

Defense of Marriage

A textbook of traditional values
for marriage advocates

Defense of Marriage

A textbook of traditional values
for marriage advocates

Originally published on the internet as an essay documenting the destruction of traditional marriage from historical, Biblical and legal perspectives, this book has been expanded to include background notes, legal citations and a discussion of the gay “marriage” debate.

**DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE:
A TEXTBOOK OF TRADITIONAL VALUES**

By
Steven D. Miller

July 2010 revision

The author will correct any errors in future revisions. Please report factual errors to author@marriage-truth.com

Your Copyright license:

You are free to Share — to copy, distribute and transmit portions of the work

But only under the following conditions:

- **Limited copy, distribution and transmission.** You may quote, distribute or transmit any portion of the work up to 3,000 words (about 7 pages), without express written permission from the copyright holder.
- **Attribution.** If any portion of the work is quoted, posted onto the internet, or emailed, you must attribute the work (but not in any way that suggests that we endorse you or your use of this work) to “Defense of Marriage: A textbook of traditional values” and include a link to www.marriage-truth.com.
- **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter or transform this work.
- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.
- Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights.

REVISION HISTORY

<i>Date</i>	<i>Version</i>	<i>Description</i>
5/6/2010	1.0	Initial version.
7/10/10	1.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Removed link to obsolete web site.2. Expanded Chapter 10 discussion of two kinds of marriage, added a photocopy of an 1873 law encyclopedia -- proof of a regular marriage would stop a divorce case.3. Added commentary about Black's definition of intermarriage.4. Removed line numbers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
REVISION HISTORY	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	6
DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE.....	1
PART 1 HOLY MATRIMONY.....	3
1. How does the Bible define the term “marriage”?.....	6
2. What is the Biblical definition of “divorce”	11
3. Family Values Are Holy.....	14
4. American laws recognize undivorceable marriage	18
5. Divorce does not cancel a real marriage.	26
6. What does History say about divorce?	30
7. Is Remarriage still a felony?.....	37
8. Marriage is the foundation of society.....	39
PART 2: CIVIL UNIONS.....	45
9. How did man’s laws redefine the term “marriage”?	46
10. Marriage License laws	52
11. Divorce bastardizes children.....	64
PART 3: POLITICAL TRAPS	67
12. The Right To Undivorceable Marriage	68
13. You are subject to your benefactors	71
14. Your benefactors have planned the destruction of family values	76
15. Divorce court jurisdiction.....	79
16. Are “Civil Unions” Treason Against Government?.....	88
17. Civil Marriage is Genocide Of Christians.....	93
18. Military Laws Enforce Perversion.....	95
PART 4 THE HOMOSEXUALS’ CURSE.....	97
19. The Planned Destruction of America	101
20. What does the Bible say about homosex?.....	103
21. What does the Bible say about false doctrine?.....	105
22. What does history say about homosex Privacy?.....	108
23. What about Lawrence v. Texas?.....	114
24. Punishment that fits the crime	122
25. The law of Nature	125
26. Arguing against the foundation of all law	133
27. What could Lot do?.....	135
28. Is homosex activism an act of terrorism ? How about judicial activism?.....	137
PART 5 CONCLUSIONS	139
29. Do we still have the right to secure the blessings of liberty?	142
INDEX.....	149

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

14th Amendment	138
Article 1, section 10	30
Fourteenth Amendment	2, 94, 108, 110, 114, 115, 119
Fourth Amendment	115
U.S. Constitution Article VI paragraph 2	93

Statutes

"The Pedophile Protection Act" H.R. 1913 in the House and S. 909 in the Senate.....	120
18 US Code, section 4	141
Federal Criminal Law (Title 18, section 2331)	137
First Marriage Act in England, 26 Geo.2, c.33.....	52
Idaho Revised Statute 1887, section 2429.....	21
The Enemy Act of October 6th, 1917, chapter 1, Title 1, Sec. 1, 48 Stat. 1.....	96
The Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917	95
Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7.....	120, 125
Title 21, Victoria, chapter 85.....	31
Title 4 US Code section 1.....	95
Trading With The Enemy Act of October 6th, 1917.....	96

Rules

Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 803(13).....	59
--	----

Cases

1 W. Hawkins, Pleas of the Crown 9 (6th ed. 1787)	123
143 U.S. 266.....	84
325 U.S. 1, 37.....	91
330 U.S. 631, at pages 636-637.....	91
Adams v. Palmer, 51 Me. 481, 483	62
Arizona v. Bateman, 429 U.S. 864.....	115, 120
Ashwander v. TVA, 297 U.S. 288.....	74
Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga 173	26, 125
Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga. 173	19, 21, 65
Beard v. Stahr, 200 F.Supp 766.....	109
Beverlin v. Beverlin, 29 W.Va. 732. 1887	61
Bowers v. Hardwick (bottom of page 196, top of 197).....	99
Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U.S. 186.....	115
Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U.S. 186 at page 214-215	123
Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616 , 6 S.Ct. 535	44
Brady v. US, 397 U.S. 742.....	86
Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. 419.....	63
Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. at 374.....	116
Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264.....	84
Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944	68
Dartmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518.....	30, 35, 43
Dartmouth v. Woodward, 17 U.S. at 629	42, 80
Dickerson v. Brown, 49 Miss. 370.....	21
German Alliance Insurance Co. v. Kansas, 233 U.S. 389 at page 432.....	b
Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479.....	110, 114

Groves v. Slaughter, 40 US 449	84
Hoage v. Murch, 60 F.2d 983.....	21
Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 197 U.S. 11	73
Julliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421	41
Linneman v. Linneman, 1 Ill. App. 2d 48, 50, 116 N.E.2d 182, 183 (1953).....	71
Maryland v. Baldwin, 112 US 490, (in 1884)	23
Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. 190	26, 46
Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at 211	41
Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at page 206.....	27, 35
Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at page 211	18
Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at page 212.....	18, 30
Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at page 213	18
Maynard, 125 U.S. at 213.....	40
Maynard, 125 U.S. back at page 205.....	40
McLaughlin's Estate, 30 Pac. 651 at 654, 4 Wash. 570 at 579	21
McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570.....	19, 26, 33, 80, 83
McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570, July 1892	19
McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570, 1892	61
Meister v. Moore 96 U.S. 76 at page 81.....	47
Meister v. Moore 96 US 76 at page 81.....	26
Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76	36
Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76 at page 78.....	48
Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76, at the bottom of page 78	21
Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390	41, 71, 94
Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, at page 399	41
Moxey Estate (1903), 2 Cof 369	40
Murdock v. Penn. 319 U.S. 105	69
Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105 (1943)	57
Norman v. Norman, 121 Cal. 620., 1898	61
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 469-471	102
Parton v. Hervey, 1 Gray 119.....	21
Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510	72, 94
Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202.....	72
Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158, 166, 88 L. Ed. 645, 64 S. Ct. 438, 442 (1944)	71
Ramon v. Ramon, 34 N.Y.S.2d 100, 1942, at page 104.....	60
Roberts v. Roberts (1947), 81 C.A.2d 871	71
Romans 13:1.....	76
Rubin v. Irving Trust Co., 305 N.Y. 288, 1953. Page 305	60
Shearer v. Shearer, 73 N.Y.S.2d 337. 1947.....	60
Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 394 U.S. 147 (1969).....	48, 74
Smayda v. U.S., 352 F.2d 251.....	109
Statewide Organization of Stepparents v. Smith, 536 P.2d 1202.....	55, 74, 148
Trezevant v. Tampa, 741 F.2d 336.....	86
U.S. Supreme Court 465 U.S. 668.....	25
U.S. v. Haupt, 1943, 136 F.2d 661	91
U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200 @ 216 (1980).....	84
United States v. Prudden, 424 F.2d 1021	32
Van Koten v. Van Koten, 323 Ill. 323, 326, 154 N.E. 146 (1926).....	71
Wallace v. McDaniel, 59 Or. 378. 1911.....	61
Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 679 (1871)	81
Williams v. North Carolina 317 U.S. 287, at page 302	42
Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205.....	72
Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978).....	43, 68, 114, 119
Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306, 314.....	25

Other Authorities

1 Williston on Contracts, section 1.....	16
2 Kent’s Commentaries page 87, fifth and subsequent editions.....	21
3 Parsons’ on Contracts 92.....	34
4 W. Blackstone, Commentaries *215	127
55 C.J.S. §7	21
A Practical Treatise of The Law of Marriage and Divorce by Leonard Shelford 1841, page 27	26
A Practical Treatise of The Law of Marriage and Divorce by Leonard Shelford, Littell Publishers, Philadelphia, 1841....	39
Abraham Lincoln, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861.....	145
Amarillo Globe-News, 4-20-2006.....	87
American Heritage Dictionary	58
Black’s Law Dictionary, up until the 7th edition in 1999	56
Blackstone, Book 1 chapter 15 “Of Husband and Wife”, page 421	55
Blackstone, Book 1, page 422-423.....	28, 35
Blackstone, Book 1, page 427	74
Blackstone, Book 4, page 7	125
Blackstone’s (First Edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1769) Book IV.....	110
Blackstone’s Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7	24, 97, 117
Blackstone’s Commentaries Page 423, Book 1	18
Blackstone’s Commentaries Page 423, Book 1, Chapter 15	48
Blackstone’s Commentaries (Book 4 PUBLIC WRONGS, introduction, starting at the bottom of page 7).....	123
Blackstone’s Commentaries Book 1, page 428.....	19
Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law, Book 1, Part 1	24
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, chapter 16, entitled “The Rights of Children”.....	72
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 421	28, 80
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, Page 423.....	26, 35, 80
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, Page 423, Chapter 15	35
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 426	121
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 427	58
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 428.....	26, 80, 85
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, Page 428.....	32
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 430	82
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 431	82
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 446, chapter 16	64, 139
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book IV, page 164.....	37
Blackstone’s, Book 1, page 427, 428	28
Blackstone’s, Book I at page 423	27, 64, 79
Blackstone’s, Book I, page 445, chapter 16	28, 64, 79
Blackstone’s, Book1 page 429	33
Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 4, Chapter 15.....	118
Communist Manifesto	59
Cooley’s Constitutional Limitations, 1868 edition, page 114.....	42
Daniel Webster, in a speech to the Senate June 3, 1834.....	96
Edmund Burke on April 23, 1770	147
Ella Wheeler Wilcox, (1914).....	32
Elliot’s Debates Vol 3, page 45.....	144
Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, 12 August 1949	95
International Treaty Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 16.....	66
John Locke’s 1690 treatise of government.....	a
John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government.....	17, 88
John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government at paragraph 135	127
John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government paragraph 211	42
John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government paragraph 222	b
John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government, paragraph 202	29
John Locke’s Second Treatise, section 233.....	93
John Philpot Curran, July 10, 1790	145

Justinian’s Institutes 13
 Laird v. Tatum, 408 U.S. 1, page 28 87
 Locke’s Second Treatise paragraph 222..... 113
 Parsons on Contracts, sixth edition, Volume III, page 89 31
 Parsons’ On Contracts 30
 Parsons’ On Contracts, Sixth edition, 1873, Volume III, page 85..... 69, 85
 Patrick Henry, March 28, 1775 76
 Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II) of 8 June 1977 95
 Report of the Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency, U.S. Senate Report 93-549..... 95
 Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 13 Of the Subordination of the Power of the Commonwealth 88
 Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 15 Of Paternal, Political and Despotical Power 89
 Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 18 Of Tyranny 89
 Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 19 Of the Dissolution of Government 90
 Shelford's 1841 textbook Treatise of the Law of Marriage, p. 331 37
 Shelford's 1841 Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29..... 125
 Shelford's 1841 Treatise on the Law of Marriage and Divorce page 27 51
 Shelfords Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29 51
 Shelford's Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29..... 24
 The Genocide Treaty ratified by the Senate on February 19, 1986, 78 UNTS 277 93
 The Virginia Law Register, Vol VI, No. 7, in a November 1900..... 40
 Theophilus Parsons, Law of Contracts (Boston, Little, Brown & Co., Sixth Edition, 1873), Volume II, page 496 31
 Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 25 20
 Treatise on the Laws of Marriage, page 28 21
 Tucker’s Blackstone (Book 1, Part 2, Note H “The state of slavery”) 67
 Tucker’s commentary on Blackstone was a Virginia law textbook published in 1803 55
 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 16 40
 Virginia Law Register Nov 1900, Vol. VI, No.7 article Essentials of a Valid Marriage 23
 Virginia Law Register, Vol VI, No. 7 52
 West’s Constitutional law, key 84, 90, 91 34, 94

Scriptures

1 Corinthians 6:9 10, 11, 25, 37, 103, 105, 139, 141
 1 Corinthians 6:9-10..... 25
 1 Corinthians 7:10 12
 1 Corinthians 7:11 12
 1 Corinthians 7:12 12
 1 Corinthians 7:13 12
 1 Corinthians 7:14 13, 15, 65
 1 Corinthians 7:15 13
 1 Corinthians 7:16 13
 1 Corinthians 7:39 13
 1 Kings 15:11-12 (KJV)..... 124
 1 Peter 4:17 147
 1 Samuel 12:17..... 39
 1 Thessalonians 4:4&5 9, 16
 1 Timothy 1:9-10..... 100
 1st Chronicles 25:5 73
 1st Corinthians 15:33 135
 1st Corinthians 6:18 13
 1st Corinthians 6:9 4, 6, 11, 147
 1st Corinthians 6:9-10 12
 1st Corinthians 7 13
 1st Corinthians 7:11 8, 15
 1st Corinthians 7:39 25
 1st John 3:13 101

1st John 4:8	106
1st Samuel 15:24	76
1st Samuel 15:29	104
1st Samuel 8:18	39
1st Samuel 8:5-19	14
1st Thessalonians 4:3	11, 12, 147
1st Timothy 4:1	2
1st Timothy 5:20	105
2 Corinthians 10:5	106
2 Kings 23:7	109
2 Peter 2:4-5 (NKJV)	135
2 Peter 2:6	113
2 Peter 2:7-12 KJV	132
2 Thessalonians 2:11	b
Acts 13:23	16
Acts 4:26	120
Acts 5:29	25
Deuteronomy 17:7	104
Deuteronomy 19	141
Deuteronomy 23:2	12, 66, 147
Ephesians 1:5	15
Ephesians 4:15	105
Ephesians 5:11-12	100
Ephesians 5:31	10, 25, 82
Ephesians 5:3-6	11
Ephesians 6	85
Exodus 21:5	59
Exodus 23:2	60
Exodus 32:27	113
Eze 21:15-23, 30:24-26, 32:11-15	13
Ezekiel 14:4	b
Ezekiel 21:15-26, 30:24-26, 32:11-15	77
Ezekiel 3:18-21	105, 107
Galatians 3:16	16
Galatians 3:29	15
Galatians 5	75, 144
Galatians 5:1 (NIV)	94
Galatians 5:19	103
Genesis 1:26	14
Genesis 2:24	6, 14, 25
Genesis 25:33	60
Genesis 32:5	73
Genesis 9:6	122
Hebrews 1:9	106
Hebrews 13:4	13
Hebrews 2:13	73
Hebrews 6:16	148
I Samuel 12:17	14, 76, 140
Isa 8:4-10, 10:5-6, 45:1-3	13
Isaiah 24:21	120
Isaiah 5:20	134
Isaiah 5:20 (KJV)	5
Isaiah 66:4	b
Isaiah 8:4-10, 10:5-6, 45:1-3	77
James 5:12	148
Jer 5:15-18, 20:4-5, 24:10	13
Jeremiah 48:10	146

Jeremiah 5:15-18, 20:4-5, 24:10.....	77
John 3:36	c
John 8:40-44.....	65, 147
Jude verse 7	103
Judges 5:23 (KJV).....	78
Leviticus 18:22.....	103, 104
Leviticus 20:13.....	103, 104
Leviticus 20:8 (KJV).....	103
Luke 11:17	138
Luke 11:20-23	2
Luke 11:21	146
Luke 11:35 (KJV).....	25
Luke 11:52	63, 85, 91, 105
Luke 14:26	106, 113
Luke 16:13	74
Luke 16:18	4, 6, 10, 11, 25, 37
Luke 22:25	74
Luke 22:36	146
Malachi 1:3.....	60
Malachi 2:15.....	6, 14, 25
Malachi 2:16.....	13
Mark 10:11-12.....	10, 25, 37
Mark 10:8.....	14, 25
Mark 10:9.....	a, 3
Mark 16:17.....	2, 143
Mark 6:11.....	104, 136, 147
Mark 7:7	11
Matthew 1:19.....	8, 15
Matthew 10:15.....	104, 136, 147
Matthew 10:34.....	113, 146
Matthew 10:34-35 (NKJV)	113
Matthew 11:24.....	104, 136, 147
Matthew 12:25.....	138
Matthew 12:28-30	2
Matthew 12:29.....	84
Matthew 15:9.....	11
Matthew 19:10.....	15
Matthew 19:12.....	15
Matthew 19:5&6	14
Matthew 19:6.....	a, 25
Matthew 19:8.....	a, 14
Matthew 19:9.....	25, 37
Matthew 23:15.....	b, 105
Matthew 5:18.....	104
Matthew 5:32.....	3, 8, 10, 11, 25, 37
Matthew 5:32-37	3
Matthew 5:33-34	148
Matthew 6:24.....	74
Matthew chapter 10.....	113
Numbers 23:19	104
Numbers 25:8	108
Numbers 30:10-11 (KJV).....	12
Psalms 106:31	108
Psalms 119:152.....	104
Psalms 2:2.....	120
Psalms 139:13	14
Revelation 12:12	147

Revelation 16:14	120
Revelation 17:2&18	120
Revelation 19:19	120
Revelation 21:8	b, 103, 146
Romans 1:18-32	103
Romans 1:26, 27.....	135
Romans 1:26,27.....	103
Romans 1:26,27,32.....	103, 106
Romans 1:27.....	109
Romans 1:32.....	103, 135, 140, 143
Romans 12:9.....	104
Romans 13:7.....	75
Romans 13:8, 12:10.....	103
Romans 14:16.....	38
Romans 7:2.....	25
Romans 7:3.....	4, 6, 10, 11, 25, 37
Romans 8:7,8.....	16
Romans 9:13.....	60
Romans 9:8.....	15, 16
Strong's Concordance 733 for a definition of "them that defile themselves with mankind"	100
Titus 1:13	106
Titus 2:15	106, 143
Titus1:2	104

Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?

Mark 10:2

This question was answered by Christ himself. The unchanging Christ of the Bible confirmed in Matthew 19:8 and Mark 10:9 that divorce has never been lawful, not even since the beginning of mankind.

And NO, He did not say that adultery was grounds for divorce.

Divorce is never lawful according to Christ himself. If you have a different belief system, then Christ is not your Lord. He might be your savior, but he is not your Lord.

WARNINGS

Warning:

This book presents traditional family values. If you believe that centuries-old moral teachings are not relevant in today's society, then this book is not for you.

Warning:

If you want society to remove punishment for criminal perversions, then this book is not for you.

Warning:

Christ warned us, in Matthew 23:15 that those who believe the lies of religious leaders are twice-fold damned. It is up to you to study the issues and to discern for yourself whether or not you are being deceived. It is your God-given duty to avoid deception. Satan's disciples lie.

Warning:

The unchanging God of the Bible is not going to change just because your church told you to get a civil (non-traditional) marriage license.

Warning:

Cowards shall have their place in the lake of fire.
Revelation 21:8.

Warning:

The LORD himself will send you strong delusion in proportion to the multitude of graven idols that you worship. 2 Thessalonians 2:11, Ezekiel 14:4 and Isaiah 66:4. Holy Matrimony was legitimate prior to any earthly government. It was not created by government. If you think a marriage is created or destroyed by a graven (manmade) government, then you are worshipping the wrong lord.

Warning:

If you want to deny principals then this book is not for you.

Warning:

If you cannot recognize that the law of nature is the foundation of all earthly law, then this book is not for you.

- The law of nature requires all creatures to obey their creator. If you cannot acknowledge that we are to obey our creator, then you will find yourself obeying the lawless one.
- There can be no law other than the law of nature, for we are all created equal, with no other superior than God Almighty. The law of nature authorizes government to exist and is acknowledged in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

Warning:

Do not set yourself up as a judge of God's word.

- It is idolatry to invent a more permissive god of your own choosing.
- It is blasphemy to redefine God's definition of marriage.

Warning:

Those who reject the Son will remain in God's wrath. John 3:36

Disclaimer:

Nothing in this book is legal advice, except for this: Obey God and suffer the consequences.

PREFACE

This is a textbook of traditional values for those who are compelled to defend them.

Traditional marriage is a lifetime union, until death they do part. Mankind cannot put marriage asunder, at least according to the Christ in Matthew 19:6. Today, many people have been deceived into thinking that divorce courts can cancel a traditional marriage. But this has never been true.

The law-of-the-land requires courts to enforce marriage. This book will present proofs that traditional church solemnized marriage cannot be divorced. The law-of-the-land still prohibits divorce of traditional marriages. No Supreme Court has ever upheld divorce of a traditional marriage. No Supreme Court has ever said that divorce cancels a marriage. The U.S. Supreme Court confirms, *"It is a relation for life."*

But divorce courts now insist that traditional church solemnized marriages can be divorced for almost any reason or, in some states, no reason at all.

Now that anti-Christian courts are firmly established, pervert politicians have declared war against the very laws that created government.¹

Legal philosopher John Locke's 1690 treatise of government was the foundation for most of the Declaration of Independence. The US Supreme Court still quotes him. He explained that the most inhumane method to overthrow a country is for officers of government to refuse to enforce the laws. Activist judges are now overthrowing your country in the most inhumane way whenever they defiantly refuse to uphold the existing law of the land.

In 1857 England's divorce courts were established on a false premise. Christians did nothing to stop them. In 1873, proof of a church wedding would stop any divorce case in America. In 1888 the U.S. Supreme Court, using English divorce as precedence, authorized legislative divorce of intermarriage, yet proclaimed that traditional marriage remained a relation for life. Since then, ungodly lawyers have worked persistently to take away this key of knowledge. The legal definition of marriage that was established in the Garden of Eden was perfectly acceptable until activist lawyers changed the definition in 1979. And again, Christians did nothing to stop them^{2,3}. Today, activist judges now exercise unwarranted jurisdiction to mock Christ, cancel our vows to God, deny the foundation of society, and rip apart the family bonds that held together your once-great nation. America has been devastated by the divorce industry, and self-professed Christians still do nothing to stop them³. Even though the Supreme Court has never legalized homosex, activist judges now expect to overthrow the very foundation of our society by advocating homosex "marriage". Lawyers want again to change the definition of marriage expecting that Christians will not interfere³.

The sanctity of undefended family will not survive their attack. By refusing to uphold the existing law of the land, activist judges have nullified family honor, taxed inheritance rights, attacked the sanctity of the church, alienated your children against Christian values, and denied the very purpose of government¹. As we shall see, ungodly perverts have destroyed your right to secure the blessings of liberty to your posterity.

Traditional marriage is the foundation of society. Society will crumble without a solid foundation. Even Lenin boasted that countries could be destroyed by destroying the family.

If apostate religious leaders will not take a stand to defend marriage, then it is up to the rest of us to take a stand. Christians are to be the salt (preservative) of the earth. The original Greek word for church was *ecclesia* – the called out ones. The church are called out to preserve traditional values.

It is my hope that there is enough information in this book for someone with a good divorce case to allow the Supreme Court to put a final end to the divorce industry. Just one good case could secure the blessings of liberty.

There should be enough information in this book to inspire a modern day Phinehas to rise up as a national hero to deter perverts from their final overthrow of your nation.

Pray that the courts will again uphold the existing law of the land.

Or forever hold your peace.

When government officers corrupt society, the result is “*to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security...*”

John Locke's [Second Treatise of Government](#) paragraph 222.

¹ We are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. This same Creator is the One that solemnized mankind's first marriage, which is also the same One that your State Constitution's preamble thanks, which is also the creator of the Laws of Nature that is explicitly mentioned in your Declaration of Independence as authorizing your government to exist. The right to marry existed prior to any human government. Governments are instituted among men to secure those rights. There is no authority to destroy the right to traditional (enforceable, non-divorceable) marriage.

² Silence has consequences:

- Silence implies consent.
- Silence is equated with fraud when there is moral duty to speak.

³ Inaction has consequences:

- By doing nothing, you acquiesce to the change. The US Supreme Court ruled in a 1913 case, [German Alliance Insurance Co. v. Kansas](#), 233 U.S. 389 at page 432 that, by your inaction, criminals can interpret your laws for you.

These laws “...permitting what theretofore had been regarded both as an ecclesiastical and civil offense. ... therefore fall within the rule that contemporary practice, if subsequently continued and universally acquiesced in, amounts to an interpretation of the Constitution.”

- *tacit procurement* according to Black's Law Dictionary
“takes place when an individual sees another managing his affairs and does not interfere to prevent it.”

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE

by Steven D. Miller

This book studies the prolonged and steady decline of family values in America.

Many people are outraged that ungodly activist judges have recently tried to redefine the term *marriage* to include sexual perversion. Yet for the past 100 years we have quietly accepted the legal fiction of divorce so that we could justify the perversion of remarriage.

Lawyers confronted Christ about the legality of divorce. Christ told them that divorce has never been lawful since the beginning of mankind. And he told them that marriage remained a permanent bond that cannot be put asunder.

Yet today, Lawyers still insist that divorce is lawful. The divorce industry vehemently denies legal due process to anyone who believes that Christ was correct.

According to the law-of-the-land, the crime of adultery is still the greatest of all civil injuries – but courts now ignore the law-of-the-land. Courts once venerated as “the pure fountain of justice” are now polluted by the perversion, filth and shame of homosex advocacy.

Public acceptance of divorce and homosex are part of the ongoing plan to destroy America. As we shall see, the moral fabric of the universe will soon hang by a thread.

The first three sections of this book explain the difference between Holy Matrimony and state licensed civil so-called “marriage”. They are totally different things. The last section of the book provides proof that consensual homosex has always been more detestable than child rape. Both perversions are now tolerated by manmade laws that are contrary to the very reason that government exists.

Real marriage is a lifetime commitment – spouses that are united until death. Yet your society has slowly accepted a radical redefinition – spouses that are disposable.

Church solemnized Holy Matrimony cannot be cancelled by divorce. The very purpose of government, now ignored, requires that real marriage must be upheld and enforced. Whereas civil licensed “marriage” has always been a phony counterfeit that courts will not uphold.

One hundred years of judicial activism has blinded your once-great nation into drifting away from our Godly purpose. The steady perversion of morals has resulted in the horror of a form of genocide that has destroyed your right to a legitimate family and forcefully replaced it with a counterfeit. As with any counterfeit, a civil licensed “marriage” is a close imitation of the actual. But worthless and without authority.

Part 4 of this book explains that homosexual “marriage” is impossible. Homosex is a crime historically punishable by death. The very purpose of government requires homosex be

punished. Homosex has never been legalized. As we shall see, The Supreme Court's Lawrence v. Texas was a Fourteenth Amendment privacy case. The Supreme Court did not suddenly "find" a right to homosex. Just as certainly as murder committed in the privacy of a closet is still a felony, so also is homosex still a felony. As we shall see, the court cases leading up to the Lawrence decision ignored evidence of terrorism.

Satan's demons have every right, under God, to possess unrepentant perverts and then seduce others. Then demand divorce rights or gay rights. Rights that have never existed. In the last days, people will abandon the faith and be seduced by the doctrines of demons (1st Timothy 4:1).

A brief word about the doctrines of demons. Driving out demons is commanded by Christ. There is no middle ground in this issue. Compromise is not an excuse: when Christ spoke of driving out demons, Christ said that "he who is not with me is against me". Matthew 12:28-30 and Luke 11:20-23. Believers have a primary duty to drive out demons (Mark 16:17). But we have been subdued to the point where we refuse to perform one of our primary duties. It is our own fault that demons have gained political power over us. Demons will work to deceive, if possible, the very elect. Do not be deceived.

Basic Biblical beliefs are now punished as crimes of hatred and intolerance. Such curses are a natural consequence of turning our backs on God. Only a revival of moral values can restore the law-of-the-land in this once-great nation.

"A simple democracy is the devil's own government."

This quote is attributed to several American patriots. Most often to Benjamin Rush, or Jedidiah Morse. And a book published in 1871 attributes the quote to Thomas Jefferson.

PART 1 Holy Matrimony

These first 8 chapters define holy matrimony as it has always existed. The purpose of this section is to convince you that Christ was correct. Divorce has never been lawful, not even since the beginning of mankind, and it remains so even today. Divorce causes the innocent spouse to commit adultery. And adulterers cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. Since divorce slams the innocent spouse into hell – only by the hardness of your hearts does this unlawful evil exist today.

Real marriage has always been enforceable in courts. For more than half of the history of America, everyone knew that traditional marriage was until-death-do-us-part, and that legitimate marriage was never divorceable.

Traditional marriage vows would include terminology like: “*till death us do part*”, “*so long as you both shall live*”, and “*all the days of my life*”. These are not just romantic sayings; they are enforceable vows, enforceable in every court. They are solemn vows to God (Matthew 5:32-37) and to mankind. Christ confirmed in [Matthew 19:8](#), and Mark 10:9 that marriage was not divorceable, even from the beginning of mankind. And Supreme Court decisions up to the 1890’s also confirm this well-established law. As Blackstone so eloquently explained: Neither could any other law possibly exist.

Marriage existed prior to any human government. Government did not create marriage. This permanent undivorceable kind of marriage is the only kind of marriage enforced by American courts. Divorceable marriage exists only because we turned our backs on God by tolerating perversion.

Eventually, the American law dictionaries definition of *marriage* was changed in 1979. The word *Marriage* now has two meanings, but the law dictionaries no longer have the original Biblical definition. Marriage as Holy Matrimony, which cannot be cancelled by a court. And so-called “marriage” as a divorceable civil union. Never confuse the two.

1. One honors the Lord who ordained and established the institution of marriage at the Garden of Eden. This type of marriage existed prior to human government. Marriage that lasts until death they depart.
2. The other worships as a substitute lord a counterfeit graven image made by men. This so-called “marriage” was created by government license. Instead of marriage until death, the new so-called “marriage” lasts until a spouse is disposable. Yet legislators have never written ecclesiastical (church) law. And black robed judges do not enforce ecclesiastical law. They changed the definition of marriage in 1979. Now they want to change the definition again. The homosexuals want you to believe that the States can define marriage.

The first three chapters of this section discuss the Holy Matrimony that has existed ever since God, for His holy purpose, entrusted this great gift to mankind at the Garden of Eden.

- Holy Matrimony was not defined by humans, and cannot be redefined by humans.

- Ever since the Garden of Eden, marriage has always been man and woman united until death. If you tolerate a redefinition of any of these three elements, however slight, then you will face the consequences. For example: It is not a union with the state.
- If you tolerate any redefinition, then you have set yourself up as a judge of God's word.
- In the Bible, divorce never cancels a marriage. Remarriage is always the crime of adultery [Luke 16:18](#), [Romans 7:3](#). Adulterers cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven [1st Corinthians 6:9](#).

Chapters 4 through 8 present the history of civil marriage laws.

- Courts must enforce permanent undivorcable marriage. Holy matrimony cannot be cancelled by government.
- Legitimate marriage is an enforceable (undivorceable) kinship relation. Even the US Supreme Court equated the permanent bond of marriage to the permanent family status of fatherhood or sonship. The "one flesh" relationship spoken of by Jesus is indeed as permanent as the flesh and blood relationship of "fatherhood or sonship" spoken of by the US Supreme Court.
- Civil licensed "marriage" is not a marriage.
- Only illicit "marriage" can be divorced. These would include clandestine weddings, or incestuous, or underage couples without parents' permission, or otherwise incompetent to contract for marriage. As we shall see, any civil licensed "marriage" can be divorced because it is illicit "marriage" due to an invalid original contract.
- Today, many people are convinced that divorce courts can cancel a marriage. But this has never been true. There is still no Supreme Court decision that upholds any divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* of a traditionally married couple. Later in chapter 15 we will read a quote from an 1873 law encyclopedia about divorce law. It contrasts a divorceable marriage with "a regular marriage". Proof of a church wedding "would stop the case".
- When the U.S. Constitution was written, divorce was unknown in New York.
- In the late 1890s marriage laws still ensured that divorceable "marriage" remain uncommon. Even divorce for aggravated cruelty did not cancel the marriage. It only separated the spouses physically.
- Men defend their families, which is why they created government. Suggestions that government has somehow acquired an authority to divorce families would be contrary to the ordained purpose of government.
- Legitimate marriage is the foundation of society. Whereas illegitimate marriage cannot create a society. Courts agree that marriage "is the parent of society". Legitimate society then creates government, or as Locke and Rutherford put it -- sovereignty is extended to society when one family is not enough to contain everyone.
- No one needs a license to marry according to the US Supreme Court in [Meister](#), quoted later. And, the right to marry is still recognized as a protected liberty by the US Supreme Court in [Meyer](#), quoted later.
- Fortunately, divorce can never cancel a legitimate marriage. Civil servants who have a duty to enforce marriage (to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity, preserve estates, and defend sacred honor) have never acquired the authority to divorce the

foundation of their society, which would be contrary to the law of nature that authorizes government to exist.

Unfortunately, the courts now presume that any state licensed “marriage” is a civil “marriage”, even if church solemnized. As we shall see, this presumption meets the definition of genocide.

Marriage is still the foundation of society. Divorce, as we know it today, is contrary to the reason government exists.

The mere suggestion that marriage can be cancelled denies God’s purpose for mankind, ridicules Christ, denies inheritance rights for all future generations and denies the legitimacy of government.

Satan is the father of legalists. Legalists want you to believe that there can be sex without consequence.

Until you enforce the law of nature there cannot be a legitimate nation.

Isaiah 5:20 (KJV) "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; "
--

1. How does the Bible define the term “marriage”?

The purpose of this chapter is to prove that (1) Biblical marriage is a lifetime status, (2) Biblical divorce never canceled the marriage, and (3) Biblical divorce never authorized remarriage.

Jesus, by quoting [Genesis 2:24](#), confirmed the pre-existing definition of the term *marriage* as the “one flesh” institution created by God for mankind. He emphasized that it is a permanent, until-death-do-they-part, Holy Matrimony between man and wife that mankind cannot put asunder.

Matthew 19:5-6 (NIV)

"and said, 'For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh' ? So they are no longer two, but one. Therefore what God has joined together, let man not separate."

The Bible calls it “one flesh”. But man and wife are still two. If Christ was speaking metaphorically then the terminology “one flesh” relationship has the same significance as today’s terminology “flesh and blood” relationship. If, however, the “one flesh” refers to the knitting together of two strands of DNA during conception, then Christ’s words make even more sense. This is supported by Malachi 2:15. Marriage and Conception becomes a holy purpose, set aside and sanctified as holy.

Note here that a DNA interpretation (which is the Malachi 2:15 interpretation) of “one flesh” renders homosex marriage impossible.

In [Matthew 19](#) and [Mark 10](#), Jesus confirmed the Genesis definition when religious leaders asked him about the legality of their divorce.

Nowhere in the Bible are there any civil government marriages or civil government divorces. Yes, Divorce is mentioned in the Bible. But as we shall see, it referred only to living separately. Divorce, in the Bible, never canceled the permanent lifetime one-flesh family relationship. Yes, Remarriage is mentioned in the Bible, but it is mentioned only as a felony. In the Bible remarriage is always adultery [Luke 16:18](#), [Romans 7:3](#). Adulterers cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven according to [1st Corinthians 6:9](#).

Divorce does not authorize remarriage. The only possible exception, which is not explicitly mentioned anywhere, is the figurative death of a spouse. Jesus often spoke of the living as being already dead.

Here are the marriage scriptures:

MARK 10:	MATTHEW 19:
Mark 10:2 "The Pharisees came and asked Him, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?" testing Him."	Matthew 19:3 "The Pharisees also came to Him, testing Him, and saying to Him, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his

<p>Mark 10:3 "And He answered and said to them, "What did Moses command you?"</p> <p>Mark 10:4 "They said, "Moses permitted a man to write a certificate of divorce, and to dismiss her." [see Deuteronomy 24]</p> <p>Mark 10:5 "And Jesus answered and said to them, "Because of the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept."</p>	<p>wife for just any reason?"</p> <p>[harmonizes with verses 7 and 8 below]</p>
<p>Mark 10:6 "But from the beginning of the creation, God 'made them male and female.'"</p> <p>Mark 10:7 "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife,"</p> <p>Mark 10:8 "'and the two shall become one flesh'; so then they are no longer two, but one flesh."</p> <p>Mark 10:9 "Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate."</p>	<p>Matthew 19:4 "And He answered and said to them, "Have you not read that He who made them at the beginning 'made them male and female,'"</p> <p>Matthew 19:5 "and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'?"</p> <p>Matthew 19:6 "So then, they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate."</p>

MARK 10:	MATTHEW 19:
[harmonizes with verses 4 and 5 above]	Matthew 19:7 "They said to Him, "Why then did Moses command to give a certificate of divorce, and to put her away?" [see Deuteronomy 24] Matthew 19:8 "He said to them, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, permitted you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so."
Mark 10:10 "In the house His disciples also asked Him again about the same matter."	
Mark 10:11 "So He said to them, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her." Mark 10:12 "And if a woman divorces her husband and marries another she commits adultery."	Matthew 19:9 (KJV) "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication [πορνεία IS NOT ADULTERY* μοιχαομαι] , and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."
NOTE for verse 12: The word divorce refers to living separately. Adultery is a crime committed by a married person, therefore the divorce Christ was speaking of in verse 11 did not cancel the man's first marriage, and in verse 12 did not cancel the woman's first marriage.	NOTE for verse 9: * Fornication is not adultery. Engaged couples were called husband and wife prior to marriage. As, for example, in Matthew 1:19 . And 1 st Corinthians 7:11. Also notice that remarriage is adultery.

Fornication is NOT adultery. Only after a wedding can someone commit adultery, violating the 7th commandment. Before the wedding it is fornication, not adultery. In both Matthew 19:9 and Matthew 5:32 Christ refers to putting away a wife for the cause of fornication, not adultery. Other verses show that engaged couples were called husband and wife prior to their wedding, therefore this "putting away" refers to canceling a wedding it does not refer to canceling a marriage. Also consider that remarriage was a felony in the Bible and remained so even in America. As we shall soon see, British and American divorce courts were created by a deliberate (never before misconstrued) misreading of these two Bible verses.

<p>MARK 10:</p>	<p>MATTHEW 19:</p> <p>Matthew 19:10 "His disciples said to Him, "If such is the case of the man with his wife, it is better not to marry."</p> <p>[We see here that the disciples certainly understood the criminal nature of remarriage.]</p> <p>Matthew 19:11 "But He said to them, "All cannot accept this saying, but only those to whom it has been given:"</p> <p>Matthew 19:12 "For there are eunuchs who were born thus from their mother's womb, and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He who is able to accept it, let him accept it."</p> <p>[Tyndale Translation: "... He that can take it, let him take it."]</p>
	<p>NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In other words, if a man leaves his fiancée, except for her fornication, he is better off to make himself eunuch and never marry. Some people want you to believe that Christ was speaking of living an unmarried celibate life, but the word Christ used (In <u>Strong's Concordance</u> Greek #2135) can refer to castration. He that can take it, let him take it. • Marriage betrothal is indeed a promise of fidelity, a lifetime enforceable contract even before the wedding ceremony. • This is not the doctrine of a cult, this is solid Christian doctrine for those who accept the words of Christ himself. • Castration is no more offensive then plucking out an eye, or

	cutting off a hand (Matthew 5:29-30, Matthew 18:8,9 or Mark 9:43,47). Fidelity is to be bred into Christians. (not like the heathen, 1 Thessalonians 4:4&5). After all, sexual immorality is the sin you commit against yourself 1 ST Corinthians 6:18.
--	--

Remarriage is always adultery [Luke 16:18](#), [Romans 7:3](#), Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9 and Mark 10:11-12. Adulterers will not inherit the kingdom of God:

[1 Corinthians 6:9-10](#) "Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God."

The word "man" in Christ's command "*let not man separate*" (or, in the King James version "*let not man put asunder*") is the Greek "anthropos" meaning all of mankind, from which we get our English anthro- words such as anthropology or anthropomorphic. It is not the Greek "aner" which would be used for an individual man. Again we see that until-death-do-us-part Holy Matrimony is not divorceable by mankind.

Husband and wife are one flesh. This was true from the beginning of creation. It was true in the early Ephesus church. And it is true today in all Christian nations. Ephesians 5:31 "*For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.*" As we will learn later, in chapters 7 and 15, one cannot testify against the other, not even in divorce court. This has always been the case in Christian nations.

The word "authority" comes from the root word *author*. If the State "married" you, then you have a civil union "marriage" only by civil authority. If Church authority married you, then you have a marriage that mankind cannot put asunder.

2. What is the Biblical definition of “divorce”

Nowhere in the Bible does divorce cancel a marriage. Divorce, in the Bible, only refers to living separately.

Remarriage is always the crime of adultery. (Matthew 5:32, Luke 16:18, Matthew 19:9, Mark 10:11-12, Romans 7:3). Adulterers cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven, 1 Corinthians 6:9.

[Matthew 5:31](#) “Furthermore it has been said, 'Whoever divorces his wife, let him give her a certificate of divorce.'”

[Matthew 5:32](#) “But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication [not adultery], causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.”

Notice that Biblical **divorce does not cancel a marriage**. Remarriage is the crime of adultery according to the words of Christ himself.

[Luke 16:18](#) “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery; and whoever marries her who is divorced from her husband commits adultery.”

Again note that Biblical **divorce does not cancel a marriage**. Remarriage is the crime of adultery. **How many times does the Bible have to repeat something before it becomes true?** Adulterers cannot go to heaven. As we shall see later, remarriage while the divorced spouse is living was still a felony when America was Christian.

[Romans 7:3](#) “So then if, while her husband lives, she marries another man, she will be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she has married another man.”

Again we notice that remarriage is the crime of adultery. Confirming Matthew 19:9, Matthew 5:32, and Luke 16:18. In America, this was also the law of the land as received from the English colonies.

Criminal remarriage?

The law of the land still says that remarriage is a felony. As we shall see later, in chapter 7, the received law-of-the-land in America states: “... *if any person, being married, **do afterwards marry again**, the former husband or wife being alive, it is felony... The first wife... is the true wife... and so, vice versa, of a ... husband*”

Why do today’s churches perform criminal weddings? Neither adulterers nor fornicators can inherit the Kingdom of God according to 1st Corinthians 6:9 and Ephesians 5:3-6 and 1st Thessalonians 4:3. They will congratulate you and tell you it is the best day of your life, while knowing that they are slamming you into hell.

Christ warned us “*in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*” Matthew 15:9 and Mark 7:7

No one who's spouse is still alive can take a new vow to violate their pre-existing vow. Not to God nor man. Why can't some churches understand this logic?

Numbers 30:10-11 (KJV) "And if she vowed in her husband's house, or bound her soul by a bond with an oath; And her husband heard it, and held his peace at her, and disallowed her not: then all her vows shall stand, and every bond wherewith she bound her soul shall stand."

Perversion: Government licensed marriage is not a marriage at all – it is only fornication. How perverted would it be if some self-called "Christian" churches actually knew that their wedding ceremonies were never valid in the first place, and therefore there are no spouses to commit adultery, it is only fornication?

Certainly they already know that descendants of bastards cannot enter the congregation of the Lord for 10 generations (Deuteronomy 23:2) here in a land where "*A bastard was also, in strictness, incapable of holy orders; ... utterly disqualified from holding any dignity in the church*"

And certainly they know that fornicators risk their salvation, 1st Thessalonians 4:3.

Know ye not that fornicators cannot inherit the Kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. 1st Corinthians 6:9-10

Here are some other divorce verses:

[1 Corinthians 7:10](#) "Now to the married I command, yet not I but the Lord: A wife is not to depart from her husband."

[1 Corinthians 7:11](#) "But even if she does depart, let her remain unmarried (Greek agamos is used only in 1st Corinthians chapter 7) or be reconciled to her husband. And a husband is not to divorce his wife."

[the phrase "remain unmarried" is another proof that the Bible refers to engaged couples as husband and wife prior to the wedding. – because marriage starts with the contract – the promise of lifetime fidelity.]

The clear Christian principle in 1 Corinthians 7:11 "*a husband is not to divorce his wife*" was delivered to an evil and adulterous generation – the same group that was immersed in the idea that giving her a notice of divorcement was sufficient to leave a wife. This is much the same today – lawyers still twist law in order to avoid God's commandments. And those who believe the lies of religious leaders are still damned today – by the same unchanging God of the Bible.

[1 Corinthians 7:12](#) "But to the rest I, not the Lord, say: If any brother has a wife who does not believe, and she is willing to live with him, let him not divorce her."

[1 Corinthians 7:13](#) "And a woman who has a husband who does not believe, if he is willing to live with her, let her not divorce him."

[1 Corinthians 7:14](#) "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; otherwise your children would be unclean, but now they are holy."

[merely living separately bastardizes the children]

[1 Corinthians 7:15](#) "But if the unbeliever departs, let him depart; a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases. But God has called us to peace."

[Divorce in the Bible refers to living separately. This verse does not prove that divorce cancels the marriage.]

[1 Corinthians 7:16](#) "For how do you know, O wife, whether you will save your husband? Or how do you know, O husband, whether you will save your wife?"

In 1st Corinthians 7, after discussing the advisability of marriage during national crisis, Paul writes [1 Corinthians 7:39](#) "A wife is bound by law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband dies, she is at liberty to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord."

Note that this also confirms Romans 7:2

[Hebrews 13:4](#) "Marriage is honorable among all, and the bed undefiled; but fornicators and adulterers God will judge."

[Malachi 2:16](#) God hates divorce.

(There's that word *hate*. As we shall see later, hate comes from God Himself).

[Sexual immorality](#) creates bastard children, which destroys society's legitimacy. Nothing legitimate can come from illegitimacy. This inevitably leads to captivity. God has always used pagan nations to punish disobedient nations. Conquering nations are instruments of His discipline ([Isa 8:4-10](#), 10:5-6, 45:1-3, [Jer 5:15-18](#), 20:4-5, 24:10, [Eze 21:15-23](#), 30:24-26, 32:11-15).

Sexual morality is very important to God. He has two commandments against sexual immorality. 1st Corinthians 6:18 perversion is the only sin that you commit against your own body.

Bastards can have few rights under God's laws, and Satan knows this. Nations can be destroyed by bastardizing the offspring. Until people want to enforce the law of the land, we cannot restore a legitimate nation.

The ancient law definition in [Justinian's Institutes](#):

"Marriage, or matrimony, is a binding together of a man and woman to live in an indivisible union."

Even the Roman Empire, after they were supposedly Christianized, understood that marriage is "indivisible". But today's Latin speaking lawyers are forcing us back into their barbaric past.

3. Family Values Are Holy.

This chapter will attempt to prove that family sanctity is holy, and merely living apart destroys everything holy about the family bond.

God created mankind in his moral image, Genesis 1:27. Then, at the Garden of Eden, God entrusted a great gift to mankind:

- After He created us in His image, he entrusted us to propagate (multiply) His image ONLY in a family setting.
- Genesis 2:24 defines marriage. According to Christ himself, divorce was not possible even from the beginning of mankind (Matthew 19:8) “**but from the beginning it was not so**”
- His law of nature requires marriage as a prerequisite for legitimate procreation. As we shall see in later chapters: Neither could any other law possibly exist.
- Legitimate procreation leads to legitimate family government (patriarchal government). This family government was perfectly good for the first ten books of the Bible, then we elected a king. Saul’s election was evil in the eyes of the Lord, I Samuel 12:17. Also see 1st Samuel 8:5-19.

Matrimony is set aside as a Holy purpose. Children of separated couples, even without divorce proceedings, were considered unclean (bastards) and not Holy by the Corinthian church. Has Christianity changed or has your church changed?

Man and wife become one flesh in the Garden of Eden. One flesh. One corpus. One corporation. A union for God's purpose, under God's authority. Marriage is the highest form of government. Anyone who opposes family opposes God. Honor your father and mother.

Christ spoke of castration for any man who would leave his fiancée for ANY reason except for her fornication (not adultery). This is a solid Christian doctrine from the words of Christ himself. To understand why he would suggest this remedy for unfaithfulness, we must first understand the holiness of “one flesh”.

Christ spoke of man and wife becoming one flesh, no longer two but one flesh. Matthew 19:5&6, Mark 10:8. There is a good possibility that he was speaking of conception. But there is also the possibility of a permanent lifetime bond (promise of fidelity) starting at their engagement.

The conception theory of “one flesh”:

- It is obvious that there are still two individuals, so many people tend to uphold the conception of a child as the interpretation of the phrase “two become one”. This theory is supported by Malachi 2:15.
- God created man in His image, [Genesis 1:26](#). He perpetuates us by Holy natural procreation. He expects us to honor His rules when we perpetuate His image. [Your physical image is re-created by the 38,000 genes in your sexual DNA. [Psalms 139:13](#)]

According to 1st Corinthians 6:13-20, your sexual bodies are members of the church, don't destroy the temple.

- Homosex cannot become one flesh.

The lifetime bond theory of "one flesh":

- It is a **promise** of a family bond.
- It is the **promise** of a birthright.
- In Matthew 19:10 the disciples suddenly realized that marriage commitment begins at betrothal, even before there are any solemn vows to God or before any ceremony.
- A man takes care of his family.

For students with good dictionaries, I want you to compare divorce with vasectomy. Both are **a destruction of promise**. Destroying the "one flesh" permanent lifetime promise of fidelity. Both also destroy God's promise for mankind.

- Marriage begins at the promise, not at the wedding. Engaged couples were called husband and wife prior to marriage. As, for example, in [Matthew 1:19](#). And 1st Corinthians 7:11. Marriage Betrothal is a **promise** of Holiness in Holy Matrimony, the plighting of troth. Our laws perpetuate this. Examples: "*Nuptias Non Concubitus Sed Consensus Facit*" Not cohabitation but consent makes the marriage. 2 Kent's Commentaries, page 87: "...consent of the parties is the essence of marriage, and that the ceremonies of celebration are but its form"
- In the male anatomy the Vas Deferens holds the promised seed. Vas is Latin for vessel, surety, bail (or **promise**). Vasectomy is a destruction of promise.
- Christians are the adopted seed (Greek word *sperma*) of Abraham. Galatians 3:29, Romans 9:8, Ephesians 1:5. Heirs of the **promise**. By the righteousness of faith (Romans 4:13-16).
- We derive our financial terminology from the same roots. A binding enforceable contract is called by familiar terms: a pledge, bond, bail, promise, or surety. Why do today's courts enforce promissory notes, but not the promise of a lifetime bond that is the very foundation of society?
- Similarly, it is only by Christ's **promise** that the remnant of a holy Church will be taken as a bride.
- The Christian Church, in 1 Corinthians 7:14 considered as unclean (not holy) the children of separated couples. That's right! Children of married couples who are living separately are not holy. We are made in the image of God. The family bond which God had entrusted to us, for rearing children (perpetuating His image), has been broken. Likewise, The received law in America also confirms that "A *bastard* was also, in strictness, incapable of holy orders; ... utterly disqualified from holding any dignity in the church" I find it interesting that today's science is only now discovering the effect of parent's nurturing on the programming of a child's epi-genome that effect attitudes and behaviors to the child's third generation.
- If a husband cannot keep his **promise**, then he is better off to castrate himself for the benefit of future society. Tyndale's Translation of Matthew 19:12: "... **He that can take it, let him take it.**" Infidelity is bred out of Christians. Fidelity, and a sense of shame, are bred into Christians. Even to the extent of castration. Whereas shameless

pagans breed unfaithful perversion among themselves. Christians control their lusts, not like the heathen, 1 Thessalonians 4:4&5. *

- Abraham had a firstborn bastard son. The **promises** were not made through his firstborn— Ishmael. The “promises” of the coming Messiah and the *birthright* for the greatest inheritance of all, was to go through Isaac. Only the children of the **promise** are counted as Abraham’s offspring. (Romans 9:8, and Galatians chapters 3 and 4), The **promise** of Christ (Acts 13:23, Galatians 3:16) was NOT through the first born bastard. Be grateful that you can be adopted as the seed of Abraham.

Exchange of **Promises** are the basis of all contract law. “*The sine qua non of any contract is the exchange of promises. From the exchange flows the obligation of one party to another.*” (from 1 Williston on Contracts, section 1)

What “exchange of promises” does an innocent spouse have with a divorce court? Is your contract something like “I’ll promise to give you my family, my house, half of my money and I’ll give you a large percentage of my future wages if you promise not to put me in a cage”?

The remainder of this book presents moral and legal history as we examine how extortion, kidnapping, and racketeering became acceptable by lawyers.

Before I continue, I want to say that traditional family rights are sacred. They are not made more sacred by written law. They are not less sacred just because you allowed rights to be stolen by those that you had entrusted to secure the blessings of liberty to yourself and your posterity.

As we shall see later, the right to marry is a liberty. If you don’t defend your liberty, you will lose it. You will be conquered by brutal pagans who have always been instruments of God’s discipline.

“Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” [Romans 8:7,8](#)

* what better way to destroy America than to convince everyone that solemn vows to God are meaningless religious chants that can be ignored by black robed priests at any courthouse. With the added advantage to Satan's disciples, that perversion becomes acceptable, Christ is mocked, and the crime of adultery, that just 100 years ago was the greatest of civil injuries, now becomes frivolous. Marriage ceases to be Holy and becomes a piece of paper to be conferred or revoked by the subjective determination of civil servants, who will eventually claim to act as "*guardians of their morals*". After society accepts unholy as Holy, then the road is paved for perverts to demand equal rights to commit their heinous crimes against the Laws of Nature.

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government:

222 "*The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their [lives, liberty and] property **it can never be supposed to be the will of the society that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure by entering into society,....** [this] holds true also concerning the [executive branch], who having a double trust put in him... acts also contrary to his trust when he employs the [offices] of the society to corrupt ... to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security...*"

4. American laws recognize undivorcable marriage

Real marriage is enforced. This chapter presents proof that laws, in the United States, require real marriage (Holy matrimony) to be enforced in courts, and prohibit real marriage (Holy matrimony) from being divorced.

- Real marriage is a permanent undivorcable lifetime relationship that cannot be cancelled by a court. (“*let not man put asunder*”)
- Real Marriage is indeed until-death-do-they-part.
- No one married in the face of the church has a right to divorce.
- No Supreme Court has ever upheld the divorce of a real marriage.
- Vows to God cannot be cancelled by man. (if we are all created equal)

As you study these laws, try to contrast the difference between enforceable marriage with today’s divorce courts’ refusal to enforce marriage. As we will learn in later chapters, their idea of “marriage” is not a permanent union. It is only licentiousness.

Here are some attributes of marriage which confirm the Biblical right to a permanent family relationship between man and wife, until death do they part, which mankind cannot put asunder:

- U.S. Supreme Court in Maynard v. Hill, [125 U.S. at page 211](#):
“*It is a relation for life.*”
- U.S. Supreme Court in Maynard v. Hill, [125 U.S. at page 212](#):
“*the relation of husband and wife, deriving both its rights and duties from a source higher than any contract of which the parties are capable, and, as to these, uncontrollable by any contract which they can make. When formed, this relation is no more a contract than ‘fatherhood’ or ‘sonship’ is a contract*”

[If marriage derives its rights “*from a source higher than any contract of which the parties are capable...*” then how did anyone get the authority to license this God given right? When the Constitution was written – ordained was the religious term they used – how did “we the people” delegate to the government they created this right to license marriages? Answer: they didn’t. Government licensed “marriage” is not a marriage at all. A licensed marriage is a contract with the State. As will be shown later, “*it is a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union.*”]

- U.S. Supreme Court in Maynard v. Hill, [125 U.S. at page 213](#), confirms that marriage “**merged the legal existence of the parties into one**”.
[If so, then how can a divorce attorney, who is an agent of the State, represent just one spouse? How can any court settle a legal controversy between one? Answer: state licensed “marriage” is not marriage.]
- Blackstone’s Commentaries Page 423, Book 1 discussed the traditional definition of marriage:
“*all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, shall be indissoluble.*”

- Blackstone's Commentaries Book 1, page 428:
*"For the canon law, which the common law follows in this case, deems so highly and with such mysterious reverence of the nuptial tie, that it **will not allow it to be unloosed for any cause whatsoever, that arises after the union is made...**"*
 The U.S. Supreme Court still relies upon Blackstone's Commentaries as proof of the law-of-the-land as received from the English Colonies when the original 13 States wrote their constitutions.
- A 518 page law textbook A Practical Treatise of The Law of Marriage and Divorce by Leonard Shelford, Littell Publishers, Philadelphia, 1841, has in the introduction a definition of marriage, on page 25, as "*Marriage is the conjunction of man and woman vowing to live inseparably together until death*" and then added the legal fact that "... *the marriage itself, and the obligations thence arising, are jure divino.*" Divine jurisdiction. We still call it Holy Matrimony, yet today divorce courts routinely rape the divine to tear asunder what God had joined together, sacrifice children on their altar of power, take half the family fortune and give it as a reward for the crime of adultery.
- Shelford's textbook also specifically stated that the law of England "*does not allow the dissolution of marriage by judicial sentence*". Later, in 1888, the US Supreme Court in Maynard will try to tell us that English law does somehow allow governments to divorce marriage. More about this in Chapters 9 and 10.
- Washington State Supreme Court McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570, July 1892, used the same terminology as the Georgia Supreme Court when it concluded that marriage contracts shall be permanent:
*"However this question is decided, it may result in hardship in some cases, but we think the lesser injury will come from an adherence to the statutory requisites than otherwise, to the end that these contracts, **shall be permanent, and not revocable at the will and pleasure of the parties;**"*
 Divorce lawyers insist that the Maynard case authorizes States to divorce marriages. But the Washington McLaughlin's Estate case was four years AFTER the US Supreme Court ruled in Maynard v. Hill, which was a local case from Washington territory, and three years after the Washington Constitution prohibited legislative divorces.
- Maryland Supreme Court Denison v. Denison, 35 Md. 372 "*indissoluble even by the consent of the parties*"
- Moxey Estate (1903) 2 Cof 369: "*Marriage... it is extremely important that its stability shall be secured, and that its contraction should be surrounded by safeguards and **its sanctity upheld...***"
- Texas Supreme Court Lewis v. Ames, 44 Tex. 341: "*A marriage is a mutual agreement of a man and woman to live together in the relation and under the duties of husband and wife, sharing each other's fate or fortune for weal or woe **until parted by death,** ...*"
- Georgia Supreme Court Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga. 173: "*And the interest of the state is that these contracts **shall be permanent, and not revocable at the will and pleasure of the parties;***"
- 1892 Washington State Supreme Court McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570, confirmed that: "*It is held it should be the policy of the law to **sustain all such contracts and relations** whenever possible, and that **this should always be done** ...[page 590 marriage has] **its origin in divine law**"*

- Shelford's 1841 Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 25 "Marriage is the conjunction of man and woman vowing to live **inseparably together until death**... the marriage itself, and the obligations thence arising, are **jure divino**." (Divine jurisdiction. Not Satanic jurisdiction).
And continuing on page 28 and 29:
"Experience, independently of religion, teaches that the great ends of matrimony cannot be fulfilled without imprinting on it a **character of indissolubility**, ... The law has therefore imposed on the contract of marriage such a conditions; It is the law... that gives effect to and supports all contracts; ... and every one who contracts matrimony knows the terms of his engagement....
"In prescribing a form of celebration, since all which either law or religion requires is, that the consent shall be given in such a solemn manner as may not only preclude all pretence of the want of a deliberate purpose, but render the contract of the **sacred** and important stature which it so justly merits.... Marriage, in its origin, is a contract of natural law antecedent to its becoming in civil society a civil contract, ... in most civilized countries, acting under a sense of the force of sacred obligations, **it is a religious contract**, the consent of the individuals pledged to each other being ratified and consecrated by a **vow to God**. This, generally speaking, is the idea of marriage as entertained in every country where the Christian religion prevails.
... but the **divine obligations** belong to the jurisdiction of another law and another judge. "

Do you still have a right to equal protection under the law? Equal to those whose marriages are upheld? Or even equal to homosexual relationships?

COMMON LAW MARRIAGE

Even common-law marriage is a real marriage until death do they part, that cannot be canceled by a court.

Satan's legalists have deceived some people into believing that common law (unlicensed) marriage is not a marriage. Yet real marriage existed prior to any government license. Marriage did not come from human government. It is your duty to avoid deception.

Shelford's 1841 Treatise on the Laws of Marriage, page 28:

*"though the law declares null all such contracts as are entered into without conformity to the enactments of the legislature, the **marriages still are valid -- because human laws cannot reach them.**"*

And continuing on page 31:

"lasting cohabitation, that in a state of nature, would be a marriage, and in the absence of all civil and religious institutes might safely be presumed to be, as it is popularly called, a marriage in the sight of God."

(Would you rather have a marriage in the sight of God, or in the sight of black robed priests of Satan who insist that your children are the state's children?)

The US Supreme Court in Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76, at the bottom of page 78, ruled that such marriages are perfectly lawful and enforceable:

*“Statutes in many of the States, it is true, regulate the mode of entering into the contract, but they **do not confer the right.** Hence they are not within the principle, that where a statute creates a right and provides a remedy for its enforcement, the remedy is exclusive. No doubt a statute may take away a common law right; but there is always a presumption that the Legislature has no such intention, unless it be plainly expressed. A statute may declare that no marriages shall be valid unless they are solemnized in a prescribed manner; but such an enactment is a very different thing from a law requiring all marriages to be entered into in the presence of a magistrate or a clergyman, **or that it be preceded by a license**, or publication of banns, or be attested by witnesses. Such formal provisions **may be construed as merely directory**, instead of being treated as destructive of a common law right to form the marriage relation by words of present assent. And such...has been the rule generally adopted in construing statutes regulating marriage. Whatever directions they may give respecting its formation or solemnization, courts have usually held a marriage good at common law to be good notwithstanding the statutes, unless they contain express words of nullity. “*

As you try to figure out your legislature's marriage laws, keep in mind that they knew of this Supreme Court decision that they cannot cancel God's law of nature, and would never attempt to eliminate Holy Matrimony with "express words of nullity"

- The legal maxim "*Nuptias Non Concubitus Sed Consensus Facit*" Not cohabitation but

consent makes the marriage.

- 2 Kent's Commentaries, page 87: "...consent of the parties is the essence of marriage, and that the ceremonies of celebration are but its form"
- New Hampshire Supreme Court, Clark v. Clark 10 NH 383 "But in most governments the contract is held to be valid and binding, notwithstanding it is entered into with no rites or ceremonies."
- And the Quakers don't believe in wedding ceremonies. After some preliminary matters, at a regular weekday meeting, they couple declares that they will be faithful to each other until death, they sign a certificate without witness signatures, and walk out of the meeting house as man and wife without any pronouncement or blessing.
- The Holy Scriptures does not prescribe any wedding ceremony. Weddings are a Catholic ritual forced on society by Pope Innocent III. It was not until the Council of Trent, in 1563, during their brutal counter-reformation, that the Catholics attempted to control the wedding ceremony. More about this in chapter 10.
- Parsons' on Contracts, Sixth edition, 1873, Volume III, page 81: "That evidence of marriage, from cohabitation, acknowledgement by the parties, reception by the family, connection as man and wife, and general reputation, is receivable in nearly all civil cases, has been distinctly held"
- 2 Kent's Commentaries page 87, fifth and subsequent editions: "If the contract be made *per verba de proesenti*, and remains without cohabitation, or if made *per verbade futuro*, and be followed by consummation, it amounts to a valid marriage, in the absence of all civil regulations to the contrary."
- Massachusetts Supreme Court Parton v. Hervey, 1 Gray 119: "But in the absence of any provision declaring marriage not celebrated in a prescribed manner or between parties of a certain age absolutely void, it is held, that all marriages regularly made according to the common law, are valid and binding, although had in violation of the specific regulations imposed by statute."
- Mississippi Supreme Court Dickerson v. Brown, 49 Miss. 370 concerning unsolemnized and undocumented marriages: if the parties intend marriage, and their intent sufficiently appears, '*they are inseparably man and wife, not only before God, but also before men*'
- Michigan Supreme Court Hutchins v. Kimmell, 31 Mich. 126: "Whatever the form of ceremony, or even if all ceremony was dispensed with, if the parties agreed presently to take each other for husband and wife, and from that time lived together professedly in that relation, proof of these facts would be sufficient to **constitute proof of a marriage binding upon the parties**, and which would subject them and others to legal penalties for a disregard of its obligations. This has become the settled doctrine of the American courts; the few cases of dissent or apparent dissent being borne down by a great weight of authority in favor of the rule as we have stated it."
- 55 C.J.S. §7 "a statute regulating marriage is construed as directory, and does not invalidate a marriage contracted in violation of its provisions, such as an informal or common-law marriage. A marriage contract without complying with such a statute is valid, even though the statute provides for the civil or criminal punishment of those who fail to comply with it."
- Idaho Revised Statute 1887, section 2429 as ruled in State v. McGilvery: "proof of a marriage ceremony performed in a church by a minister authorized to perform such ceremony, and that this was followed by cohabitation of the parties, is sufficient proof of a legal marriage, without it being shown that a license was obtained, and a certificate returned by the minister, as required by statute."
- Washington Supreme Court McLaughlin's Estate, 30 Pac. 651 at 654, 4 Wash. 570 at

579: "marriage is a natural right, which existed independent of statutes..."

- Georgia Appellate Court Allen v. State 60 Ga.App 248: marriage contracted without complying with "statute is valid, even though statute provides for the civil or criminal punishment of those who fail to comply with it"
- Hoage v. Murch, 60 F.2d 983 legislative intent to abrogate common-law marriages will not be presumed: it must be clearly expressed.
- Texas Supreme Court Lewis v. Ames, 44 Tex. 341: "What was known as and called 'marriages null in law' was a real marriage according to nature, and so intended by the parties, deficient only by the existence of some legal impediment or the want of compliance with the forms of law in contracting it."
- Georgia Supreme Court Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga. 173 emphasized the importance of documenting the marriage in the public record: "**Her honor is saved, and this is worth more than everything, even life itself. All other contracts may be rescinded, and the parties restored to their former condition; marriage cannot be undone.**"

That's right! The honor of legitimate marriage is worth more than life itself. Governments enforce marriage, they do not cancel marriage. Governments are created to protect rights. Did a government that was created to protect rights now have a duty to destroy what they were created to protect? Do they now have the right to destroy the foundation of society? Do they now deny honor which is worth more than life itself? What honor can society have if it is founded by illegitimacy?

None of these court cases even hinted that the right to marry came from a human government. There are more marriage-is-a-natural-right cases at the end of Chapter 10.

"The liberty of marriage is a natural right inherent in mankind, confirmed and enforced by the Holy Scriptures..." Virginia Law Register Nov 1900, Vol. VI, No.7 article Essentials of a Valid Marriage.

US Supreme Court in Markley v. Baldwin, published as Maryland v. Baldwin, 112 US 490, (in 1884):

- "No witness was present at any marriage ceremony, or at any contract of marriage between the parties; a marriage was inferred from their declarations and their living together"
- "a marriage is a civil contract, and may be made *per verba de praesenti*, that is, by words in the present tense, without attending ceremonies, religious or civil. Such also is the law of many other states, in the absence of statutory regulation. It is the doctrine of the common law. But where no such ceremonies are required, and no record is made to attest the marriage, some public recognition of it is necessary as evidence of its existence. The protection of the parties and their children, and considerations of public policy, require this public recognition; and it may be made in any way which can be seen and known by men, such as living together as man and wife, treating each other and speaking of each other in the presence of third parties as being in that relation, and declaring the relation in documents executed by them while living together, such as deeds, wills, and other formal instruments."

Marriage “is a contract of natural law antecedent to its becoming a civil contract in civil society” according to Shelford's Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29. Perhaps this is the entire problem. Perhaps man's counterfeit "civil contract" substitute of real marriage is how we started down the wrong path to government regulated marriage. Later we will learn that this "civil contract" was created so we could force rapists to marry their pregnant victim. We did this to protect the rights of the innocent children. Otherwise, the bastards would have no rights.

Substitute marriage is a government privilege it can be licensed, controlled and cancelled by government. This perverted civil union "marriage" can of course, be redefined to include some* perversions. Whereas real marriage, defined in the garden of Eden by the God Himself, can never be redefined.

* The reason civil union "marriage" cannot include homosex perversions. is, as we shall see, because government cannot remove punishment for homosex. The moment homosex becomes unpunishable is the moment the purpose of government ceases to exist. Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law, Book 1, Part 1, starts out with an explanation of why statutory law exists. He eloquently explains that the law of nature is from the divine revealed law of the Bible. "If man were to live in a state of nature, unconnected with other individuals, there would be no occasion for any other laws, than the law of nature, and the law of God. **Neither could any other law possibly exist**; for a law always supposes some superior who is to make it; and in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being. The law of nature authorizes government to exist. The moment homosex becomes unpunishable is the moment graven manmade law replaces the law of nature which created government. If congress were to make homosex unpunishable, then they have denied the legitimacy of their office, overthrown government in the most inhuman way, and misused government contrary to the trust that created government. Government must “*bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*” [full quote in Chapter 23]. The moment homosex becomes unpunishable is the moment the sword of Justice reverts back to those who delegated the task: “*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual*” [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7] which we delegated to our civil servants when we created government.

Civil Marriage license is never required.

- U.S. Supreme court Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76, at page 78 says that States do not confer the right to marry.
- U.S. Supreme court Meyer, quoted later, 262 US 390, 399: determined that liberty includes the right to marry and to raise children and to worship God, and these rights exist independently from any State authority
- U.S. Supreme Court Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105, quoted later: no State can convert a liberty into a privilege by demanding a license or charging a fee
- U.S. Supreme Court Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969), quoted later: if a State does try to license a right, the license can be ignored and the right exercised with impunity.

In the next chapter, we will study the real meaning of divorce to prove that divorce never cancels a marriage. Just how illogical is it to pretend that a black robed priest at the courthouse can cancel your vows to God? Does their divorce paper really put asunder the marriage that is “until death do us part?” Here are some points to consider:

- Do perverts in your Divorce Courts profit from pimping wives to their adulterers, when the purpose of marriage statutes is, again quoting Askew: “to guard against the manifold evils which would result from illicit intercourse...”? In a nation where the crime of adultery is also the greatest of civil injuries?
- You are to obey God, not decrees of man (Acts 5:29). It is unlikely that government officers can disturb your worship. Worship is defined in the Law Dictionary as “Any form of religious service showing reverence for Divine Being, or exhortation to obedience to or following of the mandates of such Being....” Many prospective jurors would consider the Bible Holy, but you cannot get a jury in divorce court.
- God said man and wife were one flesh, Genesis 2:24, Malachi 2:15, Matthew 19:6 and Mark 10:8. Also see Ephesians 5:31.
- Only if the husband dies is the wife free, Romans 7:2 and 1st Corinthians 7:39. Remarriage is always adultery Luke 16:18, Romans 7:3, Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9 and Mark 10:11-12. Adulterers will not inherit the kingdom of God 1 Corinthians 6:9-10
- U.S. Supreme Court 465 U.S. 668:
“The Constitution does not require complete separation of church and state; it affirmatively mandates accommodation, not merely tolerance, of all religions, and forbids hostility toward any. Anything less would require the “callous indifference,” Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306, 314, that was never intended by the Establishment Clause”
- There can never be a legitimate government function to participate in, encourage, ratify or condone a breach of marriage. The Clean Hands doctrine prohibits State machinery from assisting a breach of marriage.

Luke 11:35 (KJV) *"Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness."*

5. Divorce does not cancel a real marriage.

In the last chapter we confirmed that the received law of the land states:

- Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, Page 423:
"all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, **shall be indissoluble.**"
- Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 428:
"For the canon law, which the common law follows in this case, deems so highly and with such mysterious reverence of the nuptial tie, that it **will not allow it to be unloosed for any cause whatsoever, that arises after the union is made...**"
- The common law is the law that applies to everyone. Common law cannot be cancelled by the legislature unless there are express words of nullity, and there is always a presumption that the legislature had no intention to overturn the common law – according to the Supreme Court's Meister decision.
- Christ said "**Let not man put asunder.**"

Rights cannot be licensed. Rights cannot be charged a license fee, nor regulated by administrative courts that regulate licensing disputes.

Examples

- Example: the United States Supreme Court in Meister v. Moore 96 US 76 at page 81 ruled that marriage license laws cannot be enforced: "**marriage is a thing of common right... any other construction would compel holding illegitimate the offspring of many parents conscious of no violation of law**"
- Example: 1892 Washington State Supreme Court McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570, confirmed that: "**marriage is a natural right, which always existed prior to the organization of any form of government, and all laws in restraint of it should be strictly construed in consequence thereof. It is held it should be the policy of the law to sustain all such contracts and relations whenever possible, and that this should always be done ...**[page 590 marriage has] **its origin in divine law**"
- 1888 U.S. Supreme Court Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. 190:
"[page 205] Marriage, as creating the most important relation in life, as having more to do with the morals and civilization of a people than any other institution,....
[page 211] it is a relation for life
[page 212] the relation of husband and wife, deriving both its rights and duties from a source higher than any contract of which the parties are capable, and, as to these, uncontrollable by any contract which they can make..."
- Example: "The liberty of marriage is a natural right inherent in mankind, confirmed and enforced by the Holy Scriptures." A Practical Treatise of The Law of Marriage and Divorce by Leonard Shelford 1841, page 27
- Example: Georgia Supreme Court in Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga 173: "**marriage is founded in the law of nature, and is anterior to all human law**"
- Example: "The union of a man and a woman is of the law of nature." Maxims of Law from Bouvier's 1856 Law Dictionary.

Marriage is defined by Divine law, anterior to all human law. The Right to marry always existed prior to the organization of any form of government. Man cannot redefine it. God performed the first wedding. Christ confirmed the original legal definition.

Church Solemnized Marriage was always enforceable in government courts. Not divorceable.

When the U.S. Constitution was written, divorce was unknown in America. Despite the harsh living conditions, and families struggling while their men were out trying to survive in the wilderness, even when some never returned, the divorce rate was still zero. The US Supreme Court (Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at page 206) tells us that when the federal Constitution was written, New York, as a colony and then as a state, had not had a divorce for 100 years. This marriage-must-be-enforced requirement was the received law-of-the-land in all thirteen original states.

In the late 1890s marriage laws still ensured that divorce remain uncommon. Even divorce for aggravated cruelty did not cancel the marriage. It only separated the spouses physically.

That's right! When America was young, divorce never cancelled a real marriage. It was unthinkable that any court would refuse to uphold a real marriage.

It is highly doubtful that a majority of legislators would commit treason by denying the foundation of society.

America' moral compass has been so disoriented by a century of judicial activism, that the statement "divorce does not cancel a marriage" seems absurd.

Not since the early Roman Empire has divorce cancelled a marriage. Divorce does not cancel a marriage. That is not what divorce is. Divorce is a determination that the marriage had always been invalid due to a flawed original contract. The marriage is not put asunder, because the marriage never existed. All children are bastards. Real marriage is until death they depart.

Therefore, there is no such person as a living ex-wife or ex-husband.

Most of the Supreme Court decisions cited in this book are from bastards trying to inherit their divorced parent's property. No Supreme Court has ever upheld divorce of a real marriage. No Supreme Court has ever said that divorce cancels a marriage.

Blackstone's, Book I at page 423:

"These civil disabilities make the contract void ab initio, and not merely voidable: not that they dissolve a contract already [page 424] formed, but they render the parties incapable of forming any contract at all: they do not put asunder those who are joined together, but they previously hinder the junction. And, if any persons under these legal incapacities come together, it is a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union [prior marriage with a husband

or wife still living, underage without parents' permission, incompetent to contract, invalid contract to marry].”

Blackstone's, Book I, page 445, chapter 16:

*“Likewise, in case of divorce in the spiritual court a vinculo matrimonii, all the issue born during the coverture are bastards ; because such **divorce is always** upon some cause, that rendered the marriage unlawful and null from the beginning.”*

Marriage, under English Law, was always valid unless the original contract was under a disability. There were two sorts of disabilities: first as are canonical. *“These canonical disabilities,”* ... [prior contract, incest, polygamy ‘and some particular corporal infirmities’] **“being entirely the province of the ecclesiastical courts, our [law] books are perfectly silent concerning them.”** yet they were still *“esteemed valid to all civil purposes”*. The offenders were then placed under a “sentence of separation” by the ecclesiastical court, but there was no “sentence of nullity” until actual separation. (details are in Blackstone, Book 1, page 422-423).

In the original 13 states, the received law-of-the-land enforced even unscriptural (questionable) marriages. Marriage could not be divorced by government courts. Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 421: Divorce was,

*“...left entirely to the ecclesiastical law: the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriages as a sin, but merely as a civil inconvenience. The punishment therefore, or annulling, of incestuous or other unscriptural marriages, is the province of the spiritual courts; which act pro salute animae. And, taking it in this civil light, the law treats it as it does all other contracts; allowing it to be **good and valid in all cases**, where the parties at the time of making it were, in the first place, willing to contract; secondly, able to contract; and, lastly, actually did contract, in the proper forms and solemnities required by law.”*

Note that the *“solemnities required by law”* required a church wedding.

This was the law of the land in the original states, as received from the English common law. This has changed slightly. By 1803 Virginia law allowed its courts to cancel incestuous “marriages”. This seemed appropriate because America does not have a royalty that might need to keep its blood blue.

No church solemnized marriage was ever voided by government courts according to Blackstone's, Book 1, page 427, 428:

no marriage by the temporal law is ipso facto void, that is celebrated by a person in orders, --- in a parish church or public chapel (or elsewhere, by special dispensation) --- in pursuance [Page 428] of banns or a licence, --- between single persons, --- consenting, --- of sound mind, --- and of the age of twenty one years; --- or of the age of fourteen in males and twelve in females, with consent of parents or guardians, or without it, in case of widowhood.

We will learn in chapter 10 that the license mentioned by Blackstone was a church license, not a state license.

“Where-ever law ends, tyranny begins,”
John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government, paragraph 202

6. What does History say about divorce?

The purpose of this chapter is to establish a foundation (legal, moral, religious and historical foundation) as further proofs that divorce does not cancel a marriage.

LEGALITY OF DIVORCE COURTS

The United States Constitution Article 1, section 10 prohibits any state from impairing the obligation of contracts.

Could this mean that states cannot divorce anyone? To answer this, we must determine if marriage is a contract. And if so, is it a contract with the state?

We know from the U.S. Supreme Court in Meister that a contract to marry must comply with contract statutes, but that doesn't mean marriages are contracts with the state: the Meister decision stated: "*Statutes in many of the States, it is true, regulate the mode of entering into the contract, but they do not confer the right.*"

In 1819 the Supreme Court ruled on the Constitutionality of divorce and determined that divorce without a breach of contract would be a prohibited impairment of the obligation of contracts. In the case Dartmouth College v. Woodward, [17 U.S. 518](#),

"... if the argument means to assert, that the legislative power to dissolve such a contract, without any breach on either side, against the wishes of the parties, and without any judicial inquiry to ascertain a breach, I certainly am not prepared to admit such a power, or that its exercise would not intrench upon the prohibition of the Constitution. If, under the faith of existing laws, a contract of marriage be duly solemnized, or a marriage settlement be made (and marriage is always in law a valuable consideration for a contract), it is not easy to perceive why a dissolution of its obligations, without any default or assent of the parties, may not as well fall within the prohibitions as any other contract for a valuable consideration."

A later decision said that marriages are NOT contracts. The 1888 U.S. Supreme Court in Maynard v. Hill, [125 U.S. at page 212](#): determined that:

the relation of husband and wife, deriving both its rights and duties from a source higher than any contract of which the parties are capable, and, as to these, uncontrollable by any contract which they can make. When formed, this relation is no more a contract than 'fatherhood' or 'sonship' is a contract"

Note that this conflicts with the Illinois Supreme Court case that I quote in chapter 13, which concludes that marriage is a three-party contract with the state, but also notice that Illinois was speaking of government licensed marriage.

An earlier 1873 law reference book Parsons' On Contracts¹ discussed this Constitutional clause that prohibits impairing contracts. It states that in a breach of the contract to marry, "*If this be so, the operation of this clause upon the contract of marriage would be confined to*

preventing a divorce at the will of one party, against the will of the other party, and for no cause.”

¹Theophilus Parsons, Law of Contracts (Boston, Little, Brown & Co., Sixth Edition, 1873), Volume II, page 496.

HISTORY OF DIVORCE COURTS

Prior to 1857 there were no government divorce courts in America or England. The spiritual (ecclesiastical) courts sometimes granted a divorce from bed and board, *a mensa et thoro*, but never a complete divorce from the bonds of marriage. “*Complete divorce formerly occurred in England only when Parliament, by a private act made for the case, annulled a marriage.*”² presumably due to an invalid original contract to marry. We may also presume that this never occurred in marriages with children because Blackstone’s Commentaries Page 423, Book 1: “*all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, shall be indissoluble.*”

² Parsons On Contracts, sixth edition, Volume III, page 88

American divorce courts of the early 1900s are based upon English divorce courts. England established divorce courts by an 1857 statute (Title 21, Victoria, chapter 85) where the husband could obtain divorce *a vinculo* for the wife’s adultery, and a wife could obtain divorce only when the husband’s adultery was accompanied with cruelty. But these courts were based on a false authority. The authority creating this divorce court was “*the law being made to conform to what was regarded as the positive requirement of Scripture.*”³

That’s right! Divorce courts were justified by a deliberate misreading of the Bible. According to the unchanging Christ of the Bible, divorce for any reason was not lawful since the beginning of mankind, but Christians did nothing to stop these courts. Scripture does not authorize any divorce for adultery, it only allows a man to leave his fiancée for her fornication. Since the beginning of mankind, divorce was never lawful after the wedding ceremony.

Self professed Christians had a duty to stop the politically mighty, but did nothing.

Not only was this fraudulent authority used to divorce adulterers, divorce courts started permitting divorce *a vinculo* for many reasons other than adultery: “*desertion, cruelty, sentence to long imprisonment, and the like.*”³ Interestingly enough, courts would not grant divorce for adultery if there was proof of collusion or if there was continued cohabitation – forgiveness – with the guilty spouse. (Arkansas Supreme Court, *Turnbull v. Turnbull* 23 Ark. 615)

³ Parsons on Contracts, sixth edition, Volume III, page 89

Self-professed Christians did nothing to prevent this government authorized perversion. Since complete divorce bastardizes the children, the children were left without the ability to inherit property from their own family. This eventually led to the 1888 US Supreme Court case in Maynard v. Hill where the Maynard children tried to inherit some of their mother’s property.

"To sin by silence, when we should protest, makes cowards of men."

Ella Wheeler Wilcox, (1914).

"Silence is equated with fraud if there is a moral duty to speak."

United States v. Prudden, 424 F.2d 1021

DIVORCE HISTORY

There are two kinds of divorce from marriage:

- a forced separation to save the life of a spouse, which does not cancel the marriage, called divorce *a mensa et thoro* (Latin for divorce from bed and board), or
- a court determination, by either civil court or ecclesiastical court, that the marriage has always been invalid due to a flawed original contract, called divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. All children are bastards.

There is no other kind of divorce. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A DIVORCE THAT CANCELS A LEGITIMATE MARRIAGE. A court must always uphold legitimate marriages.

The difference between total and partial divorce in the English law, as explained by Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, Page 428:

*"I AM next to consider the manner in which marriages may be dissolved; and this is either by death, or divorce. There are two kinds of divorce, the one total, the other partial; the one a vinculo matrimonii, the other merely a mensa et thoro. The total divorce, a vinculo matrimonii, must be for some of the canonical causes of impediment before-mentioned; and those, existing before the marriage, as is always the case in consanguinity; not supervenient, or arising afterwards, as may be the case in affinity or corporal imbecillity. For in cases of **total divorce, the marriage is declared null, as having been absolutely unlawful ab initio**^[1]; and the parties are therefore separated pro salute animarum: for which reason, as was before observed, no divorce can be obtained, but during the life of the parties. **The issue of such marriage, as is thus entirely dissolved, are bastards.***

*"DIVORCE a mensa et thoro is when the marriage is just and lawful ab initio^[1], and therefore the law is tender of dissolving it; but, for some supervenient cause, it becomes improper or impossible for the parties to live together: as in the case of intolerable ill temper, or adultery, in either of the parties. For the canon law, which the common law follows in this case, deems so highly and with such mysterious reverence of the nuptial tie, that **it will not allow it to be unloosed for any cause whatsoever,**^[2] **that arises after the union is made.** And this is said to be built on the divine re- [Page 429] vealed law; though that expressly assigns incontinence [infertility which is a hidden condition that exists prior to the contract to marry, and voids the contract because children are a promise of the contract] as a cause, and indeed the only cause, why a man may put away his wife and marry another. The civil law, ... adultery is only a cause of separation from bed and board^[3]: for which the best reason that can be given, is, that **if divorces were allowed to depend upon a matter within the power of either the parties, they would probably be extremely frequent;** as was the case when divorces were*

allowed for canonical disabilities, on the mere consession of the parties, which is now prohibited by the canons. However, divorces a vinculo matrimonii, for adultery, have of late years been frequently granted by act of parliament^[4].

[¹] The Latin phrase *Ab initio* means from the beginning
[Notes for the student who is studying the Maynard decision:

[²] The common law is the rule of decision in all courts. Note that in Blackstone's same paragraph where he explains that the common law will not allow divorce for any cause whatsoever, he says there was frequent legislative divorce for adultery (at the same period in history when New York had no divorces in 100 years). He left unstated here whether or not these legislative divorces were for civil non-church intermarriage, but he did say the law books were silent about divorce on page 423: "*being entirely the province of the ecclesiastical courts, our books are perfectly silent concerning them.*" He also left unstated here whether or not these legislative divorces were available to families with children, but he did say, back on page 423 that "*all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, shall be indissoluble.*" Since neither the civil law nor ecclesiastical law would allow divorce *vinculo matrimonii*, perhaps this legislative recourse in England was a divorce *vinculo matrimonii* available only to non-church intermarriage without children due to infertility of the wife. But in America, this issue was never brought up to the Supreme Court, and remains to be decided. The Maynards had children but the Supreme Court never considered this. There are still no express words of nullity to change the common law.

Definition: "in the face of the church" –according to Black's Law Dictionary:

"in facie ecclesiae... In the face of the church. A term applied in the law of England to marriages, which are required to be solemnized in a parish church or public chapel, unless by dispensation or license."

[notice how they avoid telling you that it is also the law of the land in America]

[³] Note that in "*civil law...adultery is only a cause of separation from bed and board*" – partial divorce, which does not cancel the marriage – here in Blackstone's, Book1 page 429. CAUTION: Do not be confused into thinking that civil licensed marriage somehow replaced church marriage. Do not be confused by the words of the 1888 US Supreme Court decision in Maynard v. Hill, 125 US near the top of page 206, "*When this country was settled, the power to grant a divorce from the bonds of matrimony was exercised by the parliament of England. The ecclesiastical courts of that country were limited to the granting of divorces from bed and board.*" Do not be confused. All courts of England, not just ecclesiastical courts, were limited to the granting of divorces from bed and board as explained here by Blackstone. The Washington State Supreme Court was not confused. Maynard v. Hill was a case from Washington. The Washington State Supreme Court, four years after this Maynard decision, ruled on a common law marriage case in McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570. On page 589 they quoted a Washington statute: "*All marriages to which there are no legal impediments, solemnized before or in any religious organization or congregation, according to the established ritual or form commonly practiced therein, are valid.*" And don't think that ecclesiastical court jurisdiction over marriages does not exist in America. We know from Tucker's commentary that government courts in 1803 Virginia had "*jurisdiction in cases of incestuous marriages, which it may annul, but it does not appear to possess jurisdiction in*

any other matrimonial or other ecclesiastical case whatsoever.” Also don’t be confused by the Supreme Court’s terminology “*from the bonds of matrimony*” which was used to refer to the Maynard’s intermarriage.

[4] Acts of parliament do not apply to ecclesiastical marriage. Perhaps adultery is proof in a legislative divorce that the original contract for **intermarriage** was invalid. Note that the 1888 US Supreme Court decision in Maynard v. Hill, 125 US near the top of page 206, used this precedence of English legislative divorces for adultery to uphold the legislative divorce of Mr. Maynard’s **intermarriage**. This so outraged everyone that legislative divorces are now prohibited in some State Constitutions. Yet divorce lawyers will tell you that Maynard is the only Supreme Court decision to authorize government divorce.

PARTIAL DIVORCE

Partial divorce, from bed and board, is a court ordered separation, by either an ecclesiastical court or a government divorce court. This was once the only kind of divorce granted to legitimately married couples. It does not cancel the marriage. Children remain legitimate. “*This kind of divorce was once the most common*” 3 Parsons’ on Contracts 92.

Government cannot interfere in private family affairs. As with any liberty, the liberty in family life is “*susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the state may lawfully protect*”

Therefore the plaintiff in the separation case must prove cruelty which affects “life or limb or health” (Bailey v. Bailey 97 Mass 531, Odour v Odour 36 Ga 286)

Continuing with the Blackstone on page 429:

IN case of divorce a mensa et thoro, the law allows alimony to the wife; which is that allowance, which is made to a woman for her support out of the husband's estate; being settled at the discretion of the ecclesiastical judge, on consideration of all the circumstances of the case. But in case of elopement, and living with an adulterer, the law allows her no alimony.

Note that Partial Divorce does not cancel the marriage. Partial Divorce, as a court ordered separation, is an extraordinary remedy by which society may preserve itself by intervening to cut out corruption that would destroy us, such as preventing death by “inhuman treatment” of such *severity as endangers the life or health of the party... from which it may be inferred that “inhumanity” is an extreme or aggravated “cruelty”*. (Black’s Law Dictionary).

This is the compelling state interest (an interest that the state may lawfully protect) that authorizes court ordered separation (divorce *a mensa et thoro*). Marriage, like any other liberty, is “*susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the state may lawfully protect*” (West’s Constitutional law, key 84, 90, 91)

Note that historical Divorce *a mensa et thoro* was a forced separation; it did not cancel legitimate marriage nor authorize remarriage. The historical term *Divorce* conformed to the Biblical definition.

Marriage, under English Law, was presumed to be valid unless the original contract was declared, by church or government, to be invalid due to a disability. There were two sorts of disabilities: first are canonical. *“These canonical disabilities,”* ... [prior contract, incest, polygamy ‘and some particular corporal infirmities’] *“being entirely the province of the ecclesiastical courts, our books are perfectly silent concerning them.”* yet they were still *“esteemed valid to all civil purposes”*. The offenders were then placed under a *“sentence of separation”* by the ecclesiastical court, but there was no *“sentence of nullity”* until actual separation. (details are in Blackstone, Book 1, page 422-423).

Blackstone continues at page 423:

“THE other sort of disabilities are those which are created, or at least enforced, by the municipal laws. And, though some of them may be grounded on natural law, yet they are regarded by the laws of the land, not so much in the light of any moral offence, as on account of the civil inconveniences they draw after them. These civil disabilities make the contract void ab initio, and not merely voidable: not that they dissolve a contract already [page 424] formed, but they render the parties incapable of forming any contract at all: they do not put asunder those who are joined together, but they previously hinder the junction.”

Divorce, under English Law, by civil courts, was to void the marriage of those that had disabilities to contract: prior spouse still living (polygamy), want of age, want of consent of parents if underage, and want of reason. Period. Even incest was not a cause for divorce in these civil courts. No “irretrievably broken” marriages, no mother’s rights, no “best interest of the children”. In fact, the best interest of society was protected by bastardizing the children so they would not have political rights.

Notice that only church marriages were valid. Even the lack of formalities could not invalidate the marriage. Blackstone’s Commentaries, page 427:

“Neither is any marriage at present valid, that is not celebrated in some parish church or public chapel, unless by dispensation from the archbishop of Canterbury. It must also be preceded by publication of banns, or by licence from the spiritual judge. Many other formalities are likewise prescribed by the act; the neglect of which, though penal, does not invalidate the marriage....”

Divorce was not possible. Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, Page 423, Chapter 15: *“all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, shall be indissoluble.”*

Divorce is so extraordinary a remedy that when the Constitution was written, there had not been a divorce in over 100 years in the state or colony of New York (source: U.S. Supreme Court in [Maynard v. Hill](#), 125 U.S. at page 206) .

The United States Supreme Court in 1819 in [Dartmouth College v. Woodward](#), [17 U.S. 518](#), ruled that to divorce a man from the contract of marriage, without his fault and over his objection would be as *“flagrant a violation of the principles of justice”*

Divorce does not cancel legitimate marriage. Back then; as with Andrew Jackson's case, you had to risk death to question the legitimacy of a man's marriage.

Legitimate marriages must be upheld.

Should government be involved in rewarding the crime of adultery, or should they be punishing the crime?

- The received law of the land concerning adultery can be found in Blackstone's Book III, page 139: "*Adultery, or **criminal conversion** of a man's wife, though it is, as a public crime, ... considered as a civil injury (and **surely there can be none greater**) the law gives satisfaction to the husband, for it by action of trespass vi et armis, wherein the damages recovered are usually very large and exemplary.*"
- How can those who are entrusted with societies' political power, for the express purpose to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity, violate their trust by using delegated powers for quite contrary ends?
- The Clean Hands doctrine prohibits government from rewarding crimes, such as adultery or kidnapping.
- We know from the Supreme Court's Meister v. Moore, 96 U.S. 76, which was an inheritance case determining the legitimacy of a child of an unlicensed marriage, at page 79: "*No doubt, a statute may take away a common law right; but there is always a presumption that the Legislature has no such intention, ..., unless they contain express words of nullity.*"
- Divorce lawyers certainly boast that they can reward adultery. I doubt that the legislatures have actually decriminalized the criminal conversion that the law-of-the-land considered to be the greatest of civil injury.
- As quoted later, Blackstone's warned that "*encouraging licentiousness and debauchery*" would destroy both society and government.

Men defend their families, which is why they go to war. In the history of your once great nation, two million men have marched off to secure the blessings of liberty to their posterity, never to return home. If you do not have equal protection of the law, equal to Andrew Jackson when he defended the sanctity of his marriage, then the blessings of liberty have not been secured. Many men have died in vain. Do not spit on their graves just because pervert lovers tell you to.

7. Is Remarriage still a felony?

Divorce does not cancel marriage.

Whoever marries her that is divorced commits adultery. Matthew 5:32, Matthew 19:9, Mark 10:11-12, Luke 16:18, Romans 7:3.

The U.S. Supreme Court repeatedly quotes from Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England as proof of the received-law-of-the-land that existed in the original 13 States. Some states still have laws that say the common law of England shall be the rule of decision in all courts.

We notice in Blackstone's Commentaries that remarriage is a felony while a former spouse is alive. (Book IV, page 164)

*"... if any person, being married, **do afterwards marry again**, the former husband or wife being alive, **it is felony**; but within the benefit of clergy. The first wife in this case shall not be admitted as an evidence against her husband, because she is the true wife; but the second may, for she is indeed no wife at all; and so, vice versa, of a second husband. "*

This was the received law of the land in all 13 original states. Also note that a wife or husband cannot testify, not even in a divorce court, against the spouse.

Remarriage is a felony while a former spouse is alive. This was true when Christ told us so in [Luke 16:18](#) and Matthew 5:32 and Matthew 19:9. It was true in [Romans 7:3](#) (God will judge Adulterers according to Hebrews 13:4, and Adulterers cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven according to 1 Corinthians 6:9). This was true when John the Baptist was executed for suggesting that it was true. This was true in the English common law. This was true when America was Christian. And it has never been changed. No Supreme Court has ever upheld a divorce of a lawful marriage. Yet we are now faced with a government that promotes and rewards serial adultery.

Shelford's 1841 textbook Treatise of the Law of Marriage mentions, on page 331 that the first wife can divorce her husband's second marriage:

"If a man has solemnized matrimony with one, and afterwards marries another, if the lawful wife desires to be restored to her husband, she may institute a suit in a cause of divorce from the tie of the second marriage, and of restitution of conjugal rights."

Christian couples are bound by their vows and by their religion to remain faithful until death. Any innocent Christian that is divorced by a corrupt court is still bound by an oath (and religious teachings, and morals, and the law of the land) to remain faithful and wait for the unfaithful spouse to return, or until death they depart. As we shall see later, this forced divorce is within the definition of genocide. Genocide is defined by treaty as any measure taken by a government to prevent births in a religious group, in whole or in part. Another part of the treaty says that if children of a religious group, in whole or in part, are transferred to another group, this would also qualify as the crime of attempted genocide.

How did America go from a country where remarriage was the crime of adultery “*considered as a civil injury (and surely there can be none greater)... wherein the damages recovered are usually very large and exemplary.*” to a country where courts participate in the crime and the husband has to pay ransom for the government granted privilege to see his family?

Walk not in the counsel of the ungodly.

Have you been damaged by remarriage of a spouse? How much is your family worth? See the notes at the end of chapter 15.

"Do not allow what you consider good to be spoken of as evil." Romans 14:16

8. Marriage is the foundation of society

Marriage is the foundation of society. We are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Governments are instituted among men to secure these rights, not destroy them. Men defend their families, which is why they created government. Defending Marriage is a purpose of government.

Marriage is the highest form of government. It is God ordained. Anyone who opposes family opposes God.

We did not need any other government for the first ten books of the Bible, and we don't need one now. In fact, it was evil to elect a king, 1 Samuel 12:17. God will not answer our prayers to deliver us from the evil we created. 1st Samuel 8:18.

Nevertheless families created government. Governments uphold and defend their foundation. Any suggestion by a civil servant that government should not uphold its foundations is denial of government (anarchy). Suggestion by civil servants that government should divorce its foundations is betrayal of government (treason).

Don't let a divorce lawyer or ungodly judge tell you that Jesus was wrong. By denying the existence of undivorceable marriage, they deny the legitimacy of government.

Back when we had a perfectly Constitutional government, a 518 page law textbook was published in Philadelphia. A Practical Treatise of The Law of Marriage and Divorce by Leonard Shelford, Littell Publishers, Philadelphia, 1841. Don't be confused by the title's use of the word "divorce". Divorce by government courts was only for marriages that were void (when the couple had no right to contract for marriage), or voidable (infertility). In Chapter 1, section 1, fourth paragraph of the textbook you will read that marriage is

"the source of all natural relations of mankind... the source of all industry and economy.... **The origin of all subordination and government**, and consequently of all peace and safety in the world, and, finally the foundation of all religion, as it prevents promiscuous concubinage, and the children grow up and perform Christian duties."

"The characteristic feature of the marriage contract is its permanency; for although it originates in the will of the parties, yet, after being contracted, the duration of the union is totally independent of the will of the parties. In entering into the marriage state it is expressly declared, that **the parties shall be joined together till death shall separate them**; and in this the marriage contract is distinguished from every other species of contract. ... Marriage is the most solemn engagement which one human being can contract with another.... it is **the basis of civilized society** and of sound morals..."

That's right! Permanent undivorceable marriage is the origin of all government, the foundation of all religion, the basis of civilized society, and the basis of sound morals. What part don't you understand?

This quote was repeated in The Virginia Law Register, Vol VI, No. 7, in a November 1900 article on the elements of a valid marriage. Note that 1900 was 12 years after the Supreme Court's Maynard case that today's ungodly divorce lawyers use as their **only** proof that forcible divorce is legal.

Marriage is the society imposed upon us by God Almighty. Marriage is, of course, the foundation of the society that created government. Divorce of Godly society (permanent marriage) is a denial of the legitimacy of government.

First, let's take a look at our foundations.

If family is not legitimate, then nothing they create, whether their society, their constitution, or their children, could be legitimate. Without legitimate children there can be no future legitimate voters, or future heirs to government or property (originally only property owners could be Citizens). As I have shown, All of the Supreme Court cases dealing with divorce, up to 1893, were inheritance cases where children could not inherit anything from divorced parents. Nothing legitimate can come from illegitimacy.

- The Supreme Court of the United States in Maynard v. Hill [125 U.S. 205,211](#) says that marriage is to be upheld:

*“Marriage... having more to do with the morals and civilization of a people than any other institution, has always been subject to the control of the legislature... the law steps in and holds the parties to various obligations... for **it is the foundation of the family and of society, without which there would be neither civilization nor progress... It is a relation for life...**”*

- The U.S. Supreme Court in Maynard, [125 U.S. at 213](#) further confirms that marriage

*“is pre-eminently **the basis of civil institutions**, and thus an object of the deepest public concern... giving character to our whole civil polity”*

- The U.S. supreme court in Maynard, [125 U.S. back at page 205](#) acknowledged that divorce courts, even in a divorce of intermarriage, are restrained by a “*regard for certain fundamental rights of the citizen which are recognized in this country as **the basis of all government...***”
- Moxey Estate (1903), 2 Cof 369: “*Marriage is more than a contract; it is **its foundation**; it does not come from society, but contrariwise; **it is the parent of society**, and it is extremely important that its stability shall be secured, and that its contraction should be surrounded by safeguards and its sanctity upheld...*”
- McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570 at 588: “*the best interest of society, and the preservation of the home and family – **the foundation of all society**”*

That's right! Families were preserved by law, not ripped apart by law.

- [Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 16](#): “*The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection...*”

Was congress delegated any authority to destroy society's foundation?

The foundation of all civil institutions is now automatically invalidated (divorced) by activist judges without fault of innocent defendants – in order to reward adultery. The no-fault divorce process has dissolved the moral society that created government.

The dissolution of society destroys government, according to John Locke's second treatise of government. By the way, Locke's work was the foundation for most of the [Declaration of Independence](#).

Family is the highest form of government. All authority is granted to the family patriarch. This worked perfectly for the first ten books of the Bible. When we elected a king we surrendered this *imperium* (consisting of *merum* and *mixtum*) to the civil authorities. All government power comes from the family. Family is the highest form of government. Anyone who opposes family opposes God.

All sovereign authority is vested in the society that created government. Supreme power – *jura summi imperii* – resides in the people and they can write whatever law and delegate whatever authority is needed to control the government they create. The original citizens established your political society for the preservation of their liberty. Did they write a constitution that somehow granted authority for their civil servants to destroy the foundation of all society? Was there an original Citizen who could have delegated more power than he himself had, the power to destroy liberty of an innocent defendant? Or to destroy the foundation of your society? If not, then no one could have delegated it to your civil servants in the Constitution they wrote. At what point in the development of society did someone delegate to civil servants the authority to cancel his neighbors' vows to God?

Julliard v. Greenman, [110 U.S. 421](#):

"Congress can exercise no power which [the people] have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it: All else is withheld"

If you don't have the power to divorce your neighbors' vows to God, then you couldn't have entrusted that power to your civil servants.

The early Roman Empire had government granted civil Matrimonium as a form of pagan civil union "marriage", but it was granted only to Roman citizens. Perhaps this is why Christ often spoke of an evil and adulterous generation. Later in Chapter 18, I will speculate that Roman law has returned to merge itself into a pagan version of Christianity.

Consider the following proofs that congress cannot tamper with its foundation:

- The U.S. Supreme Court in Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. at 211 says of marriage "...other contracts can be modified ... Not so with marriage... in its purity the public is deeply interested, for it is the foundation of the family and of society..."
- US Supreme Court in Meyer v. Nebraska, [262 U.S. 390](#), at page 399:

The term Liberty "... denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint, but also **the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience... the established doctrine is that this liberty may not be interfered with under the guise of protecting public interest, by legislative action which is arbitrary or without reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the state to effect.**"

- The U.S. Supreme Court in Dartmouth v. Woodward, [17 U.S. at 629](#) said:
 "When any state legislature shall pass an act annulling all marriage contracts, or allowing either party to annul it, without consent of the other, it will be time enough to inquire whether such an act be unconstitutional."
 For further information, an interesting commentary on how this case may have indeed led to annulling all marriage contracts was made in Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 1868 edition, page 114.
- In Blackstone's commentary of marriage and divorce, the word "government" occurs only once. In fact, **the original received-law-of-the-land in America equated licentiousness to the destruction of government.** Blackstone's Commentaries Book 1, page 426: "restraints upon marriage [are detrimental] to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery among the single of both sexes; and thereby destroying one end of society and government, ..."

Is a license application and fee a "restraint upon marriage" that will lead to the destruction of government? In chapter 10 we will learn that the US Supreme Court says "A state may not... impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right... "

- U.S. Supreme Court, Williams v. North Carolina [317 U.S. 287](#), at page 302:
 "That choice in the realm of morals and religion rests with the legislatures of the states... Within the limits of her political power North Carolina may, of course, enforce her own policy regarding the marriage relation-an institution **more basic in our civilization than any other.** But society also has an interest in the avoidance of polygamous marriages (Loughran v. Loughran, 292 U.S. 216, 223, 54 S.Ct. 684, 686) and in the **protection of innocent offspring of marriages deemed legitimate in other jurisdictions.**"

Here we see that, yes, courts once enforced legitimate marriages. To protect the birthrights of innocent offspring. A no-fault enforcement of the foundation of society.

- John Locke's Second Treatise of Government paragraph 211: "distinguish between the dissolution of the society and the dissolution of the government... where the society is dissolved, the government cannot remain"
- 1943 WL 54417 (U.S.) Appeal brief to the U.S. Supreme Court from Massachusetts in the 1943 case of Prince v. Massachusetts :

"The prosecution of appellant through misapplication of the statute is a step toward destroying one of the oldest and fundamental institutions of society, namely, the family. **The family is the backbone of all orderly governments.** It is to democracy what blood is to the human body. Drain away the warm family relationship and **substitute the cold foster-parental care of the government and democracy will perish** as surely as will the body when the blood ceases to

*circulate. If the individual in a democracy is to retain his integrity the family relations must not be impaired by misapplied laws. **The strength of the nation depends upon the security of the family and family life.***

The U.S. Supreme Court in Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978) :

*“The decisions of the Court confirm that the right to marry is of fundamental importance to all individuals. ... It is not surprising that the decision to marry has been placed on the same level of importance as decisions relating to procreation, childbirth, child rearing, and family relationships... the relationship that is **the foundation of the family in our society**... the only relationship in which the [State] allows sexual relations legally to take place. “*

[Aside: If marriage is “*the only relationship in which the [State] allows sexual relations legally to take place.*” then how can divorce courts can get away with violating the Clean Hands doctrine by supporting, condoning and rewarding the crime of adultery, which is the greatest of civil injuries? And why did the Supreme Court ignore this in Lawrence v. Texas?]

Is an oath-of-office contract just as binding as a marriage vow? A succession of government officers, as a condition of their office, swore oaths to uphold and defend the constitution that created their office. Yet we somehow ended up with a judiciary that steadfastly refuses to uphold the foundations of the society that created it.

There are many ways in which government can be overthrown. Even corruption and conquest will still leave society with a government. But the cruelest and **most inhuman** way to destroy government is for those who were entrusted to enforce the laws of the land to refuse to do their job. John Locke’s Second Treatise Of Government has as his last chapter, the topic of Dissolution of Government. The suggestion that government would not execute the laws would be “*politics inconceivable to human capacity, and inconsistent with human society.*”

Yet we are now faced with a government that refuses to uphold the laws of the land, aids and abets the greatest of civil injury, and automatically bastardize the foundation of their society.

Even the United States Supreme Court in Dartmouth College v. Woodward, [17 U.S. 518](#), ruled that to divorce a man without his fault and over his objection would be “*flagrant a violation of the principles of justice*”

Recent political debates loudly protest that “Our nation must defend the sanctity of marriage.” This is true. But not by a vote. It is defended one family at a time. Example: On May 30, 1806, future President Andrew Jackson successfully defended, on the dueling field, the sanctity of his marriage. Back then; we had a perfectly Constitutional system, whereby one had to risk death to question the sanctity of someone’s marriage. Those who have overthrown one nation, under God, have replaced that system. In their new system all they have to do is touch you with a piece of paper to destroy your vows to God and bastardize your children, and take half of everything you own and give it as a reward for the crime of adultery.

If we had only righted ourselves while evils were sufferable, we would still have a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

U.S. Supreme Court Boyd v. United States, [116 U.S. 616](#), 6 S.Ct. 535:

*“... illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing in that way; namely, by silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security of person and property should be liberally construed. A close and literal construction deprives them of half their efficacy, and leads to gradual depreciation of the right, as if it consisted more in sound than in substance. **It is the duty of courts** to be watchful for the constitutional rights of the citizens, and against any stealthy encroachments thereon. Their motto should be *obsta principiis*.”*

The purpose of government, according to the Declaration of Independence.

We ... are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable Rights... That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government...

Part 2: Civil Unions

Civil licensed “marriage” is a phony “marriage”. Phony “marriage” cannot be enforced by a court.

Chapters 9 and 10 will present proof that civil licensed “marriage” is a graven (manmade) counterfeit of real marriage. Government courts can not enforce their phony civil “marriage” that they themselves created. Just like the old Roman Matrimonium, they can only enforce the contract to the state.

Prior existing contracts can invalidate a marriage. Interestingly enough, later in chapter 15, we will learn that prior marriage contracts could NOT invalidate a marriage in civil courts because it was a church issue.

- Anyone who has a right to marry does not need a state license to marry. People who have a right to marry will exercise their God given rights without asking permission from others. No one can be charged a license fee for exercising a right. Rights cannot be taxed. By applying for a government license to marry, you are confessing, under oath, that you do not have a right to marry. The license is admissible in court as proof that you are not lawfully married. You voluntarily submitted yourself to their jurisdiction.
- The Declaration of Independence says that we are all created equal. If we are all created equal, how could anyone delegate to their civil servants (by writing a Constitution, or by a vote, or by a vote of their representatives) the authority to cancel a neighbor’s family, an authority that we equals never had?

Chapter 11 will prove that divorce bastardizes all children.

- Because civil “marriage” is not a real marriage, children of civil “marriage” are bastards that belong to the state, and must have a state appointed custodian because “*bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes*”.
- Bastards cannot inherit anything, not even a surname. All you can hope to get is a government created (graven) all-capitalized non-proper noun.
- Bastards cannot inherit any property. No Supreme Court has said otherwise. This is still true today, only the definitions have been changed to make you believe that death taxes and inheritance laws can take what’s yours. All you can hope for is to pay a fee to hold the government’s property trust for them. The third plank of The Communist Manifesto prohibits inheritance rights. Sadly, you can no longer pass along the fruits of your liberty to your posterity.

9. How did man's laws redefine the term "marriage"?

Traditional marriage cannot be divorced. A partial divorce is merely a separation where the parties remain married. A complete divorce is granted ONLY for questionable marriages that never legally existed.

A civil "marriage" (sometimes called an intermarriage) can be divorced by a court. Because it is not a marriage at all. It is licentiousness. Courts cannot recognize as legitimate any civil "marriage" that their own government licensed.

Black's Law Dictionary Revised Fourth Edition, 1968, definition of the term marriage

*"... condition, or relation of one man and one woman **united in law for life** ... A contract, according to the form prescribed by law, by which a man and woman, capable of entering into such contract, mutually engage with each other **to live their whole lives together...**"*

The Fourth Edition was replaced by the Fifth Edition in 1979. Prior to 1979 the law dictionaries did not recognize that marriage was divorceable

Since **1979** the marriage definition added new phrases: "*or until divorced*". That's Right! Marriage that can be cancelled by divorce is a new concept in the history of American jurisprudence. The only problem is: this has never been true. No Supreme Court has ever said marriage is cancelled by a divorce.

Since then, Satan's legalists have been busy frantically trying to explain away a definition that existed prior to any human government.

Traditional Marriage cannot be redefined by man. Marriage can only be upheld by man. Bear with me as I try to state this precept in several ways, and repeating some of chapter 5:

- Man cannot redefine a term that pre-existed (anymore than we can legislate the law of gravity).
- Nobody can swear an oath to "faithfully uphold and defend the Constitution" and then turn around and suggest otherwise.
- Government was created to secure rights.
- Civil Servants cannot redefine rights that they were hired/elected to defend.
- Marriage cannot be cancelled. (The term "Divorce" is used in the Bible but it always refers to living separately). Christ said "*Let not man put asunder.*"
- 1888 U.S. Supreme Court Maynard v. Hill, 125 U.S. 190:
 "[page 211] *it is a relation for life*"
 "[page 212] *the relation of husband and wife, deriving both its rights and duties from a source higher than any contract of which the parties are capable, and, as to these, uncontrollable by any contract which they can make...*" [not even a contract with civil servants. By the way; servants do not make laws for their masters]

- Rights cannot be licensed. Rights cannot be charged a license fee, nor regulated by administrative courts that regulate licensing disputes.
- Example: the United States Supreme Court in [Meister v. Moore](#) 96 U.S. 76 at page 81 ruled that marriage license laws cannot be enforced: “**marriage is a thing of common right...**”
- Example: 1892 Washington State Supreme Court [McLaughlin’s Estate](#), 4 Wash. 570, confirmed that: “*marriage is a natural right, which **always existed prior to the organization of any form of government**, and all laws in restraint of it should be strictly construed in consequence thereof. It is held it should be the policy of the law to sustain all such contracts and relations whenever possible, and that this should always be done ...[page 590 marriage has] **its origin in divine law**”*
- “*The liberty of marriage is a natural right inherent in mankind, confirmed and enforced by the Holy Scriptures...*” Virginia Law Register Nov 1900, Vol VI, No.7, article [Essentials of a Valid Marriage](#). (and this was 12 years after the US Supreme Court ruled in [Maynard](#))
- Example: Georgia Supreme Court in [Askew v. Dupree](#), 30 Ga 173: “*marriage is founded in **the law of nature**, and is **anterior to all human law**”*

That’s right! Marriage is defined by Divine law, anterior to all human law. Man cannot redefine it. God performed the first wedding. Christ confirmed the original legal definition.

There are essentially two types of marriage.

- (1) Marriage, under God’s laws. Holy Matrimony is a permanent family relationship that mankind cannot put asunder. The laws which existed when the States wrote their constitutions required a marriage license to be issued by the church to assure that underage couples had their parent’s permission and that banns were published. All marriages “in the face of the church” were indissoluble (un divorceable). In America, a hundred years ago, conformance to the marriage statutes assured that marriage was enforceable and could not be divorced. The intent of the marriage statutes was to protect the birthrights of innocent offspring, which must be upheld according to the Supreme Court, by ensuring their legitimacy.
- (2) Marriage, under man’s laws. These existed in pagan societies, and were perpetuated under early Roman law. Roman citizens in the Empire could be granted a right to connubium (essentially un-punishable prostitution where the wife belonged to the husband and he had a legal obligation to support the family) this was referred to as civil Matrimonium. Marriage under man’s laws was unknown in early America and the marriage statutes merely defined the formalities of preferred modes for the contract to marry, but did not confer the right, and they were construed by the U.S. Supreme Court as directory not mandatory. Legislative divorces in America were granted to government-licensed intermarriage, but this was uncommon prior to the [Maynard](#) decision. Eventually intermarriage became accepted as equivalent to real marriage. Then no-fault divorce assured that divorce was always to be granted. Look at how far we have come. Nowadays conformance to the statutes assures that marriage is divorceable and that offspring have no birthrights.

Manmade “marriage” *Concubinatus*, *contubernium* and *Maritagium* were never part of American common law. Blackstone’s Commentary mentioned *maritagium* in only in contradistinction to matrimony. *Maritagium* is the feudal right enjoyed by the lord or guardian

of disposing of his ward in marriage. Government Civil Unions are not Holy matrimony. A government “Marriage” License is not issued to the couple. It is issued to an officer of the state to solemnize this disposing of a ward in marriage. As we shall see, The Family Courts consider your children to be bastards that have no rights. These bastards can be transferred to a government appointed custodian at any time, for any reason, and you cannot have access to any legal process other than their Family Court Rules, which are neither Civil nor Criminal.

Many people assume that marriage is a government granted privilege, granted by a marriage license. This has never been true.

1877 US Supreme Court case [Meister v. Moore](#), 96 U.S. 76 at page 78:

*“Marriage is everywhere regarded as a civil contract. Statutes in many of the States, it is true, regulate the mode of entering into the contract, but they **do not confer the right.**”*

at page 79:

Marriage license statutes “... may be construed as merely directory, instead of being treated as destructive of a common law right to form the marriage by words of present assent.”

If government tries to license a right, the license can be ignored and the right can be exercised with impunity, according to the US Supreme Court in a famous civil rights case; [Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham](#), [394 U.S. 147](#) (1969).

“Persons faced with an unconstitutional licensing law which purports to require a license as a prerequisite to exercise of right... may ignore the law and engage with impunity in exercise of such right.”

Blackstone’s Commentaries Page 423, Book 1, Chapter 15:

“all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, shall be indissoluble.”

MAYNARD V. HILL

Divorce Lawyers insist that the 1888 Supreme Court decision in [Maynard v. Hill](#) gave government the right to divorce marriage.

In this first page of the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in [Maynard v. Hill](#) we notice:

- that the Maynard’s were intermarried. This is not a racial distinction. They were both white.
- The Maynards’ **inter**married “at such a time and place” (Vermont in 1828). This was not a marriage in the face of the church. Details are in the next chapter.

- All children of divorce are bastards. Since bastards cannot inherit property, David Maynard's children did not even try to inherit their father's estate. The only question before the Supreme Court was whether or not David Maynard's children could claim some of their mother's land. They could not, because their parent's divorce defeated the land claim. Bastards cannot inherit anything.
- Keep in mind that traditional marriage is not a government created status.

In the Supreme Court's decision upholding the divorce of the Maynard's **intermarriage** discussed at the bottom of page 204 "*Rights acquired, or obligations incurred under such legislation...*" Yet the right to marry is never legislated¹. Their **intermarriage** was hardly, as explained here in Chapter 5, a thing of common right, a natural right, which always existed prior to the organization of any form of government, with origin in divine law, anterior to all human law.

Civil "marriage" is such a poor counterfeit for real marriage that government cannot recognize the legitimacy of the "marriage" that they themselves solemnized.

The full text of Maynard v. Hill is available online at www.findlaw.com or at your local law library. The online version has a few transcription errors. Notice that the editor's summary does not mention intermarriage, although the court report does.

(125 U. S. 190)

MAYNARD et al. v. HILL et al.¹

(March 19, 1888.)

1. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—LEGISLATIVE POWERS—DIVORCE.

A special act of a territorial legislature, dissolving the marriage relation between a husband, resident of the territory, and a wife, who is a non-resident, is a valid act of legislative power, and it does not invalidate the act that there was no cause for the divorce, nor that the wife was not notified.

2. SAME—IMPAIRING OBLIGATION OF CONTRACT.

An act of a territorial legislature, dissolving a marriage relation, does not infringe the provision of the constitution against laws impairing the obligation of contracts; the marriage relation not being a contract within the meaning of that provision.

3. DIVORCE—RIGHTS OF DIVORCED PARTIES—PUBLIC LANDS—DONATION CLAIMS.

The act of congress, September 27, 1850, which conferred title to lands in Oregon territory upon certain settlers, required four years' residence upon and cultivation of the land before the settler should become the grantee, and provided that, if he were married, the title, at the end of that time, should inure to the benefit of himself and wife, in equal parts. Plaintiff's father settled on land under the act, as a married man, but, before the four years had expired, was divorced from his wife, plaintiff's mother, whose share, under the act, they claim as her heirs. *Held*, that the right of the wife to one-half of the lands settled was not vested, and was defeated by the divorce.

MATTHEWS and GRAY, JJ., dissenting.

* Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Washington.

This is a suit in equity to charge the defendants, as trustees of certain lands in King county, Washington Territory, and compel a conveyance thereof to the plaintiffs. The lands are described as lots 9, 10, 13, and 14, of section 4, and lots 6, 7, 8, and 9, of section 5, in township 24 north, range 4 east, Willamette meridian. The case comes here on appeal from a judgment of the supreme court of the territory, sustaining the defendants' demurrer, and dismissing the complaint. The material facts, as disclosed by the complaint, are briefly these: In 1828, David S. Maynard and Lydia A. Maynard intermarried in the state of Vermont, and lived there*together as husband and wife until 1850, when they removed to Ohio. The plaintiffs, Henry C. Maynard and Frances J. Patterson, are their children, and the only issue of the marriage. David S. Maynard died intestate in the year 1873, and Lydia A. Maynard in the year 1879. In 1850 the husband left his family in Ohio and started overland for California, under a promise to his wife that he would either return or send for her and the children within two years, and that in the mean time he would send her the means of support. He left her without such means, and never afterwards contributed anything for her support or that of the children. On the 16th of September following he took up his residence in the territory of Oregon, in that part which is now Washington Territory, and continued ever afterwards to reside there. On the 3d of April, 1852, he settled upon and claimed, as a married man, a tract of land of 640 acres, described in the bill, under the act of congress of September 27, 1850, "creating the office of surveyor general of public lands in Oregon, and to provide for the survey, and to make donations to settlers of the said public lands," and resided thereon until his death. On the 22d day of December, 1852, an act was passed by the legislative assembly of the territory, purporting to dis-

¹ Affirming 5 Pac. Rep. 717.

No one in government (who has sworn an oath to uphold and defend rights) should act contrary to his or her oath by suggesting that a right be redefined by legislation or by court order or by a vote.

The further we get away from fundamental truth, the more perverted society becomes.

Redefining marriage is blasphemy. If you applied for a government licensed marriage, then you have judged God's word. You have converted a right into government granted licentiousness.

2 Timothy 3:12-13 (KJV) "... evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived."

¹ The right to marry is not legislated. The US Supreme Court's earlier decision in Meister confirmed that states do not confer the right to marry. And four years after Maynard, which was a Washington case, the Washington State Supreme Court still insisted in McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570 at page 579 that: "*marriage is a natural right, which existed independent of statutes...*" and on page 575 "*marriage is ... anterior to all human law... [590] its origin in divine law*". And Shelford's 1841 Treatise on the Law of Marriage and Divorce page 27 explains the intent of marriage laws was to make marriage undivorceable: "*It has been the policy of legislators, proceeding on the ground that marriage is the origin of all relations, and consequently the first element of all social duties, to preserve the sacred nature of this contract. In Christian countries this union ... with a few exceptions the contract has been rendered indissoluble -- regulations which have contributed more towards the general peace, happiness, and civilization of the world, than any other civil institution. The public, as well as the parties themselves have an interest in making so important a contract a matter of certainty...*"

Marriage "*is a contract of natural law antecedent to its becoming a civil contract in civil society*" according to Shelford's Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29.

As you can see, the definition of the word *marriage* that existed ever since the Garden of Eden is not anything like the legislated counterfeit redefinition.

Of course, a couple can still apply for and pay for a civil (non-traditional) marriage license if they want to confess that they do not have a right to marry. Their family will be regulated by their state god, the guardian of their morals.

10. Marriage License laws

This chapter presents proof that government licensed “marriage” (civil union, intermarriage) is not real marriage. Government licensed marriage is not a regular marriage at all – it “*is a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union*”.

Marriage is a natural right. The right to marry is not legislated. Marriage existed prior to any manmade government.

By getting a marriage license, you agree that you do not have a right to marry.

It doesn't take a Master's degree in Boolean Logic to figure out that government does not create marriage, after all, Supreme Courts have ruled:

- “*marriage is a natural right, which always existed prior to the organization of any form of government, ... its origin in divine law*”
- “*marriage is founded in the law of nature, and is anterior to all human law*”
- “*it is the foundation of the family and of society, without which there would be neither civilization nor progress... It is a relation for life...*”
- “*marriage is a natural right, which existed independent of statutes...*”
- And states do not confer the right to marry (U.S. Supreme Court's Meister case)

Holy Scriptures do not prescribe any wedding ceremony. It is a Catholic ritual. We read in the Virginia Law Register, Vol VI, No. 7:

“The solemnization of marriage by a clergyman was a thing never heard of among primitive Christians until, in consequence of its divine institution, Pope Innocent III ordered it to be solemnized, and it was not until the Council of Trent, in 1563, that the church attempted to exercise any controlling authority as to the manner in which it should be celebrated.”

If you want to worship the Catholics as a "divine institution" by participating in a wedding ritual instituted when they were massacring Bible believing Christians, then be prepared for the consequences.

The First Marriage Act in England, 26 Geo.2, c.33 required all marriages to be church solemnized marriages. Which of course made the marriage undivorcable by government courts: Shelford's 1841 textbook *A Practical Treatise of The Law of Marriage and Divorce* explains on page 25 that the law of England, does not allow the dissolution of marriage by judicial sentence. And on page 27 he states:

"In England, after the first Marriage Act, with the exception of Jews and Quakers, all marriages were required to be celebrated according to the form prescribed by the Church of England. "

Today, *Marriage* has evolved into two meanings. Marriage as Holy Matrimony, which cannot be cancelled by a court. And marriage as a divorceable civil union. Never confuse the two.

One honors the Lord who ordained and established the institution of marriage. The other worships as a substitute lord a counterfeit graven image made by men. Legislators do not write ecclesiastical (church) law. Black robed Judges do not enforce ecclesiastical law.

TWO KINDS OF MARRIAGE

One was defined in the Garden of Eden and the other is defined by the legislatures.

A marriage, in facie ecclesia, is a marriage in the face of the Church. It is a regular marriage. A regular marriage cannot be divorced. The courts must uphold a regular marriage. Proof of a regular marriage will stop a divorce case as soon as the judge sees the proof.

The legislated marriage was created to emulate real marriage so that unchurched atheists could "marry" and foreigners not subject to the same contract laws could "marry". It was also used when rapists were forced to "marry" their pregnant victims so that innocent children could be granted civil rights similar to legitimate children, "rights" that the bastards would otherwise not have. This alternate "marriage" was called intermarriage. It is a consequence of separating church from state.

There is a maxim of law that things should be called by their correct terminology. The divorce industry would not exist today if the legislatures had obeyed this simple maxim and kept the correct name of their abomination.


Ad recte docendum oportet, primum inquirere nomina, quia rerum cognitio a nominibus rerum dependet. In order rightly to comprehend a thing, inquire first into the names, for a right knowledge of things depends upon their names. Co. Litt. 68.

And there are two kinds of marriage licenses. Church and State.

Do not be deceived. Satan deceives. A counterfeit is a close imitation of something that is genuine. Do not worship a manmade graven image.

Marriage "in the face of the church" is undivorcable as noted in earlier chapters. Marriage in the face of the state is divorceable for any reason, or in some states for no reason at all.

Church Marriage requires that the couple is competent to contract, not incestuous, underage couples have parent's permission, not bigamous, etc. And that banns are published so anyone can show up at the wedding and protest the illegality or forever hold their peace. (Because silence is equated with fraud if there is a moral duty to speak.)



Marriage by government marriage license is regulated by statutes. Some state marriage laws specifically say "civil contract" to distinguish from ecclesiastical marriage. Legislatures

do not write ecclesiastical law. Their use of the term “marriage” refers ONLY to their licensed “marriage”. The State is a party to the contract.

Statewide Organization of Stepparents v. Smith, 536 P.2d 1202:

“Purpose of statute declaring marriage to be a civil contract was to make it clear that marriage was governed by civil law rather than by ecclesiastical law”

That’s Right! Legislators do not write church law. This court decision was from the Washington State supreme court that had previously ruled that marriage was a common right that exists independent of statutes. In a state where church solemnized marriages were always held to be valid (full quote in Chapters 6 and 15).

It has always been so. Nor do legislators’ law books interfere with church marriages. Blackstone’s book 1 at page 423 explained that legal disabilities to marriage, EVEN prior marriage contracts *“being entirely the province of the ecclesiastical courts, our [law] books are perfectly silent concerning them.”* yet they were still *“esteemed valid to all civil purposes”*.

State licensed marriage (It used to be called intermarriage) does not result in a type of marriage that has the attributes of real marriage. Real marriage is the kind God instituted at the Garden of Eden when He presided at the first wedding, which is a one-flesh lifetime union. Whereas licensed civil contract marriage is a graven (manmade) counterfeit. If your church only solemnizes licensed civil contracts, then you don’t have a real marriage.

Civil courts cannot rule on matrimonial issues.

Blackstone, Book 1 chapter 15 “Of Husband and Wife”, page 421:

“OUR law considers marriage in no other light than as a civil contract. The Holiness of the matrimonial state is left entirely to the ecclesiastical law: the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriages as a sin,”

Tucker’s commentary on Blackstone was a Virginia law textbook published in 1803. It explains the law of the land 16 years after the US Constitution was written: *“But since the revolution there has been no court established in Virginia, possessing general jurisdiction in cases of an ecclesiastical nature. The high court of chancery hath jurisdiction in cases of incestuous marriages, which it may annul, but it does not appear to possess jurisdiction in any other matrimonial, or other ecclesiastical case whatsoever. V. L. 1794, c. 104.”*

LICENSED MARRIAGE

MARRIAGE LICENSE. A license or permission granted by public authority to persons who intend to intermarry, usually addressed to the minister or magistrate who is to perform the ceremony, or, in general terms, to any one authorized to solemnize marriages. By statute in some jurisdictions, it is made an essential prerequisite to the lawful solemnization of the marriage.

This is the traditional definition in Black's Law Dictionary, up until the 7th edition in 1999. License is only "*granted by public authority to persons who intend to intermarry*", it is addressed to the person solemnizing the marriage. It does not mention church granted marriage licenses. Notice in their definition that their marriage license does not apply to traditional marriage, only to intermarriage. Notice that "public authority" cannot exercise church authority. And the words "authorized to solemnize marriages" just sounds too Catholic to me. It is just not Biblical. Church solemnized weddings are a Catholic ritual forced on society by Pope Innocent III in 1563, during their brutal counter-reformation. Christians did not need solemnized weddings for 1500 years, and they don't need them now.

INTERMARRIAGE. In the popular sense, this term denotes the contracting of a marriage relation between two persons considered as members of different nations, tribes, families, etc., as, between the sovereigns of two different countries, between an American and an alien, between Indians of different tribes, between the scions of different clans or families. But, in law, it is sometimes used (and with propriety) to emphasize the mutuality of the marriage contract and as importing a reciprocal engagement by which each of the parties "marries" the other. Thus, in a pleading, instead of averring that "the plaintiff was married to the defendant," it would be proper to allege that "the parties intermarried" at such a time and place.

This was the Black's Law Dictionary definition of intermarriage from 1910 to 1979.

Side Notes:

- Notice that the definition does not mention race or racial marriage.
- Notice that their definition of intermarriage puts "marries" in quotation marks in their phrase: *each of the parties "marries" the other.*
- Notice that the Supreme Court's Maynard decision in 1888 used the term *intermarriage* but the word was still not defined in Black's Law Dictionary First Edition in 1891. However Black's First Edition did use the term. It was used in the definition of the word *Alliance*. Apparently patriarchal (family) government was alive and well in America, and Maynard's legislated divorce could be used to nullify the Alliance by "marriage" of "*two persons considered as members of different nations, tribes, families, etc.*" (Even though Mrs. Maynard was never told about the divorce proceedings).
- And notice that a divorcing spouse cannot go into court and aver that he/she is in any way "married to the defendant".

Don't let the divorce industry determine your moral values for you. Do not be deceived by the more recent redefinitions of intermarriage that refer only to inter-racial miscegenation. The Maynard's were both white when they intermarried "*at such a time and place*".

Satan's legalists change definitions frequently. Yet not one jot nor tittle changes in God's definition. Don't accept the new redefinitions. It is blasphemy to redefine Holy as unholy. For the longest time, we were told that the legal community used Latin because it was a dead

language whose meanings do not change. They have abandoned their unchanging ways. We were lulled into a false sense of security. It now appears that the Latin Roman Empire still wants to force Christians into their arena where we are forced to fight for our lives.

Is it blasphemy to redefine divorceable "marriage" as Holy Matrimony? Now that Unholy is so commonly understood as equivalent to Holy, Black's Law Dictionary seventh edition in 1999 changed the definition of blasphemy. It no longer mentions the attributes of God, it no longer mentions contempt against the church, or promoting immorality, or any attempt to lessen men's reverence of God.

Back in chapter 4, we learned that early American marriage laws were intended to ensure that the marriage was always valid and enforceable. Now we have license laws that guarantee that "marriage" is always invalid and divorceable.

MARRIAGE LICENSE FEE

Bear with me as I try to get this point across:

- Rights existed before government existed. A right cannot be regulated. Governments are instituted among men to secure rights, not regulate them (with the exception, mentioned earlier, that rights are "*susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger...*" to save a life).
- A right cannot be taxed.
- Those who have rights will exercise their rights with impunity (see chapter 8), without paying for it, and without begging for permission from their civil servants.
- If government has a right to charge a fee for a granted privilege then they can increase the fee to an exorbitant amount (the right to tax is the right to destroy according to the Supreme Court).
- By paying for a privilege, you confessed it was not a right.
- *Matrimonia debent esse libera.* Marriage ought to be free
- Once you pay a fee for the government granted privilege, then you confessed that you did not have a right to marry. Your confession can be used against you in a court of law.
- We are not bastard children, but have inheritance of the promise. Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. (Galatians 4-5)

Although it was not a marriage license case, the *Murdock* case will show that that no state can convert a right into a privilege and then charge a license fee. US Supreme Court in *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, [319 U.S. 105](#) (1943):

- *"A state may not, through a license tax, impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal constitution."*
- *"The power to tax the exercise of a privilege is the power to suppress its enjoyment. ... Those who can tax the exercise of this practice can make its exercise so costly as to deprive it of the resources necessary for its maintenance. Those who can tax the privilege ... can close the doors to all those who do not have a full purse."*

CHURCH MARRIAGE LICENSE

A church may marry a couple only after banns were published so that anyone can show up at the wedding and present proof of illegality, or forever hold their peace.

Moral restrictions (not legal restrictions) allow a church to conduct their ceremony only after it is determined that there are no living spouses from prior marriages, underage have parents' permission, competent to contract and the marriage is not incestuous.

Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 427:

*“Neither is any marriage at present valid, that is not celebrated in some parish church or public chapel, unless by dispensation from the archbishop of Canterbury. It must also be preceded by publication of banns, or by licence from the spiritual judge. Many other formalities are likewise prescribed by the act; the neglect of which, though penal, **does not invalidate the marriage....**”*

Notice here that the only valid marriages are church marriages. Even violating the formalities does not invalidate the marriage.

Intermarriage is not valid. The Maynards' intermarriage was not a marriage. As we shall see in the next chapter, all children of intermarriage are bastards who belong to the state.

DEFINITION OF LICENSE

The word *license* is the same root word of *licentious*. According to dictionaries a license is permission to do something that is otherwise unlawful. If you applied for a marriage license, then you confessed that you did not have a right to marry. Your marriage is intermarriage. Once you confessed, with a perjury oath, that you needed government permission to marry, then your marriage has a legal impediment.

As Blackstone so eloquently stated, a divorceable marriage is *“is a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union”*

LICENTIOUSNESS

Licentiousness is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary as

“1. Lacking moral discipline or sexual restraint. 2. Having no regard for accepted rules or standards.

And law dictionaries definitions include disrespecting the rights of others.

Either way, applying for a civil licensed divorceable marriage lacks regard for Biblical standards that were continued by the unchanging Christ of the Bible, and then continued as the law of the land of America. By applying for a civil divorceable marriage, you show no respect for the rights of your future bastards.

Civil unions are not real marriage.

No state can impair the obligation of contracts according to the US Constitution Article 1 section 10. Civil Unions that can be cancelled by a divorce court are possible only because there is a presumption that a pre-existing confession (the marriage license application) is proof that there was no right to marry. If you wanted a marriage in the face of the church, you would not have applied for a civil license.

Does it even make sense to require a license to marry? How did anyone ever think they could have the authority to restrict their neighbor's right to marry, and then delegate this non-authority to their civil servants? (The Roman Empire's civil Concubinatus and Matrimonium authorized marriage, but these were pagan practices). The founders of your State Constitution knew that "*restraints upon marriage [are detrimental] to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ...*" (In all of Blackstone's commentary of marriage and divorce, this is the only occurrence of the word "government"). How could anyone think they could bastardize their neighbors children to prevent inheritance rights? Preventing inheritance rights is the third plank of the 1848 Communist Manifesto. How could anyone in a Christian nation think they could commit blasphemy by redefining God's definition of marriage?

Here are the fruits of divorceable civil unions which you mistakenly think are legitimate marriage: We have lost inheritance rights, lost the religious freedom to have Biblically legitimate families, lost the right to enforceable families which are the foundation of society, we have lost a republic form of government, respect for head of household, self-defense rights, and the right to punish "*criminal conversion of a man's wife*", the right to sue for the greatest of civil injury, etc – all of which were unquestioned in Andrew Jackson's day – and for 100 years thereafter. As we shall see later, you've lost the right to worship God. That's right! Accepting that traditional Marriage is a divorceable Civil Union means that the foundation of society cannot be defended as legitimate. The next move by Satan's perverts is checkmate: The total destruction of society. Yet, one of the main reasons that Government was created was to defend the family. And secure the blessings of liberty to the unbastardized posterity.

Slaves, due to their pre-existing contract, could not take vows to remain as a one-flesh family unit (this has always been so -- [Exodus 21:5](#)). They needed their owner's permission (license) to join in a civil union. Children were fruits of the license. Slave children were considered to be bastards due to the flawed original contract. As we shall see, bastards are the children of nobody and are subject to state care and protection.

Slave marriage (contubernium) was recorded in the owner's records, whereas real marriage is recorded in their fathers' family Bibles. Where is your marriage recorded? Entries recorded in a family Bible are admissible in court by Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 803(13), and similar State rules.

How then, did divorceable civil unions replace enforceable permanent marriage? Answer: they didn't. You volunteered when you paid for a state marriage license to enter into a substitute (counterfeit) marriage. You contracted with Satanic forces. Your pre existing contract with the state (the license application) renders your marriage contract invalid.

While I was researching marriage licenses, read an old article that came to the conclusion "*since the state married them, the children were fruits of the state*" and cited an American 1884 law reference encyclopedia Parsons on Contracts. I was unable to find this 1884 edition, but the earlier 1873 edition (Sixth edition, Volume III, page 88) made only one reference to a marriage license when it referred to a British case "*where the husband falsely imposed upon the wife a forged license, and a pretended clergyman*" It was not clear if this referred to a forged ecclesiastical marriage license. That's all! An 1873 American law encyclopedia that has 4½ pages in the index of entries about Marriage contracts, has no index entry for Marriage License, and has only this one mention of a marriage license.

People who have a right to marry will exercise their God given rights without asking permission from others.

Conclusion: over the past 100 years, "Civil Unions" slowly replaced legitimate marriages. Yet you mistakenly call these "marriage". Since civil unions are not marriage, your children are bastards and have no inheritance rights. They can be removed from you at any time, for any reason by a "family court". And you will not have the protection of civil court rules. Like Esau, you, with an oath, sold your birthright ([Genesis 25:33](#)). By the way, God hated Esau according to [Romans 9:13](#) and [Malachi 1:3](#) for selling his birthright. There is that word again.

Exodus 23:2 "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil"

MARRIAGE IS A NATURAL RIGHT

Rubin v. Irving Trust Co., 305 N.Y. 288, 1953. Page 305:

"The right to contract marriage is **a natural right, not a legislatively conferred privilege**. Contracts of marriage valid where made are almost universally recognized elsewhere, save those which outrage our most fundamental concepts. The question was one of status and uncertainty as to that has grave criminal and moral ramifications e. g., the possible bastardization of issue and existence of a meretricious relationship."

Shearer v. Shearer, 73 N.Y.S.2d 337. 1947:

"The ante-nuptial agreement made by respondent and petitioner clearly contemplated the preservation of the spiritual rights and status of the respondent and those of his prospective children. These rights though spiritual and intangible became for all purposes just as real, protective and enforceable as pertained to any physical property".

Ramon v. Ramon, 34 N.Y.S.2d 100, 1942, at page 104:

"Marriage is a natural right. It was not created by law. It existed before all law. "

Wallace v. McDaniel, 59 Or. 378. 1911:

"Marriage is a natural right. Where a statute is equally susceptible of two interpretations, one in favor of natural right, and the other against it, the former is to prevail."

Norman v. Norman, 121 Cal. 620,. 1898:

"It has been properly held that as **marriage is a natural right, of which no government will allow its subjects, wherever abiding, to be deprived**, if the parties happen to be sojourning in a foreign country, and under the local law there is no way by which they can enter into valid marriage, they may marry in their own forms, and it will be recognized at home as good."

Note that real marriage cannot be deprived by government, yet a government granted license is a granted privilege. And charging a license fee forces the couple to choose between one right and another.

McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570, 1892.

"After stating that **marriage is a natural right, which existed independent of statutes, and that ordinarily the statutory provisions regulating the contract of marriage should be held to be directory**; that the general rule is that a marriage good at common law is valid notwithstanding the existence of any statute on the subject, unless the statute contain express words of nullity"

"The decision in that case is put upon the ground that **marriage is a natural right, which always existed prior to the organization of any form of government**, and all laws in restraint of it should be strictly construed in consequence thereof. It is held that it should be the policy of the law to sustain all such contracts and relations whenever possible, and that this should always be done unless the legislature has expressly declared all marriages entered [page 588] into or solemnized in any form, other than the ways provided for in the statute, void. We must remember, however, that in many ways the natural rights or privileges of mankind have to be restrained in order to promote the welfare of the community and the government of the many."

Beverlin v. Beverlin, 29 W.Va. 732. 1887.

"No marriage contracted in this state is valid when it affirmatively appears that it has not been solemnized according to the requirements of our statutes on that subject, although the parties may thereafter have associated and cohabited together as husband and wife."

"While it is true statutes regulating marriages have generally and properly been construed as directory, and not mandatory, since marriage is a natural right, and one that existed independent of statutes, any commands which a statute may give concerning its solemnization should, if the form of words will permit, be interpreted as mere directions to the officers of the law and to the parties, not rendering void what is done in disregard thereof. Consequently, the doctrine has become established, as a general rule, that a marriage good at common law will be held valid, notwithstanding the existence of any statute on the subject, unless the statute contains express

words of nullity. This rule, however is not universal. 1 Bish. Mar. & Div. § 283. It seems to me, therefore, that when the terms of the statute are such that they cannot be made effective, to the extent of giving each and all of them some reasonable operation, without interpreting the statute as mandatory, then such interpretation should be given to it. The statute under consideration, in express words, declares that “every marriage in this state *shall* be under a license, and be solemnized in the manner herein provided.” It is possible that these words, standing alone, should, under the general rule just stated, be interpreted as merely directory. But the statute does not stop here. It qualifies these words by provisions which would be wholly useless and unnecessary if it were intended and should be held that the preceding provisions are simply directory. It is declared that certain marriages shall not “*be deemed or adjudged void*” because the person solemnizing them did not in fact have authority to do so. It also declares that certain other marriages shall not “*be void*” because they were solemnized without a license. These exceptions or qualifying provisions seem to me to be equivalent to an express declaration that marriages had in this state, contrary to the commands of the statute, and not saved by the exceptions, shall be treated as void. It is apparent that the legislature must have interpreted the statute as making the excepted marriages null and void without the excepting clauses, for otherwise the exceptions would be useless, and would not have been made. The introduction of the exemptions is necessary, exclusive of all other independent, extrinsic exceptions. The maxim is clear, “*expressum facit cessare tacitum*,”-affirmative specification excludes implication.”

Note: Don't be confused by the word license. It includes a church license.

Note: Don't be confused by the word *solemnize*. This is a Catholic doctrine. The Bible does not prescribe any wedding ceremony. Weddings are a Catholic ritual forced on society by Pope Innocent III. It was not until 1563, during their brutal counter-reformation, that the Catholics attempted to force their solemnization of the wedding ceremony.

BARBARISM ?

Can Intermarriage be a foundation of society? The US Supreme Court in Maynard relied on a precedent decision from a Maine court Adams v. Palmer, 51 Me. 481, 483 which said marriage was a social relation,... the obligations which arise are “*the creation of the law itself... the first step from barbarism to incipient civilization, the purest tie of social life, and the true basis of human progress*”. This was obviously not a reference to the type of marriage solemnized in the Garden of Eden (unless you consider traditional marriage – the kind that existed prior to any human government – to be barbarism). It was obviously a reference to manmade (graven) “marriage” because the court kept insisting that

- “*Their rights under [the marriage relation] are determined by the will of the sovereign*”.
- “*marriage ... was the most elementary and useful of all the social relations; was regulated and controlled by the sovereign power of the state*”
- Marriage ... “*might be abrogated by the sovereign will whenever the public good, or justice to both parties, or either of the parties, would thereby be subserved*”

Notice how these concepts are entirely contrary to earlier descriptions of undivorcable church solemnized marriage. This sovereign regulated “marriage” would be contrary to the rights of innocent offspring that government must protect (Supreme Court’s Williams

decision). Whereas real marriage existed prior to any human government. Certainly, if we were all created equal, we could not have delegated to a government we create, a power to destroy our foundation.

What we did delegate was the authority to force fornicators and rapists to “marry” their pregnant victims, to guarantee the rights of innocent offspring which must be upheld. Mimicking the pagan “marriage” of the early Roman Empire. This is the manmade (graven) “marriage” that you now worship.

I find it interesting that lawyers themselves now insist on their right to block what they themselves said was the path from barbarism to civilization.

Speaking of barbarism – The US Supreme Court in the 1793 case Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. 419, confirmed that the law profession was corrupted in ancient times when they referred to: "*The rude and degrading league between the bar and feudal barbarism....*"

Their comment, not mine.

Walk not in the counsel of the ungodly.

“Woe unto you lawyers, for you have taken away the key of knowledge” (Luke 11:52)

11. Divorce bastardizes children.

This chapter gives more proof that government licensed “marriage” is not a marriage at all.

Divorce recognizes that the civil union “marriage” was never a marriage at all. Divorce bastardizes the children. Bastards are the children of nobody. This gives judges the right to give the state’s children to a government appointed custodian. Then extort ransom.

Without legitimate marriage, there can be no inheritance rights. God hated Esau for selling his birthright. Will your judgment be any better? Esau at least got what he bargained for.

You will recall from Chapter 5 that back when the original 13 States wrote their constitutions, the pre-existing law-of-the-land defined divorce as a determination that there was never a marriage at all:

- Blackstone’s, Book I at page 423: “*These civil disabilities make the contract void ab initio, and not merely voidable: not that they dissolve a contract already [page 424] formed, but they render the parties incapable of forming any contract at all: they do not put asunder those who are joined together, but they previously hinder the junction. And, if any persons under these legal incapacities come together, it is a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union [prior marriage with a husband or wife still living, underage without parents’ permission, incompetent to contract, invalid contract to marry].*”
- Blackstone’s, Book I, page 445, chapter 16: “*In a divorce a mensa et thoro, if the wife breeds children, they are bastards ; for the law will presume the husband and wife conformable to the sentence of separation, unless access be proved : but, in a voluntary separation by agreement, the law will suppose access, unless the negative be shewn . So also if there is an apparent impossibility of procreation on the part of the husband, ..., there the issue of the wife shall be bastard. Likewise, in case of divorce in the spiritual court a vinculo matrimonii, all the issue born during the coverture are bastards ; because such divorce is always upon some cause, that rendered the marriage unlawful and null from the beginning.*”

Here are two definitions of Latin terms used by Blackstone:

Filius nullius: “*An illegitimate child; son of nobody*”

Filius populi: “*A son of the people.*”

Blackstone explains the rights of bastards at page 447, Book I, chapter 16:

“The rights are very few, being only such as he can acquire ; for he can inherit nothing, being looked upon as the son of nobody, and sometimes called filius nullius, sometimes filius populi. Yet he may gain a surname by reputation, though he has none by inheritance. A bastard was also, in strictness, incapable of holy orders; ... utterly disqualified from holding any dignity in the church: ... the civil law, so boasted of for it's equitable decisions, made bastards in some cases incapable even of a gift from their parents.”

Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 446, chapter 16:

“bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes”

By the way,

- Christ also disapproved of bastards having positions of authority. John 8:40-44.
- God gave Abraham’s birthright to Isaac, not first-born Ishmael, a bastard.
- Even the children of separated couples were considered by the early Christian Church to be unholy, 1 Corinthians 7:14. We are made in the image of God, and children must be raised in a family bond.
- We are not to be bastard children of the bondwoman, but heirs according to the promise. (Galatians chapters 3 and 4).

In Roman Law improper marriage that was divorced by the courts results in offspring being declared as bastards. And it prohibited bastards from any family rights. In [Justinian’s Institutes](#), Book 1, Chapter X:

12. If persons unite themselves in contravention of the rules thus laid down, there is no husband or wife, no nuptials, no marriage, nor marriage portion, and the children born in such a connection are not in the power of the father. For, with regard to the power of a father, they are in the position of children conceived in prostitution, who are looked upon as having no father, because it is uncertain who he is; and are therefore called *spurii*, either from a Greek word *sporadan*, meaning "at hazard," or as being *sine patre*, without a father. On the dissolution of such a connection there can be no claim made for the demand of a marriage portion. Persons who contract prohibited marriages are liable also to further penalties set forth in our imperial *constitutiones*.

Governments are instituted among men to secure rights. The purpose of government is to enforce marriage so that the offspring are not bastardized.

Georgia Supreme Court in [Askew v. Dupree](#), 30 Ga. 173:

“a legislative enactment to annul a marriage de facto is a penal enactment, not only penal to the parties, but highly penal to the innocent offspring, ...”

[Blackstone’s Commentaries](#) page 446, book I, chapter 16: *“bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes”*

The illegitimate cannot acquire legitimacy. They cannot inherit a surname, Citizenship or participate as church officers.

[this word “*Citizenship*” refers to the constituents, the people who created a Constitution, this is the word “*Citizenship*” that is always capitalized in the 11 occurrences in the U.S. Constitution, prior to any amendments that use a lower case “*citizenship*”]

Divorce bastardizes children. They cannot even inherit a surname. Although they can serve as civil servants, no bastard can ever become a legitimate officer in government. A bastard was called *Filius populi*: “A son of the people.” and as a ward of the government, cannot

become officers. Just as servants cannot be masters, neither can wards be officers. Nothing legitimate can come from illegitimacy.

No-fault divorce by activist judges bastardizes the children of otherwise legitimate parents. This is punishable unto the tenth generation - Deuteronomy 23:2, prohibiting the free exercise of religion. This free exercise of religion is a constitutionally guaranteed right. Guaranteed by a judge's oath of office contract and official bond.

Divorce bastardizes our future society. Nothing legitimate can ever come from illegitimacy.

Does this diminish the authority of the United States? If so, then it meets one of the elements of treason.

International Treaty Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 16

"The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State"

Part 3: Political Traps

Chapter 12 will present proofs that undivorced marriage is still a right. The right to marry existed prior to any human government. The right to marry did not come from government.

Family (patriarchal) government was perfectly good for the first ten books of the Bible.

In the past 100 years, family rights have now been reduced to those of a slave.

Tucker's Blackstone (Book 1, Part 2, Note H "The state of slavery") explained the laws that applied to slaves in 1803 Virginia:

*"From this melancholy review it will appear that not only the right of property, and the right of personal liberty, but even the right of personal security, has been, at times either **wholly annihilated, or reduced to a shadow**: and even in these days, the protection of the latter seems to be confined to very few cases. Many actions, indifferent in themselves, being permitted by the law of nature to all mankind, and by the laws of society to all free persons, are either rendered highly criminal in a slave, or **subject him to some kind of punishment or restraint.**"*

There are many parallels to the slavery of the past.

- Recent law dictionaries have now redefined intermarriage as formerly prohibited miscegenation (interracial marriage).
- slave marriage (contubernium) is recorded in the owner's records.
- Slaves were subject to their owner's laws.
- Even Criminal Courts could not give jury trials to slaves. Same thing today. Family court rules are neither civil nor criminal, and without jury.

If you are subject "to some kind of punishment" in your family relationship, then perhaps your rights were "wholly annihilated or reduced to a shadow" which subjects you "to some kind of punishment or restraint" for exercising a right.

This section presents political traps for those who are compelled to defend traditional values. Chapter 15 will quote well-established law as possibilities that explain divorce court jurisdiction, such as: license laws, historical slavery, putative marriage, and *maritagium*.

12. The Right To Undivorceable Marriage

- Why are divorce courts clogged up with so many marriages that they will determine to be “*unlawful and null from the beginning*” here in a nation founded on real law when marriage was until death, and divorce was impossible?
- Why are there so many marriages that are hindered by legal impediments that “*do not put asunder those who are joined together, but they previously hinder the junction.*”?
- Is it really true that a marriage license waives the right to marry?
- Is it still true that the right to “*marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, shall be indissoluble.*”?
- Is it still true that “*the common law ...will not allow it to be unloosed for any cause whatsoever, that arises after the union is made... ?*”

Real Marriage (church solemnized marriage) is a right. The U.S. Supreme Court confirms that it is a protected liberty. Whereas Government regulated “marriage” is not a right. It is a licensed privilege that will be granted only upon the payment of a licensing fee and a sworn oath to obey your state god. Government regulated “marriage” is so phony that courts will not uphold it.

The right to marry existed prior to any human government. The right to marry did not come from government. The Declaration of Independence says that our Creator endows us with unalienable rights. And that governments are instituted among men to secure those rights. Government is not instituted to destroy those rights.

The U.S. Supreme Court in Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978) :

“The decisions of the Court confirm that the right to marry is of fundamental importance to all individuals.”

Texas Supreme Court in Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944:

“The rights of the individual are not derived from governmental agencies, either municipal, state, federal, or even from the Constitution, but they exist inherently in every man, and are merely reaffirmed in the Constitution and restricted only to the extent they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government.”

Parsons' On Contracts, Sixth edition, 1873, Volume III, page 85:

[If, in a divorce proceeding] *“it should appear that the parties had celebrated a regular marriage, in facie ecclesiae, and were unquestionably husband and wife, certainly the court would not wait for the defendant to avail himself of that fact, but as soon as it was clearly before them would stop the case. For if they were once married, no agreement of both parties, and no waiver of both or either, would annul the marriage.”*

That's right! Proof of a regular marriage will stop a divorce case. A church wedding *in facie ecclesiae* is proof of a regular marriage. What kind of marriage do you have?

Four years after the US Supreme Court ruled on a Washington case Maynard v. Hill that States could divorce an intermarriage, the Washington State Supreme Court in McLaughlin's Estate, 4 Wash. 570 confirmed that:

Page 575 *“marriage is founded in the law of nature, and is anterior to all human law...”*

Page 579: *“marriage is a natural right, which existed independent of statutes...”*

Page 587: *“marriage is a natural right, which always existed prior to the organization of any form of government, and all laws in restraint of it should be strictly construed in consequence thereof. It is held it should be the policy of the law to sustain all such contracts and relations whenever possible, and that this should always be done ...*

page 590 marriage has *“its origin in divine law”*

Did you loose your right to marry just because you were tricked into a license?

Answer: Not likely. The Supreme Court says that the law of the land does not change unless the legislature specifically says so. The U.S. Supreme Court in Meister v. Moore;, which was a inheritance case focusing on illegitimacy issues, at page 79 [96 U.S. 76 at 78](#) tells us about the right to marry:

“Statutes in many of the States, it is true, regulate the mode of entering into the contract, but they do not confer the right....[page 79] No doubt, a statute may take away a common law right; but there is always a presumption that the Legislature has no such intention, ... a marriage good at common law to be good notwithstanding the statutes, unless they contain express words of nullity.”

It is not likely that any legislator would express words of nullity to deny the foundation of society, thereby denying the legitimacy of their office.

As was quoted earlier, the U.S. Supreme Court in Murdock v. Penn. 319 U.S. 105 determined that no state can convert a right into a privilege and then charge a fee.

And the Supreme Court in Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 US 390, at page 399: determined that marriage is a protected liberty. As is the right to bring up children.

Also Notice that most the Supreme Court decisions quoted in this book are inheritance cases where bastards-by-divorce tried to inherit property. Since divorce is a determination that the original wedding was illegal, divorce bastardizes the children. Bastards cannot inherit

property. (This is still true today. Nowadays they have a government granted privilege to hold the government's property, if they pay inheritance and death tax). In the last chapter we learned "*the civil law,... made bastards in some cases incapable even of a gift from their parents.*" This enables them to implement the third plank of The Communist Manifesto to prohibit inheritance rights.

Woe unto you lawyers.
You vipers, how can you escape the damnation of hell?

13. You are subject to your benefactors

Activist judges for the past 100 years have planned the destruction of America. And America has, for the most part, accepted counterfeit “marriages” as genuine.

If you applied for a government (non-traditional) marriage license, then they determine your moral values for you. You cannot then claim that it is immoral to commit adultery. (Or whatever new perversion they allow next).

California Supreme Court Roberts v. Roberts (1947), 81 C.A.2d 871:

“The state is a party to every marriage contract of its own residents as well as the guardians of their morals”

If you applied for a government (non-traditional) marriage, then they own your children. "Since the state married them, the children were fruits of the state"

Tillman v. Roberts, 108 So. 62: "The primary control and custody of infants is with the government"

Van Koten v. Van Koten, 154 N.E. 146: "Marriage is a civil contract to which there are three parties -- the husband, the wife and the state."

Illinois Supreme Court Van Koten v. Van Koten, 323 Ill. 323

“However, this constitutionally protected parental interest is not wholly without limit or beyond regulation. Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158, 166, 88 L. Ed. 645, 64 S. Ct. 438, 442 (1944). “[T]he state has a wide range of power for limiting parental freedom and authority in things affecting the child's welfare.” Prince, 321 U.S. at 167, 88 L. Ed. 645, 64 S. Ct. at 442. In fact, the entire familial relationship involves the State. When two people decide to get married, they are required to first procure a license from the State. If they have children of this marriage, they are required by the State to submit their children to certain things, such as school attendance and vaccinations. Furthermore, if at some time in the future the couple decides the marriage is not working, they must petition the State for a divorce. Marriage is a three-party contract between the man, the woman, and the State. Linneman v. Linneman, 1 Ill. App. 2d 48, 50, 116 N.E.2d 182, 183 (1953), citing Van Koten v. Van Koten, 323 Ill. 323, 326, 154 N.E. 146 (1926). The State represents the public interest in the institution of marriage. Linneman, 1 Ill. App. 2d at 50, 116 N.E.2d at 183. This public interest is what allows the State to intervene in certain situations to protect the interests of members of the family. The State is like a silent partner in the family who is not active in the everyday running of the family but becomes active and exercises its power and authority only when necessary to protect some important interest of family life.”

Aside: On the issue of forced schooling, contrary to this Illinois Supreme Court ruling, the United States Supreme Court keeps persisting, over and over and over again that it is the parents' duty to educate their children. Meyer v. Nebraska, [262 U.S. 390](#), Plyler v. Doe, 457

U.S. 202, Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510, Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205, and there are dozens of cases on family privacy.

Aside: since this is a book of family values, I want to dwell briefly on parents' duty to educate their children. Those who fail to educate their own children will lose their children to state custody where they will be forced into public schools.

The received-law-of-the-land as described in Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, chapter 16, entitled "The Rights of Children" tells us that:

"The duty of parents for the maintenance of their [legitimate] children is a principal of natural law...

The establishment of marriage in all civilized states is built on this natural obligation... The last duty of parents to their children is that of giving them an education suitable to their station in life...

Yet the municipal laws ... constraining the parent to bestow a proper education upon his children... made a wise provision for breeding up the rising generation... [these neglected children] are taken out of the hands of their parents."

That's right! By institutionalizing "your" children, you have confessed that you are incapable of raising your own children. You lose your parental rights. The children become wards of the state. No wonder family courts are so sure that they have jurisdiction over the state's children. Activist judges no longer fear that they will be charged with kidnapping, genocide, and deprivation of liberty under color of law. For un-surrendered children, state protection would be severely limited to a compelling state interest. See the notes at the end of Chapter 17.

Interestingly, in my local school district, the registration form for enrolling a student does not need a parent's signature. Another interesting point is that my local school district could not prove that they exist. Despite the public disclosure laws, they could not tell me if the document that created the school district is in their records, nor even if it ever existed. (I suspect that wards of the state are collateral for the national debt, and are owned by foreign banks to which we owe the debt. They have a duty to maximize the value of their collateral. State laws are enacted only to ensure some oversight in this process.) Public schools are the 10th plank of the Communist Manifesto.

And why do today's Anabaptists forget the rights they fought so hard to keep?

Even Roe v. Wade says that family decisions about rearing children are strictly private.

The U.S. Supreme Court in Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202, concluded, "...education is not a fundamental right..."

US Congressman in the 1840's Robert Dale Owen, later known as the father of American socialism, believed that the Christian faith hindered man's evolution. An Owen associate wrote:

"The great object was to get rid of Christianity and to convert our churches into halls of science... the plan was not to make open attacks upon religion – although we might belabor the

clergy and bring them into contempt where we could ... but to establish a system of state – we said national – schools... from which all religion would be excluded and to which all parents were to be compelled by law to send their children.”

These views influenced John Dewey at the Columbia Teacher’s College, and by 1900 a socialist system of compulsory schools, which exclude religion, became a reality.

Aside: On the issue of forced child vaccinations, contrary to this Illinois Supreme Court ruling, the United States Supreme Court had ruled, in Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 197 U.S. 11, that during a declared emergency smallpox epidemic where the state had the power to enact quarantine laws, Mr. Jacobson, who had previously been injured by a childhood vaccination, and who raised no religious objections, and who had the option of leaving the city to avoid the requirement, could be fined \$5 for refusing to be vaccinated. Mr. Jacobson argued that he was denied equal protection because children could be exempted from forced vaccination. The Supreme Court determined *“there are obviously reasons why regulations may be appropriate for adults which could not be safely applied to persons of tender years.”* They also ruled that during a smallpox outbreak children would be kept out of public schools until vaccinated. Cooley’s Constitutional Limitations, 8th Edition, page 1229 quotes this same Supreme Court’s Jacobson decision as proof that vaccinations cannot be forced. It concludes *“The police power is not supreme and is not unlimited. It is subject to the limitations imposed by the Federal Constitution upon every power of government. It will not be suffered to invade or impair the fundamental liberties of the citizen”*

Aside: on the issue of limiting parental roles, contrary to this Illinois Supreme Court ruling, the United States Supreme Court case Prince v. Massachusetts Quoted by Illinois as the basis for their decision, was a case about a child labor law that restricted the distribution of religious tracts for profit by young teenagers.

But, John Locke’s Second Treatise of government, which was the foundation for most of the Declaration of Independence, in his Chapter 6 “Paternal rights”, says that a child is not subject to legislated laws until he is old enough to make binding contracts. He said in paragraph 57: *“for nobody can be under a law, which is not promulgated to him”* and later in paragraph 73 when children become 21 years old they can choose which government to place themselves under, and, according to paragraph 62, this cannot happen until they have the recognized right to take binding oaths of allegiance.

As was explained by Blackstone and Locke, These parental rights are all based upon “divine revealed law” in the Bible.

Marriage is the joining of a man and woman to legitimize a family. GOD GIVES CHILDREN TO PARENTS (Genesis 32:5, 1st Chronicles 25:5, Hebrews 2:13). PARENTHOOD IS A RIGHT GIVEN BY GOD. By getting permission to marry, (or even by accepting welfare as a confession that you cannot manage your own affairs), children become wards of the state. You are incompetent in the eyes of the law.

In fact, by accepting welfare (such as public schooling or even Social Security) you might just be waiving almost all your rights. Locke questioned in his Second Treatise of Government

Chapter 15 “*For what compact [contract] can be made with a man that is not master of his own life?*” No wonder a judge wants you to be represented by competent counsel. It is presumed that you are insane if you expect to have rights while also availing yourself of the benefits of being a ward of the state.

There is one more possibility to explain jurisdiction, but you won’t like it. Courts can assume, unless controverted, that all marriage issues brought before it are civil “marriages”, not Holy matrimony. More about this in chapter 15.

Legislators write laws for people who are subject to their laws. They do not write ecclesiastical laws. Their term “marriage” in the law books has nothing to do with Holy matrimony. Examples:

- Statewide Organization of Stepparents v. Smith, 536 P.2d 1202:
“*Purpose of statute declaring marriage to be a civil contract was to make it clear that marriage was governed by civil law rather than by ecclesiastical law*”
- Blackstone, Book 1, page 427: “*being entirely the province of the ecclesiastical courts, our [law] books are perfectly silent concerning them.*”

JURISDICTION OF BENEFACTORS

Christ said in Luke 22:25 “... **The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so...**” In the world benefactors exercise lordship. You can only have one lord (Matthew 6:24, Luke 16:13).

Let’s explore the possibility that Satan protects his followers. And then ask ourselves if we are guilty of seeking the protection of his black robed priests at the local courthouse when applying for a license.

- The U.S. Supreme Court in Ashwander v. TVA, 297 U.S. 288 set down rules for which cases the Supreme Court will NOT consider. The Supreme Court will NOT consider any case questioning the constitutionality of a law from someone who has availed himself of the law’s benefit. In other words, benefactors exercise lordship. You cannot question the legitimacy of your benefactor (lord).
- The U.S. Supreme Court in Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 394 U.S. 147 (1969).

“Persons faced with an unconstitutional licensing law which purports to require a license as a prerequisite to exercise of right... may ignore the law and engage with impunity in exercise of such right.”

That’s right! Once you are stupid enough to beg for a license to exercise a right, then the Supreme Court will not consider the case. In addition, your confession that you do not have a right to marry will be used against you in court. It is your own fault for being deceived. You have a duty to avoid deception. Satan’s disciples lie. They are of their father the devil, and the lusts of their father they will do...there is no truth in him... for Satan was a liar and the

father of it. (Paraphrasing Christ in John 8:44) (Aside: Eve was deceived, Adam's original sin was that he "harkened unto the voice of thy wife")

CIVIL MARRIAGE is regulated "marriage". It is not Holy Matrimony. It is not in the face of the church. It is licentiousness.

- *"it is a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union."*
- *"The state is a party to every marriage contract of its own residents as well as the guardians of their morals"*

Regulated marriage is a government granted privilege, which can be charged a fee.

Once you voluntarily ask to be protected by a law that regulates civil "marriage", then you are a ward of your benefactor, you are chained to their chain of command. While you are in their house, you obey their rules. No matter how abhorrent or repugnant their rules become. The Supreme Court in the Ashwander case said that anyone who takes benefits cannot challenge their regulations. If you have their license to exercise a benefit (such as, for example, a benefit of regulated "marriage"), then Caesar has become lord. Guardian of your morals. You cannot obey two masters. And you cannot question jurisdiction once you avail yourself of benefits.

Black's Law Dictionary definition of Allegiance: *"Obligation of fidelity and obedience to government in consideration for protection that government gives."*

Question: Are you subject to your benefactors if you claim protection from them?

Answer: US Supreme Court The Supreme Court in the Cruikshank case, 92 US 551, said:

"It is the natural consequence of a citizenship which owes allegiance to two sovereignties, and claims protection from both. The citizen cannot complain, because he has voluntarily submitted himself to such a form of government."

If the State "married" you, then you have a "civil union" by civil authority. If you participate in their civil unions then:

- Give honor to whom honor is due (Romans 13:7)
- **Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's.**
- If you've agreed that government is the guardian of your moral values then you cannot claim that it is immoral to participate in vile abominations.

However, If Church authority married you, then you have a marriage that mankind cannot put asunder. You cannot serve two masters. Choose this day whom you shall serve.

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. Galatians 5.

<p>Procuracionem adversus nulla est præscriptio. There is no prescription against procuration.</p>
--

14. Your benefactors have planned the destruction of family values

Safety and liberty are opposites. The consequence of creating a graven provider-protector-benefactor (daddy government) to be obeyed has been well known since ancient times. Examples:

- Nimrod was a mighty provider ahead of the Lord. (Genesis 10:9) at the founding of Babylon.
- Family government worked just fine for the first ten Books of the Bible, until it was replaced. The election of Saul was evil in the eyes of the Lord, [I Samuel 12:17](#).
- Democracy gives political power to a gang of sinners. 1st Samuel 15:24:
“And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice.”
- In 400 BC Socrates quoted Plato, [The Republic](#), book 8, section 565:

“The people always have some champion whom they set over them and nurture into greatness... This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears he is a protector.”

- Or to put it into American terms: *“Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety.”* According to Benjamin Franklin, November 11, 1755; Reply to the Governor. This is inscribed on a plaque in the stairwell of the Statute of Liberty.
- Patrick Henry, March 28, 1775 urged others to choose between safety or liberty. *“Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased by the price of chains and slavery?... I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death”*
- the words “secure” and “security,” when used in the federal Constitution, are only used in the context of protecting the people from their own government.

As an indication of just how far we have strayed, consider that the law-of-the-land received from the original English colonies provided:

Blackstone’s Commentaries Book 4, page 58: *“the temporal courts resent the public affront to religion and morality, on [page 59] which all government must depend for support, ...Christianity is part of the laws of England.”*

Some people claim that Romans 13:1 requires us to obey government, no matter how abhorrent. Yet the divine right of Kings to rule was thoroughly debunked when we came out of the dark ages. Go read Locke and Rutherford. Romans 13 requires us to obey legitimate powers. Verse 3 excludes tyrants. In fact, Tyndale’s translation says *“Rulers are not to be feared for good works, but for evil.”*

The Declaration of Independence correctly stated:

“... all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed...”

When will evils become less sufferable? The American male has been neutered to the point that he will no longer raise the feeblest whimper when his family is torn from him by black robed priests, his children bastardized and sacrificed on the alter of perversion. And his right to marry declared void from the beginning, his vows to God ridiculed, and his Holy Matrimony determined to be “*a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union.*” And the foundation of his once-great nation sodomized by perverts. Men protect their families, which is why they go to war. Yet the American male now immediately surrenders whenever a disciple of Satan touches him with a piece of paper. Why are such evils still sufferable?

Some states have now extended government granted “rights” to perverts who want to legitimize crime. Not just any crime, but a crime that has always been more detestable than child rape. A crime that denies the legitimacy of government. Other states want the people to vote on the issue.

Agreeing to settle this issue by a vote is evil. By registering to vote, you agree to abide by the outcome, no matter how abhorrent. Should we hold a vote to determine whether or not we want a moral compass?

Is it too late to revive God’s original definition of family values?

You have two choices: obey God, or be punished. The lesson to be learned is to avoid deception. It is our own fault for being deceived.

God used Satan to test Eve. Satan is an instrument of God’s punishment. Even the pervert in 1st Corinthians 5:5 was delivered unto Satan by Christians.

God has always punished His people by allowing them to be conquered by pagans. Conquering by pagans are instruments of His discipline (Isaiah 8:4-10, 10:5-6, 45:1-3, Jeremiah 5:15-18, 20:4-5, 24:10, Ezekiel 21:15-26, 30:24-26, 32:11-15).

IS AMERICA GOING TO BE ANY DIFFERENT, OR DID GOD CHANGE?

You have a duty to oppose the politically mighty. Or be cursed bitterly for your inaction. Yes, God expects human cooperation against the political mighty.

Judges 5:23 (KJV) "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the LORD, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the LORD, to the help of the LORD against the mighty."

15. Divorce court jurisdiction

Yes, divorce courts have jurisdiction over their subject matter. Phony “marriage” must be divorced. Bastards belong to the state and must be assigned a government appointed custodian. Real marriage must be enforced, because there is no subject-matter jurisdiction over ecclesiastical matters.

A civil union “marriage” can be divorced by a court. Because it is not a marriage at all. It is licentiousness. Courts cannot recognize a civil “marriage” as legitimate. Activist judges go even further. There is a presumption that the marriage is a government licensed “marriage”, unless rebutted with evidence to the contrary. If there is no evidence to refute their presumption, they will not recognize the presumed-to-be licentious “marriage” as legitimate, even if it was a church wedding. They presume that a government-licensed minister solemnized it. They might even presume that you were pronounced man and wife by the authority of their non-profit 501(c)(3) government corporation¹.

The purpose of government divorce courts is to rule on the facts presented and to determine whether or not the original marriage was lawful. And if unlawful, then render “*the marriage unlawful and null from the beginning*”

As you will recall from chapter 5:

Blackstone’s, Book I at page 423:

*“These civil disabilities make the contract void ab initio, and not merely voidable: not that they dissolve a contract already [page 424] formed, but they **render the parties incapable of forming any contract at all: they do not put asunder those who are joined together, but they previously hinder the junction.** And, if any persons under these legal incapacities come together, it is a meretricious, and **not a matrimonial, union** [prior marriage with a husband or wife still living, underage without parents permission, incompetent to contract, invalid contract to marry].”*

Blackstone’s, Book I, page 445, chapter 16:

*“Likewise, in case of divorce in the spiritual court a vinculo matrimonii, all the issue born during the coverture are bastards ; because such **divorce is always upon some cause, that rendered the marriage unlawful and null from the beginning.**”*

They do not have the authority to convert holy matrimony into an illicit cohabitation, thereby bastardizing future generations. Which would deny the future legitimacy of their government.

Washington State Supreme Court McLaughlin’s Estate, 4 Wash. 570, July 1892, concluded that an invalid marriage “*arrangement constituted nothing more than an illicit cohabitation or concubinage subject to abandonment by either at pleasure.*” ...“*It is contrary to public policy and public morals, and revolting to the senses of enlightened society that parties could place themselves in such a condition that they might mutually repudiate an arrangement of this kind*” [and attempts to repudiate would be] *ineffectual.*”

If you placed yourself in such a condition that you can repudiate a “marriage” arrangement of this kind then you have an invalid marriage arrangement. You are subject to divorce proceedings and your bastards are wards of the state who will be assigned a custodian against your will.

If you do not have such an invalid arrangement, then the purpose of family court is to find your marriage valid, and enforceable. Examples:

- The U.S. Supreme Court in Dartmouth v. Woodward, 17 U.S. at 629 said:

“When any state legislature shall pass an act annulling all marriage contracts, or allowing either party to annul it, without consent of the other, it will be time enough to inquire whether such an act be unconstitutional.”

- Washington State Supreme Court McLaughlin’s Estate, 4 Wash. 570:

*“All marriages to which there are no legal impediments, solemnized before or in any religious organization or congregation, according to the established ritual or form commonly practiced therein, **are valid.**”*

- 1892 Washington State Supreme Court McLaughlin’s Estate, 4 Wash. 570:

*“marriage is a natural right, which always existed prior to the organization of any form of government, and all laws in restraint of it should be strictly construed in consequence thereof. It is held it should be **the policy of the law to sustain all such contracts and relations whenever possible, and that this should always be done...**”*

As we learned in chapter 4, the received law-of-the-land recognizes undivorcable matrimony:

- Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 421: *“...the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriages as a sin, but merely as a civil inconvenience. The punishment therefore, or annulling, of incestuous or other unscriptural marriages, is the province of the spiritual courts; which act pro salute animae. And, taking it in this civil light, the law treats it as it does all other contracts; allowing it to be **good and valid in all cases**, where the parties at the time of making it were, in the first place, willing to contract; secondly, able to contract; and, lastly, actually did contract, in the proper forms and solemnities required by law.”*
- Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, Page 423: *“all marriages contracted by lawful persons in the face of the church, and consummate with bodily knowledge, and fruit of children, **shall be indissoluble.**”*
- Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 428: *“For the canon law, which the common law follows in this case, deems so highly and with such mysterious reverence of the nuptial tie, that it **will not allow it to be unloosed for any cause whatsoever, that arises after the union is made...**”*

- Civil courts cannot try ecclesiastical subject matter. U.S. Supreme Court in Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 679 (1871):

"it is a very difficult thing where a subject-matter of dispute, strictly and purely ecclesiastical in its character,--a matter over which the civil courts exercise no jurisdiction,--a matter which concerns theological controversy, church discipline, ecclesiastical government, or the conformity of the members of the church to the standard of morals required of them,--becomes the subject of its action. It may be said there, also, that no jurisdiction has been conferred on the tribunal to try the particular case before it ... "

The right to a traditional undivorceable marriage existed prior to any human government. Is it fraud to coerce couples to apply for a license when they want to exercise a right? And then use this license application to destroy the foundation of society? Are we endowed by our creator with certain unalienable rights? Are we all created equal with no superior but our creator?

Activist judges deny the legitimacy of their office whenever they deny the foundation of society.

How do divorce courts get away with their crimes? After all, no Supreme Court has ever upheld divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* of a legitimately married couple.

Can governments possess an authority that they were not granted? The Marriage Right existed prior to any human government, it was not granted by government. Government cannot redefine the original definition of what marriage is; but they certainly have promoted their counterfeit re-definition. God performed the first wedding ceremony. **Let not mankind put asunder.**

Certainly, no human can delegate to his civil servants an authority to redefine marriage into some kind of cancelable civil union. Conversely, no one can grant an authority that he/she never had. If "we the people" (those who wrote the Constitution) did not have the authority to cancel our neighbor's vows to God, then we the people could not have delegated such authority to our civil servants. Not by writing a constitution, not by electing a corrupt judge, not by demanding a divorce law.

Only the church has jurisdiction over a real marriage. There is no divorce jurisdiction in government courts, according to the received-law-of-the-land.

Blackstone Book III, chapter 7, page 93:

"causes matrimonial are now so peculiarly ecclesiastical, that the temporal courts will never interfere in controversies of this kind,..."

Tucker's commentary on Blackstone was a Virginia law textbook published in 1803. It explains the law of the land 16 years after the US Constitution was written:

*“But since the revolution there has been no court established in Virginia, possessing general jurisdiction in cases of an ecclesiastical nature. The high court of chancery hath jurisdiction in cases of incestuous marriages, which it may annul, but it does **not appear to possess jurisdiction in any other matrimonial, or other ecclesiastical case whatsoever.** V. L. 1794, c. 104.”*

This is the law of the land that your government, through each successive officeholder since then, was sworn to uphold. And there is always a presumption that the legislature did not abolish common law, according to the Supreme Court in Meister. It is doubtful that any legislator, having sworn to uphold the Constitution, would suggest that the foundation of society be destroyed.

How can there even be a divorce complaint?

- *Vir et uxor consentur in lege una persona* Husband and Wife are considered one person in law. How can there be a controversy for a court to settle? How can there be a controversy between one?
- Husband and wife are one flesh. One cannot testify against the other. This has always been the case in Christian nations ever since Ephesians 5:31. For Example, Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 431:

..... But, in trials of any sort, they are not allowed to be evidence for, or against, each other : partly because it is impossible their testimony should be indifferent ; but principally because of the union of person : and therefore, if they were admitted to be witnesses for each other, they would contradict one maxim of law, “nemo in propria causa testis esse debet ;” and if against each other, they would contradict another maxim, “nemo tenetur seipsum accusare.”

These two Latin phrases mean: No one ought to be a witness in his own cause. No one is bound to accuse himself.

- *Nemo ex proprio dolo consequitur actionem.* (No one maintains an action arising out of his own wrong.)
- Marriage is not a creature subject to government, it was created by an authority higher than graven (manmade) human government.
Moxey Estate (1903) 2 Cof 369:

*“Marriage is more than a contract; it is a status; it is an institution of society and its foundation; **it does not come from society**, but contrariwise; it is the parent of society, and it is extremely important that its stability shall be secured, and that its contraction should be surrounded by safeguards and its sanctity upheld; and every solemnization of marriage should be in the face of the public; there should be no secrecy either in ceremony or in connubiation”.*

- How can alimony be legal? Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1, page 430:

"By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law: Also if a wife elopes, and lives with another man, the husband is not chargeable even for necessaries.... "

Notice back in chapter 6 that alimony is to be paid to the wife in cases of partial divorce. Because a man takes care of his family. But in a complete divorce the

marriage never existed. If there was a marriage license, then the marriage contract was to the third party – the state. Alimony is paid to the state, not to the non-spouse.

How do courts get away with it?

Possibility #1 There is a presumption that the marriage is a civil “marriage” because the divorce form didn’t ask, and the divorcing plaintiff didn’t tell. Since a civil “marriage” is no marriage at all, the divorce must be granted unless the presumption is controverted. As was explained in the Stepparents case earlier, the government’s term “marriage” does not refer to marriage in the face of the church.

There is a problem with this possibility: If there was a church wedding, man and wife are one flesh. Spouses cannot testify against each other in court.

Possibility #2 The marriage license application and the payment of a license fee may be a sufficient confession that the couple did not have a right to marry.

The main problem with this theory is that the marriage license is issued to the solemnizer, not the couple. Even ecclesiastical marriages must be preceded with published banns and the church’s license to their official who will solemnize the marriage. The purpose of the license was (at least historically) to ensure that there were no impediments to a lawful marriage.

This theory that the license invalidates the marriage seems contrary to the established purpose of government to protect rights and defend the sanctity of the family. Historically, conformance to the marriage statutes assured that marriage was enforceable and could not be divorced. Example: the Georgia Supreme Court in Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga. 173 determined that compliance with the marriage statutes would guard against illicit intercourse. Another Example: Washington Supreme Court McLaughlin’s Estate, 4 Wash. 570, concluded that compliance with statutes prevents an invalid marriage that is

“nothing more than an illicit cohabitation or concubinage subject to abandonment by either at pleasure.” ... “It is contrary to public policy and public morals, and revolting to the senses of enlightened society that parties could place themselves in such a condition that they might mutually repudiate an arrangement of this kind ”.... [and attempts to repudiate would be] ineffectual.. [page 590 marriage has] its origin in divine law”

Possibility #3 The law dictionary has a definition for “putative marriage”. It is “A marriage contracted in good faith and in ignorance (on one or both sides) that impediments exist which render it unlawful.” Perhaps getting married by the authority of the state is sufficient to render the marriage unlawful. Perhaps not; see chapter 12.

Possibility #4. Subornation of perjury is a crime. Perhaps a divorce lawyer suborns perjury of the unfaithful spouse by suggesting that he/she checks a box on a divorce complaint that says “irretrievably broken”, or in some states “irreconcilable differences”, even though real marriage cannot ever be broken. Since it is signed under penalty of perjury, the court must accept it as fact. Any argument that it is not irretrievably broken immediately creates a controversy for the court to settle.

But again, spouses cannot testify against each other.

There is a paralegal in my area that stops divorces. He files a Notice of Removal, along with proof of a church wedding, to remove the case to ecclesiastical court. The opposing lawyers NEVER offer a marriage license as proof of jurisdiction.

The United States Supreme Court held that any judge who acts without jurisdiction is engaged in an act of treason. U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200 @ 216 (1980), Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264.

- “*No polluted hand shall touch the pure fountain of justice*” was once a maxim in American courts
- Unclean hands shall *never pollute the pure fountain of justice* according to 1841 Supreme Court decision Groves v. Slaughter, 40 US 449

Like Lot, you live in a corrupt society. Let’s pray for a return to sound moral values.

- You can pray that heathen not rule over you, but it is too late. If you want your government back, you must fight for it. Daniel Webster, in a speech to the Senate June 3, 1834: “God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it.”
- On February 29, 1892 the US Supreme Court in a 9 to 0 decision (143 U.S. 266) ruled that this is a Christian Nation. If you want your nation back, you must fight for it.
- If you want your inheritance rights back, you must fight for them. Even though governments are instituted among men to secure those rights.
- You can no longer get a government document with a Christian name (the proper noun name that your father gave you, not the all capitalized alphabet soup that you see on your birth certificate, marriage license, divorce court papers and driver license). If you want your name back, you must fight for it. Even though governments are instituted among men to secure those rights. Even though the fifth commandment requires Christians to honor their father and mother. Or did your parents do something to forfeit your Christian name and your surname? Is your birth certificate proof that you were named by the state licensed doctor, who was performing a state function? By the way, traditional Anabaptists knew enough to avoid the registration of children.
- If you want your family back, you must fight for them. Even though governments are instituted among men to secure those rights.
- Or have divorce lawyers and sodomites convinced you that the purpose of government has been abolished?

“tyranny is the exercise of power beyond right, which no body can have a right to.” John Locke’s Second Treatise, paragraph 199.

Defend marriage. Christ said that he who is not with me is against me. He said this right after he asked in Matthew 12:29 how anyone could enter a strong man’s house and take his possessions. And he repeated it again in Luke 11 right after he said that a strong man, well armed, defends his own house. He was speaking of demons disarming Christians then taking what is ours.

Has mankind put asunder what God has joined together? If you want your family back you must fight for it. Ephesians 6 says that your battle is against principalities, authorities, rulers of darkness, and spiritual evil in high places. We can start defending marriage by again enforcing the law of the land.

Psalm 94:16 "Who will rise up for me against the evildoers? or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?"

LEGAL AUTHORITIES MAKE A DISTINCTION BETWEEN CHURCH MARRIAGE AND CIVIL MARRIAGE.

If your church solemnized marriage is an adjudicative fact, then you might want to give Judicial notice (your state's rule similar to Federal Evidence Rule 201).

Early law reference books made a clear distinction between traditional church solemnized marriage as contrasted with government solemnized marriage.

Church solemnized marriage, called by the Latin term *in facie ecclesiae*, cannot be divorced – "*unloosed for any cause whatsoever, that arises after the union is made...*" (Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 428).

Notice that Government solemnized marriage is the only kind mentioned in the law books. For example, in Blackstone we notice that divorce "*being entirely the province of the ecclesiastical courts, our [law] books are perfectly silent concerning them.*" yet when divorced by spiritual courts, marriages were still "*esteemed valid to all civil purposes*".

And Parsons On Contracts confirmed the validity of questionable contracts to marry by stating the contracts were as valid as church marriages. In his discussion of those marriage contracts where the only consideration was sexual contact, he concluded: "*it amounts to a valid marriage, and is equally binding as if made in facie ecclesiae*" (Sixth edition, 1873, Volume III, page 84)

If, in a divorce proceeding "*it should appear that the parties had celebrated a regular marriage, in facie ecclesiae, and were unquestionably husband and wife, certainly the court would not wait for the defendant to avail himself of that fact, but as soon as it was clearly before them would stop the case. For if they were once married, no agreement of both parties, and no waiver of both or either, would annul the marriage.*" (Parsons' On Contracts, Sixth edition, 1873, Volume III, page 85)

How do you like that? Law books contrast a divorceable marriage with "*a regular marriage*". Proof of a church marriage "*would stop the case*"

The longer we turn our backs on God, the further we get from the truth.

Christ warned them in Luke 11:52 (KJV) "**Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.**"

HOW MUCH HAVE YOU BEEN DAMAGED BY YOUR LOSS OF LIBERTY?

Did the marriage license application tell you that you were waiving your right to a traditional marriage – “relation for life” was the phrase used by the Supreme Court?

Did the divorce court recognize your right to a lifetime relationship that mankind cannot put asunder – a right that existed prior to any human government?

Marriage is a liberty. Only by informed consent can they take your liberty. According to the U.S. Supreme Court in Brady v. US, 397 U.S. 742: "*Waivers of Constitutional rights not only must be voluntary, but must be knowing, intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences*"

Were you told that a marriage license was only for divorceable intermarriage, and that all children were fruits of the state? Or were you told that marriage was until death do you part?

Marriage is a liberty. The Supreme Court in Meyer determined that liberty "... denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint, but also the right of the individual to... marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience..." If a corrupt court has "found" a right to adultery which the received-law-of-the-land said is was greatest of civil injuries "... (and surely there can be none greater) the law gives satisfaction to the husband,... wherein the damages recovered are usually very large and exemplary."

then what are the damages to liberty that every divorced innocent has suffered?

Marriage is a liberty. I don't know what your family is worth, but I do know what your liberty is worth, in 1984 dollars:

Trezevant v. Tampa, 741 F.2d 336 determined that damages to liberty in 1984 accrued at a rate of more than \$1000 per minute, which is more than 1½ million dollars per day.

- As was the case in Trezevant, there is no requirement that there be an arrest
- As was the case in Trezevant, official policy or custom is the "*moving force of the constitutional violation*"
- As was the case in Trezevant, governments are liable for any unconstitutional deprivation of liberty caused by government "custom" even if such custom has not received formal approval through governing body's official decision making channels
- As was the case in Trezevant, there is no requirement that the policy itself be unlawful
- Your State's definition of Kidnapping does not require any element of physical restraint, nor does your State definition of "Unlawful imprisonment". Both are violations of liberty. The US Supreme Court defined liberty in Meyer. Also see the definition of terrorism in Chapter 28.
- And, as in Trezevant, such award is not excessive

If your Holy Matrimony was not upheld like those in chapter 4, then you did not get equal protection of the law.

By the way, damages to a child's liberty is worth even more.

The family of an 8-year-old boy in Espanola, N.M., won an award of \$221,000 for a half-hour experience when he was improperly booked, outfitted in an orange jumpsuit, and jailed. [Amarillo Globe-News, 4-20-2006]

The US Supreme Court in Marshall v. Jerrico 446 U.S. 238 (1980) determined that Due Process guarantees "*that life, liberty, or property will not be taken on the basis of an erroneous or distorted conception of the facts or the law... with assurance that the arbiter is not predisposed to find against him*".

By the way, due process is guaranteed by the judge's official bond.

US Supreme Court, Laird v. Tatum, 408 U.S. 1, page 28:

"But submissiveness is not our heritage. ... The Constitution was designed to keep the government off the backs of the people. ... "

¹Christ spoke of corporations, he said he was the vine and we were the branches.

16. Are “Civil Unions” Treason Against Government?

The purpose of this chapter is to present a contrast in traditional values with today's perversion of family rights. What was once considered as war against America is now ratified and condoned by the courts.

Treason is the only crime defined in the Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase “levying war against” the States. In this chapter we will study the earlier writings of John Locke, which the signers of the Constitution would be well aware of, to construct the real meaning of their definition of treason.

Courts agree that marriage is the parent of society. If marriage, as the foundation of society, cannot be upheld, then there is no foundation. Bastardizing the future authority of the nation.

The Constitution could not have authorized bastards to be future officers of government. Bastards cannot even inherit a surname to represent their own family, much less represent constituents.

Today's use of brutal martial law police, see chapter 18, to enforce the state's will for the “care, custody, education, and maintenance” of the wards they bastardized seems to be armed insurrection against the United States.

The US Supreme Court still occasionally quotes from John Locke's [Second Treatise of Government](#). Here are some important concepts from Locke that existed when the Constitution was written, to help you determine what they intended when they wrote into the Constitution the phrase “levying war against” the States. Remember that the political power of the state, *jura summi imperii*, is delegated from the class of people who created government.

As you read Lock's paragraph 149, below, please consider that defense of family was one main reason that government was created. If your legislature now cancels their own foundation by denying your right to Holy Matrimony, and bastardizing your posterity, perhaps it is time to recognize that you never had the power to deliver up your family's preservation to those legislators who are “*so foolish or so wicked as to lay and carry on designs against the liberties of the subject.*”

Emphasis is added in bold letters.

Second Treatise of Government, [Chapter 13 Of the Subordination of the Power of the Commonwealth](#):

149. “Though a constituted commonwealth [is] acting for the preservation of the community, there can be but one supreme power to which all the rest are and must be subordinate yet the legislative being only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends, there remains still in the people a supreme power to remove or alter the legislative when they find the legislative act contrary to the trust reposed in them. For all power given with trust for the attaining an end being limited by that end, whenever that end is manifestly neglected or opposed, **the trust must necessarily be forfeited, and the power devolve into the hands of those that gave it**, who may place it anew where they shall think best for their safety and security. And thus the community perpetually

retains a supreme power of saving themselves from the attempts and designs of anybody, even of their legislators, whenever they be so foolish or **so wicked as to lay and carry on designs against the liberties** and properties of the subject. For no man [has a power to deliver up his preservation] to the absolute will and arbitrary dominion of another ... **they will always have a right** to preserve what they have not a power to part with, and **to rid themselves of those who invade this fundamental, sacred, and unalterable law of self-preservation for which they entered into society. And thus the community may be said in this respect to be always the supreme power...**”

155 “...using force upon the people, without authority, and contrary to the trust put in him that does so, is a state of **war** with the people, ... when they are hindered by any force from what is so necessary to the society, and wherein the safety and preservation of the people consists, the people have a right to remove it by force.. The use of force without authority always puts him that uses it into a state of **war** as the aggressor, and renders him liable to be treated accordingly.”
 166 “...it is impossible anybody in the society should ever have a right to do the people harm..”

Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 15 Of Paternal, Political and Despotical Power:

171 “political power is that power which every man... has given up into the hands of the society, and therein to the governors ... with this express or tacit trust, that it shall be employed for their good and the preservation of their [life, liberty and] property... This power... to punish the breach of the law... so as may most conduce to the preservation of himself and the rest of mankind; so that the end and measure of this power, when in every man’s hands,... being the preservation of all of his society- that is, all mankind in general- it can have no other end or measure, when in the hands of the magistrate, but to preserve the members of that society in their lives, liberties, and possessions, and so cannot be an absolute arbitrary power over their lives and fortunes, which are as much as possible to be preserved; but **a power to preserve the whole, by cutting off only those parts which are so corrupt that they threaten the sound and healthy**, without which no severity is lawful. And this power [is by] agreement and the mutual consent of those who make up the community.”

Aside: the power to separate man from wife (divorce for aggravated cruelty) comes from this authority to cut out corruption. But it still doesn’t cancel the legitimate marriage.

172 “...despotical power is an absolute, arbitrary power one man has over another... For man, not having such an arbitrary power over his own life, cannot give another man such a power over it, but it is the effect only of forfeiture which the aggressor makes of his own life when he puts himself into the state of **war** with another. For having quitted reason.... and made use of force to compass his unjust ends upon another where he has no right, he renders himself liable to be destroyed by his adversary whenever he can...”

Second Treatise of Government, Chapter 18 Of Tyranny:

201 whenever people put power into the hands of government for the preservation of their [lives, liberty and] properties, and is used to impoverish, harass, or subdue them to the arbitrary and irregular commands of those that have it, there it presently becomes tyranny

208 “if the unlawful acts done by the magistrate be maintained, and the remedy, which is due by law, be by the same power obstructed, yet the right of resisting, even in such manifest acts of tyranny, ... [men] have a right to defend themselves, and to recover by force what by unlawful force is taken from them”

Do you want your children back? How about their inheritance rights?

209 if “these illegal acts have extended to the majority of the people,... and they are persuaded in their consciences that their laws, and with them, their estates, liberties, and lives are in danger, and perhaps their religion too... resisting illegal force used against them [is] the most dangerous state they can possibly put themselves in”

Second Treatise of Government, [Chapter 19 Of the Dissolution of Government](#):

211 “distinguish between the dissolution of the society and the dissolution of the government... Whenever the society is dissolved, it is certain the government of that society cannot remain. Thus conquerors sword’s often cut up governments by the roots, and mangle societies to pieces, separating the subdued or scattered multitude from the protection of and dependence on that society which ought to have preserved them.... **where society is dissolved, the government cannot remain.**”

222 “The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their [lives, liberty and] property **it can never be supposed to be the will of the society that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure by entering into society**, and for which the people submitted themselves to legislators of their own making; whenever the legislators endeavour to take away and destroy the [lives, liberty and] property of the people,... they put themselves into a state of **war** with the people, who are thereupon absolved from any farther obedience, and are left to the common refuge which God hath provided for all men against force and violence. Whensoever, therefore, the legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society, and ...grasp ...**or put into the hands of any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people, by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends**, and it devolves to the people [to] provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society.... [this] holds true also concerning the supreme executor, who having a double trust put in him... acts also contrary to his trust when he employs the force, treasure, and offices of the society to corrupt ... to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security...”

227 when “legislators act contrary to the end for which they were constituted, those who are guilty are guilty of rebellion. For [they take] away the umpirage which every one had consented to for a peaceable decision of all their controversies, and a bar to the state of war amongst them... [by] introducing a power which the people hath not authorised, actually introduce a state of **war**, which is that of force without authority; and thus by removing the legislative established by the society, in whose decisions the people acquiesced and united as to that of their own will, they untie the knot, and expose the people anew to the state of **war**. And.. legislators themselves... who were set up for the protections and preservation of the people, their liberties and properties... [put] **themselves into a state of war with those who made them the protectors and guardians of their peace, are ... with the greatest aggravation, rebellantes, rebels.**”

231. “That subjects or foreigners attempting by force on the properties of any people may be resisted with force is agreed on all hands; but magistrates doing the same thing may be resisted, hath of late been denied; as if those who had the greatest privileges and advantages by the law

had thereby a power to break those laws by which alone they were set in a better place than their brethren; whereas their offence is thereby the greater..."

Here are some other authorities on treason:

- "Under the laws of the United States the highest of all crimes is treason. It must be so in every civilized state; not only because the first duty of a state is self-preservation, but because this crime naturally leads to and involves many others, destructive of the safety of individuals and of the peace and welfare of society..." In re Charge to Grand Jury – Neutrality Laws and Treason C.C. Mass 1851, 30 F.Cas. 1024, No. 18,275. There is no power extrinsic to that of the national government by which its laws can be rightfully resisted or their obligation impaired." In re Charge to Grand Jury – Treason, D.C. Mass, 1861, 30 F.Cas. 1039, No. 18273.
- "If the object of an assembly of persons... to resist the exercise of any one or more of its general laws,... is treason against the state" In re Charge to Grand Jury, supra.
- "... to prevent the exercise of the national sovereignty within the limits of the state, this would be treason against the United States." In re Charge to Grand Jury, supra.
- "it cannot be maintained that levying war against the United States by persons however combined and confederated (even though successful in establishing their actual authority in several states) would not be treason here" Keppel v. Petersburg R. Co., C.C. Va. 1868, 14 F.Cas357, No. 7722
- "... overt act manifesting treasonable intent is not essential element of the crime." U.S. v. Chandler D.C.Mass 1947, 72 F.Supp. 230
- "Overt act need not of itself be criminal in order to warrant conviction for treason." D'Aquino v. U.S., 1951, 192F.2d 338
- The overt act is not an essential element of treason. U.S. v. Haupt, 1943, 136 F.2d 661

Since treason requires two witnesses to the same overt act (which need not be a treasonous act – if the elder Haupt can be convicted of treason for opening his apartment's front door for his son as witnessed by FBI agents [330 U.S. 631](#), at pages 636-637 or if Cramer "*engaged long and earnestly in conversation*" with someone who later turned out to be a traitor, but with no proof of what was said [325 U.S. 1](#), 37, then) certainly you can find two witnesses to a court's overt acts to betray the fundamental foundation of the nation, or confession in open court; after all, the betrayal is in open court, sealed by an official seal.

Conclusion:

Legitimacy, by valid marriage*, of the constituents – those who constituted – government is the only foundation by which legitimate government could be ordained and established. Nothing legitimate could have come from illegitimacy. Likewise, voters (constituents, perpetuators of the blessings of liberty to their posterity) must remain legitimate. To claim that civil servants can cancel marriage*, and thereby bastardize their future constituents, is treason to the legitimacy of government. Blackstone equated licentiousness with the destruction of government.

Divorce courts, as an official act, bearing an official seal, make a mockery of humanity.

Luke 11:52 (KJV)

"Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge..."

* (the very foundation of society, which existed prior to any earthly government)

17. Civil Marriage is Genocide Of Christians

Treaties are equal to the Constitution as

“...the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby...” (U.S. [Constitution Article VI](#) paragraph 2).

The Genocide Treaty ratified by the Senate on February 19, 1948, [78 UNTS 277](#), defines genocide in its Article II as

*“any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole **or in part**, a national, ethnical, racial or **religious** group as such: ... (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”*

The innocent Christian who is served divorce papers is required by his or her vows to God, and by Christian doctrine, and by the law-of-the-land, and by a valid (enforceable) marriage contract to remain faithful to the spouse until death they depart. Therefore, forced divorce imposes *“measures intended to prevent births within the group”*. How could this not be Genocide?

Can a political power determine the care and best interests of children, contrary to the US Supreme Court’s definition of liberty in the [Meyer](#) case?

Was parental authority over children forcibly (defined as: voluntary compliance under threat of violence) restrained by the political group that appoints a custodian over children? If so: this meets every element of Genocide.

Kidnapping of children is punishable by death. Genocide is punishable by death.

The Supreme Court still occasionally quotes from John Locke’s [Second Treatise of Government](#). Here is one of his more expressive statements:

*“Must the people then always lay themselves open to the cruelty and rage of tyranny? Must they see their cities pillaged, and laid in ashes, **their wives and children exposed to the tyrant's lust and fury, and themselves and families reduced by their king to ruin, and all the miseries of want and oppression, and yet sit still?** Must men alone be debarred the common privilege of opposing force with force, which nature allows so freely to all other creatures for their preservation from injury? I answer: Self-defence is a part of the law of nature; nor can it be denied the community, even against the king himself”*

John Locke’s [Second Treatise](#), section 233

AUTHORITY TO INTERFERE WITH CHILD REARING IS VERY LIMITED.

For more information on the very limited government authority to interfere with child rearing, study the Sheppard-Towner Maternity Act of 1921, 42 Stat 224, formerly 42 USC 161-175, and the Federal Birth Registration areas of 1929, and Meeker v. US 350 US 199, and Chapter 135 sect 9, 42 USC 225 which gave the Children's Bureau power to enter homes and take children.

While studying the issues, keep in mind that US Supreme Court in Meyer v. Nebraska, [262 US 390](#), at page 399:

The term "Liberty... denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint, but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience... the established doctrine is that this liberty may not be interfered with under the guise of protecting public interest, by legislative action which is arbitrary or without reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the state to effect."

And keep in mind that the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Fourteenth Amendment rights to privacy because family decisions about bearing and rearing children are strictly private. Roe v. Wade, Zablocki v. Redhail 434 US 374, Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510.

It is within the state's legitimate functions to protect the life of a child. The Supreme Court (in Plyler) would not even say that children were subject to the laws of a state. And Locke said that parental rights are all based upon "divine revealed law" in the Bible. And that children when they are 21 years old would choose which government to place themselves under.

But Blackstone in his Book 1, chapter 16, says that a refusal to educate your children would result in the state (he used the term "municipal") laws placing them in public schools.

Liberty, like any other freedom, is "*susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the state may lawfully protect*" (West's Constitutional law, key 84, 90, 91)

Galatians 5:1 (NIV) "It is for freedom that Christ has set us free. Stand firm, then, and do not let yourselves be burdened again by a yoke of slavery."
--

18. Military Laws Enforce Perversion

- **You are living in a time of declared war.** The ongoing emergency, declared by FDR's Executive Orders, ongoing since 1933, declares that Americans are the enemy of their own government. We have been under military martial law since Calvin Coolidge. And laws to regulate us under martial law existed since FDR. All "*actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations*" were pre-approved by Congress in 1933, pursuant to an amendment to The Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917.
- Family court rules are neither civil nor criminal. With no right to a jury trial. What authorizes the courts to deny defendants access to normal civil process? Could it be martial law?
- Is there a threat to use State-armed martial law police to enforce the state's will for the "care, custody, education, and maintenance" of the state's children?
- Can an innocent civilian be denied his liberty during time of declared war, without a showing of military necessity?
- the US Supreme Court 1866 ruling in Ex parte Milligan determined that military courts cannot be used to try civilians if the civilian courts were available. But sadly, civilian courts are no longer available.
- A gold fringed flag is a military flag. Courtrooms once displayed a non-fringed flag on the wall (attached to the real estate, which is appurtenant to the land) whereas a flag on a portable staff is planted by dismounted troops as an act of conquest. What kind of court are you forced into? [Notes: Congress did not authorize any gold fringe in the flag law, Title 4 US Code section 1. Attorney General Opinion 34 OP ATTY GEN 483 acknowledges that yellow fringe is a military flag authorized by the commander-in-chief]. After almost two thousand years, Christians are again forced into Roman forums to be devoured by beast powers. Go look up "common law" and "Roman law" in an old law dictionary. Common law in the US, as received from England, is differentiated from Roman civil law. It appears that they have now been merged into a ten horned beast system.

Do available remedies against ungodly divorce courts include Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, 12 August 1949; and the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II) of 8 June 1977?

Supporting facts:

- In 1973 the Report of the Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency, U.S. Senate Report 93-549 confirms that there had been 63 years of ongoing emergency powers:

"Since March the 9th, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency. Under the powers delegated by these statutes... martial law ... control the lives of all American citizens"

- We were declared to be the enemy. The March 9th 1933 national emergency referred to by that Senate report invoked against Americans the authority of the Trading With The Enemy Act of October 6th, 1917. FDR signed into law on March 9, 1933, chapter 1, Title 1, Sec. 1, 48 Stat. 1:

“The actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgated, made, or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March the 4th, 1933, pursuant to the authority conferred by Subsection (b) of Section 5 of the Act of October 6th, 1917, as amended, are hereby approved and confirmed.”

- You are the declared enemy. The authority invoked by [Trading With The Enemy Act of October 6th, 1917](#)

“An Act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes” was amended March 9, 1933 to include *“any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof”*

- Although the World Wars and the Civil War had armistices ending the hostilities against belligerents, Congress has never terminated the wars it declared.
- President Lincoln’s martial law code, the Leiber Code, states that a declaration of martial law is never necessary. The mere fact that there are government-armed troops in the streets is sufficient notice that we are under martial law. Back in the old days, it was never a government function to kill people without a trial, except in war – therefore a policeman had to provide his own sidearm if he wanted to defend himself. – the action of defending oneself is a private act, never a government act, and cannot be funded with public funds or equipment, except in war. If government police officers are in the streets with government guns, then you are living under martial law. Again: a declaration of martial law is never necessary. Actions speak louder than words.
- International law requires a showing of military necessity to deprive a civilian of his liberty. Marriage is a liberty.

Daniel Webster, in a speech to the Senate June 3, 1834:

God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it.

PART 4 THE HOMOSEXUALS' CURSE

INTRODUCTION:

- You cannot have it both ways: either the unchanging God of the Bible will punish America, or He will apologize to Sodom and Gomorrah.
- toleration of homosexuals is part of the planned destruction of America.
- The Supreme Court repeatedly insists that the law-of-the-land requires punishment of the infamous crime against nature.
- Homosex is traditionally punishable by a death sentence. Queen Elizabeth The First modified the law so that the death penalty could not be avoided. This became the received-law-of-the-land in the original 13 states.
- The laws of nature authorize the United States to exist. The very same laws of nature that authorize the United States to exist, also allow States to execute homosexuals.
- Perverted demands that their crime be converted into a right are much more than a political debate. The real issue is whether or not the foundation of all law is now void.

When America was young, it was unquestioned that homosexual consensual sodomy was more detestable than child rape, and was in the same category as the crime of murder. It was unthinkable that any court would deny government "*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**...*" (quoted from Blackstone Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7)

- Child rape is **a** crime against nature. Murder is **a** crime against nature. But consensual homosex is **THE** crime against nature, requiring a traditional penalty harsher than child rape or murder.
- Consensual Homosex is punishable for the same exact reason that murder is still punishable. You cannot have it both ways. It is the same law. Punishing consensual sodomy is one of the main reasons government exists. Just as punishing Murder is one of the main reasons government exists. The risk to society of allowing these threats against morality to go unpunished is contrary to the reason government was created.
- No Supreme Court decision has legalized the crime of sodomy. The US Supreme Court has only upheld a 14th amendment right to privacy, which puts some limits government on snooping into their closets. The Supreme Court did not change any penalty nor did they legalize THE crime against nature. And Murder committed in the privacy of a closet is still a crime. The Supreme Court did not "find" a right to commit murder or sodomy in the privacy of a closet.
- Execution is the ultimate divinely delegated power. The right of everyone to execute certain criminals is delegated to you by the unchanging God of the Bible. In America the received law-of-the-land acknowledged that "*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual*" [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7] which we then delegated to our civil servants. Your civil servants, by the law-of-the-land must now "*bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*" [full quote in Chapter 23]. To suggest otherwise is to deny the legitimacy of the American

judicial system that the Constitution ordained and established. If judges are not bearing the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community, then your government has been overthrown in the most inhuman way possible.

- Murder is a capital felony for the same reason that consensual sodomy is a capital felony. It is the very same law: The law of nature.
- A law that punishes, with 20 years in prison, a single act of consensual sodomy committed in private was upheld by the Supreme Court's Bowers case in 1986. The U.S. Supreme Court in Bowers called the crime of consensual sodomy "a heinous act"
- Today, many people are convinced that crimes against nature are unpunishable. But this has never been true. The law of the land still requires punishment of crimes against nature.
- Satan is a legalist. People have been deceived into substituting their own counterfeit knowledge of good and evil. Until people want to control their urges, we cannot have a moral nation. Would they understand Deterrence if it the law of the land was again enforced by all courts?

Declaration of Independence, first sentence:

*"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the **Laws of Nature** and of Nature's God entitles them..."*

According to the first sentence in the [Declaration of Independence](#) the **laws of nature entitle the government to exist**. This same law that authorizes government to exist also requires the punishment of homosexual consensual sodomy. Is the foundation of all laws still legitimate?

The foundation of all law and all government hinges on the legitimacy of the law of nature. As we shall see: "*neither could any other law possibly exist.... [for] we are all equal.*"

Recent suggestions from the liberal pulpits that crimes against nature, such as consensual sodomy or even murder, are no longer to be punished by the death penalty would be contrary to the fundamental law that ordained and established a government.

Men must punish "*crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like...***" It is a necessary duty of government. Suggestions that government refrain from their necessary duty would be anarchy against the ordained purpose of civil government.

The very foundation of our nation's laws established that "*no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this [law of nature]*". *Nay, if any human law should allow ... us to commit it [crimes against nature], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we offend both the natural and the divine.*" [full quote in Chapter 24]

And it still remains true today. The US Supreme Court in a 1986 case [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) 478 U.S. 186 upheld a Georgia law:

"The Georgia statute at issue in this case, Ga. Code Ann. 16-6-2 (1984), authorizes a court to imprison a person for up to 20 years for a single private, consensual act of sodomy. ... even in the private setting of a home,"

I will now quote what the United States Supreme Court said in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) (bottom of page 196, top of 197)_ about homosex. I want you to notice two things:

1. The writings of William Blackstone are often quoted by the Supreme Court to prove what the law of the land was, as it was received by the original 13 States. I will quote extensively from his commentary later, in its original context, so that you may understand the fundamentals of American law.
2. consensual homosex, according to the Supreme Court, is contrary to the law of nature. We will study this law of nature in detail later.

*"...As the Court notes, ante, at 192, the proscriptions against sodomy have very "ancient roots." Decisions of individuals relating to homosexual conduct have been subject to state intervention throughout the history of Western civilization. Condemnation of those practices is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards. Homosexual sodomy was a capital crime under Roman law. See Code Theod. 9.7.6; Code Just. 9.9.31. See also D. Bailey, Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition 70-81 (1975). During the English Reformation when powers of the ecclesiastical courts were transferred to the King's Courts, the first English statute criminalizing sodomy was passed. 25 Hen. VIII, ch. 6. Blackstone described "the infamous crime against nature" as an offense of "deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature," and "a crime not fit to be named." 4 W. Blackstone, Commentaries *215. The common law of England, including its prohibition of sodomy, became the received law of Georgia and the other Colonies. In 1816 the Georgia Legislature passed the statute at issue here, and that statute has been continuously in force in one form or another since that time. To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."*

Notice the Supreme Court partially quoted Blackstone's reference of

"deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature"

Blackstone's full quote is in Chapter 22. The Supreme Court was too polite to give a full quote. Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape. If they had not been so polite, perhaps the decision would have stood.

Homosex is a crime, not a right. The right to punish consensual sodomy does not come from government. Rights do not come from government. The Declaration of Independence says that our Creator endows us with unalienable rights. As we shall see, the received law-of-the-land acknowledged that *"the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual"* which we then delegated to our civil servants. We created a government to perform these duties for us. Any suggestions that civil servants refrain from the duty of governing would be treason to the purpose and legitimacy of government.

As we shall see, defending marriage includes repudiating homosexual advocates. In Ephesians chapter 5, before comparing family love duties to church duties (verses 21 and on into chapter 6), and right after a sermon warning that sexual perversion will keep perverts from heaven, Paul in Ephesians 5:11-12 warned us to have nothing to do with the fruitless deeds of darkness, but rather reprove them, for it is shame to speak of things the disobedient do in secret. The very mention of homosex is a shame. This is why it has historically been called the unspeakable crime against nature.

We can reverse the curse by again enforcing the law of the land.

A word about curses. Every curse in the Holy Bible is put there by God. Curses are God's punishment upon disobedient nations. God has already warned you about the consequences of tolerating homosexuals.

1 Timothy 1:9-10 "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane,.. For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind ... "*

* See Strong's Concordance 733 for a definition of "*them that defile themselves with mankind*"

"To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."
United States Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#)

19. The Planned Destruction of America

Activist judges have tried to reverse the roles established by God. Families created – *ordained* was the religious term they used in the Constitution – a government to help them secure the blessings of liberty to their posterity. But daddy government has for the past 100 years convinced many of us that they have authority to cancel families. Now they want perversion, disease, filth and shame of homosex to be equivalent to the sanctity of family.

Ever since Christians brought forth on this continent of a new nation, disciples of Satan have worked persistently to establish their secular New World Order – a *Novus Ordo Seclorum*. (The Latin term for “secular” means “without God”).

In Genesis 19, God destroyed the city of Sodom. Sodom was destroyed, not because they were pagan, but because they had tolerated unnatural crimes. These very demons can still abuse the laws of Nature to bring about the destruction of America.

Ignoring God will have natural consequences. The unchanging God of the Bible has given us laws by which society can preserve itself. And indeed, when the 13 original American States wrote their Constitutions, the received law-of-the-land required the death penalty for consensual homosex.

The whole counsel of God requires you to consider doctrine that is no longer politically correct. After all, Luke 7:30 tells us that the whole counsel of God has been rejected by lawyers. Those lawyers lived in a society that Christ called “**an evil and adulterous generation.**” Today’s lawyers are the same, and the society they pervert is no better off than two millennia ago.

Perhaps this offends you. Perhaps you have been influenced by today’s culture, just as Lot was influenced by his, to refrain from speaking up for fear of being labeled as a hateful person. But ignoring the rapid decline of moral values will have consequences.

- Even if you don’t believe God will send wrath upon the United States, your refusal to conform to the will of the unchanging God will have still have disastrous consequences for the future of society, and for your family.
- Whether you believe in God’s wrath or not, your silence will have the same consequence.
- Tolerance (silence) compromises the word of God. To sin by silence, when you should protest, will destroy America more than any terrorist.
- By doing nothing, you are participating in the destruction of society’s foundation.
- Freedom of speech exists to permit discussion of controversial topics. There are some criminals who misuse their freedom. They want the filth, perversion, disease and shame of unspeakable crimes against nature to be equated with the legitimate law of nature, the foundation of society. Free speech ends where treason begins.
- By the way, 1st John 3:13 tells us that Christians will be hated by the world. If you are not hated, then perhaps you are not acting Christian enough.

There are many ways in which government can be overthrown. Corruption and conquest would still leave society with a government. But the cruelest and most inhuman way to overthrow government is for those who were entrusted to enforce the laws-of-the-land to refuse to do their job. John Locke's Second Treatise Of Government has as his last chapter, the topic of Dissolution of Government. The suggestion that government would refuse to execute the laws would be "*inconceivable to human capacity, and inconsistent with human society.*"

When America was Christian, it was the duty of the magistrate to impose the death sentence for certain crimes. Magistrates must use "*the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community... in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*" [full quote in Chapter 23]

Conclusion

We are now faced with a judiciary that refuses to punish "*crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like...*" In a flagrant breach of duty "*inconceivable to human capacity, and inconsistent with human society.*"

Vladimir I. Lenin: "*Destroy the family, you destroy the country.*"

U.S. Supreme Court, Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 469-471:

"In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

20. What does the Bible say about homosex?

Prior to the existence of any Jewish law, the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for tolerating homosexuals. Even Lot was affected by this tolerance of perversion. This was in 1896 BC, long before the first Jew existed. Don't blame the Jewish laws for the universal precept of capital punishment for homosex.

The Christian Bible gives these warnings, which I will mention later. Confirm them for yourself:

- [Jude verse 7](#) and Revelation 21:8
- [1 Corinthians 6:9](#) and Galatians 5:19
- [Romans 1:26,27,32](#)
- But [Romans 1:32](#) continues. It imputes this death punishment to those who merely tolerate – the NIV and the New King James Version both use the phrase “*approve of those who practice*” – these crimes. This leads up to a promise of reconciliation for the repentant four verses later, and warnings of wrath for those who reject the truth.

The Jewish law is more explicit than these Christian precepts. See Leviticus 18:22 and [Leviticus 20:13](#). This is an explicit punishment for consensual homosex, not rape. In Leviticus 20 the LORD gave his laws for his people. Homosexuals in verse 13, were to be driven out of society by the death penalty.

But these are NOT laws invented by Moses. They are instructions from the unchanging God of the Bible.

Leviticus 20:8 (KJV) *"And ye shall keep my statutes, and do them: I am the LORD which sanctify you."*

TOLERATION OF HOMOSEXUALS

The Bible warned us about those *"who suppress the truth in unrighteousness... whose hearts were darkened... to dishonor their bodies... who, knowing the righteous judgment of God, that those who practice such things are deserving of death, ... [as are they who] approve of those who practice them."* [Romans 1:18-32](#).

The margin note to Romans 1:32 in Tyndale's 1534 Bible says *"To have pleasure in another man's sin is greater wickedness than to sin thyself."* These greater-wicked who are entertained by today's television misfits have become your accusers and jurors. But it is much worse; they now control Congress. Political power so great that congressmen fear losing misfit votes. This is contrary to a republic form of government guaranteed by your Constitution Article IV section 4. You have lost the nation.

Within the very same book of Romans where those who merely tolerate homosexuals (Romans 1:26,27) *"are worthy of death"* (verse 32), the apostle Paul also tells us to love our fellow man (Romans 13:8, 12:10, etc). Love of your neighbor is sincere when you abhor that

which is evil (Romans 12:9) . You love your neighbor by driving out evil. Driving out evil is love. Don't let Satan's legalists call it hate.

Those who love their community will drive out evil. Driving out evil from your community (even as in [Deuteronomy 17:7](#)) is an act of love. It is not hate. The community will receive God's blessing and avoid God's punishment ([Leviticus 20:13, 22-24](#)).

The God of the Bible is an unchanging God. ([Malachi 3:6](#), [Hebrews 13:8](#), [Hebrews 6:17-18](#), [Numbers 23:19](#), [1st Samuel 15:29](#), [Titus 1:2](#)). His law lasts forever, [Psalm 119:152](#). The everlasting covenant mentioned in the New Testament is the same everlasting covenant of the Old. Jesus said not one jot nor tittle shall fall from the law, [Matthew 5:18](#). The Bereans (Acts 17:11) studied the Old Testament daily to prove that the New Testament was true. Did they come to the conclusion that God's law was abolished?

The unchanging God of the Bible is not going to change just because your church said it was okay to invent a more permissive god of your own choosing. The same unchanging God that said homosex is an abomination in Leviticus 18:22 is the same one who instructs you in verse 4.

"You shall observe My judgments and keep My ordinances, to walk in them: I *am* the LORD your God. 5 You shall therefore keep My statutes,..."

These are hardly just policies invented by Moses, as many perverts insist. The anti-homosex warning from the LORD himself became the law of the land in America.

In [Leviticus 18:22,24-30](#) the unchanging God of the Bible promised to destroyed **any** nation that tolerated homosexuals. And again in [Deuteronomy 28](#). Toleration of homosexuals defiles the land. Repent to avoid God's wrath.

Jesus Himself warned the cities that did not repent. He said in [Matthew 11:24](#) (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11): "But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."

Because we were warned, but they were not. Heed the warning.

21. What does the Bible say about false doctrine?

There are many examples in the Bible showing that debauchery destroys righteousness.

Many people now want the Bible to be permissive. But it is idolatry to invent a god of your own choosing.

This kind of thinking changes the grace of God into a license for immorality, and actually denies our Lord, according to Jude verse 4. They secretly introduce damnable heresies to follow their shameful ways, in order to bring the way of truth into disrepute. 2nd Peter 2.

If your church tolerates damnable heresies (sensuality, civil licentious marriage, remarriage, or tolerance of homosexuals) then find another Church. Jesus Himself, in Matthew 23:15, said that those who believe the lies of religious leaders are twice-fold damned. Judgment must begin at the house of God.

Christians have a duty to spread moral values. Look around you. If moral values are not spreading, then you haven't done your job. We are at war against the world. In the last days, people will abandon the faith and turn to doctrines of demons (1st Timothy 4:1). If the gates of hell are prevailing against your church, then perhaps you are not effectively advancing the cause of righteousness.

Here are two suggestions to more effectively get your point across:

(1) Don't send the wrong message. "*Speaking the truth in love*" (Ephesians 4:15) is the wrong message. Ephesians 4:15 is about revealing doctrines of scripture to your deceived fellow believers, it is not about confronting false teachers. Your love duty is to warn your opponents. We love the sinner by warning them. Christ warned his opponents about being slammed into hell, (as for example the more-tolerable-for-Sodom warning). This is love. You cannot advance the cause of righteousness by tolerating destruction of your society. Don't use mealy-mouthed weasel words to get your point across.

(2) Christ and Paul spoke bluntly. They risked stoning when they confronted those who twist morality. They did not "speak the truth in love" to their opponents. They spoke such things as: **Woe unto you, You hypocrites!** (spoken directly to them 7 times in Matthew 23) **Ye shall receive the greater damnation. You vipers, how can you escape the damnation of hell?** (Matthew 23:33) **Woe unto you lawyers, for you have taken away the key of knowledge** (Luke 11:52) **Ye are of your father the Devil** (John 8:44) homosexuals cannot go to heaven (1 Corinthians 6:9). Agitators should be castrated (Galatians 5:12) and fornicators turned over to Satan (1 Corinthians 5:5). They spoke plain truth. You are to love society by driving out evil.

Speaking plain truths means that you understand your Bible. 1st Timothy 5:20 "*Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.*"

You have a duty to warn sinners, Ezekiel 3:18-21. Tell them like it is. Homosexuals will burn in hell (Jude 7). This is not hate. Clear warning is not hate. It shall be more tolerable for the

land of Sodom, than for those who tolerate homosexuals. Homosexuals are “*worthy of death*” as are those who tolerate them (Romans 1:26,27,32). Peter said they are beasts to be destroyed. (2nd Peter 2:12). Jude also says homosexuals are beasts, woe unto them (verses 10,11). Intolerance of homosexuals is a true Christian virtue. How can any Christian have a problem with this?

A brief WORD about hate. Hate comes from God Himself, Genesis 3:15. Satan cannot create hate, he only redirects it to the wrong people. Christians are to hate wickedness Hebrews 1:9. And yes, Hate is a family value. Luke 14:26. Matthew 10:35. Don't let them accuse you of hate.

A brief WORD about judgment. God is love (1st John 4:8). Christians are to “*judge righteous judgment*” John 7:24. You cannot separate love from judgment. You cannot tolerate evil men. Don't be brainwashed by multiculturalism nonsense that all viewpoints are valid. If you don't stand for something, you'll fall for anything. Take a stand.

Titus 1:13 “... *rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;*”

Titus 2:15 “... *exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee.*”

2 Corinthians 10:5 “*We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ.*”

Ezekiel 3:18-21 (NIV)

"When I say to a wicked man, 'You will surely die,' and you do not warn him or speak out to dissuade him from his evil ways in order to save his life, that wicked man will die for his sin, and I will hold you accountable for his blood.

But if you do warn the wicked man and he does not turn from his wickedness or from his evil ways, he will die for his sin; but you will have saved yourself.

Again, when a righteous man turns from his righteousness and does evil, and I put a stumbling block before him, he will die. Since you did not warn him, he will die for his sin. The righteous things he did will not be remembered, and I will hold you accountable for his blood.

But if you do warn the righteous man not to sin and he does not sin, he will surely live because he took warning, and you will have saved yourself."

22. What does history say about homosex Privacy?

Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape.

Blackstone, quoted at length later, laid down the foundation that became the received law-of-the-land in the original American States. As he concluded his remarks on child rape, he introduced the laws relating to trials of the accused sodomite:

*“... the crime is the more detestable... of a still deeper malignity; **the** infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast. A crime, which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature...”*

U.S. law is based on English law as it existed in the American colonies when the States wrote their Constitutions. The Supreme Court refers to this pre-existing law as “well settled law” or as the “received law of the land.”

The pre-existing law from Queen Elizabeth I (statute 5 Eliz c 17) requires that those convicted of the crime of homosex, either consensual or rape, could not avoid the death sentence.

A discussion of privacy rights will explain why they usually get away with it.

In the United States, homosex crimes are protected by the fourteenth amendment due-process concern against unwarranted government intrusion. And now, post-Lawrence, a Fourteenth Amendment due-process liberty. Government cannot snoop to learn about these crimes until there is probable cause to do so. The crime has to be reported to government before an arrest can be made, just as the crime of murder that is committed in a closet must first be reported before an arrest can be made. [Lawrence v. Texas](#) recognized the fourteenth amendment due-process protections against government intrusion. Yet, many people mistakenly call this a “right to privacy”.

In my opinion, the crime of sodomy is not a right to privacy any more so than a child rape -- or any other crime against nature -- committed in secret could be a “right to privacy”. Crimes committed in secret are not private acts, they are public wrongs.

Crimes cannot be converted into rights. Homosex has never had a fourth amendment privacy protection. The Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) has recognized that sodomy laws are enforceable because “*The right to privacy does not extend to acts of consensual sodomy between homosexual adults*”. This ruling showed that once the crime becomes known, it was lawful to intrude into their closets in order to enforce punishment. (now protected by [Lawrence](#))

It has always been so. More than 3,200 years ago Phinehas in [Numbers 25:8](#), without respecting privacy, enforced punishment against the sexually immoral of his day, so that his community was spared God's plagues. Phinehas will be honored for his righteousness forevermore [Psalm 106:31](#). It took national heroes like Phinehas to enforce God's punishment and avoid national plagues.

Smayda v. U.S., 352 F.2d 251, determined that police can have a camera peephole in a public restroom to catch homosexuals committing their secret consensual crime against nature. But since there is an expectation of privacy, Lawrence v. Texas now prohibits such government spying. Now, the crime has to be reported to government before an arrest can be made. Secret crimes are still public wrongs, they have not become privacy rights.

Beard v. Stahr, 200 F.Supp 766, determined that undercover police can solicit consensual homosex in order to catch those so inclined. The mere intent to commit such an unspeakable crime can be punished, with no actual crime committed. Again: public wrongs are not privacy rights. Since there is NO expectation of privacy in a public setting, such police tactics should still be lawful.

Pervert lovers want you to believe that it is now wrong to break down the houses of the sodomites, as in 2 Kings 23:7, to drive them from the land.

The original law of the land prohibits consensual sodomy. Sodomy is not love. It is a crime. You love your neighbor by driving out crime. The fourth amendment right to privacy does not extend to any crime. As long as due process rights are observed, the felony shall be punished. Government has a duty to punish crimes. It is a crime to not report a felony.

The US Supreme Court often quotes from [Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England](#) in order to establish what the common law was when the former colonies wrote their State Constitutions. The received law of the land is the common law that applies to everyone. As we shall see, Blackstone's precepts remain valid in America as a solid foundation of American jurisprudence. American revisions to Blackstone's work were published in America up to 1884. The Supreme Court still quotes from it.

There has always been a deep concern for the due process rights of those falsely accused of crimes committed in secret. Blackstone's Commentaries Book IV, discusses the history of English law concerning Public Wrongs. Among these public wrongs against nature are the crime of child rape and the crime of consensual sodomy. Child rape is not discussed in Book IV as a crime against the child, but as a public wrong. In Book IV, Chapter 15, upon concluding the discussion of child rape, on page 215, Blackstone continues with a discussion of a crime more detestable ... of a deeper malignity ... whether with man or beast, of an offense so dark, yet so difficult for an innocent defendant to disprove, that a death sentence (beheading was the most lenient of the three methods of execution) may be appropriate for those who make a false accusation of witnessing a sodomy.

Now we find perverts line up to register their criminal confessions with the marriage-license authorities. They are praying to receive the "*due penalty for their perversion*" promised by [Romans 1:27](#). They waived their due-process privacy right by confessing to a felony.

After all, the crime has to be reported to government before an arrest can be made.

Concern for due process rights is the only reason that sodomy laws can be unpunished by the courts, primarily [Lawrence v. Texas](#) which treats privacy as a Fourteenth amendment due process right and NOT a fourth amendment privacy right. And indeed, we see that it is NOT a privacy concern as was confirmed by the Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#): "*The right*

to privacy does not extend to acts of consensual sodomy between homosexual adults". Now that homosexuals are openly confessing their felonies, due process cannot be raised as a defense to avoid "the due penalty for their perversion".

So that you might understand the impact of the 14th Amendment, Here are some notes on OTHER 14th Amendment privacy cases:

- Abortion in [Roe v. Wade](#) was also a [Fourteenth Amendment](#) due process case, not a fourth amendment privacy right. [Roe v. Wade](#) did not legalize abortion – in the [Roe v. Wade](#) decision, the abortion doctor, Dr. James Hubert Hallford was remanded back to Texas **for his punishment**. Those who have overthrown one nation, under God, want you to believe that abortion was legalized, so that sex will have no consequences. God invented sex with life and death consequences. We abort 3,000 babies a day and no one seems to care. Your representatives authorized this with your consent. Innocent blood is on your hands.
- In [Lawrence v. Texas](#) the Supreme Court relied upon a brief by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to show that many nations tolerate homosexuals. Has the Supreme Court determined that your laws must accommodate foreigners who want to destroy your nation? God has always used pagan nations to punish his people. Pagan Conquerors are instruments of His discipline.
- In [Griswold v. Connecticut](#), 381 U.S. 479, the Supreme Court allowed married couples to get away with the crime of using condoms. But this was a 14th Amendment due process concern about government intrusion to detect the crime. And ONLY a due-process concern. It is not a Fourth Amendment right to privacy. This case would later be cited by the Supreme Court in [Lawrence v. Texas](#) as somehow proving that crimes committed in a closet have a right to privacy.

The US Supreme Court has never found a right to homosex. Has the crime of consensual sodomy somehow become a civil right?

Sodomy was traditionally a capital felony. The fourth amendment right to privacy does not extend to any felony. As long as due process rights are observed, a felony can be punished.

What perversion of logic leads them to believe that confessing to a felony gives them civil rights as a protected minority?

Here is the exact text of [Blackstone's](#) (First Edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1769) Book IV, so that you can read for yourself exactly what our Christian society has historically required for mankind to preserve itself. I start the quote from Page 214 discussion of child rape, to show you that due process of the accused has always been a primary concern in cases of child rape and other crimes against nature that are committed in secret. But once guilt is known, punishment is swift and just. This was the received law of the land in all 13 original States,

MOREOVER, if the rape be charged to be committed on an infant under twelve years of age, she may still be a competent witness, if she hath sense and understanding to know the nature and obligations of an oath; and, even if she hath not, it is thought by sir Matthew

Haleⁱ that she ought to be heard without oath, to give the court information; though that alone will not be sufficient to convict the offender. And he is of this opinion, first, because the nature of the offence being secret, there may be no other possible proof of the actual fact; though afterwards there may be concurrent circumstances to corroborate it, proved by other witnesses: and, secondly, because the law allows what the child told her mother, or other relations, to be given in evidence, since the nature of the case admits frequently of no better proof; and there is much more reason for the court to hear the narration of the child herself, than to receive it at second hand from those who swear they heard her say so. And indeed it is now settled, that infants of any age are to be heard; and, if they have any idea of an oath, to be also sworn: it being found by experience that infants of very tender years often give the clearest and truest testimony. But in any of these cases, whether the child be sworn or not, it is to be wished, in order to render her evidence credible, that there should be some concurrent testimony, of time, place and circumstances, in order to make out the fact; and that the conviction should not be grounded singly on the unsupported accusation of an infant under years of discretion. There may be therefore, in many cases of this nature, witnesses who are competent, that is, who may be admitted to be heard; and yet, after being heard, may prove not to be credible, or such as the jury is bound to believe. For one excel-

ⁱ 1 Hal. P. C. 634.

.P 215

PUBLIC WRONGS.

BOOK IV.

Ch. 15.

lence of the trial by jury is, that the jury are triors of the credit of the witnesses, as well as of the truth of the fact.

“IT is true, says this learned judge^k, that rape is a most “detestable crime, and therefore ought severely and impartially “to be punished with death; but it must be remembered, that “it is an accusation easy to be made, hard to be proved, but “harder to be defended by the party accused, though innocent.” He then relates two very extraordinary cases of malicious prosecutions for this crime, that had happened within his own observation; and concludes thus: “I mention these instances, that “we may be the more cautious upon trials of offences of this “nature, wherein the court and jury may with so much ease be “imposed upon, without great care and vigilance; the heinousness of the offence many times transporting the judge and jury “with so much indignation, that they are overhastily carried to “the conviction of the person accused thereof, by the confident “testimony of sometimes false and malicious witnesses.”

IV. WHAT has been here observed, especially with regard to the manner of proof, which ought to be the more clear in proportion as the crime is the more detestable, may be applied to another offence, of a still deeper malignity; the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast. A crime, which ought to be strictly and impartially

proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature, so easily charged, and the negative so difficult to be proved, that the accusation should be clearly made out: for, if false, it deserves a punishment inferior only to that of the crime itself.

I WILL not act so disagreeable part, to my readers as well as myself, as to dwell any longer upon a subject, the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature. It will be more eligible to imitate in this respect the delicacy of our English law, which

^k1 Hal. P. C. 635.

.P 216

PUBLIC WRONGS.

BOOK IV.

Ch. 15.

treats it, in it's very indictments, as a crime not fit to be named; "peccatum illud horribile, inter christianos non nominandum." A taciturnity observed likewise by the edict of Constantius and Constans^l: "ubi scelus est id, quod non proficit scire, jubemus insurgere leges, armari jura gladio ultore, ut exquisitis poenis subdantur infames, qui sunt, vel qui futuri sunt, rei." Which leads me to add a word concerning it's punishment.

THIS the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God^m, determine to be capital. Of which we have a signal instance, long before the Jewish dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven: so that this is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept. And our ancient law in some degree imitated this punishment, by commanding such miscreants to be burnt to deathⁿ; though Fleta^o says they should be buried alive: either of which punishments was indifferently used for this crime among the ancient Goths^p. But now the general punishment of all felonies is the same, namely, by hanging: and this offence ... was made single felony by the statute 25 Hen. VIII. c. 6. and felony without benefit of clergy by statute 5 Eliz. c. 17. And the rule of law herein is, that, if both are arrived at years of discretion, *agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur*^q.

The terminology "without benefit of clergy" means the case cannot be removed to ecclesiastical court and thereby avoid the death penalty.

The terminology "if both are arrived at years of discretion, *agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur*" is speaking about **consensual sodomy, not homosexual rape**. The Latin is for: "Acting and consenting parties are liable to the same punishment." This is proof that death penalty for consensual homosex was the common law here in America. Legislators cannot change the common law without express words of nullity. But since the law of nature authorized the United States to exist, it is doubtful that any legislator would deny the legitimacy of their office.

Agentes et consentientes pari pœna plectentur /ajén-tiыз ət kənsənsiheyéntiыз péray piynə plekténtər/. Acting and consenting parties are liable to the same punishment.

Both are to be put to death. This Latin phrase was in American Law Dictionaries until 1999 when Black's Law Dictionary 7th edition failed to perpetuate it.

And when we compare this British first edition with an 1803 Virginia version that had been revised with commentary to conform to the U.S. Constitution, we see that these consensual sodomy laws remain unchanged in the United States. (Tucker's 1803 Blackstone is can be downloaded from the Constitution Society's on-line library www.constitution.org) And Blackstone's remained as a renowned reference book for American jurists until the late 1800's.

The Common Law is the well-established law that applies to everyone, even if not legislated.

Ever since we brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty, the common law that applies to everyone required the immediate execution of homosexuals. As quoted earlier, Blackstone's also warned that "*licentiousness and debauchery*" would destroy both society and government. It is very unlikely that government officers can commit treason by legalizing destruction of both society and government. It is also unlikely that government officers can disturb your worship. Worship is defined in the Law Dictionary as "*Any form of religious service showing reverence for Divine Being, or exhortation to obedience to or following of the mandates of such Being...*"

Locke's Second Treatise paragraph 222:

"... it can never be supposed to be the will of the society that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure by entering into society,"

The Clean Hands doctrine prohibits government from rewarding a crime.

Throughout the history of Western civilization, sodomy – whether with man or beast – has traditionally been a capital felony. Driving out evil from your community is not hate, it is love.

Because we failed to enforce family rights for 100 years, the wicked now expect a "civil right" to destroy us.

Jesus spoke of the value of family hate in Luke 14:26 -- and in Matthew chapter 10, starting with Matthew 10:34-35 (NKJV) "*Do not think that I came to bring peace on earth. I did not come to bring peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother...*" this was right after his warning us not to tolerate homosexuals in verse 15. A solid doctrine of **true family values from the words of Christ himself**. The unchanging God of the Bible understands family values; He drives out sin by demanding that we punish sinful family. As in Exodus 32:27, for example.

2 Peter 2:6 "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly;"

23. What about Lawrence v. Texas?

Did the Supreme Court finally discover a right to homosex?

The Lawrence case is confounding in many ways. The United States Supreme Court decision in Lawrence v. Texas overruled their prior decision in Bowers v. Hardwick on a technicality but did not overturn other related cases or existing laws against homosexual perversion.

Are sodomites now free to commit unpunishable crimes against nature?

The Lawrence decision stated right up front that it was a due process case,

“Resolution of this case depends on whether petitioners were free as adults to engage in private conduct in the exercise of their liberty under the Due Process Clause.”

yet it flippantly overturned their prior Bowers decision without much discussion other than to conclude that 14th Amendment due-process equal protection, rather than privacy, somehow trumps the State's right to punish crimes. As if to say that equal protection OF the law, somehow means equal protection FROM the law.

The Lawrence decision stated, *“there is a pattern of nonenforcement with respect to consenting adults acting in private.”* Are they trying to say that equal protection now means that since some get away with crimes that therefore we must allow all to get away with crimes? If so, then we have entered into an era where prosecutors must prosecute all crimes committed in private, without mercy, or by our nonenforcement the crimes automatically convert into protected rights.

Lawrence was based on their Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 decision that decriminalizes, but does not legalize, condom use in private by married couples. But Griswold was a due process privacy case not an equal protection case.

It ignored that the Laws of Nature are the foundation of government. The Laws of Nature are capitalized in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

It ignored their own decision in Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978) that States can indeed restrict legal sexual activity to the marriage relationship.

The Lawrence decision said that they ONLY considered three questions:

“We granted certiorari, 537 U. S. 1044 (2002), to consider three questions:

“1. Whether Petitioners' criminal convictions under the Texas “Homosexual Conduct” law -- which criminalizes sexual intimacy by same-sex couples, but not identical behavior by different-sex couples--violate the Fourteenth Amendment guarantee of equal protection of laws?”

"2. Whether Petitioners' criminal convictions for adult consensual sexual intimacy in the home violate their vital interests in liberty and privacy protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?"

"3. Whether *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U. S. 186 (1986), should be overruled?"

Lets briefly examine their stated reasons for even considering the case:

- Notice how they blamed a Texas "*law which criminalizes sexual intimacy by same-sex couples, but not identical behavior by different-sex couples*" -- which is not true even in Texas statute law, and never in common law. This is simply not the case. The Supreme Court has never legalized anal sex, even for married heterosexual couples, although the *Lawrence* decision implied that they had. Married heterosexual couples have never had a right to commit anal sex, not even in the privacy of their homes. Anal sex among heterosexual couples (the crime of buggery) remains punishable. The US Supreme Court, in a prior case, had refused to interfere with Arizona's sentence of 4 years in prison for a married couples anal sex in *Arizona v. Bateman*, 429 U.S. 864. They refused to rule whether or not Arizona "*may prohibit consensual sexual acts between married adults...*" They left the question unanswered. And they have never ruled otherwise. In fact, the US Supreme Court in *Arizona v. Bateman* quoted the Arizona Supreme Court's decision that: "*the legislature has acted to properly regulate the moral welfare of its people, and has specifically prohibited sodomy...*" Which, of course, it must do to perpetuate the received law of the land.
- Notice that the *Lawrence* case only considered a Fourteenth Amendment Due Process "*vital interests in liberty and privacy*". But they never explained how committing crimes is a vital interest.
- Notice that the *Lawrence* case found some technicality with the written statute law, yet crimes against nature are common law questions, not statute law questions. The common law remains the rule of decision in all courts.
- Basic human rights had nothing to do with the case. Inalienable rights had nothing to do with the case. Sixth Amendment due-process of accused criminals had nothing to do with the case. Nor Fifth Amendment due-process rights. Fourth Amendment privacy has nothing to do with the case. Only the Fourteenth Amendment liberty granted to freed slaves after the Civil War is being considered here.

Texas' death row has a very busy execution schedule. They would never argue that their right to execute murderers comes from the US Supreme Court. Yet the right to punish crimes against nature -- what Blackstone called "murder and the like" -- comes from the same received-law-of-the-land that authorizes consensual homosexual sodomy to be punished by death.

Perhaps they were only saying that Texas had bad prosecutors. The *Lawrence* decision states: "*The Texas court considered Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U.S. 186, controlling on that point.*" [the point of constitutionality under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment]. If Texas had merely stated that their authority to punish crimes against nature came from the law-of-the-land, or the Texas Constitution, or "*millennia of moral values*" or even the law of nature itself (which, after all, is the law that authorizes government to exist) then perhaps the *Bowers* decision would have stood.

Texas had bad prosecutors who insisted that prior Supreme Court case was controlling their law, when in fact

"Nobody objects to a state enforcing its own penal laws." -- Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. at 374

Here are some Supreme Court quotes, within quote marks, each of which is followed by unanswered questions and comments:

- *"Held: The Texas statute making it a crime for two persons of the same sex to engage in certain intimate sexual conduct violates the Due Process Clause."*
- *"(a) Resolution of this case depends on whether petitioners were free as adults to engage in private conduct in the exercise of their liberty under the Due Process Clause."*
 - notice the illogic of how they immediately assumed, without proof or explanation, that a crime was somehow a liberty. (A crime that has always been more detestable than -- and more harshly punished than -- child rape).
- *Laws... "seek to control a personal relationship that, whether or not entitled to formal recognition in the law, is within the liberty of persons to choose without being punished as criminals."*
 - How did the received-law-of-the-land's *"right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like"* somehow evolve to allow serious crimes to become *"the liberty of persons to choose without being punished as criminals."*? This is not logical. There should be at least an explanation to differentiate this crime from other laws against private consensual relationships like prostitution, or extortion, or usury, or buggery, or conspiracy, or even treason. And why does a government that has *"the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like"* not even deserve the consideration of any explanation at all? IF there is equal protection of criminal conspiracy against nature, THEN THE SUPREME COURT HAS CONVERTED MURDER AND CHILD RAPE INTO A LIBERTY. If not, then the Supreme Court DID NOT legalize homosex.
 - Where did this fourteenth amendment right to personal relationships come from? It did not exist in 1943 when Haupt had to spend 20 years in prison because he opened his front door to welcome his son, U.S. v. Haupt, 136 F.2d 661. It did not exist when Cramer *"engaged long and earnestly in conversation"* with no proof of what was said [325 U.S. 1](#), 37. Does a right to personal relationships now exist for other personal relationships like prostitution, or aiding a felon, or conspiracy, or for child porn rings?
- *"It should be noted, however, that there is no longstanding history in this country of laws directed at homosexual conduct as a distinct matter."*
 - Where do they get this nonsense? They did not support this absurd statement. The Bowers decision quoted the Colonial era capital punishment laws that became our received-law-of-the-land. See the "ancient roots" commentary, below. The only way this statement could be true is if their words *"homosexual conduct"* excludes genital contact.
- *"Early American sodomy laws were not directed at homosexuals as such but instead sought to prohibit nonprocreative sexual activity more generally, whether between men and women or men and men."*
 - but this has never been true. Blackstone's Commentaries made it very clear that the death penalty was for consensual homosex, not just rape. Blackstone's even used the

Latin phrase "*agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur*". The legal community used Latin because it is a dead language whose meanings do not change. When the States were created, the law was clear that acting and consenting partners were liable to the same punishment.

- AND, since when did infertility become a crime? Sodomy was always a crime. A crime more detestable than child rape.
- "*Instead, sodomy prosecutions often involved predatory acts against those who could not or did not consent:*"
- This might be true, as well as consensual. Queen Elizabeth the First changed the law (statute 5 Eliz c 17) so that the death penalty for consensual homosex could not be avoided. This became the received-law-of-the-land in America. Consensual homosex was always punishable, as noted in their Bowers decision, by millennia of moral tradition.
- "*The longstanding criminal prohibition of homosexual sodomy upon which Bowers placed such reliance is **as consistent with** a general condemnation of nonprocreative sex as it is with an established tradition of prosecuting acts because of their homosexual character.*" [emphasis added]
- Nonprocreative sex certainly was never "as consistent with" traditional crimes against nature "*as murder and the like*" [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7].
- There is no proof of this. There was never a crime against nonprocreative sex. In fact, it was rewarded by special laws not available to fertile couples. Back when marriage was until death they depart, that mankind could not put asunder, undivorceable marriage was always enforced by courts. infertility was, according to Blackstone's Commentary, Book 1, "*indeed the only cause, why a man may put away his wife and marry another.*"
- Noticed how the Supreme Court confessed that "*The longstanding criminal prohibition of homosexual sodomy... is with an established tradition of prosecuting acts because of their homosexual character.*" AND then they pretend that it was never true.
- "*Far from possessing "ancient roots," ibid., American laws targeting same-sex couples did not develop until the last third of the 20th century*"
- How can the Lawrence Supreme Court ignore obvious history to the contrary, including history cited in their Bowers case?
- The Bowers Supreme Court correctly stated: "*In fact, until 1961, all 50 States outlawed sodomy*".
- As for ancient roots, The Bowers decision referenced specific Roman laws (both Justinian and Theodosianus), and quoted English common law that became our law-of-the-land, and mentioned Judeo-Christian moral standards to support the universal death penalty for homosex. And they quoted Georgia Law from 1816 to support Georgia's 20 year imprisonment for consensual homosexual offenders.
- Bowers at the bottom of page 192 correctly stated: "*Sodomy was a criminal offense at common law and was forbidden by the laws of the original 13 States when they ratified the Bill of Rights*" How then, did the Lawrence decision conclude that the laws against homosexuals didn't exist until the last third of the 20th century?
- Was 1300BC not ancient enough roots? In Leviticus 20, the unchanging God of the Bible (not Moses) requires the death penalty for consensual homosex. The moral values of the Bible were brought by Pilgrims on the Mayflower to America, from which we derived today's laws -- and this was before British Colonies existed in America with their own laws against homosex. Notice how the Pilgrim separatists, as well as those

- they separated from, both had laws from ancient roots targeting same-sex couples. Both brought their laws to America. Embrace this diversity.
- Was Justinian Law not ancient enough? The Bowers decision gave plenty of references to support their statement that *the proscriptions against sodomy have very "ancient roots."* But the Lawrence decision left no clue as to why they would suddenly claim that laws targeting same-sex couples were recent laws.
 - Where do they come up with this? Laws targeting same-sex relations were clearly mentioned in Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law, the First Edition was published in 1769, prior to the existence of any State Constitution. Later in Tucker's Blackstone, which was an 1803 American law encyclopedia based on Blackstone's work updated with legal commentary about Virginia law. The homosex punishment (death) remained the same in Virginia. And homosex was punished by death in Canada (enforcing our shared English common law) until 1869. Blackstone's Commentaries remained a renowned reference for jurists even after Cooley's Blackstone last edition was published in Chicago in 1884.
 - Is 1896BC not ancient enough? Blackstone's Commentaries states in Book 4, Chapter 15 why the death penalty for homosex has always been universal: "*THIS the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God determine to be capital. Of which we have a signal instance, long before the Jewish dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven: so that this is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept.*"
 - "*Even now, only nine States have singled out same-sex relations for criminal prosecution. Thus, the historical grounds relied upon in Bowers are more complex than the majority opinion and the concurring opinion by Chief Justice Burger there indicated.*"
 - Imagine that! Only nine States were able to withstand the pervert politicians. Even though [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, introduction page 7] "*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual...*" [which we then delegated to our civil servants when we created a government to] *bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreigners could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*"
 - Did the Supreme Court just un-delegate the government duty to punish these crimes? If they abandoned their duty, then the duty reverts back to the source. [Blackstone's introduction to Book1, Part 1, explaining why laws exist] "*Neither could any other law possibly exist; for ... in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being...This law of nature, being coeval with mankind ... is of course superior in obligation to any other... no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this:...Nay, if any human law should allow [crimes against nature], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.*"
 - "*The 25 States with laws prohibiting the conduct referenced in Bowers are reduced now to 13, of which 4 enforce their laws only against homosexual conduct.*"
 - Wrong again. The common law, without being written by Congress, still applies in every courtroom in every State. To suggest otherwise is to deny the legitimacy of government -- The *jura summi imperii* upon which government was created. And also denies the received law of the land.

- [emphasis added] "*The Bowers Court was, **of course**, making the broader point that for centuries there have been powerful voices to condemn homosexual conduct as immoral, but this Court's obligation is to define the liberty of all, not to mandate its own moral code,*"
- How can you conclude that "murder and the like" is now a liberty or that the Supreme Court does not mandate a moral code? They said they would not mandate it's own moral code, but then did. And did the Fourteenth Amendment liberty -- which was originally for slaves freed after the Civil War -- somehow obliterate moral code or authorize "murder and the like"?

The decision ignored logic. If the law of the land acknowledges "*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, ... is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual*" AND if all political power -- the *jura summi imperii* -- is vested in "We the People" who created government, then how did these detestable crimes become unpunishable in the societies that created government? How could another law possibly exist other than the law of nature, upon which legislated law hangs its authority?

It ignored an obvious truth stated in their prior decision: *To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.* And then proceeded to cast aside millennia of moral standards. Thereby promoting exactly what Blackstone had warned us about: law detrimental "*to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ...*"

It ignored that homosex is a crime more detestable than child rape. (which the Bowers decision acknowledged by partially quoting Blackstone's "*deeper malignity*" than child rape sentence even though they did not continue to quote the "*more detestable*" than child rape part of Blackstone's same sentence).

Just because Texas had incompetent prosecutors who argued the wrong point by stating that Bowers was their controlling authority, instead of stating that the law of nature was their authority, does NOT mean homosex is now a right.

Lawrence v. Texas overturned Bowers v. Hardwick on a technicality, but did not require that Hardwick be compensated for his imprisonment, or his fine returned. It didn't even exonerate Lawrence and his buddy; it just remanded them back to Texas courts.

Lawrence v. Texas did not overturn the Texas Constitution.

Lawrence v. Texas did not overturn Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978). Therefore States can indeed still restrict legal sexual activity to the marriage relationship.

Lawrence v. Texas overturned Bowers v. Hardwick on a technicality, but did not overturn the Georgia Law that convicted Hardwick (Bowers was the Georgia Attorney General, the Hardwick pseudonym was the sodomite). In fact, Georgia did not, and can not, overturn their received-law-of-the-land. As you can see below, state powers still come from the people who created their government.

Georgia Law
TITLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS
CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

O.C.G.A. § 1-1-10 (as of 2008)

§ 1-1-10. ...; provisions saved from repeal

(c) The following specific laws and parts of laws are not repealed by the adoption of this Code and shall remain of full force and effect, pursuant to their terms, until otherwise repealed, amended, superseded, or declared invalid or unconstitutional:

(1) An Act for reviving and enforcing certain laws therein mentioned and adopting the common laws of England as they existed on May 14, 1776, approved February 25, 1784. (For the adopting Act of 1784, see Prince's 1822 Digest, p. 570; Cobb's 1851 Digest, p. 721; and Code of 1863, Section 1, paragraph 6.)

Lawrence v. Texas did not change the rules of evidence. A defendant's history of Sexual misconduct can still be considered by juries in order to convict perverts. How jury instructions can still allow consideration of past history of sexual misconduct and also instruct that it is now "*within the liberty of persons to choose without being punished as criminals.*" was left unexplained by the Supreme Court.

Lawrence v. Texas did not overturn Arizona v. Bateman, 429 U.S. 864 which upheld "*the legislature has acted to properly regulate the moral welfare of its people, and has specifically prohibited sodomy...*"

Lawrence v. Texas did not alter the federal definition of marriage, or the federal definition of spouse, in [Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7](#).

Perhaps all the High Court is waiting for is another chance to uphold the common law by a State that will argue the right point.

Satan is deceptive, if possible, to deceive the very elect.

Satan has jurisdiction over the Kings of the Earth. (Psalm 2:2, Isaiah 24:21, Acts 4:26, Revelation 16:14, Revelation 17:2&18, Revelation 19:19).

Imagine a government casting aside millennia of moral values.

Throughout the span of history, consensual Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape (according to Blackstone's commentaries Book 4, page 214 of the first edition, in the same sentence that the US Supreme Court was to polite to fully quote in the Bowers case). Once homosex becomes unpunished, there would be no rational logic or principle to outlaw child rape. Once homosex becomes unpunished, we will have no principled basis or rational logic for rejecting child rape, prostitution, polygamy, bestiality, pedophilia, indecent exposure - or any form of sexual involvement. (And indeed, we now have what is commonly called "The Pedophile Protection Act" H.R. 1913 in the House and S. 909 in the Senate). And certainly these perverts will demand equal protection of the law, equal to Lawrence and his buddy. Men defend their families, which is why we created government -- to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity. The very reason government was created will become

invalid. The Laws of Nature mentioned in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence will become meaningless. The Supreme Court has denied the legitimacy of their office.

Now that government has ceased to govern, is the final collapse of society imminent?

When government officers corrupt society, the result is *"to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security..."*
John Locke's [Second Treatise of Government](#) paragraph 222.

When marriage laws become detrimental *"... to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery among the single of both sexes; and thereby destroying one end of society and government, ..."*

Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 426

24. Punishment that fits the crime

Since consensual homosex is more detestable than child rape we would expect the punishment to be harsher. And indeed, child rape or murder are punishable by hanging but consensual sodomy is punishable by both felons being burned at the stake. The Goths would bury them alive.

The law of nature authorizes governments to exist. If homosex perversion is punishable by death, how much more so are those who try to depict holy matrimony -- ordained by God at the Garden of Eden -- as equivalent to crimes against the very law that authorizes government to exist?

Some Christians are pacifists. Some are not. The question each Christian must ponder is this: can I forgive a murderer while I execute him? Ever since Noah's descendents were commanded by an unchanging God, we have been required to take the life of a murderer. Genesis 9:6. We then delegated this authority to government. Governments execute criminals. As Blackstone put it: *"To bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community"*.

The *"right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual"* which we then delegate to our civil servants.

Questions:

Where then, does this government duty to execute homosexuals come from? Is it merely a Christian concept? Why is it the law of the land? Has the authority to execute homosexuals been done away with?

Answers:

The duty to execute murderers and homosexuals is delegated from God. As explained by the Supreme Court, quoted below, the received law of the land punishes THE crime against nature. This is the authority to execute murderers and is the same authority to execute homosexuals. Government has the duty to enforce the law of nature, because each and every man who voted to create a government had this duty, which they then delegated to their civil servants *to bear the sword of justice*. And indeed one of the very reason governments are created, is to punish *"crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**..."*. To suggest that this duty has been abolished, is to suggest that governments did not have a right to be created.

Governments have the right to *"bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreigners could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."*

And indeed, homosex was punished by death in the Roman Law, it was punished by death in the English Common law, it was punished by death in Canada up until 1869, and it is still

punishable by death in Islamic countries. Life sentence in India, Singapore, Bangladesh, Nepal and others. It is irrelevant that a UN study reports that homosexuals are tolerated in some countries.

The US Supreme Court in 1986, reaffirmed that the traditional death penalty for homosexuals is indeed in the foundation of our laws by quoting the British law that existed in the colonies when they became states. The U.S. Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#), 478 U.S. 186 at page 214-215:

See, e. g., 1 W. Hawkins, Pleas of the Crown 9 (6th ed. 1787) ("All unnatural carnal copulations, whether with man or beast, seem to come under the notion of sodomy, which was felony by the ancient common law, and punished, according to some authors, with burning; according to others, with burying alive"); 4 W. Blackstone, Commentaries (discussing "the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished").

Blackstone was quoted at length in the last chapter.

Here, is a quote from [Blackstone's Commentaries](#) (Book 4 PUBLIC WRONGS, introduction, starting at the bottom of page 7). This was the received law-of-the-land when the original 13 American States wrote their Constitutions (emphasis added):

As to *the power* of human punishment, or the right of the temporal legislator to inflict discretionary penalties for crimes and misdemeanors. It is clear, that the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual**: For it must be vested in somebody; otherwise the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution; ... it must also be vested in *all* mankind; since all are by nature equal. Whereof the first murderer, Cain, was so sensible, that we find him expressing his apprehensions, that *whoever* should find him would slay him. In a state of society this right is transferred from individuals to the sovereign power; whereby men are prevented from being judges in their own causes, which is one of the evils that civil government was intended to remedy. Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who **bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community**. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, which some have argued to belong to every state, (though, in fact, never exercised by any) of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; **in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.**

As to offences merely against the laws of society, which are only *mala prohibita*, and not *mala in se*; the temporal magistrate is also empowered to inflict coercive penalties for such transgressions: and this by the consent of individuals; who in forming societies, did either tacitly or expressly invest the sovereign power with a right of making laws, and of enforcing obedience to them when made, by exercising, upon their non-observance, severities adequate to the evil. The lawfulness therefore of punishing such criminals is founded upon this principle, that the law by which they suffer was made by their own consent; it is a part of the original contract into which they entered, when first they engaged in society; it was calculated for, and has long contributed to, their own security.

This right, therefore, being thus conferred by universal consent, gives to the state exactly the same power, and no more over all it's members, as each individual member had naturally over himself or others. Which has occasioned some to doubt, how far a human legislature ought to inflict capital punishments for *positive* offences; offences against the municipal law only, and not against the law of nature; since no individual has, naturally, a power of inflicting death upon himself or others for actions in themselves indifferent. With regard to offences *mala in se*, capital punishments are in some instances inflicted by the immediate *command* of God himself to all mankind; as, in the case of murder, by the precept delivered to Noah, their common ancestor and representative, "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." In other instances they are inflicted after the *example* of the Creator, ...; as in the case of **the** crime against nature.

The execution of murderers is not done out of hatred. It is done out of love. You love your neighbors by driving out evil. You love your God by obeying Him. Are we now somehow expected to tolerate murderers for fear of being called hateful?

Is murder committed in the privacy of a closet now a "right to privacy"?

1 Kings 15:11-12 (KJV) "And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the LORD, as did David his father. And he took away the sodomites out of the land,"

Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat
Ignorance of a law, which every one is bound to know, excuses no man.

25. The law of Nature

The Latin maxim of law *Conjunctio mariti et femina est de jure naturæ*. means "The union of a man and a woman is of the law of nature."

Summary so far:

- The law of nature authorizes government to exist.
- Georgia Supreme Court in Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga 173: "*marriage is founded in **the law of nature**, and is anterior to all human law*"
- Maxims of Law from Bouvier's 1856 Law Dictionary: "The union of a man and a woman is of **the law of nature**."
- Marriage "*is a contract of **natural law** antecedent to its becoming a civil contract in civil society*" according to Shelford's 1841 Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29.
- Federal law does not recognize homosex marriage. Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7.
- Murder is a crime against nature, and child rape is a crime against nature, but consensual homosexual sodomy is **THE** crime against nature. Traditional punishment of murder or child rape was death by hanging, but consensual homosex has traditionally deserved a harsher punishment.
- The US Supreme Court in 1986 upheld a Georgia law that punishes by 20 years in prison a single act of consensual sodomy committed in the privacy of a house.
- Satan's legalists who plan to destroy America must demean Christians in order to take away the restraining force of moral values.
- The way of God is proven by Biblical history. When Godly people turn their back on God, He uses pagans to bring his disobedient nations into captivity.
- History shows that those people that have known freedom and then lost it, have never regain it.
- The English common law, which was the received law of the land in all original States, allowed the death penalty for consensual homosexual sodomy.

The Laws of Nature are mentioned in the first sentence of the [Declaration of Independence](#). They are the foundation of our right to create a government.

The received law-of-the-land that existed at the time when the original 13 States wrote their Constitutions is explained in Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law. This was a four-volume law encyclopedia that existed in Colonial times. The first edition was published until 1769.

Human Government exists because the Laws of Nature exist. Legislatures cannot deny their legitimacy by canceling their authority. Blackstone's Commentaries, in Book1, Part 1 explain why laws exists by explaining that the Laws of Nature exist:

"This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other-It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal, without any other superior but

him who is the author of our being.”

“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind ... is of course superior in obligation to any other... no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this:...Nay, if any human law should allow [violation of natural law], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”

- Blackstone, Book 4, page 7: *“the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual”*

Government's right to execute murderers "and the like" does not come from congress. It comes from God, through us, when we delegated Natural Law to our civil servants by creating their government.

The execution of murderers "and the like" is not done out of hatred. It is done out of love. You love your neighbors by driving out evil. You love your God by obeying Him. Are we now somehow expected to tolerate murderers?

The Christians who created -- ordained was the religious term they used in the Constitution -- a government were very cautious about violating the 6th Commandment. They created a government that would provide extra protections to ensure that executions done on their behalf were just.

Continuing Blackstone's introduction to Book 4:

*Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who **bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community**. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, which some have argued to belong to every state, (though, in fact, never exercised by any) of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; **in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.***

That's right! We entrusted our civil servants to perpetuate the Laws of Nature that created their office.

We are now faced with a government that denies their duty. They confuse the "created equal" phrase in the Declaration of Independence, which was originally a conclusion that there can be no other law than the law of nature, with a new concept in American jurisprudence. They now boldly proclaim that "murderers and the like" have a "created equal" right to liberty.

Yes, we are all created equal. *“... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”* In one nation under God, we are all created equal. Because *“the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual: For it must be vested in somebody; otherwise the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution”*

As you can see, the homosexual protestors claiming to be created equal are perverting the law.

Blackstone's Commentary did not include punishing crimes against nature as a “*natural liberty which is not required by the laws of society to be sacrificed to public convenience*” (quote from Book 1 introduction) because apparently, we must rely upon government to perform their duty to bear the sword of justice. Which is, after all, the reason we created government.

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government at paragraph 135:

*“the obligations of the law of Nature cease not in society, .. human laws... enforce their observation. Thus **the law of Nature stands as an eternal rule to all men, legislators as well as others.** The rules that they make for other men's actions must [conform] to the law of Nature, and the fundamental law of Nature being the preservation of mankind, no human sanction can be good or valid against it.”*

According to The United States Supreme Court in a Georgia case, Bowers, at the top of page 197 there is an infamous crime against nature that is not fit to be named:

*“the infamous crime against nature” as an offense of “deeper malignity” than rape, a heinous act “the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature,” and “a crime not fit to be named.” 4 W. Blackstone, Commentaries *215. The common law of England, including its prohibition of sodomy, became the received law of Georgia and the other Colonies.*

As we shall see, the law of nature is not just a Christian notion.

“It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal”.

Notice here again we see that the law of nature authorizes government to exist.

Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, Part 1, starts out with an explanation of why law exists. Laws are immutable rules of action applied indiscriminately. Such as, for example: the law of gravity or the law of nature. (emphasis added)

LAW, in it's most general and comprehensive sense, signifies a rule of action; and is applied indiscriminately to all kinds of action, whether animate or inanimate, rational or irrational. Thus we say, the laws of motion, of gravitation, of optics, or mechanics, as well as the laws of nature and of nations. And it is that rule of action, which is prescribed by some superior, and which the inferior is bound to obey.”

...This then is the general signification of law, a rule of action dictated by some superior being: and, in those creatures that have neither the power to think, nor to will, such laws must be invariably obeyed, so long as the creature itself subsists, for it's existence depends on that obedience. But laws, in their more confined sense, and in which it is our present business to consider them, denote the rules, not of

action in general, but of *human* action or conduct: that is, the precepts by which man, the noblest of all sublunary beings, a creature endowed with both reason and freewill, is commanded to make use of those faculties in the general regulation of his behaviour.

Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his creator, for he is entirely a dependent being. A being, independent of any other, has no rule to pursue, but such as he prescribes to himself; but a state of dependence will inevitably oblige the inferior to take the will of him, on whom he depends, as the rule of his conduct: not indeed in every particular, but in all those points wherein his dependence consists. This principle therefore has more or less extent and effect, in proportion as the superiority of the one and the dependence of the other is greater or less, absolute or limited. And consequently, as man depends absolutely upon his maker for every thing, it is necessary that he should in all points conform to his maker's will.

This will of his maker is called the law of nature. For as God, when he created matter, and endued it with a principle of mobility, established certain rules for the perpetual direction of that motion; so, when he created man, and endued him with freewill to conduct himself in all parts of life, he laid down certain **immutable laws of human nature**, whereby that freewill is in some degree regulated and restrained, and gave him also the faculty of reason to discover the purport of those laws.

Considering the creator only as a being of infinite *power*, he was able unquestionably to have prescribed whatever laws he pleased to his creature, man, however unjust or severe. But as he is also a being of infinite *wisdom*, he has laid down only such laws as were founded in those relations of justice, that existed in the nature of things antecedent to any positive precept. **These are the eternal, immutable laws of good and evil**, to which the creator himself in all his dispensations conforms; and which he has enabled human reason to discover, so far as they are necessary for the conduct of human actions. Such among others are these principles: that we should live honestly, should hurt nobody, and should render to every one his due; to which three general precepts Justinian^[1] has reduced the whole doctrine of law.

But if the discovery of these first principles of **the law of nature** depended only upon the due exertion of right reason, and could not otherwise be obtained than by a chain of metaphysical disquisitions, mankind would have wanted some inducement to have quickened their inquiries, and the greater part of the world would have rested content in mental indolence, and ignorance its inseparable companion. As therefore the creator is a being, not only of infinite *power*, and *wisdom*, but also of infinite *goodness*, he has been pleased so to contrive the constitution and frame of humanity, that we should want no other prompter to inquire after and pursue the rule of right, but only our own self-love, that universal principle of action. For he has so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former; and, if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot but induce the latter. In consequence of which mutual connection of justice and human felicity, he has not perplexed the **law of nature** with a multitude of abstracted rules and precepts, referring merely to the fitness or unfitness of things, as some have vainly surmised; but has graciously reduced the rule of obedience to this one paternal precept, "that man should pursue his own true and substantial happiness." **This is the foundation of what we call ethics, or natural law.** For the several articles into which it is branched in our systems, amount to no more than demonstrating, that this or that action tends to man's real happiness, and therefore very justly concluding that the performance of it is a part of the **law of nature**; or, on the other hand, that this or that action is destructive of man's real happiness, and therefore that the **law of nature** forbids it.

This **law of nature, being coeval with mankind** and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other-**It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.**

But in order to apply this to the particular exigencies of each individual, it is still necessary to have recourse to reason; whose office it is to discover, as was before observed, what the **law of nature** directs in every circumstance of life: by considering, what method will tend the most effectually to our own substantial happiness. And if our reason were always, as in our first ancestor before his transgression, clear and perfect, unruffled by passions, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by disease or intemperance, the task would be pleasant and easy; we should need no other guide but this. But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error.

This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine providence; which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce it's laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures. These precepts, when revealed, are found upon comparison to be really a part of the original **law of nature**, as they tend in all their consequences to man's felicity. But we are not from thence to conclude that the knowledge of these truths was attainable by reason, in it's present corrupted state; since we find that, until they were revealed, they were hid from the wisdom of ages. As then the moral precepts of this law are indeed of the same original with those of the **law of nature**, so their Intrinsic obligation is of equal strength and perpetuity. Yet undoubtedly the revealed law is of infinitely more authenticity than that moral system, which is framed by ethical writers, and denominated the natural law. Because one is the **law of nature**, expressly declared so to be by God himself; the other is only what, by the assistance of human reason, we imagine to be that law. If we could be as certain of the latter as we are of the former, both would have an equal authority; but, till then, they can never be put in any competition together.

Upon these two foundations, the **law of nature** and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true a great number of indifferent points, in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty; but which are found necessary for the benefit of society to be restrained within certain limits. And herein it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy; for, with regard to such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to, the former. To instance in the case of murder; this is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. Those human laws that annex a punishment to it, do not at all increase its moral guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation *in foro conscientiae* to abstain from it's perpetration. **Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.** But with regard to matters that are in themselves indifferent, and are not commanded or forbidden by those superior laws; such, for instance, as exporting of wool into foreign countries; here the inferior legislature has scope and opportunity to interpose, and to make that action unlawful which before was not so.

If man were to live in a state of nature, unconnected with other individuals, there would be no occasion for any other laws, than the **law of nature**, and the law of God. **Neither could any other law possibly**

exist; for a law always supposes some superior who is to make it; and in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being. But man was formed for society; and, as is demonstrated by the writers on this subject,^[2] is neither capable of living alone, nor indeed has the courage to do it. However, as it is impossible for the whole race of mankind to be united in one great society, they must necessarily divide into many; and form separate states, commonwealths and nations, entirely independent of each other, and yet liable to a mutual intercourse. Hence arises a third kind of law, to regulate this mutual intercourse, called "the law of nations:" which, as none of these states will acknowledge a superiority in the other, cannot be dictated by any; but depends entirely upon the rules of natural law, or upon mutual compacts, treaties, leagues, and agreements between these several communities: in the construction also of which compacts we have no other rule to resort to, but the **law of nature**; being the only one to which all the communities are equally subject: and therefore the civil law^[3] very justly observes, that *quod naturalis ratio inter omnes homines constituit, vocatur jus gentium*.

Thus much I thought it necessary to premise concerning the **law of nature**, the revealed law, and the law of nations, before I proceeded to treat more fully of the principal subject of this section, municipal or civil law; that is, the rule by which particular districts, communities, or nations are governed; being thus defined by Justinian,^[4] "*jus civile est quod quisque sibi populus constituit*." I call it *municipal law*, in compliance with common speech for, though strictly that expression denotes the particular customs of one single *municipium* or free town, yet it may with sufficient propriety be applied to any one state or nation, which is governed by the same laws and customs.

Blackstone continues. He then proceeds carefully to differentiate the difference between punishment for sin and punishment for violating the law of nature, so that punishment for sin is left only to ecclesiastical courts. This is still true today. As was explained earlier, government courts in the United States have never possessed jurisdiction in any matrimonial cases whatsoever, other than the authority to annul incestuous marriages.

Ancient Law of Nature also had the same view. A very brief summary of the Law of Nature is at the introduction to [Justinian's Institutes](#):

The law of nature is that law which nature teaches to all animals. For this law does not belong exclusively to the human race, but belongs to all animals, whether of the earth, the air, or the water. Hence comes the union of the male and female, which we term matrimony; hence the procreation and bringing up of children. We see, indeed, that all the other animals besides men are considered as having knowledge of this law.

Notice in Justinian that animals are subject to the law of nature. As we shall see later, the Bible repeatedly uses the word "beasts" to refer to homosexuals.

The Ancient Law of Nature was also considered universal. Justinian continues:

The law which a people makes for its own government belongs exclusively to that state and is called the civil law, as being the law of the particular state. But **the law which natural reason appoints for all mankind** obtains equally among all nations, because all nations make use of it. The people of Rome, then, are governed partly by their own laws, and partly by the laws which are common to all mankind.

Before I continue, I want you to understand the purpose of Government, so that you will understand that governments still have “*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like*” Here is the accepted purpose of government, according to the [Declaration of Independence](#):

“all men are created equal, they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights... That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed.”

In other words: government exists to secure rights, and if you join society, you consented to be governed. As Blackstone put it: you agreed that

Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, ... of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.

You have consented to be governed. This is a difficult concept for some people to understand. So I will introduce some basic principles from John Locke. The US Supreme Court still occasionally quotes John Locke.

The Declaration of Independence evolved from long debates over the course of the prior centuries. One of the most influential publications, other than the *Magna Carta* itself, to define the purpose of government was John Locke's [Second Treatise of Government](#) wherein he explained that political power is created when men contract together to create a society “*for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates*”.

This thought continued into the new world, and when the writers of the [Declaration of Independence](#) created a new society they did so “*with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.*”

Here is a quote from John Locke's [Second Treatise on Government](#) to help explain why people created a government in order to preserve society. Government derived their just powers, and only their just powers, from the consent of the governed:

171 political power is that power which every man... has given up into the hands of the society, and therein to the governors ... with this express trust, that it shall be employed for their good and the preservation of their [lives, liberties and estates]. This political power... [to preserve] himself and the rest of mankind; so that the end and measure of this power, being the preservation of all of his society- that is, all mankind in general- it can have no other end or measure, when in the hands of the magistrate, but to preserve the members of that society in their lives, liberties, and possessions, ... a power to preserve the whole, by **cutting off only those parts which are so corrupt that they threaten the sound ... And this power is by mutual consent of those who make up the community.**

The laws of nature as quoted earlier, require that as “long as the creature itself subsists, ...it's existence depends on that obedience” to the laws of nature. The apostle Peter made a brief statement about those who violate the laws of nature.

2 Peter 2:7-12 KJV

*"... just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds;)... But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, ... **beasts** made to be taken and destroyed.*

26. Arguing against the foundation of all law

Here is the real issue in the defense-of-marriage debate:

Is the foundation of all law, and of government itself, still legitimate?

Here is what we know about the law of nature:

- The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence cites the Laws of Nature as giving the **authority for the United States to exist**.
- The US Supreme Court in 1986 Bowers case refers to crimes against nature as being enforceable as the received law of the land, which allows a 20 year prison sentence for a single act of consensual sodomy in the privacy of a home. The Supreme Court's Bowers decision at the top of page 197, quotes Blackstone:

"the infamous crime against nature" as an offense of "deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature,"

As both Blackstone and Locke so eloquently explained, we are all created equal with no other superior than our creator. But in joining society, we consent to be governed. We give up the right to

"punish the offences of all those of that society... where every one of the members hath quitted this natural power, resigned it up into the hands of the community"

"though every man quitted his power to punish offences against the law of Nature in prosecution of his own private judgment, yet with the judgment of offences which he has given up to the legislative, ... he has given a right to the commonwealth to employ his force for the execution of the judgments of the commonwealth whenever he shall be called to it, which, indeed, are his own judgments, they being made by ... his representative. And herein we have the original [source] of the legislative and executive power of civil society... Wherever, therefore, any number of men so unite into one society as to quit every one his executive power of the law of Nature, and to resign it to the public, there and there only is a political or civil society..."

[quotes from Locke's Second Treatise, paragraphs 87, 88, 89]

In other words, those who created government trusted their new government to uphold and perpetuate the law of nature that created it. You gave up the right to judge and punish crimes against nature, as murder *and the like*. If a group doesn't have the right to execute murderers and the like, then it is not a government. It is merely an association. It is a government duty to uphold the law of nature.

It is from this same delegated authority that society can issue, and you are subject to, arrest warrants, subpoenas, summons and restraining orders. Only the community itself, through its – your – authorized judges, appeal courts and executioners, can be the umpire. You, yourself, authorized this when you joined society. You pledged allegiance to the arbiter.

“Neither could any other law possibly exist; for ... in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”

“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind ... is of course superior in obligation to any other... no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this:...Nay, if any human law should allow [violation of natural law], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”

Is the very purpose that created your government now invalid?

If courts left you in the law of nature for your remedy, then you have been reinstated to the authority that you surrendered when you joined society.

- As Locke put it, no society has the right to deliver up its preservation to a wicked legislature who would destroy it. *“by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people [to] provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society....”*
- As Blackstone put it, all laws are subject to the natural law and we are bound to transgress any human law that offends the natural law.
- Blackstone book 4 page 7 explains that statute laws exist because the law of nature exists. We are all vested with the right to punish crimes against nature whenever government fails to do so. For it must be vested in somebody.

*“the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as **murder and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual: For it must be vested in somebody; otherwise the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution”*

- International law recognizes that in the absence of governmental order, when chaos reigns, the rule of necessity allows anyone to step in and perform necessary governmental functions.

“Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil” [Isaiah 5:20](#).

27. What could Lot do?

Intolerance of *beasts made to be destroyed*, as defined in 2 Peter 2:12, is a true Christian virtue.

Jude also referred to homosexuals as beasts. They will suffer eternal fire, Jude verses 7 – 10.

Lot “vexed his righteous soul”. He tolerated them. However, he was so affected by the “filthy conduct” of his neighbors that he even offered his own daughters to the perverts. You cannot tolerate them and expect to remain unaffected. What should Lot have done? 1st Corinthians 15:33, evil company corrupts good character. Even those who merely tolerate homosexuals (Romans 1:26, 27) are “worthy of death” (Romans 1:32)

God sent warnings in the form of destruction from heaven “as an example to those who afterward would live ungodly.” According to 2 Peter 2:6

2 Peter 2:4-5 (NKJV) "For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment; ..."
 2:6 "and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them to destruction, making them an example to those who afterward would live ungodly;"
 2:7 "and delivered righteous Lot, who was oppressed by the filthy conduct of the wicked"
 2:8 "(for that righteous man, dwelling among them, tormented his righteous soul from day to day by seeing and hearing their lawless deeds);"
 2:9 "then the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptations and to reserve the unjust under punishment for the day of judgment,"
 2:10 "and especially those who walk according to the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise authority. They are presumptuous, self-willed. They are not afraid to speak evil of dignitaries,"
 2:12 "But these, like natural brute beasts made to be caught and destroyed, speak evil of the things they do not understand, and will utterly perish in their own corruption,"
 2:13 "and will receive the wages of unrighteousness, as those who count it pleasure to carouse in the daytime. They are spots and blemishes, carousing in their own deceptions while they feast with you,"
 2:14 "having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin, enticing unstable souls. They have a heart trained in covetous practices, and are accursed children."
 2:15 "They have forsaken the right way and gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Beor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness;"
 2:16 "but he was rebuked for his iniquity: ... "
 2:17 "These are wells without water, clouds carried by a tempest, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."
 2:18 "For when they speak great swelling words of emptiness, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through lewdness, the ones who have actually escaped from those who live in error."
 2:19 "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are slaves of corruption; for by whom a person is overcome, by him also he is brought into bondage."

2:20 "For if, after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overcome, the latter end is worse for them than the beginning."

2:21 "For it would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than having known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered to them."

Jesus Himself warned the cities that did not repent. He said in [Matthew 11:24](#) (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11): "But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."

28. Is homosex activism an act of terrorism ? How about judicial activism?

Here is the [Federal Criminal Law](#) (Title 18, section 2331) that defines “domestic terrorism”:

5) the term 'domestic terrorism' means activities that -

(A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State;

(B) appear to be intended -

(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and

(C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

Crimes of terrorism “*involve acts dangerous to human life*”.

- This involvement need not be direct involvement.
- Dangerous need not be deadly.
- And, as for the element of “acts” (as, for example, in Supreme Court decisions determining the crime of treason), “Acts” need not be overt criminal acts.

Is it terrorism – dangerous to human life – to promote all the suicide, murder and disease that reduces the life expectancy of their population? Does spreading HIV, like Dr. Acer did, qualify? How about any other HIV spreading that intimidates a civilian population?

Another element of the crime is that the crime “appear to be intended” to influence a policy of government or that it “appear to be intended” to intimidate a civilian population.

- “appear to be intended” is the only burden of proof mentioned in this law
- the jury determines what appears or does not appear to be intended

How long should it take a jury to deliberate about a gay-pride parade, or a gay protest? Isn't it obvious that such acts “intimidate or coerce a civilian population”, or “influence the policy of government”? It is obvious that the terrorists “appear to be intended” licentiousness or debauchery that has long been known to destroy both society and government. After all, Blackstone's Commentary said:

“encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ...”

How about a gay pride parade that involves any crime (jaywalking, indecency, disorderly conduct, trespassing, disturbing the peace, or any number of other crimes) and appears to be intended to induce someone to accept a lifestyle that will spread HIV (dangerous to human life)? We would never tolerate a pedophile pride parade. Yet they routinely influence public

policies with pride in felonies that were traditionally considered more detestable than child rape.

In the book Sex Appealed a Texas judge explains the case that led up to the Supreme Court's Lawrence v. Texas. The arrest was staged by a false call to 911 about an armed trespasser, so that four policemen with guns drawn would burst into a house and find sodomy. Was this an act dangerous to human life that appears to influence a policy of government?

CAN JUDICIAL ACTIVISM BE ACTS OF TERRORISM?

No supreme court has ever upheld a divorce of a real marriage. Do judicial activists ignore the law of the land in order to reward adultery that the received-law-of-the-land said was "*criminal conversion of a man's wife, ... a public crime, ... considered as a civil injury (and surely there can be none greater)*"? Could such judicial activism cause strife and conflict dangerous to human life if real men dared to defend the sanctity of their families, as did Andrew Jackson? Not to mention dangerous conflict of trying to enforce the legitimacy of government. Does it "appear to be intended" that corrupt judges influence a policy of government?

Is abortion still dangerous to human life? Roe v. Wade was a 14th Amendment due process privacy case that struck down a Texas law on the technicality that it did not recognize "other interests involved" (see Roe v. Wade page 164). Roe v. Wade did not legalize "acts dangerous to human life" that are a violation of the law of the land, the terrorism was committed by subsequent activist judges.

Aside: Roe v. Wade went to great lengths to discuss "persons" (not people) that receive government protection. They said a fetus is not a person. But the terrorism law uses the term "human life" not "persons".

Matthew 12:25, Luke 11:17 "And Jesus ...said unto them,
Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation;

PART 5 CONCLUSIONS

Summary:

- There are two sides to the perversion coin. Neither homosexuals nor adulterers can enter the Kingdom of Heaven [1 Corinthians 6:9](#).
- Both perversions are prohibited by the law-of-the-land. When the original States wrote their constitutions, the law-of-the-land in America confirmed that perversions are detrimental *“to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ...”* [Blackstone’s law commentaries Book 1, page 426, in his only mention of the word *government* in any of his commentary about marriage]
- It is doubtful that any legislator or judge would knowingly commit treason to destroy one end of society and government, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery.
- Because your civil servants no longer enforce the law-of-the-land, perversions have destroyed the morals of your country.
- Government has a duty to enforce marriage. If your courts are not enforcing marriage, then your government has been overthrown.
- Government has a duty to punish crimes against nature such as murder, child rape and sodomy, consensual or otherwise. If your courts are not punishing crimes against nature, then your government has been overthrown.

MARRIAGE ISSUES

- Enforceable (undivorcable) marriage is the foundation of every society. Legitimate societies then create their governments to preserve themselves. History and courts all agree that marriage is the parent of society. Only legitimate marriage can create legitimate society. **Marriage is the pre-existing foundation of society.** Society then creates government to defend their families. NOT to destroy families.
- If mankind does not have the authority to cancel his neighbors’ vows to God and to bastardize his children, then we do not have the right to delegate such authority, that we don’t have, to our civil servants. Not by writing a constitution, not by electing corrupt judges, not by demanding divorce laws.
- Activist judges promote adultery by using the full force of the state to enforce the idea that sex need not have consequences. The crime of adultery that once was

“... criminal conversion of a man’s wife, though it is, as a public crime, ... considered as a civil injury (and surely there can be none greater) the law gives satisfaction to the husband,... wherein the damages recovered are usually very large and exemplary.”

is now unpunished and even condoned by the state, and rewarded by forcing the victim to pay ransom to support the State’s children, with no hope of the kidnapped children ever being returned.

- Divorce always bastardizes children, which God punishes unto the tenth generation. Bastards are the children of nobody. [Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1](#), page 446, chapter 16: *“bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes”*.

- Civil marriage is not a marriage, and cannot create anything legitimate. Their children are bastards. Bastards cannot inherit property; they cannot even inherit a surname. [This is still true today. You cannot get a government ID card with your Christian name; all you can get is an all capitalized non-proper noun. Although government may allow you to hold custody of – inherit – a percentage of what you think is the family wealth, this grant of custody is taxed as a government privilege, hardly a right that existed prior to any earthly government.]
- Black robed priests at your local courthouse (who promote inequity, debauchery and allegiance to the forces of Satan) will pretend to cancel any Holy Matrimony for any reason. But no Supreme Court has ever allowed this. Maynard v. Hill only upheld a legislative divorce by a territorial legislature, of an intermarriage, while stating that traditional marriage remained “*a relation for life*”. This was so radical at the time, that David Maynard’s children thought they would try to inherit their mother’s property. They did not even try to inherit their father’s property. They got neither. Bastards have no civil rights.
- Marx’ The Communist Manifesto third plank prohibits inheritance. A right cannot be taxed. If death has become a government taxable privilege, then how can you pretend that you own your estate? Political power of your state was originally ordained to preserve your estate, and now they take your estate. You cannot claim that society is preserved.
- Courts agree that legitimate Marriage existed prior to any human government. Marriage is not created by society (not even by a marriage license). Courts agree that marriage is the parent of society.
- When legitimate marriage becomes impossible, legitimate society cannot exist past the next generation.
- Even the word “nation” refers, not to a government, but to an extended family. “*a people ... possessing historic continuity, and distinguished from other like groups...*”
- The patriarchal form of government (family government) worked just fine for the first ten Books of the Bible until Saul was elected as King. This election was evil in the eyes of the Lord, I Samuel 12:17.
- Children are surrendered by perjury on a divorce form verifying that there is a broken civil union – allowing the full armed police power of the State to brutally enforce the surrender of the state’s children.
- America started out with a solid moral doctrine. Yet there is now an alleged “civil right” pretending unpunishable adultery.
- Real men defend their families, which is why they created government. Each successive office holder had to swear an oath to uphold and perpetuate the constitution, yet we now find ourselves with a government that rewards the greatest of civil injury. This is contrary to the Clean Hands doctrine. Someone has overthrown the lawful authority of government and declared war against the foundation of society.
- Real men defend their families, which is why they go to war. But the American male has been neutered by Civil Unions disguised as marriage. He will no longer defend the sanctity of his family. He is utterly submissive to lawyers who denounce the very legitimacy of government. He will sacrifice his family, fortune and sacred honor to Satan’s legalists. This only encourages them. It is our own fault for tolerating this abuse. Merely tolerating this perversion is, according to Romans 1:32, “worthy of

death” as quoted above. Misuse of the courts was punishable by Deuteronomy 19. Show no pity, verse 19 in order to “put the evil away from among you”.

- Those who would destroy one nation, under God, are now so sure of their overthrow that they expect to grant licentiousness (license) to commit crimes such as adultery or homosex. Licentiousness is now spoken of as a civil right. Licentiousness has destroyed the foundation of society.

HOMOSEX ISSUES

- [The Declaration of Independence](#) states, in the first sentence, that **the laws of nature authorize your government to exist**.
- History and courts agree that consensual sodomy is THE unspeakable crime against the laws of nature. Historically, throughout the history of mankind, even before Jewish or Roman law ever existed, consensual homosex has always been punishable by death.
- homosex has always been more detestable than child rape.
- Black robed priests at your local courthouse refuse to punish the crime of homosex. Even though NO Supreme Court has ever allowed such crime to go unpunished when lawfully prosecuted. In 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) “*To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.*”
- The duty of government is to punish evil. The very foundation of our nations laws presumes that “*no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this*” law of nature. The U.S. Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) has recognized that sodomy laws can be enforced because “*The right to privacy does not extend to acts of consensual sodomy between homosexual adults*”. The U.S. Supreme Court in [Arizona v. Bateman](#) 429 US 864 acknowledged that “*sodomy laws are valid as a general proposition.*” And [Lawrence v. Texas](#) only recognizes a fourteenth amendment prohibition against illegal search to discover evidence of the crime. [Lawrence](#) did not address what happens if the crime becomes known. Well-settled law has not changed.
- Anyone who knows of a felony is required by law to report it. Failing to report a felony is a crime. 18 US Code, section 4. Homosex is a felony “*the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature,*” (according to the Supreme Court’s quoting Blackstone in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#), bottom of page 196)
- The received law of the land in all thirteen original states requires prosecution of “*the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished*”.
- Either the reason State governments were created still exists or it doesn’t. The future of the nation hangs in the balance.

Be ye not deceived.

1 Corinthians 6:9 homosexuals cannot go to heaven

29. Do we still have the right to secure the blessings of liberty?

Or, asked another way: When are we going to defend marriage?

LIBERTY

Marriage is a liberty:

The United States Supreme Court at [262 U.S. 390](#), at page 399, defines the term Liberty:

“Liberty... denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint, but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience... “

At what point will we once again defend the sanctity of the family by upholding the existing law-of-the-land? At what point will we honor those who ordained the Constitution to secure the blessings of liberty to their posterity? Against all enemies foreign **or domestic**?

Pilgrims brought forth on this continent a nation conceived in liberty. They took their families and risked death at sea to flee from oppressive government so that they could seek religious liberty.

Before the start of the American Revolution, the founders of American government found out that they had to risk death after they protested when the tax of tea was increased to 17 percent.

Just twenty-one years after Patrick Henry announced his decision “*give me liberty or give me death*” Thomas Jefferson was warning about complacency to the new government. Thomas Jefferson, April 24, 1796: “*Timid men prefer the calm of despotism to the boisterous sea of liberty.*” Have we, too, become complacent to the calm of despotism?

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICA

Political forces are now so sure of their overthrow, that they have obliterated the law of the land.

As many great patriots of the past, we are again engaged in a great war between good and evil. But the risk is more than just the sanctity of families. The very legitimacy of a nation is now on the political chopping block.

Men in America have already surrendered their families, their fortunes and their sacred honor. Surrendered without the feeblest whimper. Divorce bastardizes the children so that there are no inheritance rights to “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.” The law of nature still authorizes government to exist. In the overthrow of America, only one final question remains to be decided. **Is marriage, which is the pre-established legitimacy of society, to be forevermore equated to the perversion, disease, shame**

and filth of unspeakable crimes against the very authority of government to exist?
Crimes that have always been more detestable than child rape.

CORRUPTION

Merely tolerating their perversion makes one “worthy of death” according to [Romans 1:32](#). But our moral anguish is much worse than merely watching as the world tolerates perversion. God punishes bastards unto the tenth generation. Without legitimacy of marriage, the church is destroyed. When legitimacy is destroyed, the entire future of the universe is disrupted. Without legitimacy there can be no blessings of liberty for your posterity.

Corruption destroys society on many levels. Woe unto judges, lawyers and legislators who insist that Holy matrimony is a civil union.

We already had a duty to

- drive out demons. Mark 16:17
- Deny the pernicious ways of those who brought the way of truth into disrepute. 2nd Peter 2:2
- *"have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."* Ephesians 5:11
- stand fast in liberty and not let yourselves be entangled by the yoke of bondage Galatians 5:1

but we failed at these simple duties out of fear that we would be labeled as hateful or intolerant. (Contrary to Titus 2:15 *let no man despise thee.*) We are now facing the consequence.

If we don't win a moral battle, consider what options remain.

DEFEND MARRIAGE NOW, OR DEFEND REMAINING LIBERTY LATER

It will be more difficult to shake off your yoke of bondage after it is padlocked around your neck. You need to decide now: Are family rights worth fighting for? How can decent citizens preserve society's crumbling foundation against perverts who have overthrown your government? What methods have worked in the past?

Do you want your nation back from the pervert lawyers who have nullified the law of the land?

Do you want your children back from the civil servants who vehemently insist that the state's children are to be processed (sacrificed) by the state gods?

Do you want to live in a nation where people would once again have a right to “*marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience...*” as stated by the Supreme Court?

WHILE EVILS ARE SUFFERABLE

The [Declaration of Independence](#) says that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable Rights. It then warns that governments should not be changed for light causes and “*that mankind are more disposed to suffer, **while evils are sufferable**, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But...[if abuses and usurpations intended] to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government..*”

When will evils become insufferable? Will you draw another line in the sand? When will we stand fast in liberty that Christ has made us free (Galatians 5)?

Is it too late to stand fast in this liberty, or have we lost it? According to John Locke’s Second Treatise on Government paragraph 57:

“in all the states of created beings capable of laws, where there is no law, there is no freedom”

California Governor Ronald Reagan, first inaugural address:

“Freedom is a fragile thing and never more than one generation away from extinction... It is not ours by inheritance. It must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people. Those who have known freedom and then lost it, have never regained it.”

That’s right. Those who have lost their liberty never get it back. What can decent people do to defend society against the vicious perverts who seek to destroy us all? God-fearing people throughout history have offered their suggestions. Here are some references to study, so that you can decide for yourself whether or not you want to work now to secure the blessings of liberty to your posterity. Or whether you want to face the consequences later in a battle for more than just your family. You have already lost the law of the land. Lost it by the most inhumane way possible. Few options remain.

- Patrick Henry, June 5, 1788 quoted in [Elliot’s Debates Vol 3](#), page 45:

“Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect everyone who approaches that jewel. Unfortunately, nothing will preserve it but downright force. Whenever you give up that force, you are inevitably ruined.”

- The [Declaration of Independence](#) says that governments derive “*their just power from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government...*”
- Christians in the American British Colonies had to defend themselves to bring forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty. Many of these principles were previously articulated in a 1644 publication [Lex Rex](#) by Samuel Rutherford. He explains that sovereignty comes from the people who create a government, and that men create a civil society when one family can no longer contain them. Rutherford, Locke and Blackstone all agree that Society is the extension of the family. Rutherford

and Locke agree that people are sovereign and may retake control of their society to preserve themselves. Supreme power *jura summi imperii* resides in the people.

- Your Right to defend yourself is a “*natural liberty which is not required by the laws of society to be sacrificed to public convenience*”. (According to Blackstone's Commentary on the Law Book 1, introduction.)
- This principle was still valid when Abraham Lincoln made his First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861:

“This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.”

Unstated: because the law of nature requires us to supervise our civil servants, and if they fail to enforce the law of nature, we are restored to the nature that we were in prior to creating government, for we are all equal. See Locke's Second Treatise paragraphs 135, 149, 171, 209. And Blackstone's Commentaries Book 4 Introduction.

- John Quincy Adams: “*Posterity – you will never know how much it has cost my generation to preserve your freedom.*”
- Thomas Jefferson on November 13, 1787, wrote the following to future Congressman William S. Smith:

“... God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion... And what country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time, that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms... What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be [refertilized] from time to time, with the blood of patriots and tyrants.”

These are not the words of a young radical fighting in the Revolutionary War. This was the former Governor of Virginia, and Ambassador to France, the man who proposed the Bill of Rights.

- Abraham Lincoln:

“Our safety, our liberty, depends upon preserving the Constitution of the United States as our fathers made it inviolate. The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.”

- John Philpot Curran, July 10, 1790: “*The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he breaks, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime.*”

- Christ tells His apostles in [Luke 22:36](#) to sell their clothes, if necessary, in order to purchase advanced military assault weapons. (also see [Jeremiah 48:10](#), and [Matthew 10:34](#))
- George Washington April 5, 1765 wrote on the topic of liberty:

“That no man should scruple, or hesitate a moment to use arms in defense of so valuable a blessing, on which all the good and evil of life depends, is clearly my opinion...”
- Thomas Jefferson’s inscription on his ring: *Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.*

Christ tells us that a strong man, fully armed, defends his own home. [Luke 11:21](#) But those who seek to destroy one nation under God have demanded that you surrender your families. The cowardly shall have their place in the Lake of Fire [Revelation 21:8](#). America will be the land of the free, when it is the home of the brave.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE

Christ commanded you to *“let not man put asunder”* A very simple command. How can any Christian have a problem with this?

Men defend their families, which is why they created government. And why they go to war. Occasionally, in order to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity, we have had to go to war. In the history of your once-great nation, two million men have marched off to secure the blessings of liberty to your posterity, never to return home. We are now asked to spit on their graves. You are asked to join the traitors and secure the dominion of those who overthrew government in the most inhumane way possible, so that they can continue to encourage crimes against nature, aid and abet the criminal conversion of adultery (“and surely there can be none greater”), and brutally enforce the surrender of children they bastardize.

DEFENSE OF THE LAW-OF-THE-LAND

In 1986 the US Supreme Court acknowledged the authority of the law of the land by quoting Blackstone in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) 478 U.S. 186 at pages 214-215:

“...sodomy, which was felony by the ancient common law, and punished, according to some authors, with burning; according to others, with burying alive”... “the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished”.

1986 U.S. Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#):

- *“... authorizes a court to imprison a person for up to 20 years for a single private, consensual act of sodomy. ... even in the private setting of a home,”*
- *“...there is no such thing as a fundamental right to commit homosexual sodomy”.*
- *“To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.”*

[Matthew 11:24](#) (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11) warned the cities that did not repent:

"But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."

Redefining marriage as equivalent to a crime will destroy families, and it will invalidate the purpose of government. The law of nature that authorized the United States to exist will become unenforceable. The very foundation of society will become a crime in your once-great nation where the law-of-the-land still requires that *"no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original...[law of nature] neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal"*.

CONCLUSION

Edmund Burke on April 23, 1770 wrote: *"All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing"*

Time is running out. If you do nothing, then the pervert view that daddy government can sodomize anybody he wants to sodomize will become accepted. But the situation is much worse than societal degradation. Satan has a deadline on this scheduled destruction of society.

Satan knows that he is running out of time (Revelation 12:12). The Christian church will soon judge angels (1 Corinthians 6:2-3). Satan's legalists are in a final battle to disqualify all future judges. Satan knows that bastards and their descendants cannot join the congregation of the Lord (Deuteronomy 23:2). And history within Christian nations proves that *"A bastard was also, in strictness, incapable of holy orders; ... utterly disqualified from holding any dignity in the church: ..."*

- Without legitimate marriage there will be no legitimate church to judge angels.
- Christ himself opposed bastards having authority (John 8:40-44).
- The law of the land, Blackstone and Justinian all agree that children bastardized by divorce are "spurious".

What chance do you have of judging angels if your family values are based on a license to commit licentiousness rather than a God-given right to marry? Know ye not that fornicators cannot inherit the Kingdom of God? Judgment must begin at the house of God, 1 Peter 4:17. Civil licensed marriage is not a marriage at all – it is fornication. What chance do Fornicators have of judging angels? Fornicators cannot inherit the Kingdom of God 1st Corinthians 6:9, and fornicators risk their salvation 1st Thessalonians 4:3.

Satan's legalists redefined the term *marriage* in 1979 to exclude traditional marriage¹. Now they are trying to redefine marriage as a crime that they can regulate. Satan is running out of time to disqualify all potential future judges. You are running out of time to enforce the law of the land.

Defend marriage. Or forever hold your peace.

The future of mankind hangs in the balance

¹ The traditional marriage that existed prior to any earthly government. The right to marry did not come from graven (manmade) government. Yet the 1979 redefinition ignores the existence of traditional marriage. Their counterfeit “marriage” vows are to the state, not to God. Statewide Organization of Stepparents v. Smith, 536 P.2d 1202: “*Purpose of statute declaring marriage to be a civil contract was to make it clear that marriage was governed by civil law rather than by ecclesiastical law*” An oath is always a religious ritual. Their 1979 redefinition of marriage is an oath of allegiance to their black robed courthouse priests, contrary to Matthew 5:33-34, James 5:12, Hebrews 6:16 and the first and second commandments.

INDEX

activist judges	71, 72, 79, 101, 139
Adulterers cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven.....	4, 6, 11
adultery	8, 31, 32, 135
criminal	4, 11, 36, 37, 138
greatest of civil injury	36, 138
alimony prohibited for adulterer	34, 82
allegiance, definition.....	75
American male.....	77, 140, 142
Ashwander v. TVA	74, 75
Askew v. Dupree	19, 21, 25, 26, 47, 65, 83, 125
banns	21, 28, 35, 47, 53, 58
barbarism	62
bastards	
cannot inherit a surname	64
cannot inherit birthright	16, 27, 45, 49, 64, 65, 70
incapable of holy orders.....	12, 15, 64
Betrothal	
Exchange of Promises.....	16
marriage vows.....	3
promise of fidelity.....	9, 14, 15
Blackstone's Commentaries	37, 125
Private Wrongs	36, 81
Public Wrongs	37, 76, 109, 110, 123
Rights of Persons	18, 19, 24, 26, 31, 32, 35, 42, 48, 58, 64, 65, 72, 80, 82, 85, 121, 127, 139
Bowers v. Hardwick	98, 99, 100, 108, 109, 123, 127, 133, 141, 146
castration.....	9, 14
common law marriage	21, 48
Communist Manifesto, The	45, 59, 70, 72, 140
Concubinage, cohabitation	15, 21, 79, 83
concubinatus	47, 59
contubernium	59
Dartmouth College v. Woodward.....	30, 35, 42, 43, 80
democracy.....	2, 42
demons.....	2, 84
divorce bastardizes children	64
divorce definition, Biblical	8, 11
divorce, complete	
disabilities	27, 35, 64, 68, 79
first wife's divorce of her husband's second marriage	37
legislative divorce	19, 31, 33
vinculo matrimonii.....	28, 31, 32, 33, 64, 79, 81
divorce, partial	
aggravated cruelty.....	34, 89
mensa et thoro.....	32, 34, 64
supervient cause	32, 34

divorceable marriage is not a regular marriage	54, 69, 85
Family is the highest form of government.....	14, 39, 41
genocide.....	1, 5, 37, 93
government license not required.....	21, 24, 55
Hate.....	13, 104, 106, 113
homosex, consensual	
abomination	104
consenting parties are subject to the same punishment	112
more detestable than child rape	111
punished by hanging.....	112
punished in Canada by death until 1869.....	118
punished in U.S. by 20 years in prison	99
strictly and impartially punished	112
to be burnt to death or buried alive.....	109, 112
homosexuals	
beasts.....	106, 132, 135
cannot go to heaven, 1st Corinthians 6:9.....	105
Leviticus 20:13	103
will burn in hell, Jude 7	105
worthy of death, Romans 1:32.....	103, 106
impairing the obligation of contracts.....	30
in facie ecclesiae.....	33, 53, 69, 85
intermarriage.....	56
intolerance of homosexuals	106
Jackson duel.....	43
judgment must begin at the house of God	147
Justinian law	13, 65, 117, 128, 130
law of nature	115, 116, 118, 119, 125, 128, 130
authorizes government to exist.....	125, 129
authorizes U.S. to exist.....	98, 127, 147
individuals restored to, if gov't fails to enforce, for we are all equal ...	24, 90, 123, 125, 127, 130, 145
right to punish murder and the like is vested in every individual.....	97, 123, 125, 134
THE crime against nature	99, 100, 112, 124, 127
Lawrence v. Texas.....	2, 108, 109, 110, 119, 138, 141
Locke's Second Treatise.....	29, 42, 43, 88, 93, 102, 121, 127, 131, 133
Maritagium	47
Mark 10.....	6, 7, 8, 11, 25
8 14	
Markley v. Baldwin	23
marriage definition	
Biblical.....	6
Blackstone's 1769	18
change in 1979 excludes traditional marriage	46
Federal	120
Shelford's 1841	19
Traditional.....	46
Marriage definition has two meanings	3, 52, 53
marriage, proof needed to stop a divorce case.....	54, 69

martial law	96
Matthew 19	3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15
12	15
5&6	14
Maynard v. Hill.....	18, 19, 26, 27, 30, 33, 34, 35, 40, 41, 46, 48, 140
McLaughlin's Estate	19, 21, 26, 40, 47, 51, 69, 79, 80, 83
Meister v. Moore	4, 21, 24, 26, 36, 47, 48, 69, 82
meretricious union, not matrimonial.....	18, 27, 52, 58, 64, 75, 77, 79
Meyer v. Nebraska.....	4, 24, 41, 69, 71, 94
Murdock v. Pennsylvania	57
New York, no divorce for 100 years	27
one flesh.....	4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 25, 83
pagans	9, 16, 77
Parsons' On Contracts	30, 34, 54, 60, 69, 85
pervert delivered to Satan to save his soul, 1st Corinthians 5:5	77, 105
public schools	72
remarriage.....	6, 9, 11, 34, 37, 38, 105
right to marry does not come from government	21, 30, 48, 69
rights do not come from government.....	68
Roe v. Wade.....	72, 94, 110, 138
Shelford's Treatise of the Law of Marriage	19, 20, 26, 37, 39, 51, 52
religious contract consecrated by a vow to God.....	20
solemnization of marriage since 1563	52
state is a party to every intermarriage.....	56, 71, 75
stop a divorce case	54, 69, 84, 85
terrorism.....	2, 137, 138
toleration of homosexuals.....	103, 104, 113
Lot vexed his righteous soul	135
worthy of death, Romans 1:32.....	103, 104
Vow to God.....	12, 20
wife cannot testify against husband.....	37, 82
worship	25, 113
Zablocki v. Redhail.....	43, 68, 94, 114

Traditional Marriage was once a lifetime commitment that cannot be put asunder, in a nation where divorce courts did not exist.

If you are considering the traditional prenuptial agreement – to work out your problems just the way God intended, in a marriage that cannot be divorced – find out how.

If your church solemnizes marriages that can be divorced, then for God's sake, find out what marriage is.

This book should be in the hands of

- ✓ every innocent spouse who has just been served divorce papers
- ✓ engaged couples **before** they apply for a marriage license
- ✓ Christian counselors
- ✓ everyone who conducts wedding ceremonies
- ✓ paralegals who need to refute divorce lawyers or activist judges
- ✓ activists opposed to gay marriage
- ✓ legislators and lawyers who do not yet realize what marriage is
- ✓ anyone who questions how court ordered kidnappings could be legal

The moral codes discussed in this book apply only to Christians who were, or will be, married in a church ceremony. It is not suitable for others. References are to U.S. laws.

- Warning: This book presents traditional family values. If you believe that centuries-old moral teachings are not relevant in today's society, then this book is not for you.
- Warning: If you want society to remove punishment for criminal perversions, then this book is not for you.
- Warning: The unchanging God of the Bible is not going to change just because your church told you to get a civil marriage license.

Men defend their families, which is why they created government. The purpose of government is to protect families – To secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity. Not to destroy them.

There is no gay "marriage". Homosex has never been legalized. Crimes against the immutable Law of Nature cannot be converted into rights, not even in a democracy. The law-of-the-land still equates licentiousness and debauchery with the destruction of government. The Supreme Court has never found a right to homosex.