



# LAW IN FOCUS



# LAW IN FOCUS

## An Objective Look At "Common Law"

by R Duey & Ben Williams

**T**HE object of this essay is to present an argument for single-mindedness in Christendom regarding the subject of law. The ground covered will include the Common Law, the U. S. Constitution, and God's LAW (The LAW contained in the collected books of the Bible).

In society, law is of the highest importance. All Godly societies organize, sensible bodies of law apprehensible to the average citizen that enables the society, as a whole, to function like a well-oiled machine. God's law accomplishes this. A religion or culture that does not recognize God's law relies upon nothing more than a mystical fantasy. Without God's LAW a society dies. When civilizations are in crisis it is because their law is failing them. Everything comes down to law.

### COMMON LAW

Let us begin with the legal system known as the Common Law. The COMMON LAW is perceived, in certain circles, especially in patriot circles, as a kind of savior from a bygone era when men were of sound minds and made wise laws that were designed to promote the welfare of the people and perpetuate the health of the society. It is thought that back in the hazy mists of the dim past people were all of one mind, all pulling together, one for all and all for one. If we could just somehow get back to that benign body of law our ancestors had centuries ago, we could find the strength to raise ourselves up from our sickbed and confront this inexplicable malaise that has gripped the soul of the West. So the logic goes ... "It pleases me to dream of some planet where a dynasty of wise rulers, escaping religious distractions and civil strife, establish responsible government ... where judicial discretion, doing its best to be impartial, is not hampered at every

*turn by the meddling of partisan statutes with their crude remedies of contrary excess, first one way and then the other, for the grievances of successive generations; where nobody pretends to be infallible, and honest mistake is not censured, but rather obstinate refusal to acknowledge and repair it; where Orders in Council carefully framed by servants of the state with the best skill available and after all due consultation, and operative by an inherent authority which has never been necessary to dispute, provide for most administrative needs; where commissions of inquiry are a serious and judicial preparation for action; where matters of principle are gravely and fruitfully discussed in an assembly whose considered opinion is the law of the realm; and where formal legislation, ...is an exceptional solemnity."* (3. pg 667)

Nice dream. That is a pretty good distillation of spoken and unspoken thoughts the likes of which I've heard many times from patriots. Many patriots assume Common Law to be somehow attached to Constitutional Law. "Getting back to the Constitution" is then the hope and cry of most patriots. They hope they can find a realization of this kind of dream in Common Law. Is that hope realistic?

The fact is, the concept of Common Law comes down the centuries to us from England, for the most part. English Common Law was primarily judicial in origin, being the result of court rulings. The other source of Common Law was the decrees of English kings, Edward The First being a notable example.

In contrast, Civil Law derived mainly from the old Roman law, and was legislative in origin, issued from legislative bodies. Early on, it was the dominant law on the Continent.

However, the "common law" (the

king's law) became "common" in that it began to be applied everywhere in the realm. It became higher than local legislative laws. Through a process of many years, the body of law issuing from judges and kings (edicts) increased its reach until, ... "Eventually, this legal system prevailed over the realm sufficiently to justify its description as the common law." (2.pg 116)

England, a thousand years ago, was a feudal society. Each baron, duke or other fiefholder had a great deal of autonomy. They were all little kings with their own little kingdoms, and they made their own laws. In most matters, feudal law from fief to fief was fairly consistent. If you were apprehended in the act of thievery, you could be sure you were going to be punished, but the punishments could vary considerably. Methods of corporal punishment, tolls to be exacted for passage over bridges or roads, feudal dues and privileges, etc, varied from place to place.

### EDWARD I

In the England of Edward I, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the royal power was not the overwhelming master it later came to be. There was a great, continuing struggle going on between the Crown and its competition for power ... mainly the nobility. The growth of Common Law was concurrent in this struggle, its enactments being waymarks along the road.

The Common Law is also called "the kings law," a fact that might surprise many patriots today. "*The Common Law developed with the growth of the centralized royal power in England*" (Encyclopedia Americana, 1988). It would be easy to underestimate the significance of this statement and difficult to understand the Common Law without it.

Edward I of England (reigned 1272-1307) is known as the English Justin-

ian, referring to Edward's reputation as a lawgiver. Justinian had been the Byzantine lawgiver/codifier of the sixth century AD. Edward Jenks uses this familiar analogy in his work titled *Edward I, The English Justinian*. Edward and Justinian were functional counter parts, even though they lived six hundred years apart. They did the same thing: they both took giant steps in the creation of the law codes of their respective civilizations; steps that notably increased the power of their central governments.

"*The full, harmonious splendor of the Roman ideal of citizenship was to be found in the Corpus Juris of Justinian,...*" (4. pg 43). Justinian and Rome were considerably more advanced than were Edward and England. "...*The modern conception of law, as the command of sovereign authority, to be obeyed as such, regardless of its inherent virtue or vice, was a concept from the medieval ideas of Europe*" (same). But time would bring about the same conditions in England that had obtained in the Mediterranean world in the sixth century. The momentum of government was on its collision course with the natural world.

The Justinian legal system had been developing for many centuries. As it developed it grew further and further from the law given to their ancestors. It "sat in the seat of Moses," usurping authority, robbing its subjects of their freedom and substance.

The law of Edward The First was different only insofar as it was immature. Both systems applied to all within the claimed jurisdiction; both were "common law."

## IS COMMON LAW INVIOLETE?

The Common Law is not a certain section of ancient British law, as may be thought. For those with little grounding in the history of those times legislative charters like the Magna Carta is often confused with Common Law. This confusion probably stems from the desire to magnify the principles of the Great Charter out of proportion both in their own time as well as their relationship to the events that precipitated the birth of the govern-

ment of the United States of America in the late eighteenth century. The importance of the Magna Carta is easy to exaggerate because of the prominent position it occupies in American education and lore. American children are told that our government is based on its principles because it is easier to tell them this than to tell them the truth.

The truth is that the Magna Carta was more a treaty than anything else. It was a temporary settlement of one skirmish in the war between the nobility and the Crown (Edward's grandfather, King John). It was much like the Constitution of the United States in that it was an agreement between certain powerful men who lived at a certain time under certain conditions. Without the military defeat of John the Magna Carta would never have existed. As soon as the military eased its grip on the Crown, John disregarded the principles of the Charter.

Neither the Magna Carta nor the U.S. Constitution can be construed as binding on all posterity forever simply because they live in the same land (Lysander Spooner).

We often hear that the constitutional government was designed with built-in limitations and balances of power, and that the Constitution provides chains to "bind down" the government. But, it must be understood that government and anything that would limit its growth and sovereignty are, according to John Locke, "at enmity," in a pure, unavoidable state of war that needs no formal announcement. One must overrule the other, and there is no permanent settlement of that struggle. Any formal treaty between them is just wishful thinking.

The Common Law never was the set of "good laws" that many people assume it was. It never was separate from the "bad laws." It was not a holy canon that provided peace and prosperity to England in contrast to the taxes, social injustice and military intimidation of the rulers. It was law that applied to everyone in England. And it evolved as the rulers changed.

Today, Common Law equates to central government. No one in their right mind should see promise in all the bad law contained in the Common

Law. Furthermore, any sorting out of the good from the bad would involve some standard of screening that would represent a higher law than the Common Law, and would, itself, become the new Common Law.

## ENGLISH COMMON LAW

Let us now turn from principles and philosophy and turn to specifics. Just what kind of laws are we talking about, here? What laws, for instance, did Edward I give to England?

One of the more well known of Edward's contributions to the common law of England was a project called the "Hundred Rolls." The Hundred Rolls was an attempt to sort out the confusing mess of "franchises" that had accumulated over the years.

A franchise in Edward's England was a special right or privilege that a particular noble had negotiated with his lord, such as an exemption from a certain tax. Or it may have been an exemption from particular military duties. These exemptions (special privileges) became more coveted as the feudal age matured. It may have been a right to exact a charge from tenants or fiefholders on a noble's land, a right to hunt here or there, etc.

Edward eliminated many of these and put many others on tentative footing by enforcing strict requirements for proof of former agreements, constituting a forceful assertion of royal authority, and increasing the royal income by eliminating many tax exemptions (4. pg 166). "The Hundred Rolls" was a part of the Common Law. It strengthened the Crown and its oppression of the English people.

## MERCHANT LAW

The "Statute of Merchants" was another of Edward's contributions to "Merrie England." This brilliant document made it possible to take a man's property away from him to pay his debts. The reason this bill came into being was to help foreign merchants encroach and establish a foothold in England where, supposedly, people had formerly escaped their foreign debts by simply not paying them. It is hard to say to what degree English-

man were not paying their foreign debts. There wouldn't have been many who even had the opportunity to deal with foreign merchants, and these would have been merchant types themselves for the most part. It was probably a small percentage who tried to escape debts by nonpayment. A local merchant couldn't very well expect to stay in business for long if he didn't pay his creditors. It would be a mistake to think it commonplace for Englishmen to refuse to honor contracts, but it wouldn't take many such cases to put foreign merchants off, and affect business on English shores. Therefore, Edward enacted the Law of Merchants because he "...saw that the future of England lay, not with the feudal landowner, but with the despised merchant." (4. pg 206)

Edward was smart to perceive that dealing with foreign merchants would be advantageous to the royal power in its constant struggle with the local feudal nobility. The merchants, weaker for the time being at least, promised revenue for royal coffers. Foreign merchants were not yet a powerful influence, and the nobility still was to a large degree, able to avoid royal plunder. Edward knew on which side his bread was buttered.

But the future need not lay with the merchants; it could be anything people made of it. It is true that, even as early as the 13th century, it was apparent that the feudal principle of local self-sufficiency would succumb to the Crown's lust for profit from commerce; and that those engaged in trade were a socially dominant, talented lot with the potential to effect great changes in society. So Edward presumptuously began to identify the interests of England with the interests of the Crown, and he didn't care that the commercial world would compromise the economy of his people.

## **KINGS MAKE LAWS TO GARNER REVENUE**

Clearly, Edward was concerned only with revenue. What interested him was what was good for the Crown - for his system. Merchant law had existed for centuries, even millennia. It had nothing to do with God's LAW.

This is the system that Edward chose. It became the Common Law.

Edward made many other contributions to the Common Law, as did other monarchs and English judges. To make the point that the Common Law contained some better ideas would take an exhaustive study and is not necessary. What little good that can be cited is greatly overshadowed by the bad.

Lawyers – the fifth horseman of the apocalypse – developed with the Common Law. Obviously, the Common Law is not the only law system that spawned these opportunistic leeches, but the fact that their existence was not naturally averted by the Common Law reveals its true nature. Lawyers were very functional cogs in the machine. *This creative dialectic, working on a still fresh and plastic material, is what we find..., not official or formal records ... but notes of young lawyers keen on learning the business. They cared very little who the parties were, and less about the end of the case. Good pleading was their ambition; the art which commanded the approval of the court and the confidence of the clients, and might lead them one day to be sarjeants [sic] themselves...*" (3. pg 24)

Police – the sixth horseman of the apocalypse. In the Statute of Westminster, Edward, in 1285, enhanced the principle of allegiance to the state, or in this case, the Crown. Three duties were imposed on all Englishmen: 1. report all felonies to authorities, 2. assist in the watch (nightly watchmen duties, mainly in the cities; necessary because policies of the Crown had dislocated a whole class of beggars who had no means of subsistence) and 3. to arm and present themselves twice yearly for inspection (presumably to officers of the Crown). The first requirement made all Englishmen spies and all three make them policemen. Joe Stalin would have understood.

Egon Bittner has more to say on police in the Common Law in *The Functions of Police in Modern Society*: "Now the flow of business in the criminal courts is virtually completely supplied by the police. According to

*the Common Law, judges were not obliged, nor were they entitled, to inquire how the police acquired their business in the first place. That is, how the police learned about a delict [offense against the law], how he apprehended the culprit, and how he collected evidence to support his allegation had no bearing on the subsequent trial. While no judge would allow that a defendant be compelled to testify against himself at his trial, he cared not what a policeman did to obtain the evidence as long as there were no compelling reasons for assuming that it might be false in substance"* (5. pg 24).

Again, it is not necessary to undertake a penetrating or across-the-board analysis of Common Law to dispatch it as unworthy of the attention of those searching for a system of law that will produce a wholesome society. In response to the charge that this indictment is shallow and incomplete, I say that it is characteristic. Common Law had its good points and bad points, with the bad steadily overcoming the good as it developed over the centuries into a system of law designed to promote the permanent and complete dominance of central government over its subjects. To yearn for the Common Law is no different from enthusiastically embracing a U.S. President because at one time, long ago, he was less spoiled, and still has a few good points even today.

## **COMMON LAW = MAN'S LAW**

The concept of the Common Law as something healthier, more conducive to freedom, etc, is an illusion born of dissatisfaction. The Constitution of the United States has substantial roots in the Common Law, but that hasn't prevented the growth of a terrible central government here. The Common Law is just another example of a body of law morphing from freedom to slavery; from the simple, limited rules of a small, natural society to the gigantic, complex legal system used by the Beast to control the masses.

It is a mistake to see any system of man's law as static, because whenever we create law we create the ap-

paratus of government with it. This apparatus of offices, authorities, venues, privileges, etc., draws the morally lowest elements to it, who begin to shape the law of the land to advance their own interests. An honest man has no interest in having power over his neighbors. Power over other men can serve no honest interests. Criminals flock like crows around the apparatus of government power.

## THE CONSTITUTION

From the Common Law we move now to the United States Constitution.

By the 18th century, western thought had degenerated so far from Christian thinking that it was possible to speak and write from positions of power and prestige that God is dead and Man is good, without having to fear loss of credibility. Both ideas were crucial to the development of works such as the U.S. Con and similar others, even as radical as the program of the Illuminati, organized in the same year as the U.S. Con.

Freemasonry has never come right out and plainly stated that God is dead, but it is a simple thing to establish that the “god” they refer to is actually “Force” emanating from Man himself. But the idea that Man is intrinsically good and perfectible is one of the central ideas in modern thought firmly embraced by the deliberative bodies which formulate constitutions. The argument that the U.S. Con contains concrete and respectable references to God is vaporous, as will now be shown.

For years I’ve heard that the U.S. Con was derived from the LAW of the Bible; that it was the same thing, in slightly different form, etc. About five years ago I finally sat down and compared the two to see if there was any substance to this assertion I’d taken for granted for years. The following is what I found.

Article I of The U.S. Con deals with the Congress of the United States. Can the Congress be construed to be consonant with God’s LAW? Of course not.

The congress is a government apparatus within which men “sit in the seat of Moses” and make law. But God

forbids man from making law. The law is already made and it’s good. Furthermore, men have no talent at making law and, therefore, shouldn’t. Article I, therefore, can be dispatched as inconsistent with God’s LAW.

Article II deals with the executive branch of government and the President. God’s law has no provision for a president. At times our ancestors, because of their disobedience, sought after kings to rule them, as in historical Britain and parts of Europe. But these were never condoned. With Jesus as our King there is no other. Good-bye, Article II.

Article III concerns the judicial branch of government. But, Israel’s judicial apparatus was a system of elders who served as judges: men who were generally recognized as being faithful and wise, with understanding of God’s LAW and how to apply it. They had no salary, no tenure, no retirement, no power of enforcement. They were simply called when needed, to hear problems and disputes. They would then make application of God’s Law. This system bears no resemblance whatever to the judicial branch of Article III of the U.S. Con. Good-bye, Article III.

Article IV of the U.S. Con is an assortment of four sections involving the interface of the Federal Government with States’ governments, admission of new States, and state representation at the federal level. To begin with, the concept of “State,” as embodied in the U.S. Con, is an alien form of central government that is naturally at enmity with God’s LAW.

Secondly, the “republican form of government” guaranteed to all the states, and so highly esteemed in so many circles today, is not a Biblical form of government. From the outset it is a governmental concept which turns men into gods (rulers, lawmakers, and law changers). The Biblical form of government precludes men from such powers. The “State” and Republicanism are inconsistent with God’s LAW. Good-bye, Article IV.

Article V is a description of the process for amending the U.S. Con. In addition to its being contrary to God’s LAW, it is irrelevant to this discussion.

Articles VI and VII are composed

of disjointed, unrelated items which have no similarity to God’s LAW.

That is the Constitution of the United States. Seven articles. None of it is compatible to God’s LAW.

Articles I through VII are followed by the amendments to the U.S. Con, the first ten being called the “Bill of Rights.” Amendments one, regarding freedom of religion; two, regarding the right to keep and bear arms; and four, regarding regulation of search and seizure can be construed to be compatible with freedom. But it makes little sense to talk about rights in relation to the Beast. The U.S. Con created a Beast and, as a wishful afterthought, attempted to mitigate its effect. And that’s giving them the benefit of the doubt. More likely, they did it to mollify a sceptical public and to disguise their true motives.

## THE POLITICAL HAND IS QUICKER THAN THE PUBLIC EYE

At any rate, it can readily be seen that the U.S. Con is not a godly document. The intellectual mindset of the “Founding Fathers” could hardly have been expected to produce a Christian formula for governance that would provide for the application of the LAW of the Bible.

Bible LAW doesn’t first create a Beast System to contend with. Therefore, Bible LAW doesn’t have to deal with the frivolous concept of enumerating certain “rights” (i.e., licenses) of people, which “rights” the Beast government claims to protect ... as imagined by constitutionalists. What can be said about a document involving man-made law and Beast-type powers capable of any possible eventuality that men can imagine?

To push a little further, what of the whole theory of constitutions? Consider what is not said, and compare it to what is said. It becomes clear that they are more remarkable for what they don’t say than for what they do. It’s almost like a trick, where the magician waves his hand at you, ostentatiously displaying an apple, an orange and a peach, raving about how you can have these beautiful fruits, all the while he’s taking all the other fruits in the world

from you.

Our “founding fathers” told us that “...to secure these unalienable rights, governments are created among men, deriving their powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it ....” “Sure! Could they really have been serious about that?”

Edward Jenks made a particularly astute comment about the intrinsically deceptive nature of constitutions: “It must be a poor ingenuity that cannot find a loophole of escape from a written document, .... it is an apparently curious but perfectly well-established fact that the personal safety of the average man, and his chances for obtaining evenhanded justice, are greater in those countries in which these elementary rights are taken for granted, than in those in which they are granted by solemn constitutional documents” (4. pg 106).

America and, in general, the west, in the 18th century was being tricked into thinking that “elementary freedoms” could be “granted by governments.” Rights are grants or licenses given by higher powers to those of lower status. So we need to ask ourselves when it was that someone talked us into thinking that “rights” were “freedoms.” A free man needs no rights. Only slaves need rights given to them by their masters.

So we see that it was never the intention of the writers of the western constitutions to honor our freedom. Rather, it was their intention to merely enumerate some “rights” (grants) to whitewash a document, the real weight and momentum of which could only enslave those whose misfortune it would be to live under it.

Constitutions are simply tricks. The idea is to, by manipulation of words, make people think you’re giving something to them when what you’re really doing is planning to take everything from them. “We’re not going to beat you up and take your lunch money anymore. We’re going to show you how it’s to your advantage to give it to us voluntarily.” In the 18th century, men’s skepticism of any

government reached the point where they had to be deceived into accepting a new one. A thousand years of feudalism and monarchies had made men gun shy of government. Constitutions were just the thing to make them feel comfortable again.

The extent of the duplicity of the framers of the U.S. Con is difficult to determine. It is possible to be innocently under the influence of dangerous ideas, to unwittingly use them for harm while intending good. The Masonic lodges, for example, are a vast pool of floating human resources, monitored through a peephole by unscrupulous men looking for their own kind. When found, they are moved up, given more authority until they reach their level. The average mason is too naive to go far. However, a few rise to the top and become accomplished villains.

How far did George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and the others go? Pretty far. How much did they understand about the nature of government? Enough to pilot a fledging nation into a state of slavery to serve their interests. We do know that they gave us a document for governance that would, ipso facto, produce a Beast central government as surely as storm clouds produce the rain.

## **MAN’S GOVERNMENT OR GOD’S GOVERNMENT?**

I don’t know about any other people in this world, and frankly, at this point, I’m not much burdened but for my Christian brethren who have a covenant relationship with God. Neither the Common Law nor the United States Constitution, nor any other man-made system of law will do. The era of men making their own law must end. Our people must wake up to this fact. Hopefully, this won’t take too long, but realistically, there isn’t much reason for optimism. It is difficult for individuals to admit they’re not very good at something, let alone for a whole people to admit they’ve utterly failed at something as basic as making law and governing themselves.

Everyone in the Patriot Movement today has some sense of the fact that we are in trouble. This essay is ad-

ressed primarily to the Christian elements because they at least have a basic understanding that our problems are connected to our disobedience to God ... although many, if not most of them, have yet to take the next step and realize that it is the LAW of God that we’ve disobeyed, and that solutions to our problems begin with this realization. Sadly, we’ve probably let things get so far out of control that, even with our best efforts, we’ll never put Humpty Dumpty back together again. What we have to do cannot be done without God’s intervention. That is what I, personally, believe, and is one of the main premises of this essay.

The question is, if we can’t do this without God’s intervention, how do we go about getting it? The answer is, the same way as always – repentance and obedience to His LAW. There is nothing novel or complicated about it.

There are some who have begun to understand this, but I still read statements like: “...those two strongholds of American freedom, the first and second amendments to the Constitution ....”

“...those Christians who are fulfilling their Second Amendment rights for the citizen’s militia.”; and, “...we need to bring America back to a Christian Republic!”

I wince when I hear this noise.

There is the common presumption among Christians and others that the LAW of the Bible is obsolete, inadequate, incomplete, not suited for the modern world. As for the LAW being incomplete or inadequate, this idea stems mainly from a misunderstanding of it. God’s LAW is not what people today typically expect of a system to live by. It nearly eliminates all visible government, a condition particularly difficult for people to deal with, especially after becoming addicted to human governments for centuries.

But the idea that God’s LAW is incompatible with the modern world is probably correct. We can have one or the other, but not both. For many centuries now, basking in the heady feeling of being our own gods, when faced with the choice between our own “creativity” or God’s LAW, we have consistently chosen wrong. One of the

major premises of this essay is that it is time to reverse this trend.

For instance, if modern banking practices or real estate practices are not compatible with the LAW, we must throw them out and keep the LAW. If the entertainment business can't conform to the LAW, we must discard it. If baseball and hot dogs can't measure up, they go too. If we have to wash clothes in the stream again, wear hobnail boots and ride horses again, live out our lives without traveling abroad again, birth our own children and bury our own dead again, give up the TV, the telephone and computer again, then so be it.

I don't know which of these things will be necessary, but if they all are, then that's the way it has to be. We have to kill this Beast and it is probably going to require some radical measures to do it.

## WE NEED GOD TO PROTECT US

It is important to be very clear about one thing. From the beginning: this will be no partial return to the LAW. God's LAW is not something to be implemented in conjunction with the U.S. Con or the Common Law or anything else. Christian leaders are either going to have to stop trying to strike compromises with the devils of the Beast System, or stop masquerading as Christian leaders. There is only one LAW for Christians. The time for double-mindedness is over.

All Israel who are avowedly Christian, are in a permanent covenant relationship with God. Our part of the agreement is to follow His LAW; His part is to protect us from human stupidities ... including our own. Pound for pound, we could never hold our own against powers which are organized to be gigantic instruments of war. When we follow the LAW, we become invulnerable to these powers; when we don't, they have a field day with us.

It takes faith in God for Israel to get past this point. There is always that point at which our disobedience causes God to withhold His protection. It is fear of what might happen when our eyes get opened that causes governments to arm themselves permanently

and install draconian laws to insulate themselves against the public ... like the heathen nations around us.

Followers of Christ are not to have a permanent professional military. God knows the tremendous waste of life and resources that comes to those societies obsessed with ravaging and pillaging other nations until war becomes a way of life. God gave us the LAW to prevent us from participating in that mindset. And if we are faithful to God's Law He will not allow that to happen to us in this world.

Our position today, whether we admit it or not, is that we are in a war. The Beast is waging war against us. The only way to emerge triumphantly from this life-and-death struggle is to obey God's LAW; to fulfill our part of the covenant so He can fulfill His part which is to protect and prosper us. It is a matter of faith, which is exactly the way God wants it to be. And this is the way it was for Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all our ancestors.

Moses stated it perfectly for all our people to hear and understand.

4. *Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as Yahweh my God commanded me, that you should do so in the land where you go to possess it.*
6. *Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.*
7. *For what nation is there so great, who has a God so close to them, as Yahweh our God in all that we call upon Him for?*
8. *And what nation is there so great, that has statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?*

Dt. 4:4-8

15. *See, I have set before you this day life and good, and death and evil;*
16. *In that I command you this day to love Yahweh your God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments, that you may live and multiply: and Yahweh your God shall bless you in the land where you go to possess it.*

Dt.30:15-16

Only God can make war with the Beast. We, on our own, cannot. Christ knew what would happen if we obeyed Him. It would lead us into serious conflict with the Beast System because it is at war against God's law.

There is no way to effect such a radical transformation of society as Christianity demands without disobeying the Beast's laws. But if obedience to God's LAW puts us in jeopardy of the Beast's retribution, that's the way it has to be. That is our part of this struggle.

19. *But Peter and John answered and said to them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken to you more than to God, judge you.*

Acts 4:19

Christians are in a state of paralysis today. To some it may appear that we are making strides forward, but it is an illusion. Some see that there are problems, and that the system itself is becoming decrepit. But this is not due to an awakening. Rather it is the result of ineptitude and carelessness within the System. We have done very little if anything for ourselves.

Most of what the Freedom Movement does is criticize the Beast. They march, demonstrate, lecture, pamphleteer, and write books about what awful people our enemies are. It is one thing to see the problem, but quite another thing to find a remedy. Speeches, protests, and appeals to the Beast have gotten us no where. Churches, preachers, politicians, and patriots actually serve the Beast.

God's LAW is the only right remedy. When we finally realize that fact and set to work on it, the Beast will fade away.

It all comes down to whose law you want. Whoever makes your law is your god. Followers of Christ honor God's LAW. It can't be any other way.

### References:

1. *Encyclopedia Americana, 1988*
2. *History of England, W.E. Lunt, 1928*
3. *The Genius of the Common Law, Sir Frederick Pollock, 1912*
4. *Edward I, the English Justinian, 1902*
5. *Functions of the Police in Modern Society, Egon Bittner*