.

Of course they can redefine morality and hold themselves as not subject to divine law, or to natural law, but there is an entire Psalm of warning to kings and their evil advisors, which is Psalm 2.

“Why do the nations rage? Why do the people waste their time with futile plans? The kings of the earth prepare for battle; the rulers plot together against the LORD and against his anointed one. ‘Let us break their chains,’ they cry, ‘and free ourselves from this slavery.’ [The kings and their advisors regard being subject to God and divine law and natural laws as slavery.] But the one who rules in heaven laughs. The Lord scoffs at them. Then in anger he rebukes them, terrifying them with his fierce fury. For the LORD [God the Father] declares, ‘I have placed my chosen king [Jesus Christ] on the throne in Jerusalem, my holy city.’

The king proclaims the LORD’s decree: “The LORD [God the Father] said to me, ‘You are my son [Jesus Christ]. Today I have become your Father. Only ask, and I will give you the nations as your inheritance, the ends of the earth as your possession. You will break them with an iron rod and smash them like clay pots.’”

Now then, you kings, act wisely! Be warned, you rulers of the earth! Serve the LORD with reverent fear, and rejoice with trembling. Submit to God's royal son, or he will become angry, and you will be destroyed in the midst of your pursuits - for his anger can flare up in an instant. But what joy for all who find protection in him!" Psalms 2:1-12, NLT

God's opinion of kings not being subject to divine law and, by extension, to natural law, is different from the kings and their advisors. The time is almost up, but the two Jehovahs offer Psalm 2 as an offer of reconciliation to the kings and governments of the world.

When Jesus Christ returns to this earth (Revelation 19) the role of kings will change. We can know this by now understanding the implication inherent in the below scriptural passage:

"And it shall be, in the last days the mountain of the LORD's house [the Kingdom of God] shall be established in the top of the mountains [governments], and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, Come, and let us go to the mountain of the LORD, to the

house of the God of Jacob. And He [Jesus Christ] will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths. For out of Zion shall go out the Law [instruction], and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And **He shall judge** among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, **neither shall they learn war any more.**"

Isaiah 2:2-4, MKJV

Just by looking at the few verses above we can see that the role of a future king will be to judge according to the law (both divine law and natural law, as there is no conflict properly understood). Further, we can know that a king in the future will not mean a militarily ordered and structured society of warriors and serfs. There will be no evil rationalizations for unwarranted state power, complete with a new "morality," which violates both divine and natural laws. The role of a king will change to that of being a righteous judge judging according to true, logical, and ethical principles. And it will no longer be allowed for nations to structure themselves toward the catastrophically destructive purpose of fighting wars. Natural

rights will be respected. All men and women will be valued as made in God's image and likeness.

"And I will restore your judges as at first,  
and your counselors as at the beginning;  
afterwards you shall be called the city of  
righteousness, the faithful city."  
Isaiah 1:26, MKJV

The kings in the Kingdom of God will not be allowed to abuse the men they govern, or to teach war, nor will they rationalize evil.

"... **Peace** and **righteousness** will be your leaders!" Isaiah 60:17, NLT

"But Jesus called them together and said,  
"You know that in this world kings are tyrants,  
and officials lord it over the people beneath  
them. But among you it should be quite  
different. Whoever wants to be a leader among  
you must be your servant,"  
Matthew 20:25, 26, NLT

You cannot serve someone by redefining morality and virtue. You cannot serve the people by asserting that only the king has property rights, not all men. You cannot serve the people by using them as cannon fodder for

senseless wars, which only invite future retaliatory wars. Etc.

As mentioned in an earlier section of this book, a king basically functions as a garbage man, taking out the human trash. It may sound cold, but the purpose of government is to deal with those who are wicked – those who initiate force and fraud against the peaceful and productive.

**“Take away the wicked** from before the king [and from before the citizens, too], and his throne shall be founded in righteousness.”  
Proverbs 25:5, MKJV

“A king who sits in the throne of judgment scatters away all evil with his eyes.”  
Proverbs 20:8, MKJV

The future king must and will use wisdom to decree justice.

“By Me [wisdom, also a reference to God] kings reign and princes decree justice.”  
Proverbs 8:15, MKJV

Justice, as previously mentioned, is a necessary first step toward reconciliation, social harmony, social cooperation, and peace.

In short, the future king will be a judge who is righteous. A king will both recognize and live by both divine and natural law. The future king will not teach war, nor allow war. Instead peace will be taught and all men's natural rights will be respected. The future king will instruct the people in order to build them up and will decree justice so as to lead to social harmony, social cooperation, peace, and life. And, when necessary, the future king will be the garbage man and take out the human trash, all the while hoping that the wrongdoer will wake up and change for the better. If the wrongdoer changes for the better they, too, can become a righteous and productive person and rejoin society.

### **The Corruption Of Law**

Ayn Rand once mentioned, (in so many words), the only way to deal with men is by persuasion, but if their minds are not active you must leave them to the consequences of their actions. Nature has to be dealt with by force, as nature does not have a mind. It is not practical to deal with men, as with nature, i.e., by force.

She also mentioned men are free not to think but not to escape the consequences of not thinking. In addition, she further mentioned that false premises grow inside a man and a society until they reach their logical conclusion.

And so it is with men not being willing to live under either divine law, or natural law. By being unwilling to live under divine law and by also being unwilling to live under the check and balance of respecting each other's natural rights, legal systems and governments have been created that have destroyed and are destroying men made in God's image.

Students of philosophy have noted that when philosophers attempted to break ethics free from God they ended up substituting the state or society for God. This, along with the various rationalizations for increased state power, enabled the ruling elite of the state power structure to become empowered to sacrifice some men to others in furtherance of their arbitrarily chosen goals. The men in control of the state power will attempt to use phrases like the "common good" in order to give themselves moral sanction and to win the support of the majority of the people. The concept of "good" relates to individuals, however, not a group.

There is no "common good" or "group good" as groups are simply composed of individuals. And if you are one of the individuals sacrificed to the politically favored of the state rulers it is not good to you. This is one of the main problems of democracy. Voting blocks and special interests attempt to gain control of the governmental power structure so they can legalize wealth transfers. They can never make such wealth transfers moral. They can only make them legal. It makes control of the government something to fight over and so men do just that – fight over control of the government. Unthinking men, with no objective rational ethics, no respect for the fact that all men are men, and no respect for natural rights, fight for control of government power so they can use this power against other men. When this unchecked governmental power is used against one group of citizens to benefit another group of citizens it is, in actuality, the initiation of governmental force against men who have done nothing wrong. It is institutionalizing injustice. And all this sets the stage for a descent into hell on earth.

It is a descent into hell for various reasons. The first reason, again provided by Ayn Rand, amongst others, is because if there is no

recognition of individual natural rights it means there are NO rights and now that particular society is ready for a dictator, or democratic mob rule – which generally leads to a dictator. The dictator will not hesitate to sacrifice men to achieve his arbitrarily or mystical ends. He will be an Attila who will do what he thinks is necessary without concern about reason or ethics or the individuals who are sacrificed. The second reason is because there is no proper understanding of the purpose of law or the purpose of government, or the importance of complying with divine and natural law, the politicians in power will pass a plethora of statutory laws, with the accompanying bureaucratic regulations, in a futile attempt to: change human character, overturn economic laws, build wasteful monuments, pry into other nations' business, have a strong military, reward the politician's financial supporters, redistribute wealth, etc., etc. The third reason follows from the second reason. It is deficit spending by the government due to government growing beyond the ability or willingness of its citizens to pay for all of the pie in the sky government programs. Once government taxes citizens to a certain point, productivity stops as societal capital formation is crippled and tax collection sort of reaches a "maximum," which government

spending exceeds. Debt ensues and typically grows to the point that only the interest on the debt can be included in the government budget and then it gets worse from there as desperate measures such as inflation are resorted to. Politicians are notorious short-term thinkers (your author uses the word "thinkers" charitably here). If they can pass a law and borrow money to build a pet monument they will claim they created jobs – which is false. The falseness of this statement, the effects of government caused and sponsored inflation, and other such matters will be explained in more detail in an upcoming book on economics by your author. The short answer to the falsity of the government claim that jobs were created is that jobs were diverted to the pet monument at the expense of producing goods and services of value that the participants of the marketplace would have wanted instead. Further, the fourth reason, is that the politicians and social do-gooders set up national retirement and health schemes, disability schemes, unemployment insurance schemes, welfare schemes, and educational schemes which incur trillions of dollars of government political promises. But the government can only get money for one group by taking it from another. It is easy to make promises, especially if a politician will not

be in office to watch the overburdened government attempt to make good on the promises. Let your author assure you: **Promises have been made that will not be kept.**

At any rate, to summarize, politicians in a democracy: pass statutory laws, require implementing bureaucratic regulations, which require an army of regulators, which hinder the productivity of business, which demoralize the honest productive members of society, and they meddle in other nations' business which means there is a need for a larger than otherwise necessary military industrial establishment. They set up huge welfare and retirement and educational schemes that cannot be paid for in terms of honest money. And so un-payable debt is incurred which burdens current and future generations. Money then gets created out of nothing. This debt and money creation will eventually lead to either an inflationary depression or a deflationary depression, international trade wars, actual wars and dictators, and somewhere along the way there will be a currency collapse which wipes out the honest productive savers of society – who the government was supposed to protect. It is a moral, intellectual, legal, and economic train

wreck waiting to happen. Right before this chaotic, destructive descent into actual hell laws will be passed, that instead of protecting natural rights, will make it virtually impossible for the productive saver/investors of society to protect themselves from government confiscation of their lives and property.

Big problems come from fundamental errors that compound themselves over a period of time. A lack of respect for divine law and a lack of respect for natural rights are what enabled things to get to this point. Could all of the above have been predicted and avoided? Yes.

As previously mentioned, God scattered the Israelites among the nations, who the Israelites wanted to be like, and those nations' laws, judgments, and methods do not lead to LIFE.

"I also lifted up My hand to them [the ancient Israelites] in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the nations and scatter them through the lands, because they had not done My judgments, but had despised My sabbaths and had profaned My sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers' idols. Also I gave them statutes not good, and

judgments by which **they should not live.**  
Ezekiel 20:23-25, MKJV

The two Jehovahs foretold, via various scriptures, that the law would be perverted, debt would be incurred, the purchasing power of money would be inflated away, etc. There is nothing new under the sun (Ecclesiastes 1:9) and the two Jehovahs warned ancient Israel what would happen if they adopted the corrupt and evil laws of other nations. The evil laws could happen as a result of a monarchy, a democracy, or any other form of human government that does not respect both divine and natural laws, including natural rights. The below scriptures are telling indeed:

“Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with You, which frames mischief by a law?”  
Psalms 94:20, MKJV

“Woe to those who make unjust laws, to those who issue **oppressive decrees,**”  
Isaiah 10:1, NIV

“And the people shall be crushed, every man by another, and every man by his neighbor [this sounds like democracy and the legal system run wild to your author]; the boy shall act proudly

against the old man, and the low against the honorable.” Isaiah 3:5, MKJV

“Don’t be surprised when you see that the government oppresses the poor **and denies them justice and their rights**. Every official is protected by someone higher, and both are protected by still higher officials.” Ecclesiastes 5:8 TEV

“When there is moral rot within a nation, its government topples easily. But with wise and knowledgeable leaders [and good laws], there is stability.” Proverbs 28:2, NLT

“He [God] takes away the wisdom of rulers and makes leaders act like fools.” Job 12:17, TEV

“If God decided to do nothing at all [because mankind has rebelled against him and rejected both divine and natural law], no one could criticize him. If he hid his face, we would be helpless. There would be nothing that nations could do to keep godless oppressors from ruling them.” Job 34:29–30 TEV

“And the land is defiled under its [immoral and unthinking] people [who want something for

nothing]; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, and have broken the everlasting covenant. **Therefore the curse has devoured the earth**, and they who dwell in it are deserted; therefore the people of the earth are burned, and few men left.”  
Isaiah 24:5, 6, MKJV

“... the curse without cause shall not come.”  
Proverbs 26:2, MKJV

“Foreigners who live in your land will gain more and more power, while you gradually lose yours. They will have money to lend you, but you will have none to lend them. In the end they will be your rulers. All these disasters will come on you, and they will be with you until you are destroyed, because you did not obey the LORD your God and keep all the laws that he gave you. They will be the evidence of God’s judgment on you and your descendants forever.” Deuteronomy 28:43–46 TEV

“I will turn against you, so that you will be defeated, and **those who hate you will rule over you**; you will be so terrified that you will run when no one is chasing you.”  
Leviticus 26:17 TEV

“So now today we are slaves here in the land of plenty that you gave to our ancestors! We are slaves among all this abundance! The lush produce of this land piles up in the hands of the kings [rulers] whom you have set over us because of our sins. They have power over us and our cattle [property]. We serve them at their pleasure, and **we are in great misery.**”  
Nehemiah 9:36, 37, NLT

““Evildoers live among my people; they lie in wait like those who lay nets to catch birds, but **they have set their traps to catch people.** Just as a hunter fills a cage with birds, **they have filled their houses with loot. That is why they are powerful and rich,** why they are fat and well fed. **There is no limit to their evil deeds.** They do not give orphans **their rights** or **show justice to the oppressed.** But I, the LORD, will punish them for these things; I will take revenge on this nation.””  
Jeremiah 5:26–29 TEV

“Everyone, great and small, tries to make money dishonestly; even prophets and priests cheat the people.” Jeremiah 6:13 TEV

“Listen, earth! As punishment for all their schemes I am bringing ruin on these people, because they have rejected my teaching and have not obeyed my words.”  
Jeremiah 6:19 TEV

If the reader would like a relatively concise Biblical quote that directly addresses why there is no justice, read on:

“No one cares about being fair and honest. Their lawsuits are based on lies. They spend their time plotting evil deeds and then doing them. They spend their time and energy spinning evil plans that end up in deadly actions. They cheat and shortchange everyone. Nothing they do is productive; all their activity is filled with sin. Violence is their trademark. Their feet run to do evil, and they rush to commit murder. They think only about sinning. Wherever they go, misery and destruction follow them. They do not know what true peace is or what it means to be just and good. They continually do wrong, and those who follow them cannot experience a moment’s peace.

It is because of all this evil that deliverance is far from us. That is why God doesn’t punish those who injure us. No wonder we are in

darkness when we expected light. No wonder we are walking in the gloom. No wonder we grope like blind people and stumble along. Even at brightest noontime, we fall down as though it were dark. No wonder we are like corpses when compared to vigorous young men! We growl like hungry bears; we moan like mournful doves. **We look for justice, but it is nowhere to be found.** We look to be rescued, but it is far away from us. For our sins are piled up before God and testify against us [people get the government and legal/justice system they deserve]. Yes, we know what sinners we are. We know that we have rebelled against the LORD. We have turned our backs on God. We know how unfair and oppressive we have been, carefully planning our deceitful lies. **Our courts oppose people who are righteous, and justice is nowhere to be found.** Truth falls dead in the streets, and fairness has been outlawed. Yes, truth is gone, and anyone who tries to live a godly life is soon attacked [the honest and productive are a prey]. **The LORD looked and was displeased to find that there was no justice.**" Isaiah 59:4-15, NLT

"I have thought deeply about all that goes on here in the world, where people have the power to hurt each other [because there is no respect

or regard or obedience to either divine or natural law].” Ecclesiastes 8:9, NLT

“You will plant plenty of seed, but reap only a small harvest, because the locusts will eat your crops.” Deuteronomy 28:38 TEV

The above scripture could refer to actual locusts which eat agricultural crops, or just as likely, notice what God calls government bureaucrats and officials in the below scripture:

**“Your [government] officials are like a swarm of locusts that stay in the walls on a cold day. ...”** Nahum 3:17 TEV

“And He said, Woe to you also, lawyers! For you load men with burdens grievous to be carried, and you yourselves do not touch the burdens with one of your fingers.”  
Luke 11:46, MKJV

“Woe to those who call evil good and good evil; who put darkness for light and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!” Isaiah 5:20, MKJV

“Therefore the law has become helpless, and justice does not always go forth. For the wicked

entraps the righteous; therefore justice goes forth, being perverted.” Habakkuk 1:4, MKJV

“You have planted much but harvested little. You have food to eat, but not enough to fill you up. You have wine to drink, but not enough to satisfy your thirst. You have clothing to wear, but not enough to keep you warm. Your wages disappear as though you were putting them in pockets filled with holes! [This comes true due to the combination of inflation and income tax withholding.]” Haggai 1:6, NLT

“Look here, you rich people, weep and groan with anguish because of all the terrible troubles ahead of you. Your wealth is rotting away, and your fine clothes are moth-eaten rags. Your gold and silver have become worthless [this is a reference to their money becoming worthless]. The very wealth you were counting on will eat away your flesh in hell. This treasure you have accumulated will stand as evidence against you on the day of judgment. For listen! Hear the cries of the field workers whom you have cheated of their pay. **The wages you held back** [likely a reference to income tax withholding] cry out against you. The cries of the reapers have reached the ears of the Lord Almighty. You have spent your years on earth

in luxury, satisfying your every whim. Now your hearts are nice and fat, ready for the slaughter. You have condemned and killed good people who had no power to defend themselves against you. [This is a likely reference to the corruption of the legal system and the corruption of judges and government.]” James 5:1-6, NLT

Whoever controls life, liberty, and property controls men because men need their natural rights in order to live upon the earth. Divine law and natural law both lead to justice, social harmony, social cooperation, peace, and life. The corruption of law, whether through kings and their advisors, or legislatures and democracy run amuck, has now occurred so that the legal system has little or nothing to do with justice. Even worse, the legal system engages in institutionalized plunder. As Bastiat would say, in so many words: the present day delusion is an attempt to enrich everyone at the expense of everyone else. Some men will always want to live at the expense of others. The purpose of the law was to prevent this from happening, if possible. If not possible, then to put the damage back onto the head of the offender and to provide restitution as quickly and inexpensively as possible for the victim. This no longer happens.

Further, positive (statutory) laws have been enacted to try and reform mankind. Bastiat astutely asks this of legislators, "Why don't you reform yourselves? That task would be sufficient enough." Bastiat reports that legislators, believing in social and human reform through the passing of statutory laws, have three hypothesis: 1) the total inertness of mankind, 2) the omnipotence of the law, and 3) the infallibility of the legislator. Your author would contend that all three hypotheses are wrong. Bastiat further humorously remarks that the voters are highly intelligent when choosing legislators, but, soon after, are stupid and need to be governed. Bastiat adds, that positive law substitutes the will of the legislator for the will of the people. Now the people no longer need to think, plan, compare, etc. Intelligence becomes a useless prop for the people. Bastiat further asks if the natural tendencies of mankind are so bad, that it is not safe to permit them to be free, how is it that the tendencies of the social organizers and reformers are always good? Are not the legislators and their bureaucratic agents also members of the human race? And so Bastiat would like to see titles to their superiority and would like them to prove their superior intelligence and virtue. Your author

applauds and would add that just as  $A = A$ , all men are men.

Richard Maybury has said, in so many words, positive statutory law is political and primitive, unlike the common law, where a judge scientist using objective and rational principles of justice, would discover the law and apply it to the situation at hand. Political power is the privilege of using force on persons who have not harmed anyone. It is "positive" force, something done to someone. And the government is a group of politicians and bureaucrats who are gradually conquering the country (he was speaking of America, but it could apply to any country). The first industry a government nationalizes is the justice industry because governments want to exempt themselves from law. The law and government are two different institutions.

Your author would add that legislative statutory law is man-made and political, which is to say "might makes right." It routinely violates natural law and disregards natural rights. It routinely violates divine law. It works against justice, social harmony, social cooperation, and peace and thus usually leads to war. It is lacking in ethics, logic, and truth. It sets all

against all, both within a country and also in regards to international law.

The same group of national "leaders" has consistently worked together throughout history. Loosely speaking this group of leaders consists of some or all of the following: a king or a President or a tribal leader, the king's advisors, a parliament or legislature or religious council, philosopher or Witch Doctor or religious leader apologists for the king/government/tribe, economic apologists, leading businessmen, lawyers and judges, bankers, accountants, and military leaders. Not all governments have the same grouping, but the above list of group members is typical and will be referred to hereafter as the "government leadership team." Long ago, starting from an Attila and the Witch Doctor to a modern cadre of specialists the above government leadership team formed. Each group member has their own interests to look out for so sometimes they internally fight for a while. They are all afraid of reality and God, the ultimate reality, and so they end up banding together in an attempt to live off of the masses. The way to control the masses is to control the masses' natural rights of life, liberty, and property. This is not to say the masses are of good intellectual and moral character.

People generally get the government they deserve. But the above government leadership team has now had centuries to perfect their people-control techniques – which they do not hesitate to utilize. And the masses are denied justice and exploited by them.

Sir William Blackstone, in his *Commentaries On The Laws Of England In Four Books, Volume 1*, provides some history and some clues to what has transpired. Though Blackstone has a nice discussion of natural laws, and provides them very nice lip service, his justification for the supremacy of Parliament is that the citizenry has socially contracted away their absolute natural rights in exchange for state privileges – which state privileges can be lost if the state maintains the individual in question violated the state's municipal laws. He provides no explanation why anyone in their right mind would make such a contract, trading rights for privileges, nor is any evidence of such a contract provided – because there is none. It is a rationalization. That is all. Blackstone further explains that despite a long list of taxes and revenues for the king, the king would overspend his revenues, usually due to wars, and would need to borrow money. The king was already taxing people to the limit Parliament

would approve. The additional funds could somewhat be procured by borrowing from the wealthier segment of the population, but the borrowed funds were not enough to fund the king's wars and special projects, along with the normal costs of government. So the Bank of England, a private bank, got created and soon after money started being "created," (think printed) - whether it was actually printed or a bookkeeping entry. This created money was then lent to the king, resulting in additional debt. Per Blackstone, the king was able to access this additional source of debt financing by pledging his tax and revenue stream to secure the debt. The reader will please remember that under a feudal land system all property ownership is basically by grant or permission of the king. And, per Blackstone [emphasis mine]:

"It was therefore the policy of the times to anticipate the revenues of their posterity [borrow against the tax revenues of their children and grandchildren], by borrowing immense sums for the current service of the state, and to lay no more taxes upon the subject than would suffice to pay the annual interest of the sums so borrowed: by this means converting

the principal debt into a new species of property, transferable from one man to another at any time and in any quantity; a system which seems to have had its original in the state of Florence, ad 1344 ...”

“By this means the quantity of property in the kingdom is greatly increased in idea, compared with former times; yet, if we coolly consider it, not at all increased in reality [there are artificially created claims on real goods and services which exceed the real goods and services]. We may boast of large fortunes, and quantities of money in the funds. But where does this money exist? It exists only in name, in paper, in public faith, in parliamentary security; and that is undoubtedly sufficient for the creditors of the public to rely on [for a time]. But then **what is the pledge which the public faith has pawned for the security of these debts?** The land, the trade, and the personal industry of the subject [the people, their liberty, and their property were pledged to secure the creditors, in other words the people lost their natural rights because the government overspent and pledged the people themselves as collateral, including the people’s children and future posterity]; from which the money must arise that supplies the several taxes. In these,

therefore, and these only, the property of the public creditors does really and intrinsically exist; and of course the land, the trade, and the personal industry of individuals, are diminished in their true value just so much as they are pledged to answer. If A.'s income amounts to 100l. per annum, and he is so far indebted to B. that he pays him 50l. per annum for his interest; one-half of the value of A.'s property is transferred to B. the creditor. **The creditor's property exists in the demand which he has upon the debtor**, and nowhere else; **and the debtor is only a trustee to his creditor for one-half of the value of his income.** In short, the property of a creditor of the public consists in a certain portion of the national taxes: by how much therefore he is the richer, by so much the nation, which pays these taxes, is the poorer."

Blackstone's intricate and excellent mapping of the English legal system gave away what was happening. The government, in this case the king and Parliament, pledged the property of the land, the people themselves, the people's children and posterity, and any taxes upon same to the creditors of the government. Instead of the government safeguarding the natural rights of the citizens, it sold them off to the

government's creditors. And now, as Blackstone further astutely observed, the citizen is really only a trustee for the government creditors for about one-half of his income. The citizen lost his natural rights and is now pledged and enslaved to government creditors. **It is a betrayal of the worst kind.** The citizen lost his rights so the government leadership team could pay for wars he does not want, government projects (monuments) he does not want, and a bureaucracy he does not want. The citizen lost, but the government leadership team members got temporary and short-sighted benefits through military increases, an artificial boosting of the economy, governmental contracts for the privileged, government perks and pay for the bureaucracy, an unnatural and unlawful source of seemingly easy credit, etc.

While Blackstone does not comment directly on the citizens being co-guarantors of the government debt, co-suretyship as it were, it is clear that the government creditors and government leadership team hold that each citizen is a co-guarantor of ALL of the government debt. The Bible comments on this, where in the below scripture the government creditor very much qualifies as the "stranger" in the verse. The government creditor cares

nothing for God, divine law, the citizens, or their natural rights.

**“He who is surety for a stranger shall be ruined;** and he who hates suretyship is safe.”  
Proverbs 11:15, MKJV

Blackstone also mentioned that one of the duties of the king was to “maintain the established religion.” Please keep reading.

Blackstone, in his commentaries, further mentioned something very interesting regarding bankrupts. Someone who has been cleared of his debts through bankruptcy **had a mark put upon them**. And Blackstone also mentioned that bankruptcy fraud was **punishable by death**. This reminded your author of the prophecy in Revelation where the Beast system at the end required a mark to buy or sell, i.e., in order to participate in commerce. This is pure speculation, but your author wonders if the government creditors, after a financial collapse, will have not been paid their interest they regard as being due on the government debt outstanding. The principal is way beyond repayment. Could this lead to a financial reorganization and governmental reorganization, a financial and legal reboot as it were? This

speculated financial and governmental reboot would be necessary because of the financial collapse causing havoc. And it would imply that all men everywhere, who were co-guarantors of the government debt, would get a new issue of created money, but the debtor governments and their citizens would be deemed to have defaulted on the debt. In other words the citizen co-guarantors, as co-sureties, would be regarded as a bankrupt. In order to be given the privilege of participating in the newly restructured economy each must receive a bankrupt's mark and accept the "established religion."

"And there was given to it [the second beast] to give a spirit to the image of the beast, so that the image of the beast might both speak, and might cause as many as would not worship the image of the beast to be killed [not practicing the established religion]. And it causes all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, **to receive a mark** on their right hand, or in their foreheads, even that not any might buy or sell except those having the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of its name."  
Revelation 13:15-17, MKJV

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. had some insights that are helpful in explaining the corruption of law and justice we find ourselves living under today. These below paraphrases of Holmes are found in his book, *The Common Law*. Holmes, under the influence of Darwin's natural selection, believed that the law ends up reflecting the interests of a dominant class (like the government team) and not the interests of the community at large. **In other words, law was an instrument and a result of natural selection.** The law was an instrument to accomplish certain material ends and not necessarily moral. The lawyer and the soldier, dutifully representing their causes were advancing truth. In this case truth has nothing to do with honesty. Truth means being on the winning side, i.e., assisting evolution. **It is truth by conquest, not by principle.**

Holmes further observed that no society (he means government) has ever admitted that it could not sacrifice individual welfare to its own existence. Holmes further disclosed that **the ancient surety was a hostage, but his liability was transferred into a money payment.** This sounds like "the Organic State" eating its citizens to stay alive to your author.

Holmes admitted that the law was administered in the interest of the upper classes (who are part of the government leadership team). For example, Holmes disclosed that the common carrier was presumed against in law, aka everything is a negligence in a common carrier that the law does not excuse. The law presumes against the common carrier.

Holmes further disclosed that over time mutual promises became consideration (thus weakening contract law) and this led to all of the liabilities of a bailee being considered as founded on a contract. A bailee is someone to whom goods have been delivered and who is then liable for their safekeeping. The title remains with the owner who transferred the goods. And Holmes also disclosed that the law defends possession of goods against everything except for better title.

Your author believes that contracts have been entered into, between governments and their creditors, where the government creditors now have a de facto title (or a superior security interest as good as title) to all the government's citizens' life, liberty, and property, including the life, liberty, and property of the citizens' posterity. Everything has either been re-titled

or had a lien placed upon it. A lien is a right to keep possession of property belonging to another person until a debt owed by that person is discharged (Macbook Dictionary). This is not to say that the change over of ownership or lien rights granted to the government creditors is all public record. Any such agreements entered into with government creditors would enrage the citizenry and so those agreements will never see the light of day. The government creditors likely regard themselves as the legal system winners by natural selection (a form of "might makes right" without regard to principle) and now the legal system serves them and enslaves the debtor citizens. Holmes's disclosures, combined with Blackstone's disclosures, make this a more than likely scenario. At any rate, as the two Jehovahs predicted long ago, men that hate us rule over us and we have, for the moment, lost our natural rights.

How this all got accomplished legally is likely through a process where the old Law Merchant, laws between traders, their lenders, their shippers, their investors, etc., got combined with common law and then statutory law. At this point in time common law has basically been excised from the legal system and divine law and natural rights are substantially

disregarded. The government creditors, with the government granted "right" to create money, have bought the legislatures and thereby the legal system. Judges now rule for creditors (the government creditors) and against debtors (aka citizens, the co-guarantors of the government debt). In other words, by a perversion of what government leaders are supposed to do, which is to safeguard their citizens' natural rights, instead of pledging them for what looked like an easy source of new government funding, there has been a turning upside down of law, justice, government, and natural rights. Now citizens have the "right" and the "liberty" to obey the Organic State government and the real rulers of that government, the government's creditors. And speaking of perversion, in law, words have precise definitions. The way positive statutory law is crafted is many times purposely linguistically deceitful. Definitions to ordinary language words are changed and also hidden in strange places in the statutes, so that a careless reading of the statute deceives the reader. Only the attorneys, some members of the legislature, some staff members, and the government creditors know where the real definition has been placed into the statute. Instead of everyone knowing what the rules are it perverts

the law into a coded maze, not for the uninitiated. It is deception, fraud, and a perversion of the worst kind. The government creditors and their knaves now control the legal system and the monetary system of the world. With the banking and legal systems already under their control they can buy, or effectively control, the media, the educational system, the militaries, mercenaries, and anything else they think will help them enslave mankind and take it all for themselves. All this is what God was referring to in Isaiah 10:1:

“Woe to those who decree unrighteous decrees, **and to the scribes who write toil;**”  
Isaiah 10:1, MKJV

Attorneys have become, for the most part, representatives of the government creditors and the courts have become a wealth transfer mechanism. The judges, paid by government, rule, over time, for expanded government power and against natural rights. It has been frequently said and is usually true that “The policies of the monarch are always those of his creditors.” And this saying includes all forms of government. With control of the legal system the government creditors can license, regulate, tax, restrict labor, restrict property usage

through zoning, etc. The people are now controlled for government creditor benefit. If the citizens understood why their life was hard, and if the citizens were also moral, neither of which is likely true, they would probably rise up against both the government leadership team and the government creditors in an attempt to regain their natural rights. But people do not understand why their life is hard. They complain about their life being hard, but they do not understand why it is so. Wanting something for nothing always has its price and that price will be paid. In this case the wanting something for nothing started with a king wanting a bigger government that he could pay for. But it also includes members of the governmental leadership team wanting big government with its created jobs of status and privilege along with government contracts. And many run-of-the-mill citizens want a big government dispensing government benefits, which, of course, have to be taken from Peter before they can be given to Paul.

The government creditors have created and installed an elaborate legal system and banking system which functions as a trapper's net to catch men and to take their property and their

energy from them. This was all described, long in advance, by the two Jehovahs in Habakkuk:

“Therefore the law has become helpless, and justice does not always go forth. For the wicked entraps the righteous; therefore justice goes forth, being perverted.” Habakkuk 1:4, MKJV

“Must we be strung up on their hooks and dragged out in their nets while they rejoice? Then they will worship their nets and burn incense in front of them. “These nets are the gods who have made us rich!” they will claim.” Habakkuk 1:15, 16, NLT

Your author believes it likely that at least some of these very worldly government creditors are actually in league with Satan to take over the earth and deliver it to him. Satan cannot destroy or hurt the two Jehovahs. He tried that and failed already (Isaiah 14:13-15). So Satan would now like to destroy men and/or enslave men made in God’s image as a means to do it to God in effigy. All this is leading up to the final rebellion described in Revelation 13, already mentioned above. The two Jehovahs long ago anticipated that the rich men government creditors of the earth would do all they have done and the two Jehovahs have a

prophecy specifically for them. Perhaps this is a partial fulfillment, in principle, against those who encumber men's lives and property as recorded in Nehemiah 5:1-13, particularly the curse recorded in verse 13. At any rate, they are in trouble as they have been painted with divine radar and are as good as dead.

"Because you have said, We have made a covenant with death [a covenant with Satan], and we have made a vision with hell [a joint plan with Satan to enslave men and take over the world]; when the overwhelming rod shall pass through [of correction from God], it shall not come to us; **for we have made lies our refuge, and we have hidden ourselves under falsehood**, therefore so says the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I place in Zion a Stone for a foundation, a tried Stone, a precious Cornerstone [Jesus Christ, King of Kings and Lord of Lords], a sure Foundation; he who believes shall not hurry. Also I will lay judgment to the line, and righteousness to the plummet; and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place [the rich men have prepared a hiding place(s)]. **And your covenant with death shall be wiped out, and your vision with hell shall not stand;** when the overwhelming rod shall

pass through, **then you shall be beaten down by it.**" Isaiah 28:15-18, MKJV

## **Summary & Concluding Remarks**

Law is a very broad topic and your author has endeavored to provide an overall point of view as to why there is no justice. Some of the main reasons for a lack of justice today, along with a general summary of several of the main points of this book, are:

The widespread rejection of natural law and natural rights has left mankind without a rational secular inter-personal, intra-societal, inter-religious, inter-cultural, and inter-governmental check and balance against the initiation of force or fraud and against the breaking of contracts.

The lack of understanding that respect for natural rights leads to peace and abundant life, whereas a rejection or abuse of natural rights sets the stage for the next feud or war. War is catastrophic in that it entails a civil war of man versus man, no matter who is fighting. And war is catastrophic because it leads to the destruction of all of the things necessary for life, including life itself for those who die as a result

of the war. The keeping of the two laws, as formulated by Richard Maybury, would provide a way for individuals to interact peacefully – even for individuals of different cultures, nations, and religions. For the reader’s ease these two laws are: “Do all you have agreed to do. Do not encroach on other persons or their property.”

There is a lack of understanding as to the purpose of societal law. Societal law is the collective organization of the individual right to self-defense and societal law is to therefore safeguard each man’s natural rights. If successful, societal law will have utilized the principles of justice, such as restitution to the victim and the placement of damage and harm back onto the offending individual, and this will provide a path back to enable social harmony, social cooperation, and peace. Peace is, of course, the goal of societal law as otherwise there will be a feud or war, if not now, then soon. Most human law is statutory, man-made, and politically inspired law that routinely violates natural law, natural rights, and divine law. This causes a lack of justice to be institutionalized which leads to a breakdown of social harmony, social cooperation, and peace. It is non-scientific, arbitrary law without truth, or logic behind it and without justice in mind. It

enshrines the errors of largely unprincipled politicians in the legal system and it is a disaster for mankind.

There is a lack of understanding of the purpose of government. Government has a non-exclusive delegation of authority from the citizens to function as the collective organization of the individual right to self-defense. Your author says, "non-exclusive," because the individual citizens retain the right to defend themselves, if necessary. The government cannot be everywhere at all places and times. The government workers, as agents of the citizen principals, do not have the right to violate rights. No one does. They must follow agreed upon and reasonable due process rules to safeguard the natural rights of the citizens. The government legislatures must realize that the laws they pass should be few and with the purpose of government in mind. Any laws they pass are subject to both divine law and natural law. To the extent that government tries to do things it cannot and should not do, and to the extent that the government becomes large, costly, and bureaucratic, the government itself becomes an instrument of, now institutionalized, injustice.

Men all over the world, including their established religions, reject the two Jehovahs and their divine law. They do this at their peril. The purpose of divine law is to show man what is right and what is wrong and in doing so it establishes societal norms. If mankind did not reject the two Jehovahs, particularly the Israelites, life would have been a lot better for all of mankind. The rejection of divine law will only be allowed for a relatively short time longer. After Jesus Christ returns to the earth (Revelation 19) all nations will be expected to ultimately learn and live by divine law. Any nations and their citizens who do not, will be punished:

“And it shall be, everyone who is left of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem [the survivors of the end-time judgments, plagues, wars, etc.] shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. And it shall be, whoever will not come up from all the families of the earth to Jerusalem to worship the King, Jehovah of hosts, even on them shall be no rain. And if the family of Egypt does not go up, and nor come in, they shall have no rain, but the plague with which the LORD shall strike the nations who do not come up to keep the

Feast of Tabernacles. This shall be Egypt's offense, and the offense of all the nations who do not come up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles [as a concrete example of divine law]."  
Zechariah 14:16-19, MKJV

The principles behind divine law will be taught and people will develop their judgment in applying them to the dynamic situations they experience from living life. In your author's opinion the priests will be instructed to not fall into the trap of only being what amounts to glorified Metaphor Men. Instead they themselves will understand natural law and natural rights and they will teach principles and core values to mankind. They will find techniques and methods to teach people with different learning styles, helping those with an anti-conceptual learning style to, nevertheless, get the main points of the divine law and to apply these core principles in their own lives. The priests will teach the holy versus the profane and help men learn to live holy lives; all the while keeping in mind that mankind is God's workmanship (Ephesians 2:10). Whether people initially appreciate the wisdom of divine law or not, they can at least understand and acknowledge the very simple doctrine of original appropriation which gives the two Jehovahs

permanent ownership and control of the entire universe. Since we are guests in their universe we should abide by and respect their divine law.

The mentality of tribalism has allowed for anti-conceptual, action-oriented Attila the Huns to emerge as warrior leaders and for anti-conceptual, wish-oriented, intuitive Witch Doctors to come together into a proto-typical tribal leadership team. This tribal leadership team has spiritually, mentally, and physically led men to their deaths, or to a greatly diminished existence on this earth. Actual tribalism destroys tribe members and fellow tribes, as there never is real peace - only an interlude before the next war. Even worse, the modern-day intellectual tribal mentality puts sophisticated weaponry in the hands of intellectual and ethical infants. The tribal mentality is an unmitigated disaster for men made in God's image and a chief cause of destructive wars with all their attendant effects.

In times past, a society with an active king (non-figurehead) is usually a feudal society that was structured for military activity, i.e., war. Historically, there was even a war season where men were fodder for kings' delusions of grandeur. In such a society there was a

bifurcation of men where most men were serfs living on, most likely, someone else's land. All of this was a violation of virtually all men's natural rights. The war society led to big government and rationalizations for big government from men who wanted to endear themselves to the king in the hopes of becoming one of his advisors, or perhaps THE advisor. Machiavelli redefined virtue and morality so that a king (prince) could expand his power and state any way he thought best. The king, who issued laws, became above the law. Natural law and divine law were no longer any check against the abusive growth of state power. Without natural law and without divine law there simply is no check against institutionalizing injustice – so the lack of justice becomes widespread.

The growth of state power led to the king overspending and this led to the creation of a private central bank in England, since followed in most parts of the world. The private central bank was granted the power to create money and lend it to the king. All of the king's receipts, including tax revenues, were pledged against the repayment of the debt. Even worse, since in a feudal society all land was beholden to the king and so were the citizens, the king pledged the land and lives and liberties of his citizens to

the royal bankers, and this included the citizens' posterities (children). The citizens then found themselves in the position of being co-sureties for a debt that can never be repaid. They further found themselves as de facto trustees over what should have been their own income and property – trustees for the benefit of the king's creditors. Sir William Blackstone gave the example that a citizen, if he had to pay 50% of his income to the government, in order for the government to pay interest and any principal on the debt, was basically working most of the time for the creditors of the government. The government creditors, with control of the money and banking systems in hand, then insisted on a remake of the legal system for the benefit of themselves. This remake of the legal system naturally favored creditors over debtors, which effectively gave them control over all of the land and even over the citizens themselves. No doubt there are also likely agreements, kept private between the government creditors and the king/ government, which will never see the light of day and which make perpetual this evil system of human enslavement and confiscation of property. Some of these evil government creditors likely work directly with Satan (Ephesians 6:12 and 2 Corinthians 4:4), as they certainly are not on the two Jehovahs' team.

Cleverly written commercial laws are crafted, with legal lexicon definitions hidden, or difficult to find, in order to obfuscate what has happened. All of these things are a universal denial of life, liberty, and property to the average man – who has been betrayed by his own government, which was supposed to protect its citizens' natural rights. This universal, almost unchecked, institutionalized denial of natural rights is a perpetual lack of justice and it is making living a good life almost impossible for the average man. The governmental leadership team members, who sold the average man out, work together to derive special benefits for themselves that are denied to the average man.

Your author speculates that this perverse legal system could be used in an implementation of the mark of the beast system mentioned in Revelation 13. Time will tell.

What is without doubt is that the two Jehovahs have painted the men and institutions behind this system with divine radar and they are as good as dead (Isaiah 28:15-18).

The role of a king will be changed to be more like that of a judge. The king-judge will judge

by core logical, just, and true ethical principles. War will not be taught any longer. Societies will not be structured for war (Isaiah 2:2-4). They cannot learn war any longer because **there is no social theory of violence**, nor can there ever be. Violence is a “might makes right” and “the winners write the history” mentality. This mentality leads to war, which results in death, slavery, and the destruction of property. In short, the war mentality and resulting violence results in hell on earth or wherever violence is initiated. The king will still, when necessary, function as a glorified Garbage Man taking out the human trash, but the king will not lord it over people as human governments do now:

“But Jesus called them together and said, “You know that in this world kings are tyrants, and officials lord it over the people beneath them. But among you it should be quite different. ...” Matthew 20:25, 26, NLT

“... My rulers shall never again oppress My people. ...” Ezekiel 45:8, MKJV

Of course the people need to change and become righteous themselves. The Bible foretells a time when the people will cooperate with the two Jehovahs, i.e., actually paying

attention to divine law and changing for the better.

“Your people will all do what is right, And will possess the land forever. I planted them, I made them, To reveal my greatness to all.”  
Isaiah 60:21 TEV

Ayn Rand astutely observed and commented, (in your author’s paraphrasing words): There is no escape from justice. In point of fact, nothing can be unearned and unpaid for in the universe. And nothing includes both in terms of matter and in terms of spirit. Fortunately, Jesus Christ’s creation of the universe and his sinless life, sacrificial death, and resurrection have qualified him to rule, having paid the full price, as Lord of lords and King of kings forever (Ephesians 3:9 and Revelation 17:14 and Revelation 5:12). And so as his government extends and expands there will finally be justice.

“Of the increase of his government and **peace there shall be no end**, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, **and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever**. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.”  
Isaiah 9:7, TEV