

## THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS

There is a widely held belief today that the f-ing fathers founded the United States of America on the Christian religion. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is also believed our nation has gotten away from the “intent” of the f-ing fathers and we need to get back to the “Judeo-Christian heritage” they wanted us to have. Some go as far as to claim God inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It is also commonly thought that at least most of the f-ing fathers were born-again Christians. And when today’s Christians tell you they think most of the f-ing fathers were Christians, they pause as if they think what they just said is either impressive in its own right or is somehow relevant. They want you to assume the f-ing fathers were the same kind of Christian you are and had the same political agenda you do – just because they were “Christians.” Do not assume anything.

The fact is the f-ing fathers did not put much stock in what you and I think of as Christianity; they despised “enthusiasm.” Like any Enlightened gentleman worth his salt, they abhorred “that gloomy superstition disseminated by ignorant, unenlightened preachers” and looked forward to the day when “the phantom of religious dark will be dispelled by the rays of Science and the bright charms of rising Civilization.” It is easy to pick on Jefferson because – no matter how many Christian schools have his picture up on the wall – he was the worst of the bunch. He hated enthusiastic Christianity as “an engine for enslaving mankind.” He was filled with impotent fury whenever some particularly Reasonable point he made was contradicted by a quote from Scripture. And Christians of the day returned Jefferson’s sentiments by variously calling him “infidel”, “anti-Christian”, and “Virginia Voltaire.” Remember, Voltaire was a militant deist. A *deist* subscribed completely to the ideas of the pagan Greek philosophers, and thought man’s Reason would teach him everything about religion, truth, and Nature’s god. Deists had a particular hatred for Christianity because of its belief that the Bible is a written revelation from God, and because the Bible is anti-Reason. That’s why deists like Voltaire and Thomas Paine actively campaigned against Christianity. Most educated leaders of society on both sides of the Atlantic were deists, including the first three U.S. presidents, Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. Most deists back then had been converted from Christianity to deism. A good example is Elihu Palmer, a former Presbyterian minister who converted to deism, became a great admirer of Thomas Paine, and an espouser of Morality as the new “Natural Bible” of society. Paine wrote, “The religion of deism is superior to the Christian Religion...[because] it is free of all the invented [doctrines of] the Christian religion. Its creed is pure and simple: it believes in a Supreme Being, and honors Reason as God’s gift to man by which he can know the goodness of the Creator displayed in the creation, and by which he avoids all beliefs founded on faith, and rejects, as the inventions of men, all books pretending to be divine revelation.” It was correctly said deism was but a step along the path to atheism.

Jefferson is an extreme example of the contempt with which most educated people viewed Christianity. The reason David Ramsay preferred Protestantism was it was “the best Erastian temple of Reason.” Even the Enlightened Puritan, John Adams, thought the common belief in the divinity of Christ was an “awful blasphemy” because it defied Reason and Science. In order to understand why a Puritan in a Christian society would say something like that you must understand that the educated men of that era *were true converts* of Reason and Natural Law; they *believed!* When Alexander Hamilton was asked by surprised Christians why he and the other f-ing fathers had not recognized God at all in the only official document that defines the government of the United States of America – the Constitution – he contemptuously dismissed them with a curt, “We forgot.” James Otis did not openly propose that it be made treason to believe in devils and spirits because he expected the other f-ing fathers to shower him with outraged opposition. I have never read anything that comes right out and states the opinion I am about to express, but based on what I know about people and history, I believe most of the f-ing fathers – because they really did believe in philosophy – agreed with Thomas Paine’s view that women and slaves should be liberated, and they agreed with James Otis’ view that enthusiastic Christianity should go away. And it wasn’t that they were renouncing “Christianity”, because most of them, as Rational Christians, had the same fervor toward their “Jesus” or “God” as Muslims have for “Allah.” But most of them were intellectually disdainful of *Biblical* Christianity because science was “proving” it to be obsolete; mankind had never, in any part of the globe, experienced such an explosion in knowledge and progress as had Western civilization when it embraced Reason and made it the dominant foundation of every facet of society. Most of them would have gone along with Paine and Otis and carried Jefferson’s gutted Bible if they didn’t think the moronic masses were too stupid and superstitious to understand. They well knew that several Greek philosophers had been executed for blasphemy against the gods because they let the masses know too much too soon. So the f-ing fathers were very careful.

Modern effeminate Christians who whitewash the sepulchers of the f-ing fathers are among the timid majority who follow the ignorant masses and idyllically stroll through this Christian warfare with smiles, “sharings”, “blessings”, soft hands, and lilting tones to their fair speech – as if Christianity were composed of faggots on a cake-walk instead of serious soldiers in a deadly war with numerous casualties.

It is also a common misconception that Article One in the Bill of Rights (“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...”) was merely intended to keep any specific Christian denomination from becoming the state denomination – like the Church of England was in Britain; and that Article One still intended that Christianity in general be the foundation of American government and society. That may be a popular viewpoint among ignorant pewsters and it may be a nice viewpoint but it is wrong. There are two Reasons Christians think the f-ing fathers wanted and tried to found a government and a society based on the Christian religion. I capitalized *Reasons* in the previous sentence because that popular Christian myth is based on nothing but the carnal mind. First, Christians in the Age of Reason have grown so Enlightened they think their opinions/what they want are so self-evidently what God wants that they no longer really pay attention to what the Bible actually says. And second, their hopes and dreams and prayers for a Christian nation cause them to ignore what the f-ing fathers *officially* said and did. The reason Christians so frequently drag out old unofficial remarks and parts of speeches made by the f-ing fathers that sound “Christian” is that’s all they’ve got! There was absolutely nothing, zero, zilch said or done in an official or legal capacity by the f-ing fathers suggesting they wanted a Christian nation. That’s why nothing the f-ing fathers said or did can be used by Christian legal groups and Christian political action groups to get Christianity and the Bible to be legally and officially authoritative in any governmental branch or court of law. Instead, they resort to playing politics and trying to get Christians motivated to vote and run for democratic office so the “moral

(!) majority” (not “Biblical majority”) can “put Christ back in Congress.” Christians also treat history the same way they treat Christianity: They hear or read a Christian-sounding quote of some f-ing father and assume it means *what they want it to mean*. They don’t realize the f-ing fathers were two-faced by saying “Christian” things to voters in public and then behind closed doors building a deliberately secular government and legal system. Hence, Christians think this country was – or was intended to be – founded on Christianity. That same carnal method of reaching conclusions is how Christians formulate their religious doctrine. Instead of studying and learning the Bible, they find some preacher or commentary or book or word definition from a Hebrew/Greek dictionary that supports what they already think is right. Once they’ve done that there is no need to go to the Bible because they just *know* God agrees with them *because they are honestly sincere*. That’s right; they actually think sincerity and fervency and honestly believing they are right lend credence to their ignorant opinions. And that’s why they are not *knowingly* wresting the Scriptures when they incorrectly use verses to “support” their position; they are just doing what they think is right. In other words, when they go to the word of God it is not in an effort to *find out* the truth – because they think they *already know* the truth. They go to the Bible to find *support* for *their* position. All denominations and cults do that. They are all sincere. They all believe they are right and they all believe God is on their side. And Nature’s God is on their side, but the true God of the Bible is not on anybody’s side: He’s waiting for people to be on *His* side. And anybody who does not know and submit to the Bible is not on His side.

So the benefit of Nature’s “God” is: All Enlightened people of all “faiths” all over the world can get together and agree on the self-evident “truths” of Natural religion such as: God wants us to love each other, cause pain to no one, live in peace and toleration, and be happy. That way “Allah” and “Jesus” and “Buddha” and “Baal” can all be worshipped as the “true God” with whatever trivial religious and denominational differences anybody wants – as long as they all agree on the “fundamentals.” And that reveals the problem with the Bible: The God of the Bible doesn’t care what you and I think or want; He doesn’t even want us thinking; He wants us to obey exactly what He dictates. He and His Book are so narrow and one-way that most people will take the broad path that leadeth unto destruction.

The f-ing fathers created absolutely nothing legal and official that states or implies the U.S. should be anything but *secular*. The reason they did it that way is *that’s exactly the way they wanted it!* And since that is what they wanted we know they were *at best* lousy Christians.

Because the American Revolution was dependent upon getting public support, the f-ing fathers did have to be careful with one document they created – the Declaration of Independence. Just as Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* made references to “the deity” as “God”, “the Almighty”, “Nature”, and “She” when appealing to the public for support, so, too, did the f-ing fathers have to court both Enlightened and enthusiastic patriots by using language both would think appropriate. Therefore when the relatively young, politically naïve, and overly idealistic Thomas Jefferson submitted a draft of the Declaration of Independence that had absolutely no reference to any deity of any kind, it was deemed prudent by some of the more politically-minded f-ing fathers to add four generic Thomas-Paine-like references to a deity to the document in order to garner the broadest possible support. The four politically-added references were “nature’s God” (the deity revealed by Nature’s Law of Reason), “Creator” (believing in a “creator” wouldn’t become the exclusive province of enthusiastic Christianity until the 20<sup>th</sup> century’s Scope’s monkey trial allowed public schools to Reasonably declare evolution a Scientific Fact and creationism an old myth), “the Supreme Judge of the world”, and “Divine Providence.” No Buddhists, Moslems, Hare Krishnas, or Freemasons would ever be offended by that because all of them could later claim the f-ing fathers intended their God to be the American God, and, as we shall see shortly, they have a much better claim than Christians do.

When John Adams, Ben Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson created the **Great Seal** of the United States of America they designed it to be a deliberate statement to the nation and to the world. The Great Seal is on the back of a U.S. dollar bill. The front of the Seal has a pyramid with the Enlightened eye as its chief corner stone, which was borrowed from the Egyptian all-seeing eye of the hawk god, Horus, a symbol of **knowledge**. Around the pyramid in Latin it says *Annuī Coeptis* and *Novus Ordo Seclorum*. *Annuī* means *approves* and is a verb without a subject, which suggests the Great Seal’s “Eye of Knowledge” or “Nature’s God of Reason” is the understood subject. *Coeptis* means *the beginning*. *Novus Ordo* is *new order*. *Seclorum* means *seculars*. (Recent claims that *seclorum* means “ages” have been rejected because they’d make the use of the word *seclorum* superfluous and unnecessary because “new order” and “new order of the ages” mean the same.) *Seclorum* also confuses people because it’s a plural modifier of the singular *order*. But the f-ing fathers’ use of a singular with a plural is explained by the Great Seal’s *E Pluribus Unum* (“From Many, One”). In sum, the singular-plural quote means: “Nature’s God of Reason approves the beginning of this new secular order/government formed from thirteen states.” (Some Christians, when you point to the Great Secular Seal, will indignantly argue the Latin word can’t mean *secular* because of the words *In God We Trust* on the dollar bill. That will be covered later because I want to keep things chronological, and *In God We Trust* wouldn’t show up until long after the f-ing fathers were moldering in their graves.) Because there was nothing unusual about another new nation, the dramatic and shocking revelation on the Great Seal was the word *secular*. Christians who try to convince the ignorant that the f-ing fathers wanted to create a Christian nation hate the Great Seal and never bring it up. But there is something else they ignore about the Great Seal – it is official. If you want to quote something *official* by the f-ing fathers in order to show their intent you need go no further than the Great Seal on a dollar bill.

On the back of the Seal the original bird was an Egyptian Phoenix (or it may have been a hawk) rising from the ashes of ancient Greece and Rome to create a modern nation in accordance with the principles of their philosophy. Later, when Franklin’s suggestion that the turkey be the national bird was rejected, the phoenix was changed to a bald eagle.

There were many, many things the f-ing fathers could have written on the Great Seal. Many ideas were considered but none was deemed as important as the revelation that they were creating a secular order. People around the world were growing accustomed to the fact that they had humanists, or to use the popular and redundant term, secular humanists, in their midst, but for a government to *officially* and *openly* exclude God from its affairs was blasphemy – and the Great Secular Seal would be affixed to all official government documents! No government in history had ever been Godless or godless before. Now that the Revolution was won the f-ing fathers were coming out of the closet, and from now on every *official* act they did would be carefully and deliberately secular. For political reasons they would continue to throw out a few “Christian” lines in an attempt to placate naïve pewsters – but *never* anything official.

The f-ing fathers hoped the fact that they were creating a secular government would impress the world’s Enlightened elite, mollify pagan nations traditionally at enmity with Christian nations, and at the very least produce neutral reactions from Christian nations because so many of them were also Enlightened.

### THE TRIPOLI TREATY

In some cases when dealing with other nations it was necessary for the f-ing fathers to emphasize the meaning of their “new secular order.” For example, when the U.S. Constitution was ratified in 1789, which made the new government officially secular, the new nation began the process of seeking diplomatic recognition from, and establishing diplomatic relations with, other nations of the world. Sometimes other nations were – for religious reasons – reluctant to enter into a treaty with a nation they considered to be Christian. The most famous example is the **Tripoli Treaty** of 1796. Tripoli (now called Libya) was a Mohammedan nation that, because Muslims had traditionally been enemies of crusading Christians, was reluctant to conclude a “Treaty of Peace and Friendship” with the (as they supposed) Christian United States. Because the government of Tripoli was *not* secular, their Arabic copy of the treaty continually mentions and glorifies their god, Allah. The Arabic copy of the Tripoli Treaty continually refers to the U.S. as “the American Christian nation”, and it refers to nations unfriendly with Tripoli as “Christian enemies.” In Article 3, for example, where the English says “citizens”, the Arabic copy says “American Christians.” And where the English says “an enemy”, the Arabic says “Christian enemies.”

The f-ing fathers wanted their new nation to be recognized as legitimate by other established nations. Tripoli was reluctant to do so. Therefore, in order to sweeten the deal the f-ing fathers agreed to the Bey’s demands (!) that he be given financial incentive (Article 10) and that his nation be given most favored nation trade status (Article 9). And, of course, there was the problem of Christianity. In an effort to reassure these suspicious Mohammedans (who found it hard to believe Christians would turn their backs on their God via a secular government) that they were not dealing with a Christian government, the f-ing fathers included the famous Article 11, which plainly and officially says, “the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.” Why do Christians ignore the Tripoli Treaty and the Great Secular Seal and instead turn to various unofficial remarks made by the f-ing fathers? Because they don’t like the fact that the Tripoli Treaty and the Great Secular Seal are *official*. The f-ing fathers carefully considered and carefully worded them because they were among their earliest official acts. I say again, if Christians do not like something in history or in the Bible *they ignore it!*

The Tripoli Treaty was made at the end of President George Washington’s term, discussed and ratified in person by our f-ing fathers in the Senate, who then advised the new president, John Adams, to sign it. When he signed it, President Adams ordered all U.S. citizens to faithfully observe every clause and article thereof! Read it for yourself, especially Articles 9 through 11 and the ratification’s executive order at the end (bold emphasis added):

*Treaty of Peace and Friendship, signed at Tripoli November 4, 1796 (3 Ramada I, A. H. 1211), and at Algiers January 3, 1797 (4 Rajab, A. H. 1211). Original in Arabic. Submitted to the Senate May 29, 1797. (Message of May 26, 1797.) Resolution of advice and consent June 7, 1797. Ratified by the United States June 10, 1797. As to the ratification generally, see the notes. Proclaimed June 10, 1797:*

### **Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the United States of America and the Bey and Subjects of Tripoli of Barbary.**

#### ARTICLE 1.

There is a firm and perpetual Peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Bey and subjects of Tripoli of Barbary, made by the free consent of both parties, and guaranteed by the most potent Dey & regency of Algiers.

#### ARTICLE 2.

If any goods belonging to any nation with which either of the parties is at war shall be loaded on board of vessels belonging to the other party they shall pass free, and no attempt shall be made to take or detain them.

#### ARTICLE 3.

If any citizens, subjects or effects belonging to either party shall be found on board a prize vessel taken from an enemy by the other party, such citizens or subjects shall be set at liberty, and the effects restored to the owners.

#### ARTICLE 4.

Proper passports are to be given to all vessels of both parties, by which they are to be known. And, considering the distance between the two countries, eighteen months from the date of this treaty shall be allowed for procuring such passports. During this interval the other papers belonging to such vessels shall be sufficient for their protection.

#### ARTICLE 5.

A citizen or subject of either party having bought a prize vessel condemned by the other party or by any other nation, the certificate of condemnation and bill of sale shall be a sufficient passport for such vessel for one year; this being a reasonable time for her to procure a proper passport.

#### ARTICLE 6.

Vessels of either party putting into the ports of the other and having need of provisions or other supplies, they shall be furnished at the market price. And if any such vessel shall so put in from a disaster at sea and have occasion to repair, she shall be at liberty to land and reembark her cargo without paying any duties. But in no case shall she be compelled to land her cargo.

#### ARTICLE 7.

Should a vessel of either party be cast on the shore of the other, all proper assistance shall be given to her and her people; no pillage shall be allowed; the property shall remain at the disposition of the owners, and the crew protected and succoured till they can be sent to their country.

#### ARTICLE 8.

If a vessel of either party should be attacked by an enemy within gun-shot of the forts of the other she shall be defended as much as possible. If she be in port she shall not be seized or attacked when it is in the power of the other party to protect her. And when she proceeds to sea no enemy shall be allowed to pursue her from the same port within twenty four hours after her departure.

#### ARTICLE 9.

The commerce between the United States and Tripoli, -the protection to be given to merchants, masters of vessels and seamen,- the reciprocal right of establishing consuls in each country, and the privileges, immunities and jurisdictions to be enjoyed by such consuls, are declared to be on the same footing with those of **the most favoured nations** respectively.

**ARTICLE 10.**

The money and presents **demanded** by the Bey of Tripoli as a full and satisfactory consideration on his part and on the part of his subjects for this treaty of perpetual peace and friendship are acknowledged to have been received by him previous to his signing the same, according to a receipt which is hereto annexed, except such part as is promised on the part of the United States to be delivered and paid by them on the arrival of their Consul in Tripoli, of which part a note is likewise hereto annexed. And no present of any periodical tribute or farther payment is ever to be made by either party.

**ARTICLE 11.**

**As the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion**, -as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselmen,- and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mehomitan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.

**ARTICLE 12.**

In case of any dispute arising from a notation of any of the articles of this treaty no appeal shall be made to arms, nor shall war be declared on any pretext whatever. But if the Consul residing at the place where the dispute shall happen shall not be able to settle the same, an amicable reference shall be made to the mutual friend of the parties, the Dey of Algiers, the parties hereby engaging to abide by his decision. And he by virtue of his signature to this treaty engages for himself and successors to declare the justice of the case according to the true interpretation of the treaty, and to use all the means in his power to enforce the observance of the same.

Signed and sealed at Tripoli of Barbary the 3<sup>d</sup> day of Jumad in the year of the Higera 1211-corresponding with the 4<sup>th</sup> day of Nov<sup>r</sup> 1796 by  
 JUSSUF BASHAW MAHOMET *Bey* SOLIMAN *Kaya*  
 MAMET *Treasurer* GALIL *Gen<sup>l</sup> of the Troops*  
 AMET *Minister of Marine* MAHOMET *Com<sup>l</sup> of the city*  
 AMET *Chamberlain* MAMET *Secretary*  
 ALLY-*Chief of the Divan*

Signed and sealed at Algiers the 4<sup>th</sup> day of Argib 1211-corresponding with the 3<sup>d</sup> day of January 1797 by  
 HASSAN BASHAW *Dey*

and by the Agent plenipotentiary of the United States of America

[Seal] JOEL BARLOW

[The "Receipt"]

Praise be to God &c –

The present writing done by our hand and delivered to the American Captain Obrien makes known that he has delivered to us forty thousand Spanish dollars, -thirteen watches of gold, silver & pinsbach,- five rings, of which three of diamonds, one of sapphire and one with a watch in it, -one hundred & forty piques of cloth, and four caftans of brocade,- and these on account of the peace concluded with the Americans.

Given at Tripoli in Barbary the 20<sup>th</sup> day of Jumad 1211, corresponding with the 21<sup>st</sup> day of Nov<sup>r</sup> 1796-  
 (Signed) Jussuf Bashaw – *Bey*  
 whom God Exalt

To all to whom these Presents shall come or be made known. Now Know ye, that I David Humphreys Commissioner Plenipotentiary aforesaid, **do approve and conclude the said Treaty, and every article and clause therein** contained, **reserving the same nevertheless for the final Ratification of the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate** of the said United States.

In testimony whereof I have signed the same with my Name and Seal, at the City of Lisbon this 10th of February 1797.

[Seal] DAVID HUMPHREYS

**THE UNITED STATES RATIFICATION AND PROCLAMATION**

It is under the Great Seal and is signed by Adams and attested by Pickering as Secretary of State; but before the testimonium clause is this paragraph of ratification and proclamation:

Now be it known, That I **John Adams, President of the United States of America**, having **seen and considered** the said Treaty do, **by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, accept, ratify, and confirm the same, and every clause and article** thereof. And to the End that the said Treaty may be observed and performed with good Faith on the part of the United States, I have ordered the premises to be made public; And **I do hereby enjoin and require all persons bearing office civil or military within the United States, and all others citizens or inhabitants thereof, faithfully to observe and fulfil the said Treaty and every clause and article** thereof.

All of the above is copied from:  
**Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America**  
**Volume 2: Documents 1-40 : 1776-1818**  
**Department of State**  
**U.S. Government Printing Office**  
**Washington, 1931**

Let me use the Tripoli Treaty as an example of how tradition-bound Enlightened Christians use the Bible. They have been taught in church that the f-ing fathers were good Christians who intended for the government to be based on Christianity. So they go looking not for the truth, but for snippets of information that seem to support their tradition. Alas and alack, unofficial stuff is all they can find. And when they read documents like the official Great Secular Seal and the official Tripoli Treaty, both carefully deliberated and written by the f-ing fathers themselves, they find they don't like the truth and are offended by the f-ing fathers' plainly-stated official position, so they reject the facts by either ignoring them with a who-knows-what-it-means? snappy little Pontius Pilate comeback, or by trying to excuse and explain them away. In other words, official U.S. Government documents penned personally by the f-ing fathers have no more authority than the authorized words of God when they differ from what Christians sincerely think is right and good. Christians in this Age of Reason are their own authority and will submit to neither official government documents nor the Bible when those sources are deemed offensive. That is one of the reasons I have gone to considerable trouble to go back to the beginning of history and put events into chronological perspective: I want people to see that all of this stuff verifies itself because it is so consistent with everything in history and in

## 5 H14 THE GOVERNMENT

the Bible. And I want them to see that if the f-ing fathers were good Christians they would have endorsed different preachers, read and enjoyed different authors and thinkers, would not have produced the Declaration of Independence, the Great Secular Seal, the Constitution, or the Tripoli Treaty, and would have been ostracized by the Enlightened elite of their day. If the f-ing fathers *had* wanted to use Christianity as some kind of foundation for government or society it would have been a glaring departure from their *philosophy* and it would have been inexplicably contradicted by their *actions*.

This official Tripoli Treaty undermines the modern political activism of Christian organizations today. They want people to think the f-ing fathers in some way founded our government on the Christian religion, that the f-ing fathers were good Christians, and that the original government of the f-ing fathers has been made secular by evil men hoping to subvert the “Judeo-Christian heritage” our f-ing fathers supposedly wanted us to have. In attempting to explain away the damning wording of Article 11, modern Christians point out the above is “only” the English translation of the treaty made on the scene by U.S. diplomat Joel Barlow, and as such it differs slightly from the wording of the Arabic translation. For example, the suspicious Arabs didn’t include Article 11 in their copy, and the Arab copy has many references to their deity that do not appear in the American copy. Politically motivated Christians hope you’ll not know the above Barlow translation is *the official copy* our f-ing fathers used because they couldn’t read the Arabic copy. The exact text above – including Article 11 – was read aloud in the Senate, all senators received a copy, and they read, accepted, approved, and – in a unanimous vote – ratified it. That’s why the above official text is recorded in the government’s volume of U.S. treaties. President Adam’s detailed wording of his ratification and proclamation is somewhat unusual and has caused some to think he was making an early point about Article 11 in the hope that Americans would follow their government’s lead by being more Enlightened and less religious. The above copy was published in all newspapers (as was common during the nascent period of the U.S.) and read by the populace with no outcry. Note: Before the U.S. f-ing fathers invented the blasphemy of secular governments it was customary for governmental documents to glorify the national deity. Therefore in America one or two pre-Constitution treaties did refer to our God, because they were concluded *before* our f-ing fathers had decided and agreed to create the world’s first secular constitution in 1789. After 1789, because of the Constitution and the Great Seal, any Article 11 clarification by the f-ing fathers about the secular nature of our government was redundant and unnecessary in any treaty or governmental document. The inclusion of Articles 9-11 suggests the Tripoli negotiations were unusually tough. At any rate the government never again felt the need to include clarifications about the secular nature of the U.S. government in our treaties – other than continuing to affix the Great Secular Seal to each and every official document to constantly make that point over the last two centuries!

Part of the problem Christians have is they don’t know what “the United States of America” meant back then. Sometimes it referred to the federal government and sometimes it referred to the thirteen sovereign nations that made up the United States. Each of the thirteen British colonies had its own charter from the king, drew up its own constitution, had its own government, and was separate from the other colonies. When those thirteen colonies declared and won their independence they became thirteen separate, independent, sovereign nations – also called “states.” In other words there were now thirteen more countries in the world. When the Declaration of Independence said “these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States” it correctly used the plural *States*. The American Revolution did not create a new nation state – it created thirteen of them.

When the f-ing fathers drew up the Constitution, therefore, they had a problem: They had to create a central *federal* government, which is defined – in accordance with the best democratic principles – as a central government that is separate from the individual governments of the separate states, and which derives its authority from the consent of those separate sovereign nations in order to administer the affairs of those states in accordance with their will by utilizing whatever powers are granted to it by those states. The f-ing fathers had to create a government that would be a servant to thirteen separate, sovereign masters – even though the Bible says no man can serve two masters. This central *federal* government would take care of the money, the military, and the diplomatic relations with other nations. But this federal government had no authority to influence the governments of the thirteen sovereign nations, which would draw up their own democratic constitutions and set up their own governments. Because the thirteen states were sovereign they could do whatever they wanted: If they wanted a state religion or denomination that was fine. And for that reason the federal government was to have absolutely nothing to do with religion at all because that bias might affect its dealings with the states or infringe upon their rights. The states were allowed to use superstitious, Dark Age enthusiastic religion if they wanted, but the federal government had to be run according to the pure unadulterated truth of Natural Reason. The f-ing fathers knew the majority of people in some states were very religious and were therefore likely to create state governments based on Christianity, and there was nothing they could do about it. But they could prevent those religious beliefs from contaminating the secularity of the Enlightened federal government. The U.S. Constitution prohibited any and all religions from influencing the federal government, just as philosophy prohibited any and all religions from influencing thought.

But the f-ing fathers went a step further to ensure that no religion would affect the federal government. Just as the Vatican, by creating the independent sovereign Papal States, ensured that the Italian government would have no jurisdiction over it, the f-ing fathers created a “zone of secularity” in which the secular federal government would reside. This “zone of secularity” was named the District (not *state/nation*) of Columbia. “Columbia” was a goddess modeled after the Roman and Greek gods and goddesses who symbolized this new secular philosophical order. The f-ing fathers took this step because they never wanted Maryland, which was Catholic, or Virginia, which was Episcopalian, to think they had any jurisdiction over Washington City (as it was called then) or over the secular District of the new goddess “Columbia” (who was named after the explorer who discovered the New World). The secular District of the goddess Columbia was not part of the nation of Maryland or the separate nation of Virginia. Those sovereign nations could rule their own cities any way they wanted but they couldn’t rule Washington City or the District of Columbia. That’s why – to this day – Washington D.C. rules itself – just as the Papal States are self-ruled.

The thirteen states were sovereign nations. They each even had their own national flags (which now no longer represent those states as nations because the states are no longer nations). Some of the thirteen nations, in fact, wrote impressive Christian constitutions. For example, in some states you had to be a church-going Christian in order to hold public office. In others the requirement was to be a born-again Christian, or you had to believe certain Bible doctrines, etc. Some states even collected taxes to support one denomination or another, and citizens were required to pay them whether they attended that denomination or not. The fact that Christians today do not understand the difference between the sovereign states and the federal government (at least the way it used to be), and the fact that a number of states and their laws used to be

Christian, have contributed to the misconception that the federal government was intended to be Christian. Even the states were never intended to be Christian – they were intended to be whatever they wanted to be.

Those thirteen sovereign nations sent their senators and congressmen – who by law might be Christians – to Washington City to represent their interests. But these Christians were required to figuratively check their Bibles and religious beliefs at the door of the secular District of Columbia (the District of Carnality) and only do business by using Reason. The f-ing fathers, in fact, were so paranoid about governmental affairs being contaminated by Christianity that – among other measures – they outlawed the position and office of chaplain anywhere within the realm of the goddess Columbia. The fact that you never heard any of this from your preacher means he either doesn't know it or he carnally rejects anything that contradicts that which rules his heart – tradition. Either possibility makes him a lousy preacher. But, you say, there is a third possibility: He knows all about this stuff and knows it is all incorrect or slanted information from biased or “revisionist” historians. If that is what you think, friend, it means the official, non-slanted, non-revisionist information you looked at on the back of a dollar bill didn't affect you at all. It means you are the problem with Christianity; you are a modern Pharisee. So do the world a favor – learn the Bible. And when you have learned from the Lord about authority, godly order, government, dominion, submission, and rebellion, you should then go to any set of encyclopedias or library and spend an afternoon looking all this up in whatever source you choose. You'll be as shocked at how easy it is to find this information as I was – it's not a secret. You'll find lots of info I could have added to this book. And as the years go by, you'll stumble across more stuff and be amazed at how obvious and consistent all of this is, and you'll start to get a little puffed up with pride and look down your nose at Christians who are like you used to be, and you'll thank God you are not as these publicans. Then you'll repent and be humble again. (At least that's the cycle I see in my own struggles with the flesh.) I'm reminded of an old quote I like: “Humility is elusive because when you think you've found it, you've lost it.” We need to discipline ourselves to look for and approach the truth with humility.

### THE NEW DEMOCRACY

A century before the American Revolution an Enlightened French theologian, Pierre Nicole, published *The Grounds of Sovereignty and Greatness* (1675). In it he reasoned that a secular society could never achieve godliness. And a corrupt society could never rise to greatness. In order to compensate for the absence of religious motivation, therefore, commerce should be designed in such a way that its incentives would motivate society to regulate itself in order to successfully pursue capital gain in a free market. John Locke picked up on this idea and passed it on to Adam Smith. Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) quickly became the bible of capitalism in all democratic countries. Just as Aquinas had legitimized philosophy, Smith legitimized greed and made economic prosperity the new motivator and regulator of society. He believed his economic system was part of the “System of Natural Liberty” in which the “Great Director of Nature” would inspire and lead men “by an invisible hand.” Was this original thinking? No, it originated with the Greek Epicureans.

Once the principles of democracy are accepted and put into action they *will* result in both freedom of religion and capitalism because democracy, freedom of religion, and capitalism share the same ideological foundation. Therefore, if our old buddy, Noah Webster, was correct and the principles of democracy *are* Christian, the Lord Jesus Christ will declare freedom of religion when He sets up His kingdom.

Capitalism in Britain and the United States produced such astonishingly rapid wealth that other European nations, such as Denmark, quickly became democratic in hopes of realizing similar prosperity. The Protestant denominations, already Enlightened, again ignored the Scriptures and so wholeheartedly embraced capitalism, and so zealously promoted it in their sermons (building their sermons on examples in the Bible like the hard-working ants, and on how God wants Christians to live the abundant life, and verses like **1 Ti 5:8**), that the hard-working pursuit of wealth became known as the “Protestant work ethic.” This was a *dramatic* reversal of the Protestant societies in the early British colonies in which the glorification of greed was condemned. Early Christian colonists who tried to make too much money were jailed. One merchant in New England, for example, who felt he could charge whatever the market would bear, was jailed for “defrauding the brethren” – he was charging “too much” for nails.

Great Britain was impressed with the new secular order that called itself the United States. One early report to Parliament about the new nation said, “Whoever knows these people will consider them as animated with the spirit of the new philosophy. Their system of life is a course of experiments; standing on that high ground to which the most Enlightened parts of Europe have advanced. This is the spirit of the government of the new empire of America. [The U.S. was sometimes called an empire because it consisted of a District of Columbia that ruled over a number of sovereign nations.] It is young and strong and, like the infant Hercules, its strength will grow with its years.” All Enlightened Christians believed the founding of the United States upon God's Natural Laws was the advent of a new golden age of peace and prosperity in which the light of God's truth – through Reason – would now penetrate the divisive religious superstition that prevented all men of all faiths from uniting, and it would enable them to see common truths and enter into the brotherhood of man. Alfred, Lord Tennyson, for example, wrote a poem, *Ring Out, Wild Bells*, celebrating the death of the old false, tyrannical society and the dawning of an Enlightened era of mankind that would bring on the Second Coming of Christ. And Ralph Waldo Emerson added this propaganda: “God said, I am tired of kings, I suffer them no more; up to my ears the morning brings the outrage of the poor.” In general the intellectuals of Western civilization were euphoric, even giddy, over the bright future the Age of Reason was to produce. The U.S. was commonly referred to as the “Enlightened Republic.”

The religious Great Awakening (that ended with the revolutionary war) was replaced by the type of nothing Christianity typified by a statement of Rev. William Bentley, who said anyone who was “pure from guile, peaceable in his life, and gentle in his manners [that means having an Enlightened character], is the true man of religion after God's own heart.” President John Adams – the f-ing father who signed the Tripoli Treaty and ordered everyone to abide by it – praised Rev. Bentley (who was a doctor of divinity from Harvard, a member of Franklin's American Philosophical Society, and a member of the American Antiquarian Society) as “Doctor of Physics, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Laws, and Doctor of Divinity.” Bentley, like presidents Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, rejected the divinity of Christ. Jefferson even asked Bentley to be the founding president of the University of Virginia.

Many of the conservative preachers who before the revolution had preached *against* democracy found themselves suddenly living in one. Not a problem! Just toss out the old sermons and dig into the “original Greek” in order to come up with a deeper and better understanding of God's truth. And since many pewsters tended to remain conservative and skeptical about democracy, the preachers felt they needed to encourage them with “Scriptural” sermons like this one preached by Baptist

preacher Elias Smith in 1809: “It is well for us to understand this word, so much ridiculed by the international enemies [monarchies] of our Beloved Country. The word *democracy* is formed of two Greek words, one signifies *the people*, and the other the *government* which is *in the people*...My friends, let us never be ashamed of *Democracy!*” Listen closely and you’ll hear our forefathers respond: “Amen! Let every man do that which is right in his own eyes! You preach those Greek words, brother! Praise God!”

Herman Melville (*Moby Dick*) was so thrilled with the new philosophy of equality that he pronounced it “the great God absolute: The center and circumference of all democracy!” Thomas Jefferson even came up with a “proof” that the Laws of Nature were instilled equally in all men, Christians and pagans, dolts and doctors: “State a moral case to a plowman and a professor: the former will decide it just as well as the latter.” The ever-popular Noah Webster – like St. Thomas Aquinas before him – combined the doctrines of the Age of Reason with Christianity in his textbooks for public schools: “The genuine source of correct republican principles is the Bible, particularly the New Testament of the Christian religion; and God commands *you to choose rulers* who will rule in the fear of God.” The fact that quotes like these were widely used and rarely challenged indicates the Christians who founded this nation spent little time in the Bible.

The Constitution produced dramatic changes in society that are difficult to grasp today. The old social order broke down. Wives began to back-talk their husbands, people began to ridicule government leaders, workers began to fight for “Happiness” and more pay for less work. Public drunkenness, disturbing the peace, and crime increased rapidly as people began to apply Freedom’s new principle of individual sovereignty: “You can’t tell me what to do!” Entire books have been written about this upheaval of society. In 1814 John Adams said in reference to the dramatic decadence of American society, “human nature, in no form of it, ever could bear prosperity.” By 1815 people were clamoring for the creation of professional police forces.

The French author, Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859), toured the U.S. and loved democracy but was shocked by American materialism: “I know of no country, indeed, where the love of money has taken stronger hold on the affections of men.” Almost overnight Americans had become the most liberal, democratic, and commercially-minded people in the world. This provided much fodder for those small groups of Christians who still rejected the Enlightenment. They despised freedom of religion in society, detested the separation of Christianity from the federal government, wanted government to be based on Christianity, wanted chaplains allowed in Congress, wanted national days of prayer and fasting, and wanted an end to mail delivery on Sunday.

The religious Second Great Awakening began. Motivated by the increasing decadence in society, women in churches began to campaign for, you guessed it – morality. Temperance societies sprang up as wine itself became a sin in addition to drunkenness. And motivated over the years by the principles of Natural Law, Christians began to campaign for an end to slavery, the liberation of women, equal rights for children, and later, for animal rights.

A strange thing happened to religion. Just as Christianity had incorporated Reason via Aquinas, it now incorporated both patriotism and democracy! Eventually as Christian schools developed they prominently displayed the American flag, the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and pictures of the f-ing fathers. After World War II Christian schools and churches would even begin pledging their allegiance to the flag and to the secular nation for which it stands. And then later Christians would leave their Bibles under the TV Guide at home and go out and campaign for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would protect their “sacred flag.” In fact, democracy and patriotism became such fundamental parts of American Christianity that congregations began to get on their knees and pray for the conversion of other nations to democracy! Listen to this prayer made in 1890 by a priest, H. A. Pitcherit, dedicating a Confederate war memorial in Jackson, Mississippi:

O, Lord Jesus, who whilst upon this earth, didst ever show Thyself the friend and defender of the oppressed, we ardently beseech Thee to look down in love and honor to our lamented brothers-in-arms, who have fallen in the holy cause of right and justice.

Thou, O Lord, who wert falsely charged with being a traitor to Thy country, and didst unjustly suffer a cruel death, Thou at least will sympathize with us in our Lost Cause, and we pray Thee to vindicate and to guard the memory of our comrades, who likewise wrongfully accused and condemned, willingly, aye, cheerfully laid down their lives on the consecrated altar of patriotism and liberty.

Another indication of how much Christianity and democracy became inseparably one is how Thomas Paine was treated when he returned to America. During his visit his old buddies, the f-ing fathers, were surprised to see the very same Christians who had thanked God for using Thomas Paine and his “godly” treatise on rebellion, *Common Sense*, to convince them to support the Revolution, attacking him as an infidel – because he had now come out of the closet by daring to write his blasphemous anti-Christianity book, *The Age of Reason*. Because Christians had used Reason to adopt democracy, intellectuals thought they’d also use Reason to become deists or atheists. However, Americans now embraced both democracy and Christianity as ordained by God – because both were based solely on the Reason God gave us.

The f-ing fathers were shocked by this religious revival and found that being Enlightened as distinct from Christian could now be a political liability. When Aaron Burr (grandson of the famous preacher and president of Princeton University, Jonathan Edwards) was publicly criticized for ignoring Christianity, his fellow politicians reminded him of the Christian vote and advised, “Had you not better go to church?” Even Alexander Hamilton, recognizing this strange adoption of democracy by Christianity, in frustrated resignation tried to wrap his Federalist cause in Christian rhetoric.

By the time they died, most, if not all, of the f-ing fathers were very disappointed with their “Great Experiment.” One historian says, “All the major revolutionary leaders died less than happy with the results of the revolution.” John Adams spent his later years deriding both democracy and the revived Christianity: “Where is now the progress of the human mind?” In 1786, John Jay concluded, “The mass of men are neither wise nor good”, and Noah Webster articulated a growing pro-monarchy sentiment: “I was once as strong a republican as any man in America. *Now* a republican government is among the *last* kind I would choose. I would infinitely prefer a limited monarchy, for I would sooner be subject to the caprice of one man, than to the ignorance and passions of the multitude.” That’s why Webster would soon oppose the Bill of Rights – it preserved too much of the ignorant masses’ power. George Washington admitted that “We have probably had too good an opinion of human nature in forming our confederation”, but was shocked “that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical form of government without horror.” The f-ing fathers were so disillusioned and disgusted by the voting masses that in 1787 they convened the Constitutional Convention to eliminate the Articles of Confederation and establish a new government specifically designed to *curb the power of the masses* – even going so far as to look into forming a limited monarchy like Great Britain.

Alexander Hamilton made a famous pro-monarchy speech – but other delegates like Rufus King were careful not to make their consideration of monarchy too public. Convention president Nathaniel Gorham quietly wrote to Prince Henry of Prussia asking him to consider being king of the USA. James Madison said they “were now digesting a plan which in its operation would decide forever the fate of Republican Gov’t.” However, because the new government had to be *unanimously* ratified by the 13 nation-states, and because so many people had already accepted the philosophy that monarchy is evil and unchristian, the f-ing fathers soon realized they had to reluctantly abandon any thoughts about returning to monarchy...so they wrote a Constitution that cleverly changed the basis of the federal government’s authority from the *unanimous* consent of the nation-states (which would acknowledge their *sovereignty*), and vaguely based it on a “We the people” majority. The states, seeing that the Constitution took too much power away from the people, were outraged and refused to ratify it unless a Bill of Rights was added to protect and preserve the rights of the people. But even with the Bill of Rights, the Constitution still allowed the federal government to subtly become powerful enough to silence the “states’ rights” issue of sovereignty, with the result that most people today no longer look to their once-sovereign-but-now-impotent *state* governments when they want help, protection, and laws passed – they expect the *federal* government to do *everything*.

Thomas Jefferson, for whom preachers were a real source of disgust, frustration, and rage during his entire life, was particularly upset to see Christianity incorporate the Enlightenment rather than be buried by it. When he was in his seventies he decided to enjoy some reflective moments considering what a great civilization he had helped build while learning some of the intellectual roots behind the principles upon which he built this nation. So he studied the works of Plato. Having read some nice things about this pagan philosopher who is the “wisest of the philosophers”, Jefferson looked forward to delving into this great thinker’s arguments, irrefutable Reason, and undeniable wisdom because Jefferson had always trusted that Plato was one who had – unlike Christ – reached his “peak development as a thinker.” Instead, he was shocked when he found Plato to be fraudulently overrated. Just as the Spanish-Arab scholar Averroes had created a crisis in Christianity by exposing Plato and Augustine’s Plato-based “proof” of the immortality of the unregenerate soul as indefensibly false, and just as Catherine the Great realized her philosophical idol, Diderot, was an air-headed charlatan when she got to know him, so too was the elderly Jefferson horrified to find out Plato’s arguments were just as specious, unconvincing, and unimpressive as you and I have found all of the arguments from the Greeks to Grotius. Hoist on his own petard, Jefferson died sadder but wiser, and left the mess he had created to future generations who, as he had done, would *assume* those who had gone before had laid a solid foundation.

Many people correctly said democracy is a flawed system because it assumes you get sagacity from the ignorant masses, that you get collective wisdom from individual idiots. Those fundamental charges were rebutted by Enlightened zealots who, believing our democracy to be a “new utopia”, attempted to draw sharp distinctions between a *republic* and a *democracy* by emphasizing the more aristocratic (and therefore more erudite) nature of a republic. They also argued that the United States is under the rule of law – not the masses of ignorant voters. But since both republics and pure democracies have the masses as their very source of legitimacy, power, and authority, it was impossible to denigrate the masses by exalting republicanism...without mocking the “sacred” pagan principles that are the sole foundation of the Age of Reason, the f-ing fathers’ ideology, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution – upon which foundation rests the entire free world.

### THE RULE OF LAW

In the Byzantine Empire, Emperor Justinian’s lawyers, from 529-535 A.D., produced the Codex Constitutionum, the Digest, the Institutes, and the Novels, which together defined Roman law. Because these were old they were, along with the writings of the ancient philosophers, heavily relied upon by antiquarians in their search for the principles of Natural Law. The types of rules, regulations, and governing principles these antiquarians *commonly* found were called Common Law. And these laws that were typical or common back in the old days were presumed to be visible manifestations of the much sought after divine or universal invisible truths known as Natural Law. Common Laws, and the “principles” of Natural Law derived from them, were used by lawyers as “authoritative precedents” upon which to build more laws. Just as we have watched many generations of philosophers build upon the blasphemous pagan concepts and principles of the Greek philosophers, so have generations of lawyers built upon the foundation laid for them by men like Hugo Grotius, John Locke, and Sir William Blackstone. Unlike lawyers who model their speech after the sophistry of Blackstone in order to make the laws and the legal principles and precedents upon which they are based seem impressive, my speech is plain; I want you to see that the works of Plato and company are not worthy of respect when viewed objectively – as Thomas Jefferson found out too late in his life to do anything about it.

Just as Jefferson had, others were beginning to research and reflect on what foundation we had laid, and they, too, were not happy with the fact that **the American government and legal system were based on** a bunch of – as we word this charitably and delicately – **myth**. It was all a crock of myth. No matter what rock you looked under you found a Plato, a Blackstone, an Aquinas, a Webster, the Great Secular Seal, the Magna Carta, the Tripoli Treaty – it all stunk in God’s nostrils. And perhaps because the creation of professional police forces kept heavy-handed thugs like the Sons of Liberty from shutting up good people like Joseph Galloway who dared to question the wisdom of Sam Adams’ war, **more and more people began to speak out against the pagan myth called “Natural Law” that is the foundation of Western civilization.**

In the 1830s this anti Natural Law wave crested, crashed against the seawall of tradition, inertia, and apathy, spent its energy, slid back out and was lost in the swirl of current events that tend to dominate our brief mortal lives. This brief storm lashed out against Reason and philosophy. That had not really happened since the Sons of Liberty had run out the last of the pistol-packing preachers of righteousness. And, yes, this effort during the presidency of Andrew Jackson does pale in significance when compared with what is perhaps the high water mark of New Testament Christianity. I refer, of course, to the attempts by kings James and Charles – who happen by some quirk of “fate”, “fortune”, or “coincidence” to be the last Christians who were true absolute monarchs on the order of David and his son, Solomon, to resist the growing secular swell of Reason and democracy and establish a Christian nation under the hegemony of the Authorized 1611 King James Bible. At any rate, not long after Congressman David Crockett died at the Alamo, a fight developed in legal circles over what should be done about this myth called Natural Law – after all, the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the District of Columbia, and the entire legal code of the United States were based on it.

It would be nice if we had a Bible believer like King James today because he could by decree tear down the philosophical fruits of Natural Law – our doctrinal, legal, and governmental traditions. But in a democratic society we are at the mercy of the ignorant masses. There have always been handfuls of good Christians who understood the Scriptures and



authority and knew Natural Law was anti Bible. In general, the only people who have cared over the centuries that Natural Law is a pagan myth were those Christians who really cared about doctrine – because they were motivated by Biblical principles. They realized with horror that the foundation upon which the pagans laid philosophy was their own theory that whatever supreme being might be out there had programmed a standard set of values into all men called Natural Law. The “existence” of Natural Law later *allowed* Enlightened Christians to believe Reason, conscience, “spiritual ability”, morality, and ethics were real and valid and Christian. Good Christians, however, when they realized Natural Law was a figment of pagan imagination, *applied* that and realized Reason, conscience, “spiritual ability”, morality, “family values”, and ethics did *not* come from God’s Law; they were simply products of what was right in our own eyes, they were products of humanism, they were carnal, and they were abominations to God. But so much over the centuries had been built upon the pagan belief in the divine validity of Reason, conscience, and morality! For example, Augustine and Luther’s Reason had said public nudity was sinful, and God’s Natural Law/Reason had apparently “proven” nudity’s sinfulness because many of us were *embarrassed* to be naked. Over the years that moral tradition made us ignore the Biblical teaching that God was angry when Adam and Eve’s morality/conscience/Reason/spiritual ability/family values convinced them they should cover their nudity. And many Enlightened preachers began to teach that King David had sinned when he merely looked at Bathsheba’s naked body when she was bathing – and some even made looking at nudity a bigger sin than adultery! That and many other modern doctrines were built upon our knowledge of good and evil, which we and the Greek philosophers and Augustine and Luther got from Adam who got it from the forbidden fruit.

Another example of our embracing philosophy is how we ignored what God says in **Ec 3:18,19** and instead used mythical Reason to make humans different from beasts: We saw that beasts weren’t ashamed to be seen nakedly performing all biological acts in public, we saw that beasts had no Natural Law telling them it was wrong to kill their prey, and we concluded – like the Greeks – that *Reason* is what separates us from the lowly beasts because animals don’t have God-given Reason in order to self-evidently know good and evil like we do. The shame is that today many Christians are so ignorant they still think humans have some God-given ability to know right and wrong and spiritual truths, and that that mythical ability – not the spiritual new birth in Christ – is what makes us higher than beasts and proves that even though the souls of beasts are not immortal, the souls of unregenerate humans are immortal. Those Christians think God wants us to focus on knowing good and evil rather than ignore what we think is good and evil and simply obey our authorities.

The problem 19<sup>th</sup> century Christians were facing was huge. Natural Law/Reason had been “Christian” for over six hundred years and almost nobody questioned its validity. But when lawyers and people in government figured out from historical research that Natural Law had never existed, it caused a crisis; it meant the philosophy-based arguments used to “prove” monarchy was evil, democracy was good, nudity was bad, human souls are different from those of animals, and we can know good and evil without the Bible, were all completely invalid! They were invalid because all of Western civilization, all of its “values” and “morals”, all of its laws and establishments of government, and many of the doctrines in Christianity, had been built upon, were derived from, and got their rightness and validity from *a pagan invention that never existed!* The entire Age of Reason had been nothing but secular humanism in sheep’s clothing. But even though people realized Western civilization and many Christian doctrines had no foundation – instead of a proper foundation that had the *authority* to be a foundation – most people did not want to change anything. Why not? Because even though there was no foundation or authoritative source for what had been built over the centuries, when they thought about their doctrines, laws, and governments, they all *seemed so right and good*; their goodness was so *self-evident*. Therefore, the status quo would remain because it would be too much work to change it and because it seemed so right and good in our own eyes.

What new foundation replaced the old one of Natural Law? Faith in humanism. Faith in self. Faith in our self-evident knowledge of good and evil. Faith in the goodness of the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. (That is why Christianity dropped any serious preaching about why God made the tree of the knowledge of good and evil off limits. And that is why Christians do not understand the topic.) In other words, when the old false foundation fell away, we replaced it with confidence in our own knowledge of Right as defined by Self. When Natural Law was believed to exist it had given Christians assurance that their lives were securely resting on a foundation provided by God. But by the time Natural Law was exposed, we had already incorporated philosophical thought into our souls for so long that we relied more on Self than on the Bible. It was therefore easy and Natural for Christians to assume anything they thought was good – such as an “equity-based” life – would be pleasing to God, too. “I think” had replaced “thus saith the Lord.” Man was now the measure of all things.

A good sample of what was debated about the non-existence of Natural Law is provided by Robert Rantoul, a Jacksonian reform lawyer who delivered this speech on the fourth of July 1836:

The laws should be intelligible to all, and since we are governed by the “Common Laws of Nature”, they ought to be officially written down. After all, it is said by writers on the subject that there are numerous Principles of the Common Law which are definitely settled and well known, which they say should *not* be written because now they can, as guiding Principles, be fairly applied by the courts to whatever cases require it. These unwritten Laws or Principles, therefore, actually leave the law in certain cases *to be enacted by the judges*, even though the Constitution forbids judges to legislate. In order to rule on and apply laws, they should be written down, otherwise the judges have arbitrary and unconstitutional powers. It is said the judges only apply already existing Principles of Common Law. But from whence did they come? From pagan antiquity and the Dark Ages; it had its origin in folly and barbarism, while the fountain of true justice is the throne of the Deity, from whence justice rises, like the Son of Righteousness, with healing on His wings, whose justice is the irradiance of divine wisdom, divine truth, which scatters the doubts and mists of scholastic subtlety with the light that lights every man that comes into the world. Older, nobler, clearer, and more glorious, then, is everlasting justice than the ambiguous, base-born, purblind, perishable Common Law. If Common Law is lauded for its antiquity, that which is older than the creation may be *more* extolled for its venerable age. But among created things, the argument from antiquity is a false criterion of worth. Sin and death are older than the Common Law; are they therefore to be preferred to it? The mortal transgression of Cain was anterior to the Common Law; does it therefore furnish a better precedent?

It is said that Common Law was the precedent for ancient philosophies and statutes, and that old statutes and principles recovered from remote antiquity may be presumed to have originated in some older statute which, through lapse of time, has perished. This is unparalleled presumption! And to suppose the legislation of a barbarous age is rich and worthy is folly. Even if there were such ancient statutes, what of it? The specimens which have survived neither are impressive themselves nor do they inspire a favorable opinion of those that may have been lost. Crudely conceived, savage

in their spirit, vague, indeterminate, unlimited in their terms, and incoherent when regarded as parts of a system, the remains of ancient legislation are of little use, and what is lost was probably still more worthless. Why then should unwritten and supposed Common Law statutes, which probably never had any but an imaginary existence – and which if they ever existed were the rude work of barbarians – why should such supposed statutes govern in the 19<sup>th</sup> century?

No man can tell *what* the Common Law is, therefore, it is not law; for a law is a rule of action – but a rule that is unknown can govern no man's conduct. Common Law has been called the perfection of human Reason. Common Law *is* human Reason! Indeed, the subtle spirit of the Common Law is *human Reason*, double distilled, 'till it becomes rank poison. Human Reason is sweet and pleasant to the unsophisticated intellect, but this sublimated perversion of reason bewilders and perplexes and plunges its victims into mazes of error.

From this Common Law have been over the years extorted principles and statutes. These then have been used as "legal precedents" for still more laws, which were themselves extensions of others, 'till, by the continuance of this accommodating method, an *entire system of law* is built up *without authority*. It is hardly necessary to observe that opportunity should be taken to reform and remodel the great body of the law, which stands in need of such a revision more than any other science.

That year the Massachusetts state legislature, intrigued by the irrefutability of these Averroes-like arguments, formed a committee to study the foundational roots of the United States. However, incumbent powers were already lining up their big guns to preserve the status quo. George Bancroft, for example, became an advocate for Natural Law. Bancroft's hobby was history but he had little time for it because he circulated among the political elite in both the U.S. and Europe, and was appointed to several influential positions. He is credited with founding the United States Naval Academy during his tenure as Secretary of the Navy. Let's compare Bancroft's arguments justifying the mythical – and dying – Natural Law foundation of democracy and Western civilization with those we just heard from Rantoul and see who makes more sense:

The sun that shone on Homer [Greek poet] shines on us in unchanging luster. Nature is the same. For her no new forces are generated; no new capacities are discovered. But the five senses do not constitute the whole inventory of our sources of knowledge. We have Functions which connect us with heaven, as well as organs which set us in relation with earth. We have an Internal Sense, which connects us with the world of intelligence and the decrees of God.

There is a Natural spirit in man: not in the privileged few; not in those of us only who by the favor of Providence have been nursed in public schools. It is *in* man. It is the guide to truth, is the gracious gift to each member of the human family. This Reason exists in every breast. I mean not that faculty that deduces inferences from the experience of the senses, but that Higher Faculty which from the infinite treasures of *its own consciousness* originates truth, and assents to it by the Force of *Intuitive Evidence*.

Conscience is God's Umpire, whose light illumines every heart. Religion is a dead letter wherever its truths are not renewed in the soul. The rule of Morality is distinctly marked; its harmonies are to the mind like music to the ear; and the Moral Judgment, when carefully analyzed and referred to its principles, is always founded in Right. This admirable Power, which is the instinct of Deity, is the Attribute of every man. Conscience, like Reason and Judgment, is universal.

That the Moral affections are planted everywhere needs only to be asserted to be received. The savage mother loves her offspring with all the fondness that a mother can know. Beneath the odorous shade of the boundless forests of Chile, the native youth repeats the story of love as sincerely as it is chanted in the valley of Vaucluse. They are not the fruit of study, but a Natural instinct. Beauty, like Truth and Justice, lives within us; like Virtue and like Moral Law, it is a companion of the soul. The barbarian who roams our western prairies has like passions and like endowments with ourselves. He bears within him the instinct of Deity, the consciousness of a spiritual nature, the love of beauty, the Rule of Morality.

If it be true that the gifts of mind and heart are universally diffused, if the sentiment of truth, justice, love, and beauty exists in everyone, then it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the *common judgment* [the majority] in taste, politics, and religion is the *highest authority on earth* and the *nearest possible* approach to an *infallible decision*. If Reason is a universal faculty, the *universal decision* [the majority] is the *nearest criterion of truth*. The *common mind* [the majority] is the sieve which separates error from certainty. The exercise by many of the same faculty on the same subject would naturally lead to the same conclusions. But if not, the very differences of opinion that arise prove the supreme judgment of the *general mind* [the majority]. Truth is one. It never contradicts itself. One truth cannot contradict another truth. Hence truth is a bond of union. But error not only contradicts truth but may contradict itself; so that there may be many errors, and each at variance with the rest. Truth is therefore of necessity an element of discord. Thus there can be no continuing *universal judgment* [the majority] but a right one. Men cannot agree in a falsehood.

If wrong opinions have often been cherished by the masses, the cause always lies in the complexity of the ideas presented. Error finds its way into the soul of a nation only through the channel of truth. It is to a truth that men listen; and if they accept error also, it is only because the error is for the time so closely interwoven with the truth that the one cannot readily be separated from the other.

Unmixed error can have no existence in the *public mind* [the majority]. Wherever you see men clustering together to form a party, you may be sure that however much error may be there, truth is there also. Apply this principle boldly; for it contains a lesson of candor and a voice of encouragement. There never was a philosophy nor a clan of opinion, that didn't carry along with it some important truth. And therefore every sect that has ever flourished has benefited humanity; for the errors of a sect pass away and are forgotten; its truths are received into the common inheritance. To know the seminal thought of every prophet and leader of a sect is to gather all the wisdom of mankind.

In like manner the best government rests on the people, and not on the few; on the free development of public opinion, and not on authority; because the munificent Author of our being has conferred the gifts of mind upon every member of the human race without distinction of outward circumstances. A government of Equal Rights, therefore, must rest upon the sum of the Moral intelligence [as] society studies to eradicate established abuses, and to bring social institutions and laws into harmony with Moral Right. The public happiness is the true object of legislation, and can be secured only by the masses of mankind themselves awakening to the knowledge and the care of their own interests. The world can advance only through the culture of the Moral and Intellectual powers of the people. To accomplish this end by the means of the people themselves is the highest purpose of government. If it be the duty of the individual to strive after perfection like the perfection of God, how much more ought a nation to be the image of the Deity. The common mind [the

majority] is the true Parian marble [the marble quarry used by Classic Greek sculptors when shaping their masterpieces], fit to be wrought into likeness to a God. The duty of America is to secure the culture and the happiness of the masses by their reliance *on themselves*.

We have approached so near to Nature that we can hear her gentlest whispers; we have made Humanity our Lawgiver and our Oracle. The government by the people dares to rule by Moral force, and has its citadel in the heart. Such is the political system which rests on Reason, reflection, and the free expression of deliberate choice. The Spirit of God breathes through the combined intelligence [the majority] of the people. Truth emerges from the dictates of pure Reason itself, proclaimed by the general voice [the majority] of mankind. The decrees of the universal conscience [the majority] are the *nearest approach* to the presence of God in the soul of man.

Thus the opinion which we respect is the sagacity of the many. The people collectively are wiser than the most gifted individual, for all his wisdom constitutes but a part of theirs. When the great sculptor of Greece was endeavoring to fashion the perfect model of beauty he did not passively imitate the form of the loveliest woman of his age; but he gleaned the several lineaments of his faultless work from the many [the majority]. The organ of truth is the invisible decision of the *unbiased* [philosophical] world: she pleads before no tribunal but *public opinion*; she owns no safe interpreter but the *common mind*; she knows no court of appeals but the soul of humanity.

Not one benevolent institution, not one ameliorating principle in the Roman state, was a voluntary concession of the aristocracy; each useful element was borrowed from the democracies of Greece, or was a reluctant concession to the demands of the people. The same is true in modern political life. It is the confession of an enemy to democracy that “all the great and noble institutions of the world have come from popular [the majority] efforts.” Such is the voice of Nature; such the conscious claim of the human mind. Yes, reforms in society are only effected through the masses of the people, and through them have continually taken place. Yes, truth is immortal, it cannot long be resisted. Philosophy has sometimes forgotten God; a great people never did. The skepticism of the last century [the f-ing fathers’ century] could not uproot Christianity because it has lived in the hearts of the millions. Do you think that infidelity is spreading? Christianity never lived in the hearts of so many millions as at this moment. Wherever Moral Truth has started into being, humanity claims and guards the bequest. Each generation gathers together the imperishable children of the past, and increases them by new sons of light – alike radiant with immortality.

If you could stay awake through that drivel you noticed Bancroft touched on several things we’ve seen repeated over many centuries, things that go back to the Greek philosophers and were still being used long after the f-ing fathers were compost. But it didn’t matter that the arguments defending the status quo had nothing to say, because the incumbents were not about to give up and go away. For example, the effectiveness of the Massachusetts committee appointed to look into the matter was blocked by the political maneuverings of a Massachusetts lawyer/politician, Joseph Story, who, in spite of his lack of judicial experience, was appointed by President James Madison to the Supreme Court. Justice Story quickly joined forces with Chief Justice John Marshall in working not just to *preserve* but also to *expand* the powers of the federal government. In fact, Justice Story is considered a founder of “**equity jurisprudence**” because he was so successful at changing legal terminology: Formerly it was called a “Natural Law” legal system, but that was reworded to an “**equity-based**” legal system in order to not remind people that it was all based on pagan myth.

The problem was nobody knew how to right the wrong of Natural Law. And where would anyone get the authority to get rid of the principles upon which the very Constitution that governed our actions was based? It was now admitted that our nation was founded on nothing more than what the Bible calls the carnal mind. The Biblical implications (**Ro 8:7**) were staggering, as were the historical implications for Western civilization and the doctrinal implications for Christianity: It made the movers and shakers of the Free World throughout history the bad guys, and it made preachers and denominational leaders Pharisees blinded by carnality and church tradition. It was all just too much for the few Christians who understood the problem. The magnitude of centuries of errors compounded upon errors had become such a large mountain that only faithful Christians could move it. Therefore, the majority of carnal Christians in their churches and the carnal people in society merrily pressed on, full speed ahead, down the broad way of ignorance and apathy that leadeth to destruction. Christians shifted their attention to more pressing issues such as banning liquor advertising, condemning smokers, proscribing the use of the f word, and making sure their children learned about the Constitution so our Judeo-Christian heritage could be preserved.

Do not think I lie awake at night lamenting the fact that we live in a secular nation, or that I plot ways to make American government Christian. There is nothing wrong with a non-Christian nation like the U.S. having an idiotic, contradictory, unscriptural government and society – *because we Christians have no dominion!* What does concern me is reaching Bible believers in order to help them understand that at the same time they are living law-abiding lives under the secular laws and leaders of this officially and legally Godless nation, they should be learning the Bible and applying it to everything around them as they prepare to rule and reign under Christ some day.

We often hear it said – in a positive way – that ours is “a nation of laws.” But the “rule of law” is bad because, even though most Christians don’t understand it, that’s what the term “legalism” they are so fond of tossing around really means. So we need to take a minute to address **legalism** and the **rule of law** from a Scriptural perspective.

I never want to be ruled by the Bible; I want to be ruled by the God of the Bible. I shall never try to please or satisfy the laws of the Bible because they are not animate – I shall endeavor to please and satisfy God, and in this life that means live by the Bible. Without God the Bible has no authority because God authorized the Bible, He is the authority behind the Bible. Everything having authority – the Bible, parents, governments, teachers, bosses – gets its authority from God because He said it is so – and He is the only one in existence with the authority to make such decrees.

We used to be directly under God. But through sin we distanced ourselves from Him. Because of our sins, God established rules or laws (**Ga 3:19**) as a *punishment*, a *curse* (**Ga 3:13**). The law, the curse, the punishment, is God’s rod of correction (**Pv 22:6; 23:14**) that, *if we voluntarily submit ourselves to*, will lead us to Christ (**Ga 3:24**). Why does the Bible say we should submit to Christ instead of submitting to the law (**Ga 2:21; 3:24**)? Because the law is a punishing curse, not a savior. If the law were to be our authority the kingdom we are serving would be called the Kingdom of Law instead of the Kingdom of God. We are to be ruled by a ruler, a person – not by laws. Christians should want to be a nation under God, not a nation under law. Legalism is when we are serving the law.

The Bible says I shouldn’t steal. If I don’t steal because I want to satisfy that commandment, I am committing idolatry because I am trying to satisfy the law rather than God. I should have a broader view than the law. I should be trying to satisfy

God. If that is my objective, and if I know the Bible thoroughly, I can look beyond the commandment at the will of God as expressed in the Bible, and see that – at least 99% of the time – keeping that specific law is the way to satisfy Him. When I do that I am glorifying Him – not glorifying a curse. More on this in the doctrinal section, but before I conclude this Rule of Law topic, I want to clarify what the people of Western civilization and Christianity are doing when they base their lives on the rule of law (or tradition-based doctrines). First, they are democratizing their lives. By that I mean they are living according to what Self thinks is right, not according to the dictates of a dictator like a king or God. The masses have written and approved the secular, philosophy-based laws of the land. We are pledging allegiance to that system every time we brag about being a “nation under the rule of law” rather than a kingdom under a dictator. And from what have those laws we are so proud of gotten their authority and validity? From the people, from us, from what we think is right, from carnality. Our religion is that which orders our lives. And our religion today is Self; we live according to what we sincerely think is right and good. Freedom of religion, democracy, our laws, our morals, and the way we think did not come from the Bible – they came from us. And that is the second thing we are doing with our rule of law: We are feasting on the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, we have become our own authority by *knowing* good and evil.

Christians have done the same thing in church the secular leaders have done in government and society. When we based our doctrines on self-evidence/Reason/Natural Law/conscience/spiritual ability/morality/family values/church tradition rather than on what God says in His Bible, we made Self the foundation of our lives. We are supposed to glorify God by living according to what He says rather than what we think is right and good.

The rule of law only seems good if you ignore the Bible and base your outlook on Enlightened principles. For example, the rule of law is designed to prevent the “evil” of arbitrary government. Arbitrary government is any time something – nation, family, or tribe – is ruled by the arbitrary dictates of a ruler such as a king, father, or patriarch. The only thing that makes arbitrary rule “evil” is pagan philosophy. Philosophy says *equality* is the good and just law of the cosmos. Therefore anyone – God, king, father, or patriarch – that has arbitrary authority is evil. Philosophy also says knowing good and evil – as defined by Self – is the object of life. Even though that contradicts what God says in His Book, Christianity has swallowed it hook, line, and sinker.

Our belief in *equality* now governs our thoughts and lives. Most of what we think of as *fair* is based on equality. We think *fair* and *justice* are closely related. Therefore, our justice system (the legal system) exists primarily to enforce equality-based fairness. And that seems right and good and Christian to us. Therefore, in spite of the fact that our ancestors were shocked to learn that the Natural Law upon which our civilization is based never existed, they were quickly placated by being told that everything was now based upon *equity*. They liked that because equity is a combination of equality and fairness, and both of those have seemed right and good to us ever since Thomas Aquinas made Reason part of Christianity.

When the pagan, mythical, humanistic Natural Law foundation of the Age of Reason and Western civilization fell away, there was only a minor bump in the road as civilization was placed upon a foundation of equity. You’d think picking up something as huge and complicated as Western civilization and moving it over and basing it on some other foundation would be such a massively huge and life-changing affair, and that it would take so long to iron out all of the societal, legal, and governmental wrinkles, that history would focus on it as an earth-shattering event or undertaking. But history pays almost no attention to it. And there is a good reason history doesn’t think it was a big deal: *Nothing changed except terminology*. That’s right; equity and Natural Law are the same thing. They are both nothing but what seems right to the carnal mind. They are both philosophy because philosophy is living according to what is self-evident without any religious considerations at all. The transition from Natural Law to equity did not replace a Christian-based system with a secular system, and it did not replace a secular system with a Christian one. The same old secular system carefully crafted by our f-ing fathers remained in place – it just picked up a different label.

The Bible teaches that the Pharisees’ dedication to the rule of law – even if the laws came from God Himself – was bad. By focusing on keeping the laws, the Pharisees were ignoring God Himself. So they failed to glorify Him as their King, and merely showed they agreed with His laws. Our focus should be on pleasing and obeying our authorities, not on obeying their laws. Yes, most of the time that will involve keeping their laws – but not always...as I cover in detail in the doctrinal section. Let’s press on and finish this historical section because I’m itching to get into doctrine.

### THE CIVIL WAR

Social unrest continued to grow in our young nation almost as fast as the economy. And a power struggle was developing politically. The industrial north favored a stronger central government because it controlled congress, which taxed *all* states in order to pay for the roads, canals, and railroads needed to support the booming industrial economy in the *north*. Increasingly, the southern nations thought the northern politicians were using their political majority in the District of Columbia to take economic advantage of the less populous southern nations.

Because the south was a rural agrarian society it hadn’t established all the Enlightened institutions of higher learning that were undermining enthusiastic Christianity in the north. As a result the south became known for its relative piety, and northern Christians derisively labeled it the “Bible Belt.”

The early years were not smooth sailing for the young republic. For example, a commercial dispute almost caused some New England states to secede from the District of Columbia union. Those offended New England nations were of the opinion that just as their sovereignty gave them the right to confederate with other nations in the District of Columbia, it also gave them the right to withdraw from that union. After all, had they not, as British colonies without any national sovereignty, each claimed the right to secede from Britain? Ultimately the commercial dispute was settled and all thirteen nations continued their confederacy. But the fact that sovereign nations had a right to resign from any association, and, indeed, had the Declaration of Independence as a “legal precedent” for secession, was never seriously doubted or questioned until the growing commercial prosperity of the north gave it an economic incentive to use its military against the southern rebels...just as Britain had used its military against the “Yankee doodle” rebels.

In times of turmoil, such as the buildup to the Civil War, people – liberals and conservatives – tend to become more religious. One example of an Enlightened Christian activist on the order of the Maccabees was John “Barabbas” Brown.

Many northern Christians were more Enlightened than their southern brethren. And because they no longer had an economic need for slaves they developed a sudden interest in the infidel Thomas Paine’s belief that slavery was offensive to Equality and therefore a sin against Nature’s God. The southerners reacted by holding up their King James Bibles and asking,

“What? Did not Nature’s God authorize slavery forever in **Le 25**?” Then the politicians in the District of Columbia came out with the Missouri Compromise, which decreed that for every new sovereign state admitted to the union in which slavery was prohibited, another slave state would be admitted to the union. This placated the dumb southerners who were so happy with this guaranteed balance of power that – unlike King James – they failed to see the “legal precedent” being established: The federal government was dictating to sovereign states what they could and couldn’t do! Eventually it would use this power to establish the supremacy of the principles of the Age of Reason over any and all religions within the states. For example, any religious doctrine – including those based on Le 25 – that did not conform to the higher authority of the Laws of Nature’s God would be made illegal by federal law in spite of the fact that Article One in the Bill of Rights said congress could make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This was but another example (along with driving out pistol-packing preachers of righteousness) that “freedom of religion” in America only applied to religions whose doctrines conformed to economically feasible Enlightened principles – no matter what the Bible said.

When John Brown saw his tax dollars being spent by his congressmen to justify the “sin” of slavery via the Missouri Compromise, he decided it was time to put feet to his faith by rebelling against the sinful tyranny of a pagan government – just as the Maccabees, Barabbas, Oliver Cromwell, and Sam Adams had done. He’d seen abolitionist Christians murder slave-owning Christians and release their slaves, and he’d seen pro-slavery Christians retaliate with murder. And, having murdered pro-slavery people himself and seeing that it accomplished nothing, he decided to form a Christian militia to free the slaves. He captured the federal arsenal at Harper’s Ferry in northwestern Virginia in order to arm the throngs of volunteering slaves and abolitionists...who never showed up. Brown was arrested and hanged by two Virginia Christians doing their duty – Robert E. Lee, serving in the federal army, and Stonewall Jackson, serving in the Virginia militia.

John Brown was one of many Christians who wanted to carry out the intent of the f-ing fathers that this be an Enlightened nation that didn’t let the Bible interfere with the implementation of the Equitable Laws of Reason. But the Christian revival caused by the Civil War resulted in a resurgence of enthusiastic Christianity. These Christians wanted to get away from the intentions of the f-ing fathers: They wanted to replace the secular government with one based on Jesus Christ and the Bible. Ever since the Jacksonian era had exposed Natural Law, Reason, etc., as false, some serious Christians wondered if it might be their Christian duty to stop being blind followers of the blind, go ahead and admit the f-ing fathers were anything but good Christians, and follow the lead of kings James and Charles by basing both government and society on the Authorized 1611 King James Bible. These Christians had not been mindlessly singing “God bless America, land that I love. Stand beside her [the she-god, Columbia], and guide her...”, they had been thinking about the fact that God was actually damning America with one curse after another: They had an openly and officially Godless government that, in order to isolate itself from any possible contact with Christianity, had created its own “Garden of Evil” – the District of Columbia – in which only the fruit of the tree of secular knowledge could be used in government; they had a nation cursed with a bloody civil war; and they had so much rampant materialism that even the Frenchman de Tocqueville had been shocked when touring the country. Yes, God was damning America, and these Christians decided it was time for the religious right to correct the blasphemy of the f-ing fathers by making America a Christian nation.

The U.S. Protestant denominations finally admitted the “Godly” Age of Reason/Natural Law foundation of American government was nothing but pagan humanism. So in 1863 they joined the **National Reform Association**, whose objective was to replace the f-ing father’s Reason-based government with a Bible Christianity-based government. Knowing the only way to legally make America Christian was to make a major change to the U.S. Constitution, these eleven Protestant denominations and the National Reform Association wanted to rewrite the Preamble of the Constitution in order to clearly and legally establish – as the Pilgrims had done in their Mayflower Compact – that the United States was under the ruling authority of not just some ambiguous “God”, “Nature’s God”, “the Almighty”, or “the Creator”, but was plainly under the true God of the Bible. Even though it also promoted some liberal causes of Equality, the National Reform Association generated a lot of enthusiastic support among Christians across the land, especially when they read the proposed new Preamble to the Constitution: “We, the people of the United States, humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among the nations, His revealed will [the Bible] as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian government, and in order to form a more perfect union...” and the rest was the same. Aside from the fact that they didn’t understand the issue of dominion, the proposed Preamble was pretty good. Even though it had a lot of general public support, the National Reform Association had to begin a national lobbying campaign because the Constitution could not be changed unless the states ratified it.

The arguments used by the NRA to support the new Preamble included shame, the punishments of God, and the judgment of history. If the United States were to cease to exist, the NRA asked, what would future generations think of us when they dug up old official U.S. government documents? The NRA argued: “Would not the antiquarians of succeeding centuries rightly reason that we were a heathen nation?...This [new constitution] would relieve us from the ignominy of heathenism...our national shame in *disowning* God [is] not the least of present national disasters.”

The NRA’s proposed Preamble was not ratified by a single state: In fact, it *couldn’t* be ratified because – according to the very Constitution they were trying to change – it was *unconstitutional!* The f-ing fathers must have smiled from their whitewashed and garnished sepulchers; they had successfully repulsed a major assault by enthusiastic Protestant Christians, and had legally and officially enforced their “original intent” that the government of the United States not be in *any* sense founded on the Christian religion.

Christians were outraged, and the politicians inside the secular Garden of Evil realized they had to appease these voters by tossing them a bone in the form of a face-saving “victory”: In 1864 Congress authorized that **IN GOD WE TRUST** be put on the two-cent coin! Nothing legally binding, nothing anywhere that would officially define who this “God” was, no Jesus Christ, and no Bible – just another nebulous Enlightened term on a two-cent coin that would make Thomas Jefferson laugh at the gullible stupidity of enthusiastic Christians who rejoiced and thanked God for “giving them the victory.”

Over the years Congress felt it necessary to toss out more bones: It later put **IN GOD WE TRUST** on all the money! (That was a major boost for the Protestant work ethic!) Congress stopped mail delivery on Sunday because some Christians thought the first day of the week was supposed to be a day of rest, chaplains were allowed in the District of Carnality, churches that voluntarily submitted themselves to the incorporation laws of the U.S. were rewarded with tax-exemption, and President Reagan became the darling of Christians by declaring a temporary “national Bible week.” In 1954 when Moslems, Hare Krishnas, and Christians complained about the 1942 officially-adopted secular version of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag,

Congress, at the urging of President Eisenhower, added the generic “under God” to the Pledge. The Pledge instantly became a hit in Christian schools and churches, Masonic temples, American Buddhist meetings, etc.

During the buildup to the Civil War people were killing each other over the issue of abolition, but nobody wanted to secede from the union over it – just like nobody wants to secede from the union today over the issue of abortion. The fact is slavery was quickly being made obsolete by economics; it was simply too expensive to have slaves, and the institution was already being phased out – even in the South. Eli Whitney’s cotton gin did slightly prolong the economic feasibility of slaves because it processed cotton faster than the existing work force could pick it. But that ended when machinery was developed that harvested cotton. By the time the Southern Confederacy drew up its Constitution, it included a timetable for the abolition of slavery. That, however, did not keep the North from trying to use the issue of slavery to claim the moral high ground. President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation (which assumed powers the Constitution did not give him) freed only the slaves in the states the North *had not yet conquered*; Lincoln preserved slavery in the northern states that still practiced it and in the Confederate states occupied by the North.

Because the right of a sovereign state to secede from anything with which it might be confederated was not seriously questioned, the initial sentiment in the North when the South threatened to secede was “good riddance.” But then economics intervened. The most important harbor in the U.S. was New York. Charleston, because of its eastern seaboard location and its extensive railroad system linking it with the east, was second. New Orleans was third because the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio rivers gave it natural highways reaching far into the continent west of the Appalachian Mountains. The North charged a 25% import tariff. The South set its rate at 10%. If you were shipping steel from France to the U.S., a 15% profit margin would certainly cause you to unload in Charleston or New Orleans. Because of its more sophisticated economy the North had higher overhead costs and could not compete with a 10% tariff. Newspaper editorials appeared in the North saying if the South seceded there would be grass growing in the deserted streets of New York in ten years. That’s why Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor was so important to the North, and is why the military action of the Civil War began there.

To southerners, President Lincoln was like King George III: he was taxing them, denying their “right” to self-determination, and he was responding with military might to their declaration of independence. From a Biblical perspective the North was right (unless the southern nations were in fact sovereign) because rebellion against evil and oppressive authority is never right. From the standpoint of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, however, the southern states were right (whether they were sovereign or not). But it is difficult or impossible to defend one side or the other because democracy is rife with contradictions whether viewed through Scripture or secular logic – contradictions that are compounded by years of “legal precedent.” As soon as the U.S. came into existence it began changing as it reacted to inconsistencies and problems, and in so doing it created new problems and inconsistencies. Because the states were sovereign nations people used to say, “I’m proud to be a citizen of these United States.” Until the Fourteenth Amendment there was no such thing as an “American citizen” because you were not a citizen of the United States, you were a citizen of (for example) New Jersey, which was confederated with the other states by its participation in the federal government in the District of Columbia. But when immigrants were processed in New Jersey and then went inland to find a home, were they to be treated by Virginians as foreign citizens of New Jersey, or were they to be treated as all colonists had been before the American Revolution when all colonists were citizens of Great Britain/citizens of *the* United States? Slowly the ideological lines were drawn: Those who valued the principles of the Declaration of Independence favored states’ rights; those who valued a practical compromise favored a stronger central government. (As Bible believers you and I favor anything that gives authority to the single head.)

Another problem with democracy for Christians concerns government officials. Should we pray for them and refrain from speaking ill of them because they have the rule over us, or should we view them as our public servants? We can only ignore such contradictory nonsense if we ignore the importance of authority. And for Christians to ignore authority is a critical mistake with huge and far-reaching ramifications and consequences.

When Article Thirteen prohibited slavery in violation of Article One, this contradiction was made possible by the increasing importance of the Declaration of Independence as an authoritative bible for society. When Natural Law was exposed as nothing but Greek mythology, some other mystical authority had to be found to rule society. And since the National Reform Association’s lost cause showed everyone the Constitution could not be based upon Christianity or the Bible, all Enlightened eyes turned to the Declaration of Independence. It had it all: It combined a generic “God” and democracy and patriotism and the principles of the Age of Reason in one foundational document that could be an ideological substitute for the Bible. Proponents of treating the Declaration of Independence as a “higher authority” include President Lincoln, who appealed to the principles of the Declaration to make slavery evil; William Seward, a senator from New York and Lincoln’s Secretary of State who purchased Alaska; and modern-day Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, who wants to restore Natural Law as “human nature” and “reason” rather than as the old discredited God-implanted moral code. Vestiges of “godly” Natural Law still existed in Lincoln’s day, so it was easy to claim an ideological supremacy for the Declaration of Independence because no patriotism-and democracy-worshipping Christian would argue with it. Therefore, the Declaration ceased being merely a joint announcement by thirteen rebellious colonies and became – without legislation of any kind – a document superior to the Constitution. The southern states had already accepted the authority of the federal government over the states when they applauded the Missouri Compromise, and now they found that the very Constitution that restricted the powers of the federal government (by limiting it to specific tasks beneficial to the states) had become itself subject to the principles of Greek mythology behind the Declaration of Independence! It was perfect...because Americans may scoff at Natural Law, but they’d never deny their belief in the “sacred” principles behind the Declaration of Independence. From a Christian perspective, therefore, “Seward’s folly” wasn’t Alaska; it was making the Declaration a clever substitute for discredited Natural Law. And that is how the federal government justified the creation of laws that told the states what they could and couldn’t do: The Thirteenth Amendment wasn’t violating either Article One or the Bible, because *anything* that contradicted the principles of the Declaration of Independence was now unconstitutional and unchristian. The government was merely submitting to the same “higher authority” that all Freedom worshippers bowed to.

For the same reasons, the legal system was (supposedly) no longer based on Natural Law/Common Law – it was based on “Equity” (or “Conscience” as it used to be called), which is now known as “equity jurisprudence.” In this way the legal system became based on the same principles as the Declaration of Independence. The brilliance of this is in the fact that the Declaration of Independence can *never* be changed. We can vote to change the Constitution, and revision committees can change the words in the Bible, but not one jot or tittle of the Declaration of Independence can ever be changed because it is a historical document.

Today no church doctrine or governmental law will be tolerated if it violates the underlying ideology of the Declaration of Independence. Satan has done well: All Christians now worship the “original Greek”, whether it be the ERROR manuscripts or the Greek philosophy underlying the Declaration of Independence and the Age of Reason.

I’ll use this Civil War era quote to show that Reason had become so unquestionably authoritative that self-evidence was its own proof: “Slavery is contrary to the principles of Natural Right and to the great law of Love. It is founded on injustice and fraud, and can be supported only by the existing laws and customs which have been established by men acting against the Laws of Nature. This point is not necessary to prove, indeed, a discussion of these principles has become unnecessary in consequence of the revelations of the Enlightenment concerning Reason and Common Sense.”

And now look at this 21<sup>st</sup> century Hollywood movie quote. This speech was made by the star of the movie to a congressional committee, and it was the patriotic, dramatic, and ideologically-inspiring turning point of the show that made you want to jump up and recite the Pledge of Allegiance: “Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee...I stand for a woman’s right to choose. I stand for the elimination of the death penalty. I stand for a strong and growing armed forces because we must stomp out genocide on this planet – and I believe *that* is worth dying for! I stand for seeing every gun taken out of every home – period. I stand for making the selling of cigarettes to our youth a federal offense. I stand for term limits and campaign reform. Mr. Chairman, I stand for the separation of church and state. The reason that I stand for that is the same reason that I believe our forefathers did: It is not there to protect religion from the grasp of *government*, but to protect our government from the grasp of *religious fanaticism*. I may be an atheist, but that does not mean I do not go to church; I do go to church: The ‘church’ I go to is the one that emancipated the slaves, that gave women the right to vote, that governs every freedom that we hold dear. My ‘church’ is this very chapel of democracy that we sit in together, and I do not need God to tell me what are my moral absolutes; I need my heart and my brain and this ‘church’.”

The Civil War was the first and only time the United States declared war on a democracy. In many ways the Civil War was necessary in order to resolve some of the questions and problems that were not anticipated when the Constitution was written. The Civil War also served as a distraction from the issue of *upon what* – now that Natural Law was discredited – *is the government of the U.S.* – including the now-sacred Declaration of Independence – *based?* With the practical problems faced by the nation during the buildup to war, during the fighting, and during Reconstruction, people were not able to remain focused on the principles and concepts of the Bible. And by the time the dust of Reconstruction settled, states’ rights and the sovereignty of the states were dead issues, and “these United States” passed into history and became “the United States.” A union of confederated sovereign nations became one nation under a strong central government. The original meaning of sovereign *state* in practice became *county*, and therefore the original meaning of *federal* government became that of *central* government. And the District of Columbia lost its reason for being, which has resulted in people today wanting it to be represented in Congress just like a state.

As the government in the District of Columbia gained the ascendancy and the states lost their sovereignty, the central government gradually forced the states to adopt secular governments. The early state constitutions that in some way recognized the Christian religion were declared to be contrary to the Enlightenment doctrines embraced by the central government and the f-ing fathers, so they were all rewritten and made secular. Constitutions can be changed because as official laws they are under the control of the people. The Declaration of Independence, however, cannot be changed because as a “sacred” historical document it is under the control of no one on earth. Today in the United States the philosophic doctrines embodied in the Declaration of Independence are, in practice, the final authority in church and state.

### MODERN HISTORY

By the late 1800s everybody knew Natural Law was a myth, and Western civilization found itself in turmoil. Some people wanted to press on with “progress” as if the faulty origin of the Age of Reason didn’t matter, and some people wanted to return to the old ways in an effort to restore order, discipline, and predictability to society. As a result, Western civilization found itself full of well-intentioned social activists who variously preferred monarchy, democracy, capitalism, socialism, communism, anarchy, women’s rights, etc. Even the working class rose up and formed labor parties to fight the “evil” of corporate monarchs. (This social turmoil would eventually boil over into two world wars that would ensure the triumph of the principles of Natural Law.) In an effort to understand the social issues, a number of European philosophers went all the way back to the Greeks and analyzed the history of philosophy – similar to what Thomas Jefferson had done before he died. They, too, found themselves unimpressed with the arguments used to establish democratic government, and they were disgusted with the decadent fruits of democratic society. Two of these men were Germans: **Friedrich Nietzsche** (1844-1900) was the first in a series of German philosophers who rejected the liberal principles of the Enlightenment, and who was dismissively contemptuous of democracy. Nietzsche also attacked the contradictory value system of Enlightened Christianity (he was an atheist), and was highly critical of the theory of self-evidence popularized by René Descartes.

**Oswald Spengler** (1880-1936) opposed the validity of the mental processes used to justify the Enlightenment. He was the Einstein of philosophy because his philosophical relativism said *any* human system of thinking, or any method of formulating values that utilizes Self or human culture or experience, is *invalid* because of its limited perspective. (The mature Christian would word that differently: Any system of thought or values that utilizes the carnal mind is invalid, because only God has the big picture, the perspective, and the authority to think and decide.)

In France **Charles Maurras** (1868-1952) rejected the democracy in which he lived because he believed its philosophical foundation was wrong. A large anti-democracy movement started that, like many rebellious groups, contained unsavory elements who, in this case, were Roman Catholics who blamed the evil Enlightenment on Protestantism, Judaism, and Freemasonry. Maurras was editor of a royalist, anti-democratic newspaper who collaborated with the Germans in World War II, and he was sentenced to life in prison at the Nuremberg trials.

Because of these men many Germans rejected not only the principles of the Enlightenment, but also believed Western civilization had been wrong to abandon the paternalistic monarchical social structure used by God’s people during the previous six thousand years of human history. The old social order and the new were ideologically at enmity with each other; war clouds were brewing between democratic nations and nations wanting to remain autocratic. The issue is authority.

**Frederick the Great**, the King of Prussia from 1740-1786, was a brilliant military campaigner who made Prussia the greatest military power in Europe. He was an Enlightened absolute monarch who liberalized much of society and started Germany on the road to modern Enlightenment.

One hundred years later **Kaiser Wilhelm I** was King of Prussia and emperor of Germany from 1861-1888. He was influenced by his wife who was Enlightened and who encouraged him to be open towards British political theory (democracy). Wilhelm I proclaimed a “New Era” of liberalism, but appointed a conservative, **Otto von Bismarck**, as his “iron chancellor.” Bismarck subdued proponents of Enlightenment and espoused the old paths. Bismarck also fought against the political meddling of the Roman Catholic Church, which he distrusted. After Wilhelm’s death his son, Frederick, ruled for a short time (1888). He was the first Prussian prince to attend a university. His Enlightened education, together with the fact that he married the eldest daughter of Britain’s Queen Victoria, caused him to be very liberal. But this liberal man died only three months after coming to power. His son, **Wilhelm II**, who was the grandson of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, ruled from 1888-1918. His Enlightened mother – Queen Victoria’s daughter – tried to make Wilhelm II a liberal, as did his Calvinist tutor who tried to instill in him the Protestant love of Reason. Wilhelm surprised everyone, however, by seriously studying the Bible and noting the glaring discrepancies between it and the democratic Enlightenment. His trips to England to visit his grandparents became less frequent as he matured and became increasingly disgusted with England’s moral laxity, comparative lack of social order, and its open, vulgar love of money. He sided with the conservative elements in Germany who thought they needed to be guardians of virtues increasingly abandoned in Western nations.

When Queen Victoria died in 1901 relations between the two countries deteriorated. Later when Enlightened Serbian nationalists, motivated by the same “Freedom-fighting” ideals as Barabbas and the U.S. f-ing fathers, tried to start a revolution and liberate the Slavs from Austria-Hungary by assassinating the Austrian crown prince and his wife, the different ideologies in the West resulted in rapid polarization and war. Prussia (Germany) backed Austria-Hungary’s attempt to stop the revolt. Democratic England, France, and the U.S., who were all philosophically opposed to autocracy, quickly declared war on the German Empire in President Woodrow Wilson’s “war for democracy.” Thus, World War I was the first war in history (as opposed to revolutions) fought because of Enlightenment principles.

Germany was defeated, Kaiser Wilhelm II went into exile in Holland, democracy was forcibly installed in Germany, and the allies literally divided Germany into East Germany and West Germany by giving a middle portion of Germany to Poland so it could have a seaport.

Events happened rapidly again. In France in 1922 Catholic royalists formed a large anti-democratic movement. In Italy, Germany, and Spain a surge of anti-democratic and anti-communist sentiments sparked popular uprisings. For reasons that go back to the division of Catholicism into Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodox Catholicism, the Vatican brought Mussolini, Hitler, and Franco to power – just as it later brought Poland’s Lech Walesa to power in a more successful campaign against Russian communism. Mussolini is the one who coined the term “fascism” for this growing ideology. These fascist revolutionary leaders, like the American revolutionary leaders, were not men of high character with idealistic motives. So why did honor-oriented Japan join them?

Back in 1854 the United States in an attempt to bolster its economy by expanding its trading empire, sailed a fleet of modern warships to medieval, isolationist Japan, and at gunpoint forced it to end its policy of self-sufficiency and isolationism by signing a trade agreement against its will. Japan rapidly became a modern industrial and military giant. It also became increasingly disgusted with America’s moral laxity, comparative lack of social order, and its open, vulgar love of money. Adopting the methods used by the U.S. in 1854, Japan began using military aggression to protect its economic interests. In response to that aggression, President Franklin Roosevelt put an economic squeeze on Japan’s monarchy, which countered by signing a treaty with its ideological allies, Italy and Germany, in 1940 in an attempt to create a stabilizing balance of power against U.S. economic and ideological imperialism. Other nations had valid reasons to fear American ideological aggression because the U.S. now believed it had to force other nations to be “good” by making them embrace both democracy and capitalism. In other words, the U.S. thought itself justified in violating the sovereignty of other nations because it now believed the issue to be right and wrong – not authority.

The democratic countries defeated the authoritarian countries in the world’s second war for democracy. (Back in the WWII era there were still only about twenty democratic countries among hundreds of monarchies.) The victors forcibly established democratic governments in Italy, Germany, and Japan, and then held the infamous war crimes trials at Nuremberg, Germany. During the trials the Nazi officers claimed to be innocent of any crimes because in their ideology and in their country orders were to be obeyed without question, just as they had been for six thousand years of history. The democracies, utilizing Hugo Grotius’ theory that Natural Law applies to all men of all nations and religions, told these officers they should have used René Descartes’ self-evident Reason and John Locke’s democratic principles to overthrow the evil authorities over them instead of wickedly employing the age-old authoritarian belief – resurrected by Nietzsche – that rebellion was wrong and obedience was right. And, in a move that still shocks legal minds, the Enlightenment theories of the democratic countries were *retroactively* applied to these Germans who, it was agreed, should have “known” through “self-evidence” that the newly emerging theory of “human rights” superseded duty and obedience. (Yes, I’ve simplified things in order to make historical and ideological points.) The German officers were declared guilty and were executed.

In only three wars, the American Revolution, World War I, and World War II, the United States made it clear to the rest of the world that any laws, customs, or religious practices that violate the doctrines of the Age of Reason/Declaration of Independence will not be tolerated. The military efforts of Alexander the Great to Hellenize the world are now being completed by the United States. Today most nations are democratic.

Oliver Cromwell and the U.S. f-ing fathers militarily forced their Enlightened beliefs upon the authorities over them, which established precedents for rebellion against superiors. The allies at Nuremberg had a different problem; they wanted to militarily impose their Enlightened beliefs upon other sovereign states and the people who lived in them – just as the District of Columbia had used its Enlightened beliefs to fight the Civil War and force the states to rewrite their constitutions. The victors at Nuremberg had four problems. First, because of national sovereignty, they had no authority over other nations. Second, they had no precedent upon which to base and legitimize the trial. Third, they wanted to take the astonishing step of holding the defendants accountable *ex post facto* for violating Enlightenment principles that were not part of their culture. Fourth, they wanted to make the predetermined outcome of their Cromwellian monkey trial appeal to the masses so Nuremberg could later be used as a legal precedent when necessary. The allies’ ideological position in the trial and the precedent they wanted to set was, “You should not have obeyed the orders, rules, or laws of the authorities over you if those laws or authorities are deemed to be immoral or wrong by a majority of Enlightened and Reasonable people.” The position of the defendants was, “Our



responsibility as subordinates is to obey the will, orders, rules, and laws of our authorities, who alone have the prerogative to determine whether those orders are good or not.”

Just as Martin Luther, Cromwell, and Thomas Paine had, the allies knew emotionalism would sway the grazing masses – not detailed Bible discussions and philosophic and legal arguments. So they used over two hundred court sessions to graphically illustrate and describe how *hideous* the actions of the defendants were and how nice the victims were – neither of which was the purpose of the trial. The issue was should they have obeyed orders or disobeyed orders. The allies also purposely left a German representation of the Ten Commandments hanging in the courtroom in order to convey the Aquinas doctrine that anything offensive to human Reason is also self-evidently contrary to the laws of God.

Nuremberg did establish the desired “legal precedent.” But it established another curious precedent in courtrooms: When a man is on trial for murder the *issue* in the trial is whether he did it or not. In spite of that, prosecutors spend much time trying to sway the “grazing jurors” with irrelevant emotionalism. Much time is spent in court with graphic illustrations and descriptions of how *hideous* the crime was and how nice the victim was, neither of which does *anything* to establish guilt and is a complete waste of time.

Nuremberg was the most significant event in world history since the American f-ing fathers established a secular democracy. Biblically speaking, Nuremberg signified the official imposition of the Age of Reason upon the rest of the world. Yes, autocratic forms of government still existed in abundance in 1945, but they were now officially and openly considered to be evil by Enlightened Christian nations. And the handful of Enlightened Christian nations that won WWII launched the largest and most widespread evangelistic crusade in history: The objective was not to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the objective was to spread the Doctrines of the Age of Reason. The United States alone spends billions of dollars a year to preach and enforce democracy around the world.

Martin Luther was tried and convicted in 1521 at Worms, Germany, by Christian advocates of obedience for the crime of resisting the authority of his superiors. Only 115 miles from Worms and 424 years later, Luther’s descendants were tried and convicted in 1945 at the Nuremberg trials by Christian advocates of independence and rebellion for the crime of *not* resisting the authority of their superiors. What had been good was now evil, and what had been evil was now good. The world was now upside down; the Age of Reason was firmly and “officially” established as right and good (**Is 5:20,21**).

#### SATAN’S GREAT SEAL

If I were to design a Great Seal to symbolize Satan’s subtle efforts to prevail over Christianity, it would be modeled on the Great Secular Seal of the United States and would be a pyramid with six layers depicting the historical steps leading to damnation for Christians:

- **Equality** is the bottom or foundation of the pyramid. This is the poison of the forbidden fruit that caused Adam to rise up to a position of equality with God so that he usurped God’s prerogative of being the Authority who decided right and wrong. Equality is the *opposite* of authority. It is enmity against God. It makes us carnal and it starts a war in our members as our old man and new man struggle for supremacy.

- **Philosophy** is the second layer. Once a Christian begins thinking on his own without the Bible he is philosophizing, he is being carnal. The Greek prophets of philosophy used impressive achievements in math and science to “legitimize” their written instructions on how to utilize Reason. Greek philosophy is not just pagan, it is the Gospel of Satan. Philosophy taught naïve, unsuspecting Christians how to ascend to a position of equality with God *from the standpoint of authority*.

- **Laws of Nature** are the third layer of the pyramid and were an important and necessary interim step. The “Laws of Nature” took the “pagan” out of philosophy and made it palatable to Christians, who used the fact that God created nature to convince themselves that He really does want us to use Reason. The Laws of Nature became the justification for all the developments of Western civilization from Aquinas until the era of Andrew Jackson, when it was discredited. The Laws of Nature gave Christians Reason to believe it was not only acceptable to be carnal by ignoring the Bible when determining right and wrong, but that it might even be better for the development of Christianity and society to do so.

- **Laws of Man** are built upon the Laws of Nature and become the new foundation of democratic society when the Laws of Nature crumble and fall away. Upon what then do the Laws of Man rest? Faith. Faith in self, in self-evidence, in good intentions, and in “equity.” Faith in the doctrine that God will be pleased with us as long as *we* think what we do is both right and good. The Laws of Man truly make man the foundation and measure of all things. The Laws of Man (also called the Rule of Law) make society of the people, by the people, and for the people, which is idolatry and blasphemy.

- **Rights** are derived from philosophy and legitimized by the Laws of Man. Rights are “inalienable”, which produces covetousness – a desire to possess, to own, and to keep that to which you have a “right”, including things like life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In short, “rights” make us covet Self, and coveting anything is idolatry. It was covetousness that made Christians decide not to repudiate the democratic Reason they had inherited from the f-ing fathers and go back to the old paths when the “Laws of Nature” were exposed as a pagan hoax and Trojan horse.

- **Freedom** is the top cornerstone of the pyramid and is represented by the Enlightened eye. Personal freedom – being liberated from a dependence on the Bible and from the ideological enslavement of the Bible – is Satan’s objective. Having incorporated the lower levels of the pyramid and having personalized them by making them part of who you are, how you think, and how you look at things, means you have achieved the freedom and independence of being your own authority. You are on your own. You are damned.