

WHAT IS “JUSTICE”?



“Evil men do not understand justice, But those who seek the LORD understand all.”
[Prov. 28:5, Bible, NKJV]

"Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been, and ever will be pursued, until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit."
[[The Federalist No. 51 \(1788\)](#), James Madison]

“The violence of the wicked will destroy them, because they refuse to do justice.”
[Prov. 21:7, Bible, NKJV]

DEDICATION

"Better is a little with righteousness, than vast [government socialist handout, Form #05.040 and Form #05.051] revenues without justice."

[[Prov. 16:8](#), Bible, NKJV]

"Let us choose justice for ourselves; Let us know among ourselves what is good."

[Job 34:4, Bible, NKJV]

"Should one who hates justice govern? Will you condemn Him who is most just?"

[Job 34:17, Bible, NKJV]

"He [God] loves righteousness and justice; The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord."

[Psalm 33:5, Bible, NKJV]

"The mouth of the righteous speaks wisdom, And his tongue talks of justice."

[Psalm 37:30, Bible, NKJV]

"The Lord executes righteousness And justice for all who are oppressed."

[Psalm 103:6, Bible, NKJV]

"Blessed are those who keep justice, And he who does righteousness at all times!"

[Psalm 106:3, Bible, NKJV]

*"My son, if you receive my [God's] words,
And treasure my commands within you,
So that you incline your ear to wisdom,
And apply your heart to understanding;
Yes, if you cry out for discernment,
And lift up your voice for understanding,
If you seek her as silver,
And search for her as for hidden treasures;
Then you will understand the fear of the Lord,
And find the knowledge of God.
For the Lord gives wisdom;
From His mouth come knowledge and understanding;
He stores up sound wisdom for the upright;
He is a shield to those who walk uprightly;
He guards the paths of justice,
And preserves the way of His saints.
Then you will understand righteousness and justice,
Equity [[EQUALITY, Form #05.033](#)] and every good path.
[Proverbs 1:1-9, Bible, NKJV]*

*"To do righteousness and **justice** Is more acceptable to the LORD than sacrifice."*

[Prov. 21:34, Bible, NKJV]

*"It is a joy for the just to do **justice**, But destruction will come to the workers of iniquity."*

What Is "Justice"?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

2 of 102

EXHIBIT: _____

[Prov. 21:15, Bible, NKJV]

*“The king establishes the land by **justice**, But he who receives bribes [socialist handouts] overthrows it.”*

[Prov. 29:4, Bible, NKJV]

*“Many seek the ruler’s favor [[franchises and privileges, Form #05.030](#)], But **justice** for man comes from the LORD.”*

[Prov. 29:26, Bible, NKJV]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES.....	4
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	4
1 Introduction	15
2 Legal Justice	15
2.1 Legal definition of “justice”	15
2.2 Statutory definition of “Justice”	17
2.3 Legal justice can easily be perverted when it is defined as “give every man his due”	21
2.4 What is “law”?	29
2.5 The original founding documents FORBID welfare or “benefits”. There IS not “legal justice” for the poor.....	31
2.6 Socialism results when governments ignore or try to circumvent the founding documents..	35
2.7 PREVENTIVE justice requires consent and voluntary membership, while CORRECTIVE justice does not.....	41
2.8 The Right to Ignore the State (Civilly)	45
3 Social/Political Justice.....	53
3.1 Political definition of “Social Justice”	53
3.2 Aristotle’s Definition of Justice	55
4 Biblical Justice.....	64
4.1 Biblical definition of “justice”: God’s law is the ONLY measure for whether “justice” is in deed and in fact served by any secular judge.....	64
4.2 “Biblical Justice” v. “Social/Political Justice”	67
5 Corruption of the government: Turning “Legal Justice” into “Social Justice”	73
5.1 “Legal justice” v. “Social/Political justice”	73
5.2 “Justice” in your interactions with government	75
5.3 The Criminality and Injustice of Turning Legal Justice into a Statutory Franchise or Privilege	78
5.4 Equality of Opportunity v. Equality of Outcome.....	83
6 What Justice is NOT or what is “injustice”	86
7 Abuses of the term “justice” to accomplish “injustice”	87
8 God’s Biblical Prescription to Restore “Legal Justice”	89
9 Biblical Hope for Justice.....	97
10 Conclusions	98
11 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Legal justice v. Social/Political Justice	73
Table 2 Equality of Opportunity v. Equality of Outcome	83

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

4 of 102

EXHIBIT: _____

1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, or 10th Amendment rights	88
Article 1, Section 8.....	36
Articles of Confederation	99
Bill of Attainder	75
British Magna Carta	78
Declaration of Independence	32, 44, 68, 72, 76, 77, 80, 98, 101
Eleventh Amendment	76
Federalist #41. Saturday, January 19, 1788, James Madison	31
Fifth Amendment	41, 75
Fifth Amendment takings clause	45
Fifth or Thirteenth Amendments	41
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1	84
Magna Carta, ch. 40 (1215).....	25
Thirteenth Amendment.....	41
U.S.A. Constitution	77

Statutes

18 U.S.C. §208	81
26 U.S.C. §3401(c).....	45
28 U.S.C. §144	79
28 U.S.C. §455	79
42 U.S.C. §433(a).....	41
California Civil Code, §§678-680	33, 35, 42
California Civil Code, §655	34, 35, 42
California Civil Code, Section 1427	17
California Civil Code, Section 1428	17
California Civil Code, Section 22.2	17
California Code, Section 1708	17
Civ.Code La. art. 533	33, 43
Civ.Code La. art. 534	33, 43
Code N. Y. § 462.....	20
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97	19
U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)	20, 78
U.C.C. §2-104(1).....	20, 78

Regulations

26 C.F.R. §301.3401(c)-1.....	45
-------------------------------	----

Rules

Federal Rule of Evidence 610	18
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	80

Cases

Arnson v. Murphy, 109 U.S. 238, 3 Sup.Ct. 184, 27 L.Ed. 920.....	23
Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936).....	92
Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326.....	44
Board of County Com'rs of Lemhi County v. Swensen, Idaho, 80 Idaho 198, 327 P.2d. 361, 362	93
Boston & L.R. Corp. v. Salem & L. R. Co., 2 Gray (Mass.), 35	20
Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134.....	44
Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398	28, 32
Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521.....	44

Child Labor Tax Case, 259 U.S. 20, 38 (1922)	32
City of Dallas v Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944	19
Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. 264 at 418	37
Eisendrath v. Knauer, 64 111. 402	20
Electric Co. v. Dow, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088.....	92
Farmers' & Mechanics' National Bank v. Dearing, 91 U.S. 29, 35, 23 L.Ed. 196	23
Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144.....	44
Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n of California, 271 U.S. 583.....	83
Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority, 469 U.S. 528, 572 (Powell, J., dissenting)	76
Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773	44
Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339, 345.....	83
Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527.....	91
Great Northern Ins. Co. v. Read, 322 U.S. 47, 51 (1944)	76
Hamilton v. Rathbone, 175 U.S. 414, 20 Sup.Ct. 155, 44 L.Ed. 219	20
Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47.....	28, 32
Harman v. Forssenius, 380 U.S. 528 at 540, 85 S.Ct. 1177, 1185 (1965).....	83
Heider v. Unicum, 142 Or. 416, 20 P.2d. 384	44
In re Young, 235 B.R. 666 (Bankr.M.D.Fla., 1999).....	19, 27
International News Service v. Associated Press, 248 U.S. 215, 250 (1918) (dissenting opinion)	16
Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164 (1979)	16
Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979)	16
Lawrence v. Hennessey, 165 Mo. 659, 65 S.W. 717.....	20
Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co., 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108.....	92
Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874).....	28, 32, 54, 76
Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419, 433 (1982)	16
Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408	23, 46, 92
Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77	28, 32
McLean v. United States, 226 U.S. 374, 33 Sup.Ct. 122, 57 L.Ed. 260.....	23
Medbury v. United States, 173 U.S. 492, 198, 19 Sup.Ct. 503, 43 L.Ed. 779.....	23
Modern Music Shop v. Concordia Fire Ins. Co. of Milwaukee, 131 Misc. 305, 226 N.Y.S. 630, 635	33, 43
Moulton v. Witherell, 52 Me. 242.....	20
Mulford v. Le Franc, 26 Cal. 102.....	33, 43
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1877)	43, 44, 84, 91
National Tel. News Co. v. Western Union Tel. Co., 119 Fed. 294, 56 C.C.A. 198, 60 L.R.A. 805	20
New England Trust Co. v. Wood, Mass., 93 N.E.2d. 547, 549.....	33, 43
Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663	77
Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n, 483 U.S. 825 (1987)	16
Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104.....	28, 32
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928).....	15
Parish v. MacVeagh, 214 U.S. 124, 29 Sup.Ct. 556, 53 L.Ed. 936.....	23
Phelps v. People, 72 N.Y. 357.....	20
Pierce v. Somerset Ry., 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316.....	92
Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 157 U.S. 429 (Supreme Court 1895).....	25, 94
Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 157 U.S. 429, 158 U.S. 601 (1895).....	94
Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69.....	28, 32
Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton Railroad Co., 295 U.S. 330	38
Sacramento Orphanage & Children's Home v. Chambers, 25 Cal.App. 536, 144 P. 317, 319	45
Scranton v. Wheeler, 179 D.S. 141, 21 Sup.Ct. 48, 45 L.Ed. 126.....	20
Smith v. Allwright, 321 US. 649, 644.....	83
St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351	91
Stanton v. Lewis, 26 Conn. 449	20
State v. Grosnickle, 189 Wis. 17, 206 N.W. 895, 896.....	45
State v. Shedoudy, 45 N.M. 516, 118 P.2d. 280, 287.....	42
Steward Machine Co. v. Davis, 310 U.S. 548 (1937)	92
Steward Machine Co. v. Davis, 310 U.S. 548, 606 (1937).....	92
Stief v. Hart, 1 N.Y. 24.....	20
Trustees of Phillips Exeter Academy v. Exeter, 92 N.H. 473, 33 A.2d. 665, 673.....	33, 35, 42

U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)	28, 32
U.S. v. Kuhn, D.C.N.Y., 49 F.Supp. 407, 414	39
United States v. Lutz, 295 F.2d. 736, 740 (CA5 1961)	16
United States v. Pueblo of San Ildefonso, 206 Ct.Cl. 649, 669-670, 513 F.2d. 1383, 1394 (1975)	16
United States v. Winstar Corp. 518 U.S. 839 (1996)	19
Utah Farm Bureau Ins. Co. v. Utah Ins. Guaranty Ass'n, Utah, 564 P.2d. 751, 754	93
Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229	91
Wilson v. Ward Lumber Co. (C. C.) 67 Fed. 674.....	20

Other Authorities

"'Positive' Retributivism and the Meaning of Desert". Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved June 2, 2014	70
"Social Justice in an Open World: The Role of the United Nations", The International Forum for Social Development, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS, Division for Social Policy and Development, ST/ESA/305" (PDF). New York: United Nations. 2006. p. 16	53
"The Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine" of the U.S. Supreme Court.....	83
1 Bl.Comm. 138	20
1 Hamilton's Works, ed. 1885, 270	25, 93
2 BL Comm. 389	20
2 Bl.Comm. 2, 15	20
2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327	41
3 Barn. & Adolph. 318, note	21
44 Cong.Rec. 4420.....	82
6 Adolph. & El 11. 469	21
6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584	23, 46, 92
9 Barn. & Cr. 586.....	21
A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31	23, 46, 92
A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Book of Psalms, 1906, 1, p. lxxxvii.....	65
Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, Form #02.001	21
America's Socialist Origins, Prager University	32
American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999).....	44
Are You Obstructing Justice?, Nike Insights, 6/15/2019	87
Aristotle.....	70
Aristotle's Conception of Justice, Anton-Hermann Chroust, David L. Osborn, Notre Dame Law Review, Volume 17, Issue 2, Article 2.....	102
Aust. Jur. (Campbell's Ed.) § 1103	20
Authorities on why we must PERSONALLY learn, follow, and enforce man's law and God's law	86
Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 1095	54
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1112	42
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1359	45
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693	77, 98
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1713	33, 43
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 1359-1360	45
Black's Law Dictionary, Second Edition, p. 955	20
Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 1021	33, 42
Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 668	24, 81
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1106.....	34, 35, 42
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 864.....	22
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 960.....	42
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1397-1398	93
Bouvier's Law Dictionary	24
Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1856)	22
Bouvier's Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2131	55
Bouvier's Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2147	55
Bouvier's Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2159.....	55

Bouvier's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 1848	21
Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856.....	26, 41, 77
Charles V. Darnell, DhSc.	96
Civil Disobedience, Henry David Thoreau	46
Commandments About Relationship of Believers to the World	86
Communism, Socialism, Collectivism Page, Section 10: Welfare State, Family Guardian Fellowship	92
Communist Manifesto, Karl Marx	68
Cooley, Const. Lim., 479	76
Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024	100
Corruption, Scams, and Frauds, Family Guardian Fellowship	73
Damer, T. Edward (2009), Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-free Arguments (6th ed.), Wadsworth, p. 121, ISBN 978-0-495-09506-4.....	34
Damer, T. Edward (2009), Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-free Arguments (6th ed.), Wadsworth, p. 123, ISBN 978-0-495-09506-4.....	34
De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043	19, 100
De Legibus, (106 BC)	70
Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007	95
Devil's Advocate: Lawyers-What We Are Up Against, SEDM	28
Doing Justice and Mercy, Pastor Tim Keller	102
Easton's Bible Dictionary, 1996.....	22
Edward I	24
Famous Quotes About Rights and Liberty, Form #08.001	97
Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.018, Section 3	26
Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.).....	40
Fischer, D. H. (June 1970), Historians' fallacies: toward a logic of historical thought, Harper torchbooks (first ed.), New York: HarperCollins, p. 274, ISBN 978-0-06-131545-9, OCLC 185446787.....	34
Fonb. Eq. B; 1, c. 2, s. 1	20
Form #05.002	80
Form #05.003	86
Form #05.006	95
Form #05.010	80
Form #05.014	68
Form #05.016, Section 5.4	69
Form #05.018, Section 3	79
Form #05.020, Section 5.1	100
Form #05.022	80
Form #05.030	3, 68, 86, 95
Form #05.033	75, 78, 94
Form #05.037	80
Form #05.040	2
Form #05.042	40
Form #05.045	78
Form #05.046	75
Form #05.048	86, 94
Form #05.050	86, 94, 95
Form #05.050, Section 13	95
Form #05.051	2
Form #09.073	95
Form #10.002	94
Form #11.302	86, 95
Form #11.407	69
Form #12.014	21
Form #12.025	76, 86, 95
Form #12.040	95
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction.....	28, 74
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 2: Freedom, Sovereignty, and Justice	102
Founding Fathers.....	31, 99

Frederic Bastiat (b. 1801 - d. 1850), The Law	19
Generous Justice, Tim Keller	68
Gerald Allan Brown, Ed.D.	96
Government Corruption, Form #11.401	73
Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course, Form #12.026	73
Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012	73
Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046	47, 95, 101
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030.....	19, 24, 48, 72, 73, 78, 87, 94, 99, 101
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 28.2: Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine	83
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302.....	68
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 4.4.12 and 6.11.1	78
Grot. de Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. 2, c. 11, s. 6.....	20
Hegel's Philosophy of Right.....	70
Henry David Thoreau.....	46
Herbert Spencer.....	46
How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	73
How to Leave the Government Farm, Form #12.020.....	44, 85
Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027	21
INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN, I, I, sees. 1, 3.....	22
James Madison, The Federalist No. 51 (1788).....	15
James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod Fishery Bill, granting Bounties	31, 92, 100
John Locke's Second Treatise of Government Chapter 15	39
John Murray, Redemption, Accomplished and Applied, 1955, p. 155.....	66
John Stewart Mill, On Liberty, p. 223.....	17
Justice and Compassion in Biblical Law, Richard Hiers, Scribd	102
Kant, Immanuel. Science of Right	70
Kant's Science of Right	70
Law and Government Page, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	102
Law and Government Page, Section 14, Family Guardian Fellowship	83
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001	102
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014	24, 72, 101
Lysander Spooner.....	48
Mackeld. Rom. Law, § 265	20
Mackeld. Rom. Law, §307	33, 43
Magna Carta, National Archives	78
Michael Medved.....	71
Michael Sandel Course on Justice, Harvard University	102
Nichomachean Ethics, Aristotle	102
Nichomachean Ethics, Book V, Aristotle.....	55
Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020	47, 81, 101
Nozick, Robert (1981). Philosophical Explanations. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 366–368. ISBN 9780674664791	70
O'Reilly Factor, April 8, 2015, John Piper of the Oklahoma Wesleyan University	23
O'Neill, Ben (2011-03-16) The Injustice of Social Justice, Mises Institute	74
Open Bible, Search Page: "Social Justice".....	55
Origins and Authority of the Internal Revenue Service, Form #05.005	16
Pard. Dr. Com. part 2, tit. 1, n. 1, 38 to 178	20
Path to Freedom, Form #09.015	94
PAULSEN, ETHICS (Thilly's translation), chap. 9	15, 21
Petition for Admission to Practice, Family Guardian Fellowship	79
Policy Document: Members Who Reenter the Franchise System, Form #08.017.....	102
President Cleveland's June 21, 1886 veto of military pensions.....	37
President Franklin Pierce in 1854.....	36
President Grover Cleveland.....	36
President James Madison	36
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017	19, 70, 81, 82
Proof That There Is a "Straw Man", Form #05.042	24

Published Authors: Lysander Spooner, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	48
Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki (Rashi).....	72
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 1	22
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 2	15, 22
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 4	24
Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 3	75
Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 9.10.4: Justice in the context of franchises and your right to contract	78
Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002	41, 102
Restatement 2d, Contracts §174	44
Rick Shenkman. "When Did Social Security Become the Third Rail of American Politics?". George Mason University. Retrieved 21 October 2014.....	79
Robert E. Schaefer.....	97
Robert F. Huntsman	97
Roger Stone, Boston Herald, 1/26/2019	87
Rules of Statutory Construction and Interpretation	24
Schadenfreude, sadism	70
SEDM.....	96
SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.3	46
SEDM Exhibit 11.006	24
SEDM Forum 9.4: Errata reports	89
SEDM Member Forum 9.4.....	21
SEDM Website, Opening Page	87, 95
Selected Works of Herbert Spencer, Constitution Society	46
Senate Document #43, Senate Resolution No. 62, p. 9, paragraph 2, 1933	82
Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025	44, 84, 101
Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is, Heritage Foundation	102
Social Security: Mark of the Beast, Form #11.407	41, 102
Social Security: Mark of the Beast, Form #11.407, Section 4.3.....	31
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016.....	81, 85, 86, 92, 100
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016, Section 11.1.1: "Social Justice" as the justification for the transformation	102
Sovereignty and Freedom Page, Section 7.4: Justice, Family Guardian Website	101
Sovereignty and Freedom Points and Authorities, Litigation Tool #10.018, Preface	89
Sovereignty for Police Officers Course, Form #12.022	80
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by topic: "justice".....	102
Story on Ag. Sec. 91.....	21
Story on Eq. Jur. Sec. 385 to 390	21
Story, Ag. B 346.....	42
Sun Tzu, The Art of War.....	89
Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201	21
The Australian Achievement: From Bondage To Freedom, Dr Mark Cooray	71
The Australian Achievement: From Bondage To Freedom, LJM Cooray, 1996	71
The Federalist No. 51 (1788), James Madison	1
The Fundamental Nature of the Federal Income Tax, Form #05.035	96
The Government "Benefits" Scam, Form #05.040.....	73
The Hope for Justice, Nike Insights	97
The Law, Form #11.403	102
The Law, Frederic Bastiat	31, 53, 100
The Law, Frederic Bastiat, 1850	35, 69
The Legal Basis for the Term "Nonresident Alien", Form #05.036.....	96
The Man Versus The State, Herbert Spencer	46
The Moral Roots of Liberals and Conservatives, Jonathan Haidt, TED	74
The New Bible Dictionary, Third Edition	66
The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10.....	23, 46
The Right to Ignore the State, Herbert Spencer.....	46
The Theology of the Old Testament, 1925, p. 143	66
The Truth About Equality: Outcome vs. Opportunity, Stefan Molyneux	85, 102

Theo. Laetsch, Biblical Commentary, Jeremiah, 1952, pp. 191–192, 254	66
This Evil Social Justice Mindset Threatens All, Jordan Peterson	102
Thomas Jefferson on Politics and Government, Section 30: The Justice System	102
Thomas Jefferson to Charles Hammond, 1821. ME 15:331	27
Thomas Jefferson to Charles Hammond, 1821. ME 15:332	27
Thomas Jefferson to Gideon Granger, 1800. ME 10:168	27
Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Ritchie, 1820. ME 15:297	27
Thomas Jefferson: 1st Inaugural, 1801. ME 3:320	16
Thomas Jefferson: Autobiography, 1821. ME 1:121	27
Thomas Jefferson: Opinion on National Bank, 1791. ME 3:148	32
Tim Keller	68
Unalienable Rights Course, Form #12.038	19
USLegal.com: Points and Authorities	89
W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949)	24, 81
Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1118	85
Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1361	77, 83
Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 259	53, 85
Wester Theories of Justice, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy	102
What Happened to Justice?, Form #06.012	102
What is "law"?, Form #05.048	31, 72, 101, 102
What is Social Justice?, Prager University	74, 102
Which Side is God On?, Michael Medved	71, 72
Why All Man-Made Law is Religious in Nature, Family Guardian Fellowship	48
Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002	47
Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 8	79
Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037	24
Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Family Guardian Fellowship	97
Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006	80
Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001	41, 102
Wikipedia: "Third rail of politics", Downloaded 6/6/2018	79
Wikipedia: Dulocracy, Downloaded 9/28/17	99
Wikipedia: Equivocation, Downloaded 9/15/2015	34
Wikipedia: Retributive justice; Downloaded 5/21/18	70
Wikipedia: Social Justice	68
Wikipedia: Social Justice; Downloaded 8/21/2014	75
William Blackstone, Commentaries (1765)	19
William Safire (8 February 2007). "On Language: Third Rail". The New York Times. Retrieved 21 October 2014	79
Wisdom, Philosophy, and Morality Page, Section 3: Ethics and Morality, Family Guardian Fellowship	101
Wolff, Ins. Nat. part 1, SSSS 27-30	20
Your Exclusive Right to Declare and Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008	47, 101

Scriptures

1 Cor. 1:30	66
1 Jn. 1:9	66
1 Peter 3:12	98
1 Sam 8:4-20	82
1 Sam. 8:4-20	26, 54
1 Thes. 2:10	65
2 Peter 2:9	98
2 Sa. 15:4	64, 65
2 Sa. 8:15	64, 65
2ND Thessalonians 3:6-14	37
Acts 10:22	65
Acts 28:4	65
Acts 3:14	65

Acts 8:18-24.....	90
Col. 2:8.....	47
Col. 4:1.....	65
Daniel 4:35.....	99
Deut. 10:15.....	82
Deut. 15:6.....	93
Deut. 28:12.....	93
Deut. 28:43-51.....	91
Deut. 28:47-51.....	68
Deuteronomy 10:18; 24:17; 27:19.....	68
Deuteronomy 32:4.....	68
Dt. 16:18, 20.....	65
Dt. 25:15.....	65
Dt. 32:22.....	65
Dt. 33:21.....	65
Dt. 9:5.....	65
Ec. 7:15; 8:14.....	65
Eccl. 10:5-7.....	90
Ecclesiastes 7:7.....	26
Eph. 6:11-20.....	86
Ephesians 6:12.....	35
Ex. 9:27.....	65
Exodus 20.....	69, 99
Ezk. 18:9.....	65
Form #05.033.....	2, 78
Genesis 3:19.....	37
Gn. 15:6.....	66
Gn. 18:19.....	64, 65
Gn. 30:33.....	65
Gn. 6:9.....	65
Hab. 1:13.....	65
Hab. 2:4.....	66
Heb. 12:29.....	65
Heb. 4:12.....	86
Heb. 4:15.....	66
Is. 1:17.....	66
Is. 26:7.....	65
Is. 45:19.....	65
Is. 45:21.....	66
Is. 45:24.....	66
Is. 45:8; 46:13.....	66
Is. 54:17.....	66
Is. 58:2-3.....	65
Is. 59:14.....	65
Is. 9:7.....	65
Isaiah 1:24.....	98
Isaiah 33:22.....	48
Isaiah 40:15.....	99
Isaiah 40:17.....	100
Isaiah 40:23.....	100
Isaiah 41:29.....	100
James 1:27.....	69
Jb. 12:4.....	65
Jb. 36:17.....	64
Jb. 7:21; 13:26.....	65
Jb. 9:2.....	65
Jdg. 5:11.....	65

Je. 23:6; 33:16	66
Je. 31:23; 50:7	66
Jeremiah 17:17-18	98
Jesus' Olivet Discourse	69
Jn. 15:13	66
Job 34:17	2
Job 34:4	2
Joel 2:18	65
Judges 2:1-4	28, 93
Lev. 25:35-43	44
Leviticus 19:15	71
Lk. 2:25	65
Lk. 23:41	65
Luke 16:13	46
Lv. 19:36	65
Matt. 20:25-28	95
Matt. 23:23	25
Matt. 25:31-36	99
Matt. 25:31-46	68
Matt. 25:44-46	69
Matt. 5:37	28
Matthew 22:39	69
Matthew 25:40	69
Mi. 6:8	65
Mk. 6:20	65
Mt. 1:19	66
Mt. 27:19	65
Mt. 5:20	66
Mt. 5:48	65
Ne. 9:33	65
Pharaoh	27
Phil. 3:9	66
Pr. 1:3	65
Pr. 18:17	65
Pr. 3:33	65
Prov. 15:27	25
Prov. 16:8	2
Prov. 21:15	3
Prov. 21:34	2
Prov. 21:7	1
Prov. 22:7	43, 91
Prov. 28:5	1
Prov. 28:9	47
Prov. 29:26	3
Prov. 29:4	3
Prov. 3:30	16, 17
Proverbs 1:10-19	29
Proverbs 1:1-9	2
Proverbs 11:15	40
Proverbs 17:18	40
Proverbs 22:26	40
Proverbs 6:1-11	40
Ps. 112:9	66
Ps. 119:121	65
Ps. 23:3	65
Ps. 36:6	65
Ps. 51:14	65

Ps. 51:5	65
Ps. 7:8-9	65
Ps. 82:3	64, 65
Ps. 89:14	65
Ps. 89:16	66
Ps. 94:15	65
Psalms 103:6	2
Psalms 106:3	2
Psalms 109:8, 28	98
Psalms 145:20	98
Psalms 2:1-12	67
Psalms 21:8-9	97
Psalms 27:13-14	97
Psalms 33:10	97
Psalms 33:1-2	97
Psalms 33:5	2
Psalms 36:11-12	97
Psalms 37:30	2
Psalms 46:10	97
Psalms 76:10	98
Psalms 82	83
Psalms 82 (Amplified Bible)	83
Psalms 82:1-8	67
Psalms 82:8	99
Psalms 91	86
Psalms 91:1	97
Psalms 94:20-23	82
Psalms 94:22-23	98
Psalms 97:1, 3	98
Pss. 31:1; 103:17; 143:1	65
Rev. 1:16	86
Rev. 15:3	65
Revelation 18:13	41
Rom. 1:17	66
Rom. 2:13	65
Rom. 3:26	66
Rom. 3:8	65
Romans 13:8	28
Samuel	26
Ten Commandments	69, 70, 99
Zc. 9:9	65
Zp. 1:12	65
Zp. 3:5	65

1 Introduction

A very important subject that comes up all the time in the freedom community and especially in the context of litigation is the subject of “justice”. This term is widely misunderstood and quite subjective for most people.

Almost universally, everyone says they want “justice” but even among those who want it, there is no agreement on what it means.

Among the left, they want “social justice” and equate it with redistribution of wealth and villainizing the producers. Among the right and conservatives, they want legal justice and/or biblical justice. These two approaches are completely incompatible. If we can’t agree on a common definition, then we predict that revolution and anarchy will eventually result sooner rather than later. Therefore, this subject is of EXTREME importance and EVERYONE should study it. It ought to be taught in grammar school.

Without a convergence and common agreement throughout society on precisely what it means, true “justice” can NEVER realistically be achieved. We must agree upon a definition in order to know EXACTLY what we are fighting for in the context of this ministry. That is the purpose of this memorandum of law.

2 Legal Justice

2.1 Legal definition of “justice”

The essence of the meaning of “justice” in fact, is the right to be “left alone”:

PAULSEN, *ETHICS* (Thilly's translation), chap. 9.

“Justice, as a moral habit, is that tendency of the will and mode of conduct which refrains from disturbing the lives and interests of others, and, as far as possible, hinders such interference on the part of others. This virtue springs from the individual's respect for his fellows as ends in themselves and as his co equals. The different spheres of interests may be roughly classified as follows: body and life; the family, or the extended individual life; property, or the totality of the instruments of action; honor, or the ideal existence; and finally freedom, or the possibility of fashioning one's life as an end in itself. The law defends these different spheres, thus giving rise to a corresponding number of spheres of rights, each being protected by a prohibition. . . . To violate the rights, to interfere with the interests of others, is injustice. All injustice is ultimately directed against the life of the neighbor; it is an open avowal that the latter is not an end in itself, having the same value as the individual's own life. The general formula of the duty of justice may therefore be stated as follows: Do no wrong yourself, and permit no wrong to be done, so far as lies in your power; or, expressed positively: Respect and protect the right.”

[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 2]

The U.S. Supreme Court stated the above slightly differently:

“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.”

[Olmstead v. United States, [277 U.S. 438, 478](#) (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, [494 U.S. 210](#) (1990)]

So in the context of “government” as legally defined, the FIRST duty of government is to LEAVE YOU ALONE, and to ONLY enforce that which you have specifically asked for and consented to in a civil context. If they won’t do that, then you shouldn’t be hiring them to protect your right to be left alone by anyone ELSE through paying them “taxes”.

“Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been, and ever will be pursued, until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit.”

[James Madison, *The Federalist* No. 51 (1788)]

The Bible also states the foundation of justice by saying:

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

1 "Do not strive with [or try to regulate or control or enslave] a man without cause, if he has done you no
2 harm."
3 [Prov. 3:30, Bible, NKJV]

4 And finally, Thomas Jefferson agreed with the above by defining "justice" as follows in his First Inaugural Address:

5 "With all [our] blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing
6 more, fellow citizens--a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another,
7 shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not
8 take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is
9 necessary to close the circle of our felicities."
10 [Thomas Jefferson: 1st Inaugural, 1801. ME 3:320]

11 Therefore, the word "injustice" means interference with the equal rights of others absent their consent and which constitutes
12 an injury NOT as any law defines it, but as the PERSON who is injured defines it. Under this conception of "justice",
13 anything done with your consent cannot be classified as "injustice" or an injury.

14 The most obvious form of injustice is a criminal mafia that will continue to disturb and threaten you until you pay them
15 "protection money" in order to essentially procure the PRIVILEGE to be left alone. This is the model upon which the IRS
16 operates: They continue to harass, lien, and levy you administratively, even if you are NOT a statutory "taxpayer" and
17 instead are a non-resident non-person, unless and until you essentially pay them "protection money". Materials on our site
18 prove extensively that a criminal mafia is EXACTLY what the IRS is, including the following memorandum of law:

Origins and Authority of the Internal Revenue Service, Form #05.005
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

19 The concept of justice explains why a policeman must have "probable cause" in order to detain, arrest, or interrogate you.
20 The presumption is that you have a right to be left alone and the policemen must not disturb your peace unless they have a
21 reasonable cause to do so that is or can be demonstrated with court-admissible evidence.

22 The concept of justice originates from the legal definition of property. The essence and foundation of the "property right",
23 as held by the U.S. Supreme Court, is the right to EXCLUDE ANYONE AND EVERYONE else, from using, controlling,
24 or benefitting from the use of YOUR property:

25 "We have repeatedly held that, as to property reserved by its owner for private use, 'the right to exclude
26 [others is] 'one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are commonly characterized as
27 property.'" Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419, 433 (1982), quoting Kaiser
28 Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979). "
29 [Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n, 483 U.S. 825 (1987)]

30
31 "In this case, we hold that the 'right to exclude,' so universally held to be a fundamental element of the
32 property right,^[11] falls within this category of interests that the Government cannot take without
33 compensation."
34 [Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164 (1979)]

35 [11] See, e. g., United States v. Pueblo of San Ildefonso, 206 Ct.Cl. 649, 669-670, 513 F.2d. 1383, 1394 (1975);
36 United States v. Lutz, 295 F.2d. 736, 740 (CA5 1961). As stated by Mr. Justice Brandeis, "[a]n essential
37 element of individual property is the legal right to exclude others from enjoying it." International News Service
38 v. Associated Press, 248 U.S. 215, 250 (1918) (dissenting opinion).

39 The right to exclude that is the essence of the right to PRIVATE property extends not only to other people or businesses,
40 but to ANY and EVERY government, because under the concept of equal protection and equal treatment, all "persons",
41 including artificial "persons" such as government corporations, are EQUAL. The result of exercising your right to exclude
42 the government is that they HAVE to LEAVE THE PROPERTY ALONE, and NOT try to steal it or deceive you into
43 donating it to them. The only lawful basis for interfering with the use or ownership of any kind of property is when the
44 property is abused to INJURE the equal rights of your sovereign neighbor, and that interference can come only AFTER the
45 injury is inflicted, and not before.

46 "The sole end, for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively... in interfering with the liberty of
47 action of any of their number, is self-protection."

[John Stewart Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 223]

“Do not strive with [or try to regulate or control or enslave] a man without cause, if he has done you no harm.”
[Prov. 3:30, Bible, NKJV]

Every remedy provided by a lawful de jure government for the protection of private rights, therefore BEGINS with demonstrating a quantifiable PAST and not FUTURE injury to a specific, enumerated natural or constitutional right. That remedy can only be imposed absent our consent when the following two conditions are met:

1. Someone’s else’s equal rights have been injured. . . AND
2. A specific injury has resulted from that violation under the common law.
 - 2.1. If the remedy is a civil statutory remedy, we must have a domicile within the jurisdiction of the court administering the remedy before it can be invoked.
 - 2.2. If the remedy is a civil common law remedy, no domicile is necessary to invoke it in court.
 - 2.3. If the remedy is a criminal remedy, the violation occurred on territory protected by the sovereign. Otherwise the act of criminal enforcement against nonresident parties amounts essentially to international terrorism.

Fulfillment of the above requirements in a court of law is why those serving as “judges” are referred to as “justices”.

“Leaving people alone” and “not injuring them” are therefore equivalent. The biblical definition of “love” also fills this requirement not to harm others and thereby to ensure that you “leave them alone”.

For the commandments, “You shall not commit adultery,” “You shall not murder,” “You shall not steal,” “You shall not bear false witness,” “You shall not covet,” and if there is any other commandment, are all summed up in this saying, namely, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.”

Love does no harm to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.
[Romans 13:9-10, Bible, NKJV]

In order to sue someone in court for an injury to your private rights under the common law, you must be able to demonstrate an injury. This is called “standing”. You don’t have the right or the jurisdiction to interfere with others and drag them into court until THEY have injured you and thereby disturbed your right to be left alone. That’s what the Readings on the History and System of Common Law book above implies.

2.2 Statutory definition of “Justice”

The legal definition of “justice” can be easily discerned by examining HOW “obligations” are created in the civil statutes of your state. A statutory enforcement action, either administrative or judicial, is one in which statutes are used to enforce GOVERNMENT ALLEGED but usually not ACTUAL “obligations” or “duties” upon a non-consenting party. Enforcement actions would be unnecessary if the party was consenting. “operation of law” is the term used in statutes to describe obligations where the party who is the subject of the enforcement is non-consenting.

The California Civil Code, Section 1427 defines what an obligation or duty is:

*California Civil Code - CIV
DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS [1427 - 3272.9]
(Heading of Division 3 amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 160, Sec. 14.)
PART 1. OBLIGATIONS IN GENERAL [1427 - 1543] (Part 1 enacted 1872.)
TITLE 1. DEFINITION OF OBLIGATIONS [1427 - [1428.]] (Title 1 enacted 1872.)*

1427. *An obligation is a legal duty, by which a person is bound to do or not to do a certain thing.*

(Enacted 1872.)

The California Civil Code then describes how obligations may lawfully be created. Section **22.2** of the California Civil Code (“CCC”) shows that the **common law** shall be the rule of decision in all the courts of this State. CCC section **1428** establishes that obligations are legal duties arising either from contract of the parties, or the operation of law (nothing else). CCC section **1708** states that the obligations imposed by operation of law are only to abstain from injuring the person or property of another, or infringing upon any of his or her rights.

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

17 of 102

EXHIBIT: _____

California Civil Code - CIV
DEFINITIONS AND SOURCES OF LAW
(Heading added by Stats. 1951, Ch. 655, in conjunction with Sections 22, 22.1, and 22.2)

22.2. The common law of England, so far as it is not repugnant to or inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, or the Constitution or laws of this State, is the rule of decision in all the courts of this State. (Added by Stats. 1951, Ch. 655.)

California Civil Code – CIV
DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS [1427 - 3272.9]
(Heading of Division 3 amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 160, Sec. 14.)
PART 1. OBLIGATIONS IN GENERAL [1427 - 1543] (Part 1 enacted 1872.)
TITLE 1. DEFINITION OF OBLIGATIONS [1427 - [1428.]] (Title 1 enacted 1872.)

[1428.] Section Fourteen Hundred and Twenty-eight. An obligation arises either from:

One — The contract of the parties; or,

Two — The operation of law. An obligation arising from operation of law may be enforced in the manner provided by law, or by civil action or proceeding.

(Amended by Code Amendments 1873-74, Ch. 612.)

California Civil Code – CIV
DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS [1427 - 3272.9]
(Heading of Division 3 amended by Stats. 1988, Ch. 160, Sec. 14.)
PART 3. OBLIGATIONS IMPOSED BY LAW [1708 - 1725]
(Part 3 enacted 1872.)

1708. Every person is bound, without contract, to abstain from injuring the person or property of another, or infringing upon any of his or her rights.

(Amended by Stats. 2002, Ch. 664, Sec. 38.5. Effective January 1, 2003.)

The phrase “operation of law” uses the word “law” and therefore implies REAL law. REAL law in turn consists of ONLY the criminal law, the common law, and the Constitution, as we prove in this document.

Based on the above provisions of the California Civil Code, when anyone from the government seeks to either administratively or judicially enforce a “duty” or “obligation”, such as in tax correspondence, they have the burden of proof to demonstrate.

1. That you expressly consented to a contract with them. This would include:

- 1.1. Written agreements.
- 1.2. Trusts.
- 1.3. Statutory franchises.

This class of obligations is what we call “private law” or “special law” throughout this document. It is NOT “law” in a classical sense.

2. That “operation of law” is involved. In other words, that:

- 2.1. You injured a specific, identified flesh and blood person and
 - 2.2. The injured party has standing to sue in a civil or common law action.
 - 2.3. The party against whom the enforcement action is imposed DOES NOT consent.
- THIS is what we refer to as “PUBLIC law” or “law” in this document.

They must meet the above burden of proof with legally admissible evidence and may not satisfy that burden with either a belief or a presumption. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 610, neither beliefs or opinions constitute legally admissible evidence. Likewise, a presumption is not legally admissible evidence for the same reason. We cover why presumptions are not evidence in:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

In practice, they NEVER can meet the above burden of proof, and consequently, you will always win when they send you a tax collection notice if you know what you are doing and have read this document! That is PRECISELY why we claim and can prove that the present government is DE FACTO rather than DE JURE, as described in:

De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The first option above, contracts, is described in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Any enforcement action that does NOT satisfy the burden of proof or proceeds upon PRESUMPTION in satisfying the above is, by definition:

1. An “injustice”, because it violates your right to be left alone.
2. A violation of due process of law because it is NOT proceeding with evidence. PRESUMPTIONS are NOT “evidence” or a substitute for evidence. See:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. A purely private commercial transaction. As such, if the Plaintiff or the enforcer claim to be a “government”, they:
 - 3.1. Are subject to the Clearfield Doctrine. See [United States v. Winstar Corp. 518 U.S. 839 \(1996\)](#).
 - 3.2. Are “purposefully availing themselves” of commerce in an otherwise legislatively but not constitutionally foreign jurisdiction. Hence they waive sovereign, official, and judicial immunity.
 - 3.3. Waive sovereign, official, and judicial immunity under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/28/part-IV/chapter-97>
4. A non-governmental function. REAL government PROTECTS absolutely owned private property rather than making a business or “trade or business” out of converting it to PUBLIC property or property CONTROLLED by the public.

"For the principal aim of society is to protect individuals in the enjoyment of those absolute rights, which were vested in them by the immutable laws of nature; but which could not be preserved in peace without the mutual assistance and intercourse, which is gained by the institution of friendly and social communities. Hence it follows, that the first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals."

"By the absolute rights of individuals we mean those which are so in their primary and strictest sense; such as would belong to their persons merely in a state of nature, and which every man is entitled to enjoy whether out of society or in it." - Ibid.
[William Blackstone, Commentaries (1765)]

"Under basic rules of construction, statutory laws enacted by legislative bodies cannot impair rights given under a constitution. 194 B.R. at 925. "
[In re Young, 235 B.R. 666 (Bankr.M.D.Fla., 1999)]

"The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government."
[City of Dallas v Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944]

"Life, faculties, production— in other words individuality, liberty, property— that is man. And in spite of the cunning of artful political leaders, these three gifts from God precede all human legislation, and are superior to it."
[Frederic Bastiat (b. 1801 - d. 1850), The Law; <http://famguardian.org/Publications/TheLaw/TheLaw.htm>]

[More at: Unalienable Rights Course, Form #12.038; <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/UnalienableRights.pdf>]

5. A request by the Plaintiff and the GOVERNMENT court or administrative enforcer to procure absolutely owned private party.
- 5.1. That property is, at minimum, the “services” needed to respond to the ILLEGAL and even UNCONSTITUTIONAL enforcement action.
- 5.2. The property might also include any and all property or services that might be awarded as a consequence of the enforcement proceeding.
6. An attempt to make you into a Merchant under U.C.C. §2-104(1) who is SELLING absolutely owned private property to the Plaintiff or GOVERNMENT administrative enforcer.
7. A request or OFFER by the Plaintiff or GOVERNMENT administrative enforcer to become a Buyer under U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a) of your absolutely owned private property.
8. A request for you to specify any and all CONDITIONS you want to attach to the use, custody, or control of your absolutely owned private property.
- 8.1. As the absolute owner, you have a PRIVATE and CONSTITUTIONAL right to dictate any and ALL conditions you wish to attach to the use of your property.

“PROPERTY. Rightful dominion over external objects; ownership; the *unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing; the right to dispose of the substance of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it and to exclude every one else from interfering with it. Mackeld. Rom. Law, § 265.*

Property is the highest right a man can have to anything; being used for that right which one has to lands or tenements, goods or chattels, which no way depends on another man's courtesy. Jackson ex dem. Pearson v. Housel, 17 Johns. 281, 283.

A right imparting to the owner a power of indefinite user, capable of being transmitted to universal successors by way of descent, and imparting to the owner the power of disposition, from himself and his successors per universitatem, and from all other persons who have a spes successions under any existing concession or disposition, in favor of such person or series of persons as he may choose, with the like capacities and powers as he had himself, and under such conditions as the municipal or particular law allows to be annexed to the dispositions of private persons. Aust. Jur. (Campbell's Ed.) § 1103.

The right of property is that sole and despotic dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe. It consists in the free use, enjoyment and disposal of all a person's acquisitions, without any control or diminution save only by the laws of the land. 1 Bl.Comm. 138; 2 Bl.Comm. 2, 15.

The word is also commonly used to denote any external object over which, the right of property is exercised. In this sense it is a very wide term, and includes every class of acquisitions which a man can own or have an interest in. See Scranton v. Wheeler, 179 D.S. 141, 21 Sup.Ct. 48, 45 L.Ed. 126; Lawrence v. Hennessey, 165 Mo. 659, 65 S.W. 717; Boston & L.R. Corp. v. Salem & L. R. Co., 2 Gray (Mass.), 35; National Tel. News Co. v. Western Union Tel. Co., 119 Fed. 294, 56 C.C.A. 198, 60 L.R.A. 805; Hamilton v. Rathbone, 175 U.S. 414, 20 Sup.Ct. 155, 44 L.Ed. 219; Stanton v. Lewis, 26 Conn. 449; Wilson v. Ward Lumber Co. (C. C.) 67 Fed. 674.

—Absolute property. In respect to chattels personal property is said to be “absolute” where a man has, solely and exclusively, the right and also the occupation of any movable chattels, so permanent, but may at some times subsist and not at other times; such for example, as the property a man may have in wild animals which he has caught and keeps, and which are his only so long as he retains possession of them. 2 BL Comm. 389.—Real property. A general term for lands, tenements, and hereditaments; property which, on the death of the owner intestate, passes to his heir. Real property is either corporeal or incorporeal. See Code N. Y. § 462 — Separate property. The separate property of a married woman is that which she owns in her own right, which is liable only for her own debts, and which she can encumber and dispose of at her own will.—Special property. Property of a qualified, temporary, or limited nature; as distinguished from absolute, general, or unconditional property. Such is the property of a bailee in the article bailed, of a sheriff in goods temporarily in his hands under a levy, of the finder of lost goods while looking for the owner, of a person in wild animals which he has caught. Stief v. Hart, 1 N.Y. 24; Moulton v. Witherell, 52 Me. 242; Eisendrath v. Knauer, 64 111. 402; Phelps v. People, 72 N.Y. 357.

[Black's Law Dictionary, Second Edition, p. 955]

- 8.2. If you fail to specify the terms and conditions of the GRANT of your absolutely owned private property to the opposing party, you are PRESUMED to DONATE the property to the Plaintiff or GOVERNMENT enforcer.

CONSENT. An agreement to something proposed, and differs from assent. (q.v.) Wolff, Ins. Nat. part 1, SSSS 27-30; Pard. Dr. Com. part 2, tit. 1, n. 1, 38 to 178. Consent supposes,

1. a physical power to act; 2. a moral power of acting; 3. a serious, determined, and free use of these powers. Fonb. Eq. B; 1, c. 2, s. 1; Grot. de Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. 2, c. 11, s. 6.

2. Consent is either express or implied. Express, when it is given viva voce, or in writing; implied, when it is manifested by signs, actions, or facts, or by inaction or silence, which raise a presumption that the consent has been given.

[...]

8. - 6. Courts of equity have established the rule, that when the true owner of property stands by, and knowingly suffers a stranger to sell the same as his own, without objection, this will be such implied consent as to render the sale valid against the true owner. Story on Ag. Sec. 91, Story on Eq. Jur. Sec. 385 to 390. And courts of law, unless restrained by technical formalities, act upon the principles of justice; as, for example, when a man permitted, without objection, the sale of his goods under an execution against another person. 6 Adolph. & El 11. 469; 9 Barn. & Cr. 586; 3 Barn. & Adolph. 318, note. 6 [Bouvier's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 1848]

To ensure that you are NEVER victimized by the ILLEGAL or UNCONSTITUTIONAL enforcement actions and especially government or de facto government enforcement actions, we recommend the following resources and/or examples to use in your defense. These documents identify YOU as the Merchant, the enforcer as the Buyer, and specify powerful “default terms and conditions” to the sale of your absolutely owned private property to them:

1. Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, Form #02.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2.3 Legal justice can easily be perverted when it is defined as “give every man his due”

This section is prompted by the following question appearing in our Member Forums:

Ministry Introduction: Your Definition of "Justice"

After advising a friend to review materials regarding the Introduction to your Ministry, she raises a valid point on the “Legal definition of Justice”. According to your Form #12.014, It is stated that the legal definition of justice is the right to simply be left alone.

Her concerns as well as mine are these:

1. After clicking the link and reading the entire page including Black's Law Dictionary, we didn't find anywhere where the “legal definition” of Justice is the right to be left alone.

2. After researching the bible, hoping to discover even biblical law that implies justice as simply the right to be left alone, I came up empty handed there as well.

3. No legal dictionary has this meaning, and it appears on the surface that this statement is purely driven by your contempt of the government. Not that that's a bad thing, however, it doesn't reflect “truth” and truth is justice.

I address these issues because that statement seems a bit misleading to the average person whose reading your material for the first time, and might be deterred from moving forward on the Path to Freedom if in fact there is no way to prove the author's perspective of it.

As a member subscriber, I understand the mission at hand, and probably share the same sentiment as the author, however, I feel it my duty to at least address it, as it might be a hindrance to those who are willing to learn from and be a part of this ministry.

[SEDM Member Forum 9.4, SOURCE: <http://sedm.org/forums/topic/ministry-introduction-your-definition-of-justice/#post-122811>]

First of all, the author of the above appears to have missed the definition of “justice” in the context of the common law that we provided in section 2 earlier:

PAULSEN, ETHICS (Thilly's translation), chap. 9.

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

1 **“Justice, as a moral habit, is that tendency of the will and mode of conduct which refrains from disturbing**
2 **the lives and interests of others, and, as far as possible, hinders such interference on the part of others.** This
3 virtue springs from the individual's respect for his fellows as ends in themselves and as his co equals. The
4 different spheres of interests may be roughly classified as follows: body and life; the family, or the extended
5 individual life; property, or the totality of the instruments of action; honor, or the ideal existence; and finally
6 freedom, or the possibility of fashioning one's life as an end in itself. The law defends these different spheres,
7 thus giving rise to a corresponding number of spheres of rights, each being protected by a prohibition. . . . To
8 violate the rights, to interfere with the interests of others, is injustice. All injustice is ultimately directed against
9 the life of the neighbor; it is an open avowal that the latter is not an end in itself, having the same value as the
10 individual's own life. The general formula of the duty of justice may therefore be stated as follows: Do no wrong
11 yourself, and permit no wrong to be done, so far as lies in your power; or, expressed positively: Respect and
12 protect the right.”
13 [Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 2]

14 The author also overlooked most of the other treatment in section 2, which also defined “justice” using the Bible and the
15 U.S. Supreme Court. The fact that the word “justice” does not appear in the authorities cited isn’t terribly relevant, because
16 the concept is sound from the authorities provided. The reader too should reread section 2 if they are at all uncertain about
17 the meaning of justice.

18 Second of all, the main source of confusion comes from those who define justice as “giving every man his due”. It is quite
19 common, for instance, to see legal definitions of “justice” include the phrase “give every man his due” rather than simply
20 “the right to be left alone”. Below are a few notable examples we dug up from various authoritative sources:

21 *Justice, n. Title given to judges, particularly judges of U.S. and state supreme courts, and as well to judges of*
22 *appellate courts. The U.S. Supreme Court, and most state supreme courts are composed of a chief justice and*
23 *several associate justices.*

24 *Proper administration of laws. In jurisprudence, the constant and perpetual disposition of legal matters or*
25 *disputes **to render every man his due.***

26 *Commutative justice concerns obligations as between persons (e.g., in exchange of goods) and requires*
27 *proportionate equality in dealings of person to person; Distributive justice concerns obligations of the*
28 *community to the individual, and requires fair disbursement of common advantages and sharing of common*
29 *burdens; Social justice concerns obligations of individual to community and its end is the common good.*

30 *In Feudal law, jurisdiction; judicial cognizance of causes or offenses. High justice was the jurisdiction or right*
31 *of trying crimes of every kind, even the highest. **This was a privilege claimed and exercised by the great lords***
32 **or barons of the middle ages.** Law justice was jurisdiction of petty offenses.

33 *See also Miscarriage of justice; Obstructing justice.*
34 [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 864]

35 _____
36 *The object of Law is the administration of justice. Law is a body of rule for the systematic and regular public*
37 *administration of justice. Hence we may ask, at the outset, what is justice?*

38 *INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN, I, I, sees. 1, 3.*

39 *Justice is the set and constant purpose which **gives to every man his due.** The precepts of law are these: to live*
40 *honorably, to injure no one, and **to "give every man his due".***
41 [Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 1]

42 _____
43 *JUSTICE - The constant and perpetual disposition to **render every man his due.** Justinian, Inst. b. 1, tit. 1; Co.*
44 *2d Inst. 56.*
45 [Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1856)]

46 _____
47 *Justice — is **rendering to every one [equally, whether citizen or alien] that which is his due.** It has been*
48 *distinguished from equity in this respect, that while justice means merely the doing [of] what positive law*
49 *demand, equity means the doing of what is fair and right in every separate case.*
50 [Easton's Bible Dictionary, 1996]

The above definitions invite a PERVERSION of justice, and especially by judges. This is because:

1. He who writes the rules or definitions always wins. In other words, the CREATOR or GRANTOR of a PUBLIC right (franchise) literally OWNS everyone who exercises that right. See:
 - 1.1. The U.S. Supreme Court:

"These general rules are well settled:

(1) That the United States, when it creates rights in individuals against itself [a "public right", which is a euphemism for a "franchise" to help the court disguise the nature of the transaction], is under no obligation to provide a remedy through the courts. United States ex rel. Dunlap v. Black, 128 U.S. 40, 9 Sup.Ct. 12, 32 L.Ed. 354; Ex parte Atocha, 17 Wall. 439, 21 L.Ed. 696; Gordon v. United States, 7 Wall. 188, 195, 19 L.Ed. 35; De Groot v. United States, 5 Wall. 419, 431, 433, 18 L.Ed. 700; Comegys v. Vasse, 1 Pet. 193, 212, 7 L.Ed. 108.

(2) That where a statute creates a right and provides a special remedy, that remedy is exclusive. Wilder Manufacturing Co. v. Corn Products Co., 236 U.S. 165, 174, 175, 35 Sup.Ct. 398, 59 L.Ed. 520, Ann. Cas. 1916A, 118; Arnson v. Murphy, 109 U.S. 238, 3 Sup.Ct. 184, 27 L.Ed. 920; Barnet v. National Bank, 98 U.S. 555, 558, 25 L.Ed. 212; Farmers' & Mechanics' National Bank v. Dearing, 91 U.S. 29, 35, 23 L.Ed. 196. Still the fact that the right and the remedy are thus intertwined might not, if the provision stood alone, require us to hold that the remedy expressly given excludes a right of review by the Court of Claims, where the decision of the special tribunal involved no disputed question of fact and the denial of compensation was rested wholly upon the construction of the act. See Medbury v. United States, 173 U.S. 492, 198, 19 Sup.Ct. 503, 43 L.Ed. 779; Parish v. MacVeagh, 214 U.S. 124, 29 Sup.Ct. 556, 53 L.Ed. 936; McLean v. United States, 226 U.S. 374, 33 Sup.Ct. 122, 57 L.Ed. 260; United States v. Laughlin (No. 200), 249 U.S. 440, 39 Sup.Ct. 340, 63 L.Ed. 696, decided April 14, 1919."
[U.S. v. Babcock, 250 U.S. 328, 39 S.Ct. 464 (1919)]

- 1.2. *O'Reilly Factor, April 8, 2015*, John Piper of the Oklahoma Wesleyan University

http://famguardian.org/Media/20150408_1958-The_O'Reilly_Factor-Dealing%20with%20slanderous%20liberals%20biblically-Everett%20Piper.mp4

2. Congress WRITES the rules in their statutory civil franchises and civil laws. This includes the entire civil code. These "rules" protect ONLY "public rights", not PRIVATE rights. In fact, you have to give up ALL of your natural and constitutional and common law rights to pursue a civil statutory remedy OF ANY KIND. In other words, you have to VOLUNTARILY SURRENDER your SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY to invoke a statutory remedy. This waiver of sovereignty and sovereign immunity under the common law and the Constitution is, in fact, how one becomes a "subject" under any "act of Congress":

"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law. Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption."

[The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10;

SOURCE:

http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf
f]

See Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31.

Municipal law, thus understood, is properly defined to be "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

[. . .]

It is also called a rule to distinguish it from a compact or agreement; for a compact is a promise proceeding from us, law is a command directed to us. The language of a compact is, "I will, or will not, do this"; that of a law is, "thou shalt, or shalt not, do it." It is true there is an obligation which a compact carries with it, equal in point of conscience to that of a law; but then the original of the obligation is different. In compacts we

1 ourselves determine and promise what shall be done, before we are obliged to do it; in laws, we are
2 obliged to act without ourselves determining or promising anything at all. Upon these accounts law is
3 defined to be "a rule."
4 [Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 4]

- 5 3. The civil franchise code, in turn, only regulates public officers on official business and cannot impair PRIVATE or
6 CONSTITUTIONAL rights. That is why 4 U.S.C. §72 requires public officers to serve in places NOT protected by the
7 Constitution on federal territory within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress. See:
8 3.1. Proof That There Is a "Straw Man", Form #05.042
9 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
10 3.2. Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
11 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
12 4. Judges essentially by fiat write the "definitions" by adding to statutes and case law through presumption and violation
13 of the Rules of Statutory Construction and Interpretation. On the other hand, judges CANNOT violate these rules if
14 statutes are not invoked to determine "what is due". See:
15 Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
16 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
17 5. Judges are financially "incentivized" to use the statutory PUBLIC definitions and thereby ENFRANCHISE you and
the administration of justice in order to increase their importance, pay, and government revenues.¹ It makes them into
lords over their own franchise "fiefdom":

18 "franchise court. Hist. A privately held court that (usu.) exists by virtue of a royal grant [privilege], with
19 jurisdiction over a variety of matters, depending on the grant and whatever powers the court acquires over
20 time. In 1274, Edward I abolished many of these feudal courts by forcing the nobility to demonstrate by what
21 authority (quo warranto) they held court. If a lord could not produce a charter reflecting the franchise, the
22 court was abolished. - Also termed courts of the franchise.

23 Dispensing justice was profitable. Much revenue could come from the fees and dues, fines and amercements.
24 This explains the growth of the second class of feudal courts, the Franchise Courts. They too were private
25 courts held by feudal lords. Sometimes their claim to jurisdiction was based on old pre-Conquest grants ... But
26 many of them were, in reality, only wrongful usurpations of private jurisdiction by powerful lords. These were
27 put down after the famous Quo Warranto enquiry in the reign of Edward I." W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on
28 Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949)."
29 [Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 668]

- 30 6. The definition judges INVENT by illegal means and fiat invites you to use the civil STATUTORY definitions of what
31 is "due" if you or they don't like the common law definitions. This then invites you to become a public officer and
32 therefore "subject" of the government who is INFERIOR. That public officer is called a civil statutory "citizen",
33 "resident", "person", or "taxpayer", etc.

34 The reason that so many legal reference sources try to confuse the definition of "justice" and replace "the right to be left
35 alone" with the phrase "give every man his due" is to try to turn justice into a franchise and "benefit" that they can charge
36 for and which you then have an obligation to PAY directly and personally for. That payment usually is demanded through
37 income (franchise) taxes:

38 "Hominum caus jus constitutum est. Law is established for the benefit of man."
39 [Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856; SOURCE:
40 <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

41 Franchises are covered in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

42 This type of abuse by judges in collusion with legislators is a perversion of the original meaning of the word so that
43 "justice" can be turned into a profitable franchise and the courts can be turned into a place of business, like the money
44 changers who Jesus got angry at.

¹ Watch the following video for proof, right from Supreme Court justice Antonin Scalia: SEDM Exhibit 11.006;
<http://sedm.org/Exhibits/ExhibitIndex.htm>.

"To no one will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay right or justice."
[Magna Carta, ch. 40 (1215)]

"Woe to you, scribes [religious leaders] and Pharisees [lawyers], hypocrites! For you pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin [to the false god of government with your attorney licenses and your 501(c)(3) and "privileged" tax exemptions, neither of which any positive law requires], and have neglected the weightier [most important] matters of the law [God's Law]: justice and mercy and faith [in God, and Truth]. These you ought to have done, without leaving the others undone."
[Jesus (God) in Matt. 23:23, Bible, NKJV]

Government is a ministry OF GOD that can never be done for profit. The minute it adopts a profit motive or tries to recruit you as a public officer in order to pay you "benefits" is the minute it becomes INJUSTICE. That injustice turns an ELITE class of BENEFACTORS of the franchise loot into plunderers of the oppressed or enfranchised class. It also turns the ballot box and the jury box into a BATTLEGROUND for loot.

"The income tax law under consideration is marked by discriminating features which affect the whole law. It discriminates between those who receive an income of four thousand dollars and those who do not. It thus vitiates, in my judgment, by this arbitrary discrimination, the whole legislation. Hamilton says in one of his papers, (the Continentalist,) "the genius of liberty reprobates everything arbitrary or discretionary in taxation. It exacts that every man, by a definite and general rule, should know what proportion of his property the State demands; whatever liberty we may boast of in theory, it cannot exist in fact while [arbitrary] assessments continue." 1 Hamilton's Works, ed. 1885, 270. The legislation, in the discrimination it makes, is class legislation. Whenever a distinction is made in the burdens a law imposes or in the benefits it confers on any citizens by reason of their birth, or wealth, or religion, it is class legislation, and leads inevitably to oppression and abuses, and to general unrest and disturbance in society [e.g. wars, political conflict, violence, anarchy]. It was hoped and believed that the great amendments to the Constitution which followed the late civil war had rendered such legislation impossible for all future time. But the objectionable legislation reappears in the act under consideration. It is the same in essential character as that of the English income statute of 1691, which taxed Protestants at a certain rate, Catholics, as a class, at double the rate of Protestants, and Jews at another and separate rate. Under wise and constitutional legislation every citizen should contribute his proportion, however small the sum, to the support of the government, and it is no kindness to urge any of our citizens to escape from that obligation. If he contributes the smallest mite of his earnings to that purpose he will have a greater regard for the government and more self-respect 597*597 for himself feeling that though he is poor in fact, he is not a pauper of his government. And it is to be hoped that, whatever woes and embarrassments may betide our people, they may never lose their manliness and self-respect. Those qualities preserved, they will ultimately triumph over all reverses of fortune."

[. . .]

"Here I close my opinion. I could not say less in view of questions of such gravity that go down to the very foundation of the government. If the provisions of the Constitution can be set aside by an act of Congress, where is the course of usurpation to end? The present assault upon capital is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping-stone to others, larger and more sweeping, till our political contests will become a war of the poor against the rich; a war constantly growing in intensity and bitterness."

"If the court sanctions the power of discriminating taxation, and nullifies the uniformity mandate of the Constitution," as said by one who has been all his life a student of our institutions, "it will mark the hour when the sure decadence of our present government will commence." If the purely arbitrary limitation of \$4000 in the present law can be sustained, none having less than that amount of income being assessed or taxed for the support of the government, the limitation of future Congresses may be fixed at a much larger sum, at five or ten or twenty thousand dollars, parties possessing an income of that amount alone being bound to bear the burdens of government; or the limitation may be designated at such an amount as a board of "walking delegates" may deem necessary. There is no safety in allowing the limitation to be adjusted except in strict compliance with the mandates of the Constitution which require its taxation, if imposed by direct taxes, to be apportioned among the States according to their representation, and if imposed by indirect taxes, to be uniform in operation and, so far as practicable, in proportion to their property, equal upon all citizens. Unless the rule of the Constitution governs, a majority may fix the limitation at such rate as will not include any of their own number."
[Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 157 U.S. 429 (Supreme Court 1895)]

"And you shall take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the discerning and perverts the words of the righteous."
[Exodus 23:8, Bible, NKJV]

"He who is greedy for gain troubles his own house,
But he who hates bribes will live."
[Prov. 15:27, Bible, NKJV]

1 *"Surely oppression destroys a wise man's reason.*
2 *And **a bribe debases the heart.**"*
3 *[Ecclesiastes 7:7, Bible, NKJV]*

4 Justice implies equity between you and the government, and franchises destroy that equity. If you and the government are
5 truly equal to each other and THEY claim to be "sovereign" then you are too, because all their authority was delegated by
6 WE THE PEOPLE individually. You can't delegate what you don't have. Usury and injustice always happen when private
7 financial interest is allowed to trump justice, equality, and equity between you and the government. By "usury", we mean
8 the abuse of money and franchises to create inequality between people under the law. Justice and "leaving you alone" on
9 the one hand, and franchises and "giving men their due" on the other hand are entirely incompatible with each other. They
10 should NEVER be allowed to be confused, because EVIL and criminal conflict of interest will always result. That evil will
11 happen because of the inequality and subjection that is created through franchises and commerce.

12 *"Protectio trahit subjectionem, subjectio projectionem.*
13 *Protection draws to it subjection, subjection, protection. Co. Litt. 65."*
14 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*
15 *SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>*

16 To choose a domicile within the jurisdiction of a secular and therefore pagan government under civil statutes that impute
17 superior or supernatural powers to the government is to nominate a secular king to be ABOVE you and to FIRE God as
18 your protector:

19 *Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah, and said to him, "Look, you are*
20 *old, and your sons do not walk in your ways. **Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations** [and be*
21 *OVER them]"*.

22 *But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, "**Give us a king to judge us.**" So Samuel prayed to the Lord.*
23 ***And the Lord said to Samuel, "Heed the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have rejected***
24 ***Me [God], that I should not reign over them.*** According to all the works which they have done since the day
25 *that I brought them up out of Egypt, even to this day—**with which they have forsaken Me and served other***
26 ***gods [Kings, in this case]—so they are doing to you also** [government becoming idolatry]. Now therefore,*
27 *heed their voice. **However, you shall solemnly forewarn them, and show them the behavior of the king who***
28 ***will reign over them.**"*

29 *So Samuel told all the words of the LORD to the people who asked him for a king. And he said, "**This will be***
30 ***the behavior of the king who will reign over you: He will take [STEAL] your sons and appoint them for his***
31 ***own chariots and to be his horsemen, and some will run before his chariots. He will appoint captains over his***
32 ***thousands and captains over his fifties, will set some to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and some to***
33 ***make his weapons of war and equipment for his chariots. He will take [STEAL] your daughters to be***
34 ***perfumers, cooks, and bakers. And he will take [STEAL] the best of your fields, your vineyards, and your***
35 ***olive groves, and give them to his servants. He will take [STEAL] a tenth of your grain and your vintage, and***
36 ***give it to his officers and servants. And he will take [STEAL] your male servants, your female servants, your***
37 ***finest young men, and your donkeys, and put them to his work [as SLAVES]. He will take [STEAL] a tenth***
38 ***of your sheep. And you will be his servants. And you will cry out in that day because of your king whom you***
39 ***have chosen for yourselves, and the LORD will not hear you in that day.**"*

40 *Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, "No, but we will have a king over*
41 *us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our*
42 *battles."*
43 *[1 Sam. 8:4-20, Bible, NKJV]*

44 Judges in civil franchise court try to make justice profitable by saying that the civil STATUTES are what is "due" rather
45 than the Bill of Rights. If you gave a judge a choice of WHICH law he would enforce:

- 46 1. Common law or the Constitution that netted him NO money, NO power, and creates extra work executing because it
47 relies on case law instead of statutes.
48 2. Civil franchise "codes", which are profitable and literally make him the head of his own little fiefdom or "franchise".

49 ...then which one do you think he will ALWAYS choose? This subject is called "choice of law" in the legal field². It's
50 inevitable that the judge will ALWAYS choose civil franchises so he can STEAL the most money and grab the most
51 power. Why even OFFER a judge this option by choosing a domicile, becoming a statutory "citizen" or "resident"? It's
52 insanity and commercial suicide.

² For a discussion of Choice of Law rules, see: *Federal Jurisdiction*, Form #05.018, Section 3; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

"It has long been my opinion, and I have never shrunk from its expression,... that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Federal Judiciary--an irresponsible body (for impeachment is scarcely a scare-crow), working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped from the States and the government be consolidated into one. To this I am opposed."
[Thomas Jefferson to Charles Hammond, 1821. ME 15:331]

"Contrary to all correct example, [the Federal judiciary] are in the habit of going out of the question before them, to throw an anchor ahead and grapple further hold for future advances of power. They are then in fact the corps of sappers and miners, steadily working to undermine the independent rights of the States and to consolidate all power in the hands of that government in which they have so important a freehold estate."
[Thomas Jefferson: Autobiography, 1821. ME 1:121]

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. This will lay all things at their feet, and they are too well versed in English law to forget the maxim, 'boni judicis est ampliari jurisdictionem.'"
[Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Ritchie, 1820. ME 15:297]

"When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."
[Thomas Jefferson to Charles Hammond, 1821. ME 15:332]

"What an augmentation of the field for jobbing, speculating, plundering, office-building [["trade or business scam"](#)] and office-hunting would be produced by an assumption [[PRESUMPTION](#)] of all the State powers into the hands of the General Government!"
[Thomas Jefferson to Gideon Granger, 1800. ME 10:168]

However, you can't cite the statutes if you are private, because they don't and can't regulate PRIVATE people. The only people this ministry helps are PRIVATE people who don't participate in government franchises.

"Under basic rules of construction, statutory laws enacted by legislative bodies cannot impair rights given under a constitution. 194 B.R. at 925. "
[In re Young, 235 B.R. 666 (Bankr.M.D.Fla., 1999)]

Civil statutes are privileges and franchises that only public officers can invoke. Accepting the "benefit" and "protection" of the civil statutes, which create PUBLIC rights (privileges) available only to PUBLIC OFFICERS called STATUTORY (civil) "citizens", is how they recruit you into volunteering to make Pyramids for Pharaoh without straw for free and make you fornicate with the Beast. In effect, they try to bribe you with "benefits" to put PERSONAL interest above the requirements of God's law and even above the requirements of the Constitution.

"Where do wars and fights come from among you? Do they not come from your desires for pleasure [unearned money or "benefits", privileges, or franchises, from the government] that war in your members [and your democratic governments]? You lust [after other people's money] and do not have. You murder [the unborn to increase your standard of living] and covet [the unearned] and cannot obtain [except by empowering your government to STEAL for you!]. You fight and war [against the rich and the nontaxpayers to subsidize your idleness]. Yet you do not have because you do not ask [the Lord, but instead ask the deceitful government]. You ask and do not receive, because you ask amiss, that you may spend it on your pleasures. Adulterers and adulteresses! Do you not know that friendship [statutory "citizenship"] with the world [or the governments of the world] is enmity with God? Whoever therefore wants to be a friend [[STATUTORY "citizen"](#), "[resident](#)", "[inhabitant](#)", "[person](#)" [franchisee](#)] of the world [or [the governments of the world](#)] makes himself an enemy of God."
[James 4:4, Bible, NKJV]

"I [God] brought you up from Egypt [government slavery using franchises] and brought you to the land of which I swore to your fathers; and I said, 'I will never break My covenant with you. And you shall make no covenant [contract or franchise or agreement of ANY kind] with the inhabitants of this [corrupt pagan] land; you shall tear down their [man/government worshipping socialist] altars.' But you have not obeyed Me. Why have you done this?

"Therefore I also said, I will not drive them out before you; but they will become as thorns [terrorists and persecutors] in your side and their gods will be a snare [slavery!] to you."

1 So it was, when the Angel of the LORD spoke these words to all the children of Israel, that the people lifted up
2 their voices and wept.
3 [Judges 2:1-4, Bible, NKJV]

4 We demonstrate in the following document how using “giving every man his due” as the definition of justice inevitably
5 perverts and corrupts the finest of people in government because it turns the civil statutory code into a “protection
6 franchise” that makes you into an indentured servant, slave, and whore of the government, often without even your
7 knowledge:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8 The only way that the equity and equality that justice demands can be maintained between EVERYONE is to ensure that
9 the ONLY measure for whether an injury has occurred is the criminal law and the constitution and the common law but
10 NOT the civil statutes or franchise codes. Equality between the governed and the governors as the basis for ALL your
11 freedom is covered in the following. You should NEVER surrender that equality, even for a bribe or “benefit”:

- 12 1. *Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment*, Form #05.033
13 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 14 2. *Foundations of Freedom Course*, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction
15 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

16 The Bible already defines “what is due to others”, which is NOTHING. Why, then, would you want to define “justice” as
17 giving people “what is their due”? If you owe others NOTHING, they have NO CHOICE but to “leave you alone”, and
18 especially in court:

19 *“Owe no one anything except to love one another, for he who loves another has fulfilled the law.”*
20 [Romans 13:8, Bible, NKJV]

21 Adding ANYTHING to the above definition of “what is due” merely invites what Jesus called “the evil one” (Matt. 5:37)
22 into your life. That method of invitation is dramatized in the following video:

Devil’s Advocate: Lawyers-What We Are Up Against, SEDM
<http://sedm.org/what-we-are-up-against/>

23 For those die-hard socialists who think the world owes them something for nothing, or that they have the right to abuse
24 their authority as a jurist or a voter to sanction the government to STEAL your money and redistribute it to others, consider
25 the following holding of the U.S. Supreme Court.

26 *“To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to*
27 *bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a*
28 *robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree*
29 *under legislative forms.*

30 *Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or*
31 *property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges*
32 *imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const.*
33 *Lim., 479.*

34 *Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John’s Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, ‘I think the common*
35 *mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the*
36 *government for the purposes of carrying on the government in all its machinery and operations—that they*
37 *are imposed for a public purpose.’ See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y.,*
38 *11 Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47;*
39 *Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra.’*
40 *[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]*
41

42 *“A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies an exaction for the*
43 *support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group*
44 *for the benefit of another.”*
45 *[U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]*

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

28 of 102

EXHIBIT: _____

1 Consider also what Mark Twain said on the same subject:

2 *"Don't go around saying the world owes you a living. The world owes you nothing. It was here first."*
3 *[Mark Twain]*

4 It's a crime and sin to bribe a jurist or a voter, including with "benefits". Any politician who offers more STOLEN loot,
5 meaning an increase in "benefits" to government dependents, indirectly is guilty of that crime. No one receiving such a
6 benefit can vote for any politician offering such "bribes" without becoming a CRIMINAL under both secular law and
7 God's law. That crime is IMPLEMENTED by using franchises to create inequality and impute superior powers to the
8 government. It makes the government into the owner of EVERYTHING and EVERYONE, because ultimately
9 EVERYONE becomes a public officer called a "taxpayer". Property held in the name of the office and associated with the
10 franchise license number, meaning the SSN or Slave Surveillance Number, becomes PUBLIC property you no longer own.
11 That's the ONLY way they can lawfully redistribute wealth: by moving money around that continues to be THEIRS and
12 not YOURS, no matter WHOSE hands it ends up in.

13 Most of what happens in modern political campaigns would be irrelevant to the average American if the government had no
14 "goodies" or "benefits" to ILLEGALLY bribe voters and jurists with. The bribes are STOLEN money to those who do not
15 wish to participate or who are not allowed to quit. This makes those who receive the bribes into criminals and money
16 launderers. God says it's outside your "delegation order" found in the bible to be able to consent to do this. When you do
17 it, you are a sinner and surrender the protections of His holy law:

18 *"My son, if sinners [socialists, in this case] entice you,*
19 ***Do not consent [do not abuse your power of choice]***
20 *If they say, "Come with us,*
21 *Let us lie in wait to shed blood [of innocent "nontaxpayers"];*
22 *Let us lurk secretly for the innocent without cause;*
23 *Let us swallow them alive like Sheol,*
24 *And whole, like those who go down to the Pit:*
25 ***We shall fill our houses with spoil [plunder];***
26 ***Cast in your lot [AND YOUR VOTE] among us,***
27 ***Let us all have one purse [share the STOLEN LOOT]"--***

28 *My son, do not walk in the way with them [do not ASSOCIATE with them and don't let the government*
29 *FORCE you to associate with them either by forcing you to become a "taxpayer"/government whore or a*
30 *"U.S. citizen".*
31 *Keep your foot from their path;*
32 *For their feet run to evil,*
33 *And they make haste to shed blood.*
34 *Surely, in vain the net is spread*
35 *In the sight of any bird;*
36 ***But they lie in wait for their own blood.***
37 ***They lurk secretly for their own lives.***
38 ***So are the ways of everyone who is greedy for gain [or unearned government benefits];***
39 ***It takes away the life of its owners."***
40 *[Proverbs 1:10-19, Bible, NKJV]*

41 **2.4 What is "law"?**

42 Law is the mechanism for effecting "justice" as legally defined. Below is an excellent definition of HOW it serves this
43 function.

44 **What Is Law?**

45 *What, then, is law? It is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense.*

46 *Each of us has a natural right – from God – to defend his person, his liberty, and his property. These are the*
47 *three basic requirements of life, and the preservation of any one of them is completely dependent upon the*
48 *preservation of the other two. For what are our faculties but the extension of our individuality? And what is*
49 *property but an extension of our faculties?*

50 *If every person has the right to defend – even by force – his person, his liberty, and his property, then it follows*
51 *that a group of men have the right to organize and support a common force to protect these rights constantly.*
52 *Thus the principle of collective right – its reason for existing, its lawfulness – is based on individual right. And*

the common force that protects this collective right cannot logically have any other purpose or any other mission than that for which it acts as a substitute. Thus, since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of another individual, then the common force – for the same reason – cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

Such a perversion of force would be, in both cases, contrary to our premise. Force has been given to us to defend our own individual rights. Who will dare to say that force has been given to us to destroy the equal rights of our brothers? Since no individual acting separately can lawfully use force to destroy the rights of others, does it not logically follow that the same principle also applies to the common force that is nothing more than the organized combination of the individual forces?

If this is true, then nothing can be more evident than this: The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitution of a common force for individual forces. And this common force is to do only what the individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect persons, liberties, and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all.

The Complete Perversion of the Law

But, unfortunately, law by no means confines itself to its proper functions. And when it has exceeded its proper functions, it has not done so merely in some inconsequential and debatable matters. The law has gone further than this; it has acted in direct opposition to its own purpose. The law has been used to destroy its own objective: It has been applied to annihilating the justice that it was supposed to maintain; to limiting and destroying rights which its real purpose was to respect. The law has placed the collective force at the disposal of the unscrupulous who wish, without risk, to exploit the person, liberty, and property of others. It has converted plunder into a right, defense into a crime, in order to punish lawful defense.

How has this perversion of the law been accomplished? And what have been the results?

The law has been perverted by the influence of two entirely different causes: stupid greed and false philanthropy. Let us speak of the first.

A Fatal Tendency of Mankind

Self-preservation and self-development are common aspirations among all people. And if everyone enjoyed the unrestricted use of his faculties and the free disposition of the fruits of his labor, social progress would be ceaseless, uninterrupted, and unending.

But there is also another tendency that is common among people. When they can, they wish to live and prosper at the expense of others. This is no rash accusation. Nor does it come from a gloomy and uncharitable spirit. The annals of history bear witness to the truth of it: the incessant wars, mass migrations, religious persecutions, universal slavery, dishonesty in commerce, and monopolies. This fatal desire has its origin in the very nature of man – in that primitive, universal, and insuppressible instinct that impels him to satisfy his desires with the least possible pain.

Property and Plunder

Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor, by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property.

But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

Now since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain – and since labor is pain in itself – it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. And under these conditions, neither religion nor morality can stop it.

When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.

It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder.

But, generally, the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the laws.

This fact, combined with the fatal tendency that exists in the heart of man to satisfy his wants with the least possible effort, explains the almost universal perversion of the law. Thus it is easy to understand how law, instead of checking injustice, becomes the invincible weapon of injustice. It is easy to understand why the law is

used by the legislator to destroy in varying degrees among the rest of the people, their personal independence by slavery, their liberty by oppression, and their property by plunder. This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law, and in proportion to the power that he holds.
[The Law, Frederic Bastiat, SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/TheLaw/TheLaw.htm>]

For a complete definition of what “law” is that is consistent with the above definition, please see the following short memorandum on our site:

What is “law”?, Form #05.048
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2.5 The original founding documents FORBID welfare or “benefits”. There IS not “legal justice” for the poor³

It might surprise the reader to learn that the original founding documents deprived the poor of legal justice. They became dependents and wards of the state under legal disability and were excluded from voting. These founding documents have NEVER been repealed and are still in effect. This subject directly addresses the view of the Founding Fathers toward government welfare and/or benefits.

The Founding Fathers explained why public charity is against our constitution:

“With respect to the words general welfare, I have always regarded them as qualified by the detail of powers connected with them. To take them in a literal and unlimited sense would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution into a character which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its creator.”

“If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in every State, county and parish and pay them out of their public treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may assume the provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-roads; in short, every thing, from the highest object of state legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress.... Were the power of Congress to be established in the latitude contended for, it would subvert the very foundations, and transmute the very nature of the limited Government established by the people of America.”

“If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the general welfare, the government is no longer a limited one possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one subject to particular exceptions.”
[James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod Fishery Bill, granting Bounties]

It has been urged and echoed, that the power “to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States,” amounts to an unlimited commission to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defense or general welfare. No stronger proof could be given of the distress under which these writers labor for objections, than their stooping to such a misconstruction. Had no other enumeration or definition of the powers of the Congress been found in the Constitution, than the general expressions just cited, the authors of the objection might have had some color for it... For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power? Nothing is more natural nor common than first to use a general phrase, and then to explain and qualify it by a recital of particulars... But what would have been thought of that assembly, if, attaching themselves to these general expressions, and disregarding the specifications which ascertain and limit their import, they had exercised an unlimited power of providing for the common defense and general welfare? (Federalists #41)
[Federalist #41. Saturday, January 19, 1788, James Madison]

Congress has not unlimited powers to provide for the general welfare, but only those specifically enumerated.

They are not to do anything they please to provide for the general welfare, but only to lay taxes for that purpose. To consider the latter phrase not as describing the purpose of the first, but as giving a distinct and

³ Adapted from: *Social Security: Mark of the Beast*, Form #11.407, Section 4.3; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

independent power to do any act they please which may be good for the Union, would render all the preceding and subsequent enumerations of power completely useless. It would reduce the whole instrument to a single phrase, that of instituting a Congress with power to do whatever would be for the good of the United States; and as they would be the sole judges of the good or evil, it would be also a power to do whatever evil they please.... Certainly no such universal power was meant to be given them. It was intended to lace them up straightly within the enumerated powers and those without which, as means, these powers could not be carried into effect.

That of instituting a Congress with power to do whatever would be for the good of the United States; and, as they would be the sole judges of the good or evil, it would be also a power to do whatever evil they please.
[Thomas Jefferson: Opinion on National Bank, 1791. ME 3:148; SOURCE:
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Politics/ThomasJefferson/jeff1020.htm> and
<http://thefederalistpapers.org/founders/jefferson/thomas-jefferson-opinion-on-national-bank-1791>]

The following fascinating video describes the origins of the above sentiments by the founding fathers:

America's Socialist Origins, Prager University
<https://youtu.be/7dAmroKyzGY>

The courts also agree with the founding fathers on the subject of public charity:

"Grant the validity of this law, and all that Congress would need to do, hereafter, in seeking to take over to its control any one of the great number of subjects of public interest, jurisdiction of which the States have never parted with, and which are reserved to them by the Tenth Amendment, would be to enact a detailed measure of complete regulation of the subject and enforce it by a so-called tax upon departures from it. To give such magic to the word "tax" would be to break down all constitutional limitation of the powers of Congress and completely wipe out the sovereignty of the States."
[Child Labor Tax Case, 259 U.S. 20, 38 (1922)]

"To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms."

Nor is it taxation. 'A tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.' 'Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.' Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.

Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, 'I think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public purpose.' See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra."
[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

"A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies an exaction for the support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another."
[U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]

Social justice advocates base their idea of egalitarianism on the founding documents such as the Declaration of Independence, which claims that all men are CREATED equal. Unfortunately, social justice advocates confuse "rights" granted by God with civil privileges created and granted by PAGAN government through civil franchise statutes. The "rights" spoken of in the Declaration of Independence cannot be either granted or taken away or even given away to a REAL de jure government. That is why the Declaration calls these rights "unalienable". These rights BEGIN with property rights, because the Declaration of Independence refers to property rights literally as "the pursuit of happiness".

"The provision [Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1], it is to be observed, places property under the same protection as life and liberty. Except by due process of law, no State can deprive any person of either. The provision has been supposed to secure to every individual the essential conditions for the pursuit of happiness; and for that reason has not been heretofore, and should never be, construed in any narrow or restricted sense."

[*Munn v. Illinois*, 94 U.S. 113 (1877)]

You must therefore absolutely own YOURSELF and all of your property and not share that ABSOLUTE ownership with any and every government before happiness is even realistically possible at all. In legal terms, that means that there can be neither moities or usufructs that attach to any of your property originating from any government. In other words, you cannot share OWNERSHIP or control over any of your property with ANY government EVER!

“Moiety (moy-a-tee). 1. A half of something (such as an estate). 2. A portion less than half; a small segment. 3. In customs law, a payment made to an informant who assists the seizure of contraband.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 1021]

USUFRUCT. In the civil law. The right of enjoying a thing, the property of which is vested in another, and to draw from the same all the profit, utility, and advantage which it may produce, provided it be without altering the substance of the thing. Civ.Code La. art. 533. Mulford v. Le Franc, 26 Cal. 102; Modern Music Shop v. Concordia Fire Ins. Co. of Milwaukee, 131 Misc. 305, 226 N.Y.S. 630, 635.

Under Greek Law. A right attached to the person which may not be inherited. New England Trust Co. v. Wood, Mass., 93 N.E.2d. 547, 549.

Imperfect Usufruct

An imperfect or quasi usufruct is that which is if things which would be useless to the usufructuary if he did not consume or expend them or change the substance of them; as, money, grain, liquors. Civ.Code La. art. 534.

See Quasi Usufruct infra.

Legal Usufruct

See that title.

Perfect Usufruct

An usufruct in those things which the usufructuary can enjoy without changing their substance, though their substance may be diminished or deteriorate naturally by time or by the use to which they are applied, as, a house, a piece of land, furniture, and other movable effects. Civ.Code La. art. 534.

Quasi Usufruct

In the civil law. Originally the usufruct gave no right to the substance of the thing, and consequently none to its consumption; hence only an inconsumable thing could be the object of it, whether movable or immovable. But in later times the right of usufruct was, by analogy, extended to consumable things, and therewith arose the distinction between true and quasi usufructs. See Mackeld. Rom. Law, §307; Civ.Code La. art. 534. See Imperfect Usufruct, supra.
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1713]

Real de jure government cannot take away absolutely owned property, so under social justice concepts, property ownership must be a revocable PUBLIC PRIVILEGE rather than an unalienable absolute PRIVATE right:

Ownership. Collection of rights to use and enjoy property, including right to transmit it to others. Trustees of Phillips Exeter Academy v. Exeter, 92 N.H. 473, 33 A.2d. 665, 673. The complete dominion, title, or proprietary right in a thing or claim. The entirety of the powers of use and disposal allowed by law.

The right of one or more persons to possess and use a thing to the exclusion of others. The right by which a thing belongs to someone in particular, to the exclusion of all other persons. The exclusive right of possession, enjoyment, and disposal; involving as an essential attribute the right to control, handle, and dispose.

Ownership of property is either absolute or qualified. The ownership of property is absolute when a single person has the absolute dominion over it, and may use it or dispose of it according to his pleasure, subject only to general laws. The ownership is qualified when it is shared with one or more persons, when the time of enjoyment is deferred or limited, or when the use is restricted. Calif. Civil Code, §§678-680.

There may be ownership of all inanimate things which are capable of appropriation or of manual delivery; of all domestic animals; of all obligations; of such products of labor or skill as the composition of an author, the

goodwill of a business, trademarks and signs, and of rights created or granted by statute. Calif. Civil Code, §655.

In connection with burglary, "ownership" means any possession which is rightful as against the burglar.

See also Equitable ownership; Exclusive ownership; Hold; Incident of ownership; Interest; Interval ownership; Ostensible ownership; Owner; Possession; Title.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1106]

The confusion of social justice advocates of PRIVATE rights with PUBLIC civil privileges is called "equivocation":

equivocation

EQUIVOCATION, n. Ambiguity of speech; the use of words or expressions that are susceptible of a double signification. Hypocrites are often guilty of equivocation, and by this means lose the confidence of their fellow men. **Equivocation is incompatible with the Christian character and profession.**
[SOURCE: <http://1828.mshaffer.com/d/search/word/equivocation/>]

Equivocation ("to call by the same name") is an informal logical fallacy. It is the misleading use of a term with more than one meaning or sense (by glossing over which meaning is intended at a particular time). It generally occurs with polysemic words (words with multiple meanings).

Albeit in common parlance it is used in a variety of contexts, when discussed as a fallacy, equivocation only occurs when the arguer makes a word or phrase employed in two (or more) different senses in an argument appear to have the same meaning throughout.⁴

It is therefore distinct from (semantic) ambiguity, which means that the context doesn't make the meaning of the word or phrase clear, and amphiboly (or syntactical ambiguity), which refers to ambiguous sentence structure due to punctuation or syntax.⁵

[Wikipedia: Equivocation, Downloaded 9/15/2015; SOURCE: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Equivocation>]

The ultimate result of this equivocation by social justice advocates is both a logical fallacy and INJUSTICE, not justice.

Property and Plunder

Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor, by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property.

But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

Now since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain – and since labor is pain in itself – it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. And under these conditions, neither religion nor morality can stop it.

When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.

It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder.

But, generally, the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the laws.

This fact, combined with the fatal tendency that exists in the heart of man to satisfy his wants with the least possible effort, explains the almost universal perversion of the law. Thus it is easy to understand how law,

⁴ Damer, T. Edward (2009), [Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-free Arguments](#) (6th ed.), Wadsworth, p. 121, ISBN 978-0-495-09506-4

[Fischer, D. H.](#) (June 1970), [Historians' fallacies: toward a logic of historical thought](#), Harper torchbooks (first ed.), New York: HarperCollins, p. 274, ISBN 978-0-06-131545-9, OCLC 185446787

⁵ Damer, T. Edward (2009), [Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-free Arguments](#) (6th ed.), Wadsworth, p. 123, ISBN 978-0-495-09506-4

1 *instead of checking injustice, becomes the invincible weapon of injustice. It is easy to understand why the law is*
2 *used by the legislator to destroy in varying degrees among the rest of the people, their personal independence*
3 *by slavery, their liberty by oppression, and their property by plunder. This is done for the benefit of the person*
4 *who makes the law, and in proportion to the power that he holds.*
5 *[The Law, Frederic Bastiat, 1850; SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/TheLaw/TheLaw.htm>]*

6 Injustice results when law is abused to redistribute property and wealth, because in order to do so lawfully, the government
7 must destroy ALL individual private property rights and make the government the real and absolute owner. This approach
8 turns government into a deity with “superior” or “supernatural” powers who must be worshipped for the “privilege” of
9 using or possessing ANY type of property. The right to absolutely own property must be EQUALLY shared by all, not
10 held by government as a monopoly. Government, after all, cannot redistribute wealth lawfully without absolutely owning
11 ALL property and relegating all human beings to mere “qualified owners” as defined below. Otherwise they would be
12 STEALING:

13 *Ownership. Collection of rights to use and enjoy property, including right to transmit it to others. Trustees of*
14 *Phillips Exeter Academy v. Exeter, 92 N.H. 473, 33 A.2d. 665, 673. The complete dominion, title, or proprietary*
15 *right in a thing or claim. The entirety of the powers of use and disposal allowed by law.*

16 *The right of one or more persons to possess and use a thing to the exclusion of others. The right by which a*
17 *thing belongs to someone in particular, to the exclusion of all other persons. The exclusive right of possession,*
18 *enjoyment, and disposal; involving as an essential attribute the right to control, handle, and dispose.*

19 **Ownership of property is either absolute or qualified. The ownership of property is absolute when a single**
20 **person has the absolute dominion over it, and may use it or dispose of it according to his pleasure, subject**
21 **only to general laws. The ownership is qualified when it is shared with one or more persons, when the time**
22 **of enjoyment is deferred or limited, or when the use is restricted. Calif. Civil Code, §§678-680.**

23 *There may be ownership of all inanimate things which are capable of appropriation or of manual delivery; of*
24 *all domestic animals; of all obligations; of such products of labor or skill as the composition of an author, the*
25 *goodwill of a business, trademarks and signs, and of rights created or granted by statute. Calif. Civil Code,*
26 *§655.*

27 *In connection with burglary, "ownership" means any possession which is rightful as against the burglar.*

28 *See also Equitable ownership; Exclusive ownership; Hold; Incident of ownership; Interest; Interval ownership;*
29 *Ostensible ownership; Owner; Possession; Title.*
30 *[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1106]*

31 **2.6 Socialism results when governments ignore or try to circumvent the founding documents**

32 When the limitations of the founding documents are ignored or circumvented by implementing moities and usufructs
33 against all otherwise absolutely owned private property then you end up with socialism. Socialism cannot recognize the
34 God-given PRIVATE rights of individuals. The only “sovereign” under socialism is the collective and there are no
35 individual or PRIVATE, absolutely owned rights. Government granted “privileges” and “franchises” take the place of
36 constitutional rights. Principalities and powers in high places (Ephesians 6:12) had to overcome the U.S. Constitution to
37 allow welfare benefits to trap you. This chapter will prove that welfare cannot be a U.S. government function. It is foreign
38 and PRIVATE, but administered locally by an agency of your benefactors. It is available only to those who worship their
39 socialist lords contrary to Luke 22:25. **But ye shall not be so.**

40 Your Constitution does not allow government to provide ordinary people with entitlements such as welfare or Social
41 Security benefits. It is not a government function to provide entitlements to people. It is not a government function to take
42 care of people. Nor is there any authorized source of funds to take care of people, nor can civil servants receive a paycheck
43 for performing such non-governmental services. And indeed, your Government does not give entitlements to ordinary
44 people. ORDINARY PEOPLE CANNOT QUALIFY FOR FEDERAL BENEFITS. Again: it is not a government
45 function to provide entitlements to people.

46 There is ONLY one way to Constitutionally provide welfare, even Social Security, to individual people. Government has a
47 duty (called by several names "compelling state interest" or “interests which the state may lawfully protect” or “overriding
48 governmental interest”) to prevent an individual's death. You can become a ward of government. All you have to do is
49 request that government save your life by applying for relief under any program funded by federal funds. If you applied for
50 federal-funded programs under any other circumstance than to save your life, then you falsified a federal application.

When your Constitution was being considered for ratification by the State Senates, some people were suspicious of the "general welfare" clause and tried to claim that these two words could authorize any kind of welfare. The general welfare clause in Article 1, Section 8 of your Constitution reads:

"The Congress shall have Power to ... provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;..."

It is an introductory phrase which is followed, after a semi-colon, by a specific list of the 17 things the new government would be authorized to do, such as; to establish post offices, coin money, make treaties, establish standard weights and measures, provide for a Navy, punish pirates, punish counterfeiting, fund a temporary army, declare war, and exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all cases in the future District of Columbia., etc.

To counter those rumors that the general welfare clause in the proposed Constitution would authorize any kind of welfare, James Madison, in Federalist Paper #41, explained its clear intent. He stated that it:

"is an absurdity" to claim that the General Welfare clause confounds or misleads, because this introductory clause is followed by enumeration of specific particulars that explain and qualify the meaning of phrase "general welfare".

That's right! YOUR CONSTITUTION WAS RATIFIED UNDER THE ASSURANCE THAT IT WOULD NEVER BE INTERPRETED TO PROVIDE WELFARE TO INDIVIDUALS. And it has not. And indeed, to this very day, your U.S. government cannot and does not provide entitlements to ordinary Americans. Here is the catch: The ONLY way to qualify for entitlements, such as welfare or Social Security, is to become a ward of a foreign authority. The U.S. government administers the foreign program as their agent. SOCIAL SECURITY AND WELFARE REMAIN CONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE ORDINARY AMERICANS CANNOT QUALIFY FOR ENTITLEMENTS. The Supreme Court says, 92 U.S. 551:

"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."

Congress cannot appropriate funds for entitlements to Americans. No one who swears an oath to uphold the Constitution can lawfully spend funds for any entitlement. Government funds can only be spent for legitimate purposes. Examples:

- In 1792 Congressman and future-President James Madison voted against a congressional appropriation to assist war refugees. He said "I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article of the Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents."
- President Franklin Pierce in 1854 vetoed a health care bill to help the mentally ill. He said "*I cannot find any authority in the Constitution for public charity.... [this] would be contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and subversive to the whole theory upon which the Union of these States is founded.*"
- In 1897, President Grover Cleveland vetoed an appropriation to provide disaster aid to victims of a Texas drought. His veto stated: "I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the plan to indulge in benevolent and charitable sentiment through the appropriation of public funds... I find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution. The lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people should support the government, the government should not support the people."

AND IT DOESN'T. And indeed, to this very day, YOUR U.S. GOVERNMENT CAN NOT AND DOES NOT PROVIDE ENTITLEMENTS TO ORDINARY PEOPLE.

It has never been a governmental function to help people. In fact, it would be a crime of embezzlement to use government funds for private use. If you expect welfare to provide for you, then you are "*subversive to the whole theory upon which the Union of these States is founded*".

Congressman Davy Crockett's famous "[it is not yours to give](#)" speech to Congress also made it clear that welfare to individuals is not Constitutional.

Conclusion #1, welfare is prohibited by your constitution. IT HAS NEVER BEEN A GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTION TO HELP PEOPLE

Jesus Christ said in Luke 22:25: "... they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors."

And 2ND Thessalonians 3:6-14 prohibits Christians from associating with freeloaders.

Genesis 3:19 requires you to earn your bread from the sweat of your face. This principle was still true when Abraham Lincoln gave his second Inaugural address, March 4, 1865:

"It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces..."

He was speaking of slave owners, but the principle is still true today. IF you expect the law to force others to provide for you, then you are of the same mindset as a slave owner.

Those who manage themselves will not accept socialist benefits. Christians will not force others to pay for their retirement. Those who accept benefits do so only by a pledge of allegiance to a worldly master. Perhaps you've chosen the wrong provider.

Another interesting document is President Cleveland's June 21, 1886 veto of military pensions. His veto blasted into politicians because a pension would:

"urge honest men to become dishonest."

And he refused to pass such a "demoralizing lesson". Military pensions were dishonest in 1886. Federal pensions are still dishonest today. If earned pensions are dishonest, how depraved are those who think of unearned welfare as honest?

Conclusion #2, pensions are prohibited by your constitution.

By the way, The Federalist Papers are not just some antiquated editorial opinions, they are, according to the Supreme Court in Cohens v. Virginia (6 Wheat), the exact record of the intent of the Constitution.

Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. 264 at 418

The opinion of the Federalist has always been considered as of great authority. It is a complete commentary on our constitution; and is appealed to by all parties in the questions to which that instrument has given birth. Its intrinsic merit entitles it to this high rank; and the part two of its authors performed in framing the constitution, put it very much in their power to explain the views with which it was framed. These essays having been published while the constitution was before the nation for adoption or rejection, and having been written in answer to objections founded entirely on the extent of its powers, and on its diminution of State sovereignty, are entitled to the more consideration where they frankly avow that the power objected to is given, and defend it.

Just in case you think a law or an amendment changed the intent of your Constitution, Think again. A congressman cannot swear an oath to support and defend your constitution and then suggest an amendment to change something that he is sworn to perpetuate.

If you don't believe me, perhaps you can believe the U.S. Supreme Court in S. Carolina v. U.S. 199 U.S. 437 (1905): "The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when it was adopted, it means now..."

Busser v. Snyder, 37 ALR 1515:

"An Old Age Assistance Law is prohibited by a constitutional provision that no appropriation shall be made for charitable or benevolent purposes to any person."

Conclusion #3, Old Age Assistance is prohibited by your constitution.

And if Old Age Assistance Law is prohibited by a constitutional provision, how likely is it that the Supreme Court will ever declare Social Security or Medicare to be constitutional?

Also in *Busser v. Snyder*:

"The term 'poor,' as used by lawmakers, describes those who are destitute and helpless, unable to support themselves, and without means of support."

I want you to remember the legal definition of the term "poor" from this *Busser* case. Destitute, helpless, unable to support themselves, without means of support. The U.S. Supreme Court in 1941 in *Edwards v. California* used very similar language. Later on, I will show that this is entirely consistent with the *poor laws*. If you cannot take care of yourself, others are allowed to take care of you, EVEN IF YOU DON'T LIKE IT. Just as Christ told you in John 21:18. Hint: since Social Security is only available to those who need these foreign benefits, your confession is sufficient to prove that you cannot take care of yourself.

Your constitution has not changed. WELFARE, PENSIONS, AND OLD AGE ASSISTANCE REMAIN UNCONSTITUTIONAL. Such things are not within the realm of the United States government, they must remain foreign. The only way to get such assistance is to become a ward of a foreign authority. The U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, as the agent of your foreign masters, will administer the foreign program with "actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken..." pursuant to Title 12 United States Code, section 95(b). The Secretary of the Treasury uses this very same multinational authority to issue Social Security Cards.

Yet social security and welfare remain legal. Here is a history of what is really going on:

The funds for social security, welfare, housing, disaster relief, and now terrorist attack relief, come from the foreign authorities who loan us the national debt. These funds are not appropriated by Congress, but by treaties and trusts administered by the President. In 1933, the U.S. government was threatened by financial emergencies that threatened legitimate constitutional duties. Instead of resorting to direct taxes to collect funds, as was allowed by the Constitution, the government went bankrupt. When the government declared bankruptcy in 1933, it was put under the control of a receivership governed by its creditors. The government provided a (still ongoing) public emergency to administer foreign funds borrowed from the receivership. The U.S. has a duty to secure the assets and income of the federal government as collateral for its creditors. Federal lands were already mortgaged, so the federal government had to secure more collateral as surety on the country's debts. The only assets remaining were the labor of federal people. The U.S. government now uses the labor of its numbered people to secure its debts. To secure the pledge to the creditors, the U.S. has a duty to manage and protect these assets, keep them healthy, and provide for their welfare and enforce their obligations. More details will be provided later.

Here is an anti-welfare anti-tax quote once attributed to Abraham Lincoln: "You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot lift the wage earner by tearing down the wage payer. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do themselves."

Although this was once published in the Congressional Record, Lincoln scholars now doubt he ever said it.

US Supreme Court in *Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton Railroad Co.*, 295 U.S. 330:

"The catalog of means and actions which might be imposed upon an employer in any business, tending to the satisfaction and comfort of his employees, seems endless. Provision for free medical attendance, nursing, clothing, food, housing, and education of children, and a hundred other matters might with equal propriety by proposed as tending to relieve the employee of mental strain and worry. Can it fairly be said that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce extends to the prescription of any or all of these things? Is it not apparent that they are really and essentially related solely to the social welfare of the worker, and therefore remote from any regulation of commerce as such? We think the answer is plain. These matters obviously lie outside the orbit of congressional power." [May 6, 1935]

Read that again. There are no mandated benefits. The welfare of workers cannot be regulated. Benefits for "the social welfare of the worker" cannot be "imposed upon an employer in any business." No Unemployment Insurance, no Worker's Compensation, no minimum wage, no mandatory disability, first-aid, health or safety (OSHA) regulation, no forced Social Security contributions.

Welfare cannot be provided by the U.S. Government. Welfare remains a church and family responsibility. Yet slave owners must provide for their slaves.

1 If you pray to your foreign provider for benefits, then they are your church. Give allegiance to whom allegiance is due.

2 Black's Law Dictionary definition of Allegiance:

3 *"Obligation of fidelity and obedience to government in consideration for protection that government gives.*
4 *U.S. v. Kuhn, D.C.N.Y., 49 F.Supp. 407, 414"*

5 Allegiance is defined by Homeland Security in their [Title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, section 337](#) as a commitment

6 *"... I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that I*
7 *take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God"*

8 Is there a limit to this "work of national importance", or is it an oath to perform unlimited hours of perpetual slavery?
9 Involuntary servitude is prohibited by the 13th Amendment. Voluntary servitude is entirely Constitutional.

10 If you have absolute allegiance to a foreign benefactor, then you must obey their rules.

11 This is the only Constitutional way to qualify for welfare. But you must give up your rights when you give up your
12 responsibility to take care of yourself. Since rights only come with responsibilities, you give up all your rights and are
13 forevermore a ward of the system.

14 But this welfare-for-wards function will waive all your rights. Rights are "*susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave*
15 *and immediate danger to interests which the state may lawfully protect*". You even waive your religious rights to
16 "overriding governmental interest" according to the Supreme Court in U.S. v. Lee ([455 U.S. 252](#)) which ruled that Amish
17 who have obtained SSNs have lost their religious liberty to "overriding governmental interest". Note that the same
18 religious liberties are accorded to Amish who are exempt from SSNs. Amish objectors are exempt from SSNs per section
19 1402(g) of the Internal Revenue Code (mentioned in the Legislative History of Public Law 99-514 section 4)

20 If you accepted welfare (or even a Social Security Number) under any other circumstance other than grave and immediate
21 danger of death, then you were fraudulently induced to participate in unlawful means to raid the Treasury.

22 Welfare applicants lose their citizenship.

23 A pauper is one who is supported by public funds. Paupers cannot have rights. The Articles of Confederation excluded
24 paupers from ANY rights of citizenship. Article IV of the Articles of Confederation requires:

25 *"... the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted, shall*
26 *be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States;..."*

27 Social Security numbers can only be assigned to aliens (after 1972) or to those who register to accept federal benefits
28 (according to section 205(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act). Yet government benefits are only available to those who
29 are absolutely destitute and without the means to survive.

30 As you can see, Social Security Cards are only available to those few select people who actually have the authority to
31 convert federal funds to private use, which can deplete the federal treasury.

32 That's right! If you apply for a Social Security Number, it is either embezzlement of federal funds or it is a confession that
33 you cannot take care of yourself. If you cannot take care of yourself, how could you expect the rights of citizenship? John
34 Locke's [Second Treatise of Government](#) Chapter 15 asks the question "For what compact can be made with a man that is
35 not master of his own life?" Once you get a number by signing up for socialist benefits financed in whole or in part from
36 Federal funds, what happens next? You have received unjust enrichment at the expense of others thereby creating a
37 constructive contract. The Social Security Act Title VIII section 801 requires you to pay Social Security AND OTHER
38 TAXES. This is also repeated word-for-word in Section 3101(a) of the Internal Revenue Code:

39 *"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to the*
40 *following percentages of the wages..."*

1 A PRIVATE right cannot be taxed. **You waived your right to earn PRIVATE wages, thereby making your earnings**
2 **PUBLIC STATUTORY “wages” of a public officer on official business that are taxable.** Those who are numbered do
3 not have a right to sell their labor. They have no right to their “own” labor. Their labor belongs to their master. Your take-
4 home living allowance is taxable as a gift.

5 According to the Supreme Court in [Ashwander v. TVA](#) anyone who "avails himself of a benefit" cannot then question the
6 Constitutionality of the law that he benefited from. The Supreme Court WILL NOT consider the case.

7 Others will represent you. This maxim of law is known as *tacit procuration* This basic law extends much deeper than
8 welfare. You no longer have a right to contract. You are incompetent to represent yourself, and must be represented by a
9 competent attorney. You are allowed to conduct business only through a government-created strawman. You are the
10 collateral for the fines he must pay. But you already know that. Proverbs 6:1-11, Proverbs 11:15, Proverbs 17:18, Proverbs
11 22:26.

12 Welfare is unconstitutional except for the truly destitute. You received unjust enrichment at the expense of others, and
13 thereby become liable for your public liability. Just like any other deadbeat who has forfeited his right to whatever is
14 seized. You must now pay your fair share. We will learn more about unjust enrichment when we discuss constructive
15 contracts.

16 You no longer have a PRIVATE right to a PRIVATE bank account. Yes indeed, you cannot buy without a mark of the
17 beast. That biblical “mark of the beast” is what the Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.) calls a “franchise mark”. If you
18 don't want to believe me, will you believe your bank? Take a check from your own checkbook. Look at the line under the
19 signature space. Magnify the line 30 times and read the text. Then confess that you are not a principal owner of a bank
20 account. It is not your account; you are merely signing as an agent of the real owner. You have somehow become the
21 authorized representative of the real owner. NO ONE CAN BUY without a mark of the beast. You can deal with the beast
22 only as a representative of a “fiction of law” that it created. That fiction of law is a public office and is called the “straw
23 man” in the freedom community. See Form #05.042 for proof. It is no wonder the IRS can seize their own account without
24 a judicial determination.

25 Revelation 13:4 asks the questions: Who is like the beast? And who can make war with the beast? Are you beginning to
26 sense that you are subordinate to, not like, the beast? Are you beginning to sense that you have no authority to make war
27 (confront, challenge) the beast in court?

28 According to Black's Law Dictionary there is a legal maxim that Protection Draws Subjection:

29 *"The protection of an individual by government is on condition of his submission to the laws, and such*
30 *submission on the other hand entitles the individual to the protection of the government."*

Protectio trahit subjectionem, et subjectio pro-
tectionem. Protection draws with it subjec-
tion, and subjection protection. 7 Coke, 5a.
The protection of an individual by government
is on condition of his submission to the laws,
and such submission on the other hand enti-
ties the individual to the protection of the
government. Broom, Max. 78.

31 This has always been so. As Blackstone eloquently stated in the introduction to his commentaries on the law, the very
32 essence of laws that require us to obey our creator, also "oblige the inferior to take the will of him on whom he depends..."

33 That's right! If you cannot agree to their perverted, licentious laws then don't take their protection. You qualify for benefits
34 by agreeing that they are your protector/master/lord/benefactor. If you take their benefits, you must submit whether you
35 like it or not. No matter how evil they become. No matter how much they demand. If you take their benefits, they make
36 your rules. They determine what is right and what is wrong. Your moral values are now dictated from your benefactor.
37 This maxim has always existed. Slaves submit to their lords. Slaves must be provided for. Children must submit to
38 parents.

1 Conclusion:

2 Social Security CANNOT BE a program of the United States government.

3 There are federal statutes (which are required by treaty and by the bankruptcy receivership) that administer Social Security
4 in the United States. Social Security cannot be a United States program. It must remain foreign.

5 You have already been sold to a world government. Your SS number is much more than the Number of your Name. Read
6 the last item on the manifest in Revelation 18:13. Your soul has been sold.

7 Title 42 U.S.C. §433(a):

8 *"The President is authorized... to enter into agreements establishing totalization arrangements between the*
9 *Social Security System established by this subchapter and the social security system of any foreign country"*

10 Lastly, to prove to you that the average American born within and domiciled within a state of the Union is NOT eligible to
11 participate in Social Security, see:

- 12 1. *Social Security: Mark of the Beast*, Form #11.407
13 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
14 2. *Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security*, Form #06.001
15 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
16 3. *Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee*, Form #06.002 – how to terminate ILLEGAL and
17 UNCONSTITUTIONAL participation in government welfare
18 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

19 **2.7 PREVENTIVE justice requires consent and voluntary membership, while CORRECTIVE**
20 **justice does not**

21 There are two main conditions that courts and government can intervene:

- 22 1. PREVENTIVE JUSTICE: BEFORE an injury or likely injury occurs to prevent the injury. This is done usually under
23 the auspices of a franchise contract of some kind, such as the vehicle code, tax code, etc. This is also sometimes called
24 "prospective" enforcement.
25 2. CORRECTIVE JUSTICE: AFTER a proven injury occurs, to provide financial compensation to undo the damage.
26 This is done using the common law. This is also sometimes called "retrospective" enforcement.

27 It is very important to recognize that when government acts in a PREVENTIVE mode before an injury occurs against a
28 non-consenting party, they cannot do so without violating the Thirteenth Amendment prohibition on involuntary servitude
29 and the Fifth Amendment prohibition on the taking of property, meaning labor or services. Hence, whenever governments
30 seek to institute PREVENTIVE justice, they must procure your consent in advance of the enforcement action in order to
31 lawfully do so to avoid violating the Fifth or Thirteenth Amendments. It is a maxim of law that anything you consent to
32 cannot form the basis for an injury, remedy, or standing in any court of law:

33 *"Volunt non fit injuria.*
34 *He who consents cannot receive an injury. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T. R. 657; Shelf. on mar. & Div. 449.*

35 *Consensus tollit errorem.*
36 *Consent removes or obviates a mistake. Co. Litt. 126.*

37 *Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo consentire.*
38 *It is better to suffer every wrong or ill, than to consent to it. 3 Co. Inst. 23.*

39 *Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.*
40 *One cannot complain of having been deceived when he knew the fact and gave his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 145."*
41 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*
42 *SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm>]*

The civil statutory code is an example of law that implements PREVENTIVE justice. Statutes which implement PREVENTIVE justice are defined as “malum prohibitum”:

“Malum prohibitum. A wrong prohibited; a thing which is wrong because prohibited; an act which is not inherently immoral, but becomes so because its commission is expressly forbidden by positive law; an act involving an illegality resulting from positive law. Compare Malum in se. “
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 960]

CORRECTIVE justice is different. When an injury can be proven in court with evidence, the party instituting the injury has an implied duty and obligation to provide remedy to his or her victim and the court may compel the perpetrator to supply the remedy, regardless of whether they consent or not. For instance, if another driver damages your vehicle, then he has to reimburse you to fix the damage, whether he wants to or consents to. If he refuses to do so, the court can lien or even order the confiscation of his property. The criminal law is an example of CORRECTIVE justice. Law which implements CORRECTIVE justice is called “malum in se”.

MALUM IN SE. A wrong in itself; an act or case involving illegality from the very nature of the transaction, upon principles of natural, moral, and public law. Story, Ag. B 346. State v. Shedoudy, 45 N.M. 516, 118 P.2d. 280, 287.

An act is said to be malum In se when it is inherently and essentially evil, that is, immoral in its nature and injurious in its consequences, without any regard to the fact of its being noticed or punished by the law of the state. Such are most or all of the offenses cognizable at common law, (without the denouncement of a statute;) as murder, larceny, etc.
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1112]

Next, we must consider HOW consent is obtained in the case of PREVENTIVE justice. In practical terms that consent is procured by filling out an application to procure the “benefits” of a civil status under a government franchise. For example, the penalty or civil provisions of the vehicle code only becomes enforceable against statutory “drivers”, who are those that INDIVIDUALLY consented to participate in the vehicle code licensing franchise. For instance, police cannot tow an unregistered vehicle operated by an unlicensed driver. The vehicle has to be registered before it can be towed or else towing it would be THEFT. The act of “registering” it transmutes ownership of the property from ABSOLUTE to QUALIFIED, in which ownership and/or control is shared with the government.

Ownership. Collection of rights to use and enjoy property, including right to transmit it to others. Trustees of Phillips Exeter Academy v. Exeter, 92 N.H. 473, 33 A.2d. 665, 673. The complete dominion, title, or proprietary right in a thing or claim. The entirety of the powers of use and disposal allowed by law.

The right of one or more persons to possess and use a thing to the exclusion of others. The right by which a thing belongs to someone in particular, to the exclusion of all other persons. The exclusive right of possession, enjoyment, and disposal; involving as an essential attribute the right to control, handle, and dispose.

Ownership of property is either absolute or qualified. The ownership of property is absolute when a single person has the absolute dominion over it, and may use it or dispose of it according to his pleasure, subject only to general laws. The ownership is qualified when it is shared with one or more persons, when the time of enjoyment is deferred or limited, or when the use is restricted. Calif. Civil Code, §§678-680.

There may be ownership of all inanimate things which are capable of appropriation or of manual delivery; of all domestic animals; of all obligations; of such products of labor or skill as the composition of an author, the goodwill of a business, trademarks and signs, and of rights created or granted by statute. Calif. Civil Code, §655.

In connection with burglary, "ownership" means any possession which is rightful as against the burglar.

See also Equitable ownership; Exclusive ownership; Hold; Incident of ownership; Interest; Interval ownership; Ostensible ownership; Owner; Possession; Title.
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1106]

The act of consenting to share the ownership of otherwise absolutely owned property with the government is called “moiety”:

“Moiety (moy-ə-tee). 1. A half of something (such as an estate). 2. A portion less than half; a small segment. 3. In customs law, a payment made to an informant who assists the seizure of contraband.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 1021]

1 You can NEVER be free as long as you share either ownership or control of ANY of your property with any government.
2 Everything you have should be “absolutely owned”. The Declaration of Independence describes the right to
3 ABSOLUTELY own property as “the pursuit of happiness”, and it is the most important right you have. Any attempt to
4 dilute or alienate that right is a recipe for UNHAPPINESS:

5 “The provision [[Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1](#)], it is to be observed, places property under the same
6 protection as life and liberty. Except by due process of law, no State can deprive any person of either. The
7 provision has been supposed to secure to every individual the essential conditions for the pursuit of happiness;
8 and for that reason has not been heretofore, and should never be, construed in any narrow or restricted sense.”
9 [[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 \(1877\)](#)]

10 Property that is absolutely owned is PRIVATE property. Property whose ownership or control is shared with any
11 government is PUBLIC property. Property in your custody that is absolutely owned in its entirety by the government is
12 called a “usufruct”:

13 USUFRUCT. In [the civil law](#). The right of enjoying a thing, the property of which is vested in another, and to
14 draw from the same all the profit, utility, and advantage which it may produce, provided it be without altering
15 the substance of the thing. Civ.Code La. art. 533. *Mulford v. Le Franc*, 26 Cal. 102; *Modern Music Shop v.*
16 *Concordia Fire Ins. Co. of Milwaukee*, 131 Misc. 305, 226 N.Y.S. 630, 635.

17 *Under Greek Law*. A right attached to the person which may not be inherited. *New England Trust Co. v. Wood*,
18 *Mass.*, 93 N.E.2d. 547, 549.

19 Imperfect Usufruct

20 An imperfect or quasi usufruct is that which is of things which would be useless to the usufructuary if he did not
21 consume or expend them or change the substance of them; as, money, grain, liquors. Civ.Code La. art. 534.

22 See *Quasi Usufruct* infra.

23 Legal Usufruct

24 See that title.

25 Perfect Usufruct

26 An usufruct in those things which the usufructuary can enjoy without changing their substance, though their
27 substance may be diminished or deteriorate naturally by time or by the use to which they are applied, as, a
28 house, a piece of land, furniture, and other movable effects. Civ.Code La. art. 534.

29 Quasi Usufruct

30 In the civil law. Originally the usufruct gave no right to the substance of the thing, and consequently none to its
31 consumption; hence only an inconsumable thing could be the object of it, whether movable or immovable. But
32 in later times the right of usufruct was, by analogy, extended to consumable things, and therewith arose the
33 distinction between true and quasi usufructs. See *Mackeld. Rom. Law*, §307; Civ.Code La. art. 534. See
34 *Imperfect Usufruct*, supra.

35 [*Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1713*]

36 If there is anything that you absolutely must have to survive that is absolutely owned by the government or whose
37 ownership is shared with the government, then the government has you by the balls and you become a slave, whether you
38 want to or not:

39 “The rich rules over the poor,
40 And **the borrower is servant to the lender.**”
41 [*Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV*]

42 Every type of government franchise at its core is nothing more than a purchase/sale of government property. This includes
43 marriage license, driver license, professional license, the income tax, etc. The abuse of sales or offers of property to create
44 slavery is called usury. Below is the biblical prohibition against usury:

1 *'If one of your brethren becomes poor [desperate], and falls into poverty among you, then you shall help*
2 *him, like a stranger or a sojourner, that he may live with you.*
3 *Take no usury or interest from him; but fear your God, that your brother may live with you.*
4 *You shall not lend him your money for usury, nor lend him your food at a profit.*
5 *I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan and to be*
6 *your God.*
7 *'And if one of your brethren who dwells by you becomes poor, and sells himself to you, you shall not compel*
8 *him to serve as a slave.*
9 *As a hired servant and a sojourner he shall be with you, and shall serve you until the Year of Jubilee.*
10 *And then he shall depart from you—he and his children with him—and shall return to his own family. He shall*
11 *return to the possession of his fathers.*
12 *For they are My servants, whom I brought out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as slaves.*
13 *You shall not rule over him with rigor, but you shall fear your God.*
14 *[Lev. 25:35-43, Bible, NKJV]*

15 Any attempt to COMPEL you to consent to PREVENTIVE justice or to any civil or franchise status that implies consent is
16 ALSO a form of usury and illegal duress. Furthermore, if your rights are “inalienable” as the Declaration of Independence
17 says, then you aren't even ALLOWED legally to consent. Any attempt by a REAL de jure government to alienate rights
18 that are supposed to be unalienable is itself DURESS:

19 *“An agreement [consensual contract] obtained by duress, coercion, or intimidation is invalid, since the party*
20 *coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much the means by which the party is compelled to*
21 *execute the agreement as the state of mind induced.⁶ Duress, like fraud, rarely becomes material, except where*
22 *a contract or conveyance has been made which the maker wishes to avoid. As a general rule, duress renders*
23 *the contract or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the person coerced,⁷ and it is susceptible of*
24 *ratification. Like other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is avoided by the person entitled to avoid it.⁸*
25 *However, duress in the form of physical compulsion, in which a party is caused to appear to assent when he has*
26 *no intention of doing so, is generally deemed to render the resulting purported contract void.⁹”*
27 *[American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999)]*

28 The essence of ownership is the right to exclude ANYONE and EVERYONE from using or benefitting from the property.
29 If you can't exclude the government from owning or controlling specific property, then THEY and not YOU are the REAL
30 absolute owner. If the so-called “government” will not provide a way for you to absolutely own ANYTHING, then there is
31 no de jure government. Instead, you live on a FARM and you are government cattle:

How to Leave the Government Farm, Form #12.020
<http://youtu.be/Mp1gJ3iF2Ik>

32 Everything you own should be PRIVATE and you should NEVER allow any portion of your property to become PUBLIC.
33 That is the ONLY way you can ever be truly happy or truly free. “Pursuit of happiness” mentioned in the Declaration of
34 Independence has been equated by the courts as the right to absolutely and privately own private property. *Munn v.*
35 *Illinois*, 94 U.S. 113 (1877). The main purpose of establishing government is, in fact, to PREVENT such a conversion. For
36 more information on the mandatory legal separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE, see:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
FORMS PAGE: <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
DIRECT LINK: <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

⁶ *Brown v. Pierce*, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134

⁷ *Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank*, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 (holding that acts induced by duress which operate solely on the mind, and fall short of actual physical compulsion, are not void at law, but are voidable only, at the election of him whose acts were induced by it); *Faske v. Gershman*, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; *Glenney v. Crane* (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962); *Carroll v. Fetty*, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85.

⁸ *Faske v. Gershman*, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; *Heider v. Unicume*, 142 Or. 416, 20 P.2d. 384; *Glenney v. Crane* (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962)

⁹ Restatement 2d, Contracts §174, stating that if conduct that appears to be a manifestation of assent by a party who does not intend to engage in that conduct is physically compelled by duress, the conduct is not effective as a manifestation of assent.

2.8 The Right to Ignore the State (Civily)

Private property is the origin of your right to be left alone by the state. Absolute ownership of land is the origin of your right to post “No Trespassing” signs around the property and to control anyone and everyone who sets foot on the property. Without private property, legal “justice” is IMPOSSIBLE. We define “private property” as follows:

SEDM Disclaimer

4. Meaning of Words

4.3 Private

The word "private" when it appears in front of other entity names such as "person", "individual", "business", "employee", "employer", etc. shall imply that the entity is:

1. In possession of absolute, exclusive ownership and control over their own labor, body, and all their property. In Roman Law this was called "dominium".
2. On an EQUAL rather than inferior relationship to government in court. This means that they have no obligations to any government OTHER than possibly the duty to serve on jury and vote upon voluntary acceptance of the obligations of the civil status of "citizen" (and the DOMICILE that creates it). Otherwise, they are entirely free and unregulated unless and until they INJURE the equal rights of another under the common law.
3. A "nonresident" in relation to the state and federal government.
4. Not a PUBLIC entity defined within any state or federal statutory law. This includes but is not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any under any civil statute or franchise.
5. Not engaged in a public office or "trade or business" (per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)). Such offices include but are not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any civil statute or franchise.

"PRIVATE PERSON. An individual who is not the incumbent of an office."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1359]

6. Not consenting to contract with or acquire any public status, public privilege, or public right under any state or federal franchise. For instance, the phrase "private employee" means a common law worker that is NOT the statutory "employee" defined within 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) or 26 C.F.R. §301.3401(c)-1 or any other federal or state law or statute.
7. Not sharing ownership or control of their body or property with anyone, and especially a government. In other words, ownership is not "qualified" but "absolute".
8. Not subject to civil enforcement or regulation of any kind, except AFTER an injury to the equal rights of others has occurred. Preventive rather than corrective regulation is an unlawful taking of property according to the Fifth Amendment takings clause.
9. Not "privileged" or party to a franchise of any kind:

"PRIVILEGE. "A right, power, franchise, or immunity held by a person or class, against or beyond the course of the law. [. . .] That which releases one from the performance of a duty or obligation, or exempts one from a liability which he would otherwise be required to perform, or sustain in common [common law] with all other persons. State v. Grosnickle, 189 Wis. 17, 206 N.W. 895, 896. A peculiar advantage, exemption, or immunity. Sacramento Orphanage & Children's Home v. Chambers, 25 Cal.App. 536, 144 P. 317, 319.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 1359-1360]

"Is it a franchise? A franchise is said to be a right reserved to the people by the constitution, as the elective franchise. Again, it is said to be a privilege conferred by grant from government, and vested in one or more individuals, as a public office. Corporations, or bodies politic are the most usual franchises known to our laws. In England they are very numerous, and are defined to be royal privileges in the hands of a subject. An information will lie in many cases growing out of these grants, especially where corporations are concerned, as by the statute of 9 Anne, ch. 20, and in which the public have an interest. In 1 Strange R. (The King v. Sir William Louthier,) it was held that an information of this kind did not lie in the case of private rights, where no franchise of the crown has been invaded.

If this is so--if in England a privilege existing in a subject, which the king alone could grant, constitutes it a franchise--in this country, under our institutions, a privilege or

immunity of a public nature, which could not be exercised without a legislative grant, would also be a franchise."
[People v. Ridgley, 21 Ill. 65, 1859 WL 6687, 11 Peck 65 (Ill., 1859)]

10. The equivalent to a common law or Constitutional "person" who retains all of their common law and Constitutional protections and waives none.

"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law. Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption. "

[The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10; SOURCE:

http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf/

See Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31.

Every attempt by anyone in government to alienate rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE shall also be treated as "PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITY" that cannot be protected by sovereign, official, or judicial immunity. So called "government" cannot make a [profitable business or franchise](#) out of alienating inalienable rights without ceasing to be a classical/de jure government and instead becoming in effect an [economic terrorist and de facto government in violation of Article 4, Section 4](#).

"No servant [or government or biological person] can serve **two masters**; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. **You cannot serve God and mammon [government].**"
[Luke 16:13, Bible, NKJV]

[SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.3; SOURCE: <http://sedm.org/disclaimer.htm>]

The best description we have seen of your absolute right to be left alone by the government comes from an author named Herbert Spencer, whose works you can read below:

Selected Works of Herbert Spencer, Constitution Society
<http://constitution.famguardian.org/hs/spencer.htm>

A fascinating essay on "The Right to Ignore the State" is found in the above list below. Indirectly, this essay is a description of "justice" as legally defined, because justice itself is the right to be left alone by EVERYONE:

The Right to Ignore the State, Herbert Spencer
http://constitution.famguardian.org/hs/ignore_state.htm

Herbert Spencer was an incredible prophet and a magnificent defender of laissez-faire. Among his numerous works is *The Man Versus The State*, first published in 1884. That book launched one of the most spirited attacks on statism ever written. He ridiculed the idea that government intervention of any kind "will work as it is intended to work, which it never does." He drew on his tremendous knowledge of history, citing one dramatic case after another of price controls, usury laws, slum clearance laws, and myriad other laws which, touted as compassionate policies, intensified human misery. Below is one of his essays that explores the principles of self-government, which Henry David Thoreau defended in his seminal essay, *Civil Disobedience*.

Not being a lawyer, Spencer did not distinguish WHAT aspect of your connection with the state you may voluntarily abandon, but the implication is quite clear: It is the protection of the civil statutes of the state. Those civil statutes only acquire the "force of law" among those who have voluntarily and consensually chosen a civil domicile within the state, and thereby acquired the statutory civil status of "citizen" or "resident". We cover this subject at length in the following exhaustive free memorandum of law:

Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

A human being who must be CIVILLY left alone and who is therefore protected ONLY by God's law, the constitution, the criminal law, and the common law is referred to by any one or more of the following names:

1. "nonresident".
2. "transient foreigner".
3. "stateless person".
4. "in transitu".
5. "transient".
6. "sojourner".
7. "civilly dead".

You have an absolute, constitutional right to acquire and retain ANY civil status you want from the above list, and violating that right constitutes criminal identity theft. This is covered in:

Your Exclusive Right to Declare and Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Indirectly, what Herbert's essay does is define and identify the legal existence of all the above civil statuses. Judges and government prosecutors intent on STEALING your money or your PRIVATE property sometimes try to mock those who claim to be any of the above civil statuses by falsely calling them "frivolous", even though these are perfectly acceptable civil statuses expressly identified by the courts themselves. They do this as a mind-game and guilt trip to prevent you from escaping their usury and the CRIMINAL IDENTITY THEFT that implements it as described below:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

An entire memorandum of law has been written about those who have the absolute, constitutional right to be left alone as follows:

Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Unfortunately, Spencer writes more as a philosopher than a lawyer, and because of this, falls prey to the plight of all philosophers who are legally ignorant. One member in our forums who apologized for being a philosopher who is legally ignorant got the following response in the member forums:

Family Guardian is confused about the definition of socialism

*The bible says that people who focus on philosophy rather than REAL LAW from the Bible are an abomination.
You should study law BEFORE you study philosophy:*

*One who turns away his ear from hearing the law,
Even his prayer is an abomination.
[Prov. 28:9, Bible, NKJV]*

*"Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the
tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to
Christ."
[Col. 2:8, Bible, NKJV]*

[SOURCE: <https://famguardian.org/forums/forums/topic/family-guardian-is-confused-about-the-definition-of-socialism/#post-21640>]

The MAJOR mistake of Spencer, like so many other philosophers before him, is in thinking that ANY MAN can be a legitimate source of law for any civilized society. The Bible identifies God as THE ONLY "lawgiver" and therefore source

1 of law. Isaiah 33:22. Any attempt to make any man the source of law results in religious idolatry, as described in the
2 following:

Why All Man-Made Law is Religious in Nature, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/ChurchVState/WhyAllManmadeLawRelig.htm>

3 Everything not found in God's law is, in turn, merely a temporary civil man-made rather than god-made franchise that
4 Christians are FORBIDDEN from consenting to or participating in. They are "non-resident non-persons" to all such law as
5 described in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6 The remainder of this section after the horizontal line below reprints Spencer's fascinating essay for the edification of the
7 reader on the subject of what "justice" means. What he calls "the law of equal freedom" is documented in Requirement for
8 Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033. If you like his genre of writing, Lysander Spooner¹⁰ also lived the
9 same time as him and wrote about many of the same subjects.

10 _____

11 **The Right to Ignore the State**
12 by Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)

13 **1. The Right to Voluntary Outlawry**

14 As a corollary to the proposition that all institutions must be subordinated to the law of equal freedom, we cannot choose
15 but admit the right of the citizen to adopt a condition of voluntary outlawry. If every man has freedom to do all that he
16 wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man, then he is free to drop connection with the state — to
17 relinquish its protection, and to refuse paying toward its support. It is self-evident that in so behaving he in no way trenches
18 upon the liberty of others; for his position is a passive one; and whilst passive he cannot become an aggressor. It is equally
19 self-evident that he cannot be compelled to continue one of a political corporation, without a breach of the moral law,
20 seeing that citizenship involves payment of taxes; and the taking away of a man's property against his will, is an
21 infringement of his rights. Government being simply an agent employed in common by a number of individuals to secure to
22 them certain advantages, the very nature of the connection implies that it is for each to say whether he will employ such an
23 agent or not. If any one of them determines to ignore this mutual-safety confederation, nothing can be said except that he
24 loses all claim to its good offices, and exposes himself to the danger of maltreatment — a thing he is quite at liberty to do if
25 he likes. He cannot be coerced into political combination without a breach of the law of equal freedom; he *can* withdraw
26 from it without committing any such breach; and he has therefore a right so to withdraw.

27 **2. The Immorality of the State**

28 "No human laws are of any validity if contrary to the law of nature; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and
29 all their authority mediately or immediately from this original." Thus writes Blackstone^[1], to whom let all honour be given
30 for having so far outseen the ideas of his time; and, indeed, we may say of our time. A good antidote, this, for those
31 political superstitions which so widely prevail. A good check upon that sentiment of power-worship which still misleads us
32 by magnifying the prerogatives of constitutional governments as it once did those of monarchs. Let men learn that a
33 legislature is *not* "our God upon earth," though, by the authority they ascribe to it, and the things they expect from it, they
34 would seem to think it is. Let them learn rather that it is an institution serving a purely temporary purpose, whose power,
35 when not stolen, is at the best borrowed.

36 Nay, indeed, have we not seen that government is essentially immoral? Is it not the offspring of evil, bearing about it all the
37 marks of its parentage? Does it not exist because crime exists? Is it not strong, or as we say, despotic, when crime is great?
38 Is there not more liberty, that is, less government, as crime diminishes? And must not government cease when crime ceases,
39 for very lack of objects on which to perform its function? Not only does magisterial power exist *because* of evil; but it

¹⁰ See: Published Authors: Lysander Spooner, Family Guardian Fellowship;
<https://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Indiv/SpoonerLysander/LysanderSpooner.htm>.

exists *by* evil. Violence is employed to maintain it; and all violence involves criminality. Soldiers, policemen, and gaolers; swords, batons, and fetters, are instruments for inflicting pain; and all infliction of pain is in the abstract wrong. The state employs evil weapons to subjugate evil, and is alike contaminated by the objects with which it deals, and the means by which it works. Morality cannot recognize it; for morality, being simply a statement of the perfect law can give no countenance to any thing growing out of, and living by, breaches of that law. Wherefore, legislative authority can never be ethical must always be conventional merely.

Hence, there is a certain inconsistency in the attempt to determine the right position, structure, and conduct of a government by appeal to the first principles of rectitude. For, as just pointed out, the acts of an institution which is in both nature and origin imperfect, cannot be made to square with the perfect law. All that we can do is to ascertain, firstly, in what attitude a legislature must stand to the community to avoid being by its mere existence an embodied wrong; — secondly, in what manner it must be constituted so as to exhibit the least incongruity with the moral law; — and thirdly, to what sphere its actions must be limited to prevent it from multiplying those breaches of equity it is set up to prevent.

The first condition to be conformed to before a legislature can be established without violating the law of equal freedom, is the acknowledgment of the right now under discussion — the right to ignore the state.^[2]

3. The People as the Source of Power

Upholders of pure despotism may fitly believe state-control to be unlimited and unconditional. They who assert that men are made for governments and not governments for men, may consistently hold that no one can remove himself beyond the pale of political organization. But they who maintain that the people are the only legitimate source of power — that legislative authority is not original, but deputed — cannot deny the right to ignore the state without entangling themselves in an absurdity.

For, if legislative authority is deputed, it follows that those from whom it proceeds are the masters of those on whom it is conferred: it follows further, that as masters they confer the said authority voluntarily: and this implies that they may give or withhold it as they please. To call that deputed which is wrenched from men whether they will or not, is nonsense. But what is here true of all collectively is equally true of each separately. As a government can rightly act for the people, only when empowered by them, so also can it rightly act for the individual, only when empowered by him. If A, B, and C, debate whether they shall employ an agent to perform for them a certain service, and if whilst A and B agree to do so, C dissents, C cannot equitably be made a party to the agreement in spite of himself. And this must be equally true of thirty as of three: and if of thirty, why not of three hundred, or three thousand, or three millions?

4. Subordination of Government Authority

Of the political superstitions lately alluded to, none is so universally diffused as the notion that majorities are omnipotent. Under the impression that the preservation of order will ever require power to be wielded by some party, the moral sense of our time feels that such power cannot rightly be conferred on any but the largest moiety of society. It interprets literally the saying that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," and transferring to the one the sacredness attached to the other, it concludes that from the will of the people, that is of the majority, there can be no appeal. Yet is this belief entirely erroneous.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that, struck by some Malthusian panic, a legislature duly representing public opinion were to enact that all children born during the next ten years should be drowned. Does any one think such an enactment would be warrantable? If not, there is evidently a limit to the power of a majority. Suppose, again, that of two races living together — Celts and Saxons, for example — the most numerous determined to make the others their slaves. Would the authority of the greatest number be in such case valid? If not, there is something to which its authority must be subordinate. Suppose, once more, that all men having incomes under 50 pounds a year were to resolve upon reducing every income above that amount to their own standard, and appropriating the excess for public purposes. Could their resolution be justified? If not, it must be a third time confessed that there is a law to which the popular voice must defer. What, then, is that law, if not the law of pure equity — the law of equal freedom? These restraints, which all would put to the will of the majority, are exactly the restraints set up by that law. We deny the right of a majority to murder, to enslave, or to rob, simply because murder, enslaving, and robbery are violations of that law — violations too gross to be overlooked. But if great violations of it are wrong, so also are smaller ones. If the will of the many cannot supersede the first principle of morality in these cases, neither can it in any. So that, however insignificant the minority, and however trifling the proposed trespass against their rights, no such trespass is permissible.

1 When we have made our constitution purely democratic, thinks to himself the earnest reformer, we shall have brought
2 government into harmony with absolute justice. Such a faith, though perhaps needful for this age, is a very erroneous one.
3 By no process can coercion be made equitable. The freest form of government is only the least objectional form. The rule of
4 the many by the few we call tyranny: the rule of the few by the many is tyranny also; only of a less intense kind. "You shall
5 do as we will, and not as you will," is in either case the declaration: and if the hundred make it to the ninety-nine, instead of
6 the ninety-nine to the hundred, it is only a fraction less immoral. Of two such parties, whichever fulfils this declaration
7 necessarily breaks the law of equal freedom: the only difference being that by the one it is broken in the persons of ninety-
8 nine, whilst by the other it is broken in the persons of a hundred. And the merit of the democratic form of government
9 consists solely in this, that it trespasses against the smallest number.

10 The very existence of majorities and minorities is indicative of an immoral state. The man whose character harmonizes with
11 the moral law, we found to be one who can obtain complete happiness without diminishing the happiness of his fellows.
12 But the enactment of public arrangements by vote implies a society consisting of men otherwise constituted — implies that
13 the desires of some cannot be satisfied without sacrificing the desires of others — implies that in the pursuit of their
14 happiness the majority inflict a certain amount of *unhappiness* on the minority — implies, therefore, organic immorality.
15 Thus, from another point of view, we again perceive that even in its most equitable form it is impossible for government to
16 dissociate itself from evil; and further, that unless the right to ignore the state is recognized, its acts must be essentially
17 criminal.

18 **5. The Limits of Taxation**

19 That a man is free to abandon the benefits and throw off the burdens of citizenship, may indeed be inferred from the
20 admissions of existing authorities and of current opinion. Unprepared as they probably are for so extreme a doctrine as the
21 one here maintained, the radicals of our day yet unwittingly profess their belief in a maxim which obviously embodies this
22 doctrine. Do we not continually hear them quote Blackstone's assertion that "no subject of England can be constrained to
23 pay any aids or taxes even for the defence of the realm or the support of government, but such as are imposed by his own
24 consent, or that of his representative in parliament?" And what does this mean? It means, say they, that every man should
25 have a vote. True: but it means much more. If there is any sense in words it is a distinct enunciation of the very right now
26 contended for. In affirming that a man may not be taxed unless he has directly or indirectly given his consent, it affirms that
27 he may refuse to be so taxed; and to refuse to be taxed, is to cut all connection with the state. Perhaps it will be said that this
28 consent is not a specific, but a general one, and that the citizen is understood to have assented to every thing his
29 representative may do, when he voted for him. But suppose he did not vote for him; and on the contrary did all in his power
30 to get elected some one holding opposite views — what then? The reply will probably be that, by taking part in such an
31 election, he tacitly agreed to abide by the decision of the majority. And how if he did not vote at all? Why then he cannot
32 justly complain of any tax, seeing that he made no protest against its imposition. So, curiously enough, it seems that he
33 gave his consent in whatever way he acted — whether he said yes, whether he said no, or whether he remained neuter! A
34 rather awkward doctrine this. Here stands an unfortunate citizen who is asked if he will pay money for a certain proffered
35 advantage; and whether he employs the only means of expressing his refusal or does not employ it, we are told that he
36 practically agrees; if only the number of others who agree is greater than the number of those who dissent. And thus we are
37 introduced to the novel principle that A's consent to a thing is not determined by what A says, but by what B may happen to
38 say!

39 It is for those who quote Blackstone to choose between this absurdity and the doctrine above set forth. Either his maxim
40 implies the right to ignore the state, or it is sheer nonsense.

41 **6. On Civil and Religious Liberty**

42 There is a strange heterogeneity in our political faiths. Systems that have had their day, and are beginning here and there to
43 let the daylight through, are patched with modern notions utterly unlike in quality and colour; and men gravely display
44 these systems, wear them, and walk about in them, quite unconscious of their grotesqueness. This transition state of ours,
45 partaking as it does equally of the past and the future, breeds hybrid theories exhibiting the oddest union of bygone
46 despotism and coming freedom. Here are types of the old organization curiously disguised by germs of the new —
47 peculiarities showing adaptation to a preceding state modified by rudiments that prophesy of something to come — making
48 altogether so chaotic a mixture of relationships that there is no saying to what class these births of the age should be
49 referred.

As ideas must of necessity bear the stamp of the time, it is useless to lament the contentment with which these incongruous beliefs are held. Otherwise it would seem unfortunate that men do not pursue to the end the trains of reasoning which have led to these partial modifications. In the present case, for example, consistency would force them to admit that, on other points besides the one just noticed, they hold opinions and use arguments in which the right to ignore the state is involved.

For what is the meaning of Dissent? The time was when a man's faith and his mode of worship were as much determinable by law as his secular acts; and, according to provisions extant in our statute-book, are so still. Thanks to the growth of a Protestant spirit, however, we have ignored the state in this matter — wholly in theory, and partly in practice. But how have we done so? By assuming an attitude which, if consistently maintained, implies a right to ignore the state entirely. Observe the positions of the two parties. "This is your creed," says the legislator; "you must believe and openly profess what is here set down for you." "I shall not do any thing of the kind," answers the non-conformist, "I will go to prison rather." "Your religious ordinances," pursues the legislator, "shall be such as we have prescribed. You shall attend the churches we have endowed, and adopt the ceremonies used in them." "Nothing shall induce me to do so," is the reply; "I altogether deny your power to dictate to me in such matters, and mean to resist to the uttermost." "Lastly," adds the legislator, "we shall require you to pay such sums of money toward the support of these religious institutions, as we may see fit to ask." "Not a farthing will you have from me," exclaims our sturdy Independent: "even did I believe in the doctrines of your church (which I do not), I should still rebel against your interference; and if you take my property, it shall be by force and under protest."

What now does this proceeding amount to when regarded in the abstract? It amounts to an assertion by the individual of the right to exercise one of his faculties — the religious sentiment — without let or hindrance, and with no limit save that set up by the equal claims of others. And what is meant by ignoring the state? Simply an assertion of the right similarly to exercise *all* the faculties. The one is just an expansion of the other — rests on the same footing with the other — must stand or fall with the other. Men do indeed speak of civil and religious liberty as different things; but the distinction is quite arbitrary. They are parts of the same whole and cannot philosophically be separated.

"Yes they can," interposes an objector; "assertion of the one is imperative as being a religious duty. The liberty to worship God in the way that seems to him right, is a liberty without which a man cannot fulfil what he believes to be Divine commands, and therefore conscience requires him to maintain it." True enough; but how if the same can be asserted of all other liberty? How if maintenance of this also turns out to be a matter of conscience? Have we not seen that human happiness is the Divine will — that only by exercising our faculties is this happiness obtainable — and that it is impossible to exercise them without freedom? And if this freedom for the exercise of faculties is a condition without which the Divine will cannot be fulfilled, the preservation of it is, by our objector's own showing, a duty. Or, in other words, it appears not only that the maintenance of liberty of action *may* be a point of conscience, but that it *ought* to be one. And thus we are clearly shown that the claims to ignore the state in religious and in secular matters are in essence identical.

The other reason commonly assigned for nonconformity, admits of similar treatment. Besides resisting state dictation in the abstract, the dissenter resists it from disapprobation of the doctrines taught. No legislative injunction will make him adopt what he considers an erroneous belief; and, bearing in mind his duty toward his fellow-men, he refuses to help through the medium of his purse in disseminating this erroneous belief. The position is perfectly intelligible. But it is one which either commits its adherents to civil nonconformity also, or leaves them in a dilemma. For why do they refuse to be instrumental in spreading error? Because error is adverse to human happiness. And on what ground is any piece of secular legislation disapproved? For the same reason — because thought adverse to human happiness. How then can it be shown that the state ought to be resisted in the one case and not in the other? Will any one deliberately assert that if a government demands money from us to aid in *teaching* what we think will produce evil, we ought to refuse it; but that if the money is for the purpose of *doing* what we think will produce evil, we ought not to refuse it? Yet such is the hopeful proposition which those have to maintain who recognize the right to ignore the state in religious matters, but deny it in civil matters.

7. Progress Hindered by Lack of Social Morality

The substance of the essay once more reminds us of the incongruity between a perfect law and an imperfect state. The practicability of the principle here laid down varies directly as social morality. In a thoroughly vicious community its admission would be productive of anarchy. In a completely virtuous one its admission will be both innocuous and inevitable. Progress toward a condition of social health — a condition, that is, in which the remedial measures of legislation will no longer be needed, is progress toward a condition in which those remedial measures will be cast aside, and the authority prescribing them disregarded. The two changes are of necessity coordinate. That moral sense whose supremacy will make society harmonious and government unnecessary, is the same moral sense which will then make each man assert his freedom even to the extent of ignoring the state — is the same moral sense which, by deterring the majority from

1 coercing the minority, will eventually render government impossible. And as what are merely different manifestations of
2 the same sentiment must bear a constant ratio to each other, the tendency to repudiate governments will increase only at the
3 same rate that governments become needless.

4 Let not any be alarmed, therefore, at the promulgation of the foregoing doctrine. There are many changes yet to be passed
5 through before it can begin to exercise much influence. Probably a long time will elapse before the right to ignore the State
6 will be generally admitted, even in theory. It will be still longer before it receives legislative recognition. And even then
7 there will be plenty of checks upon the premature exercise of it. A sharp experience will sufficiently instruct those who may
8 too soon abandon legal protection. Whilst, in the majority of men, there is such a love of tried arrangements, and so great a
9 dread of experiments, that they will probably not act upon this right until long after it is safe to do so.

10 **8. The Coming Decay of the State**

11 It is a mistake to assume that government must necessarily last forever. The institution marks a certain stage of civilization
12 — is natural to a particular phase of human development. It is not essential, but incidental. As amongst the Bushmen we
13 find a state antecedent to government, so may there be one in which it shall have become extinct. Already has it lost
14 something of its importance. The time was when the history of a people was but the history of its government. It is
15 otherwise now. The once universal despotism was but a manifestation of the extreme necessity of restraint. Feudalism,
16 serfdom, slavery, all tyrannical institutions, are merely the most vigorous kinds of rule, springing out of, and necessary to, a
17 bad state of man. The progress from these is in all cases the same — less government. Constitutional forms means this.
18 Political freedom means this. Democracy means this. In societies, associations, joint-stock companies, we have new
19 agencies occupying big fields filled in less advanced times and countries by the State. With us the legislature is dwarfed by
20 newer and greater powers — is no longer master, but slave. "Pressure from without" has come to be acknowledged as
21 ultimate ruler. The triumph of the Anti-Corn Law League is simply the most marked instance yet of the new style of
22 government, that of opinion, overcoming the old style, that of force. It bids fair to become a trite remark that the law-maker
23 is but the servant of the thinker. Daily is Statecraft held in less repute. Even the "Times" can see that "the social changes
24 thickening around us establish a truth sufficiently humiliating to legislative bodies," and that "the great stages of our
25 progress are determined rather by the spontaneous workings of society, connected as they are with the progress of art and
26 science, the operation of nature, and other such unpolitical causes, than by the proposition of a bill, the passing of an act, or
27 any other event of politics or of State." Thus, as civilization advances, does government decay. To the bad it is essential; to
28 the good, not. It is the check which national wickedness makes to itself, and exists only to the same degree. Its continuance
29 is proof of still-existing barbarism. What a cage is to the wild beast, law is to the selfish man. Restraint is for the savage, the
30 rapacious, the violent; not for the just, the gentle, the benevolent. All necessity for external force implies a morbid state.
31 Dungeons for the felon; a strait jacket for the maniac; crutches for the lame; stays for the weak-backed; for the infirm of
32 purpose a master; for the foolish a guide; but for the sound mind in a sound body none of these. Were there no thieves and
33 murderers, prisons would be unnecessary. It is only because tyranny is yet rife in the world that we have armies. Barristers,
34 judges, juries, all the instruments of law, exist simply because knavery exists. Magisterial force is the sequence of social
35 vice, and the policeman is but the complement of the criminal. Therefore it is that we call government "a necessary evil."

36 What then must be thought of a morality which chooses this probationary institution for its basis, builds a vast fabric of
37 conclusions upon its assumed permanence, selects acts of parliament for its materials, and employs the statesman for its
38 architect? The expediency-philosopher does this. It takes government into partnership, assigns to it entire control of its
39 affairs, enjoins all to defer to its judgment, makes it, in short, the vital principle, the very soul, of its system. When Paley
40 teaches that "the interest of the whole society is binding upon every part of it," he implies the existence of some supreme
41 power by which "that interest of the whole society" is to be determined. And elsewhere he more explicitly tells us that for
42 the attainment of a national advantage the private will of the subject is to give way, and that "the proof of this advantage
43 lies with the legislature." Still more decisive is Bentham when he says that "the happiness of the individuals of whom a
44 community is composed — that is, their pleasures and their security — is the sole end which the legislator ought to have in
45 view, the sole standard in conformity with which each individual ought, as far as depends upon the legislature, to be made
46 to fashion his behavior." These positions, be it remembered, are not voluntarily assumed; they are necessitated by the
47 premises. If, as its propounder tells us, "expediency" means the benefit of the mass, not of the individual, — of the future as
48 much as of the present, — it presupposes some one to judge of what will most conduce to that benefit. Upon the "utility" of
49 this or that measure the views are so various as to render an umpire essential. Whether protective duties, or established
50 religions, or capital punishments, or poor-laws, do or do not minister to the "general good" are questions concerning which
51 there is such difference of opinion that, were nothing to be done till all agreed upon them, we might stand still to the end of
52 time. If each man carried out, independently of a State power, his own notions of what would best secure "the greatest
53 happiness of the greatest number," society would quickly lapse into confusion. Clearly, therefore, a morality established

upon a maxim of which the practical interpretation is questionable involves the existence of some authority whose decisions respecting it shall be final, — that is, a legislature. And without that authority such a morality must ever remain inoperative.

See here, then, the predicament, a system of moral philosophy professes to be a code of correct rules for the control of human beings — fitted for the regulation of the best as well as the worst members of the race — applicable, if true, to the guidance of humanity in its highest conceivable perfection. Government, however, is an institution originating in man's imperfection; an institution confessedly begotten by necessity out of evil; one which might be dispensed with were the world peopled with the unselfish, the conscientious, the philanthropic; one, in short, inconsistent with this same "highest conceivable perfection." How, then, can that be a true system of morality which adopts government as one of its premises?

Author's Endnotes

¹ Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780) was the most renowned of English jurists.

² Hence may be drawn an argument for direct taxation; seeing that only when taxation is direct does repudiation of state burdens become possible.

3 Social/Political Justice

3.1 Political definition of “Social Justice”

“Social Justice” is used as the justification by statists for transforming a free society where the people are equal to the government into a civil religion that worships government as a pagan deity. Here is a POLITICAL definition of the term from a United Nations report:

“Social justice may be broadly understood as the fair and compassionate distribution of the fruits of economic growth...”

[. . .]

“Social justice is not possible without strong and coherent redistributive policies conceived and implemented by public agencies.”

[“Social Justice in an Open World: The Role of the United Nations”, The International Forum for Social Development, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS, Division for Social Policy and Development, ST/ESA/305” (PDF). New York: United Nations. 2006. p. 16]

According to the above U.N. definition, “social justice” therefore implies:

1. A strong overarching government MUCH more powerful than individuals so it can STEAL from individuals with impunity.

The Law and Charity

*You say: “There are persons who have no money,” and you turn to the law. but the law is not a breast that fills itself with milk. Nor are the lacteal veins of the law supplied with milk from a source outside the society. Nothing can enter the public treasury for the benefit of one citizen or one class unless other citizens and other classes have been forced to send it in. **If every person draws from the treasury the amount that he has put in it, it is true that the law then plunders nobody. But this procedure does nothing for the persons who have no money. It does not promote equality of income. The law can be an instrument of equalization only as it takes from some persons and gives to other persons. When the law does this, it is an instrument of plunder.***
[The Law, Frederic Bastiat; SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/TheLaw/TheLaw.htm>]

2. A collectivist society, where everything is controlled by the state. Control is synonymous with ownership, because ownership is based on the right to EXCLUDE any and all others from using or benefitting from a thing:

Collectivism: a political or economic theory advocating collective control [e.g. OWNERSHIP] esp. over production and distribution or a system marked by such control.
[Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 259]

Property. [. . .]The term is said to extend to every species of valuable right and interest. More specifically, ownership; the unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing; the right to dispose of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it, and to exclude everyone else from interfering with it. That dominion or indefinite right of use or disposition which one may lawfully exercise over particular things or subjects. The exclusive right of possessing, enjoying, and disposing of a thing. The highest right a man can have to anything; being used to refer to that right which one has to lands or tenements, goods or chattels, which no way depends on another man's courtesy.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 1095]

A government that can take away your property that you haven't hurt someone with is the REAL owner. You are just a custodian over THEIR property if they can do THAT. For more on collectivism, see:

Collectivism and How to Resist It Course, Form #12.024

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. A government with superior or supernatural powers above human beings, who are the natural. If it is theft for a human to steal wealth from one and give to another and all people are equal, then the government can't do it either.

To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

Nor is it taxation. 'A tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.' 'Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.' Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.

Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa. St., 104 says, very forcibly, 'I think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public purpose.' See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St., 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra."
[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

4. No equality between the government and the governed.
5. Coerced servitude to the will of the majority at the expense of the individual.
6. Idolatry, which is the worship or servitude towards anything but God, and ESPECIALLY towards civil rulers.

Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah, and said to him, "Look, you are old, and your sons do not walk in your ways. Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations [and be OVER them]".

But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, "Give us a king to judge us." So Samuel prayed to the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, "Heed the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have rejected Me [God], that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt, even to this day—with which they have forsaken Me and served other gods [Kings, in this case]—so they are doing to you also [government becoming idolatry]. Now therefore, heed their voice. However, you shall solemnly forewarn them, and show them the behavior of the king who will reign over them."

So Samuel told all the words of the LORD to the people who asked him for a king. And he said, "This will be the behavior of the king who will reign over you: He will take [STEAL] your sons and appoint them for his own chariots and to be his horsemen, and some will run before his chariots. He will appoint captains over his thousands and captains over his fifties, will set some to plow his ground and reap his harvest, and some to make his weapons of war and equipment for his chariots. He will take [STEAL] your daughters to be perfumers, cooks, and bakers. And he will take [STEAL] the best of your fields, your vineyards, and your olive groves, and give them to his servants. He will take [STEAL] a tenth of your grain and your vintage, and give it to his officers and servants. And he will take [STEAL] your male servants, your female servants, your finest young men, and your donkeys, and put them to his work [as SLAVES]. He will take [STEAL] a tenth of your sheep. And you will be his servants [PUBLIC OFFICER SLAVES/WHORES!]. And you will cry out in that day because of your king whom you have chosen for yourselves, and the LORD will not hear you in that day."

Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, "No, but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles."
[1 Sam. 8:4-20, Bible, NKJV]

7. The resulting government CANNOT be one of delegated powers from the people, because The Sovereign People cannot delegate a power to a government that they themselves do not possess. The following maxims of law prove this point out.

*“Derivativa potestas non potest esse major primitive. Wing. Max. 36; Pinch. Law, b.1. c.3, p.11.
The power [sovereign immunity in this case] which is derived cannot be greater than that from which it is derived.”
[Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2131]*

*“Nemo potest facere per obliquum quod non potest facere per directum.1 Eden 512.
No one can do that indirectly which cannot be done directly.”
[Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2147]*

*“Quod per me non possum, nec per alium..4 Co. 24 b: 11 id. 87a.
What I cannot do in person, I cannot do through the agency of another.”
[Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2159]*

For an exhaustive listing of scriptures pertaining to “social justice”, see:

Open Bible, Search Page: “Social Justice”
https://www.openbible.info/topics/social_justice

3.2 Aristotle’s Definition of Justice¹¹

1

With regards to justice and injustice we must

(1) consider what kind of actions they are concerned with,

(2) what sort of mean justice is, and

(3) between what extremes the just act is intermediate. Our investigation shall follow the same course as the preceding discussions.

We see that all men mean by justice that kind of state of character which makes people disposed to do what is just and makes them act justly and wish for what is just; and similarly by injustice that state which makes them act unjustly and wish for what is unjust. Let us too, then, lay this down as a general basis. For the same is not true of the sciences and the faculties as of states of character. A faculty or a science which is one and the same is held to relate to contrary objects, but a state of character which is one of two contraries does not produce the contrary results; e.g. as a result of health we do not do what is the opposite of healthy, but only what is healthy; for we say a man walks healthily, when he walks as a healthy man would.

Now often one contrary state is recognized from its contrary, and often states are recognized from the subjects that exhibit them; for (A) if good condition is known, bad condition also becomes known, and (B) good condition is known from the things that are in good condition, and they from it. If good condition is firmness of flesh, it is necessary both that bad condition should be flabbiness of flesh and that the wholesome should be that which causes firmness in flesh. And it follows for the most part that if one contrary is ambiguous the other also will be ambiguous; e.g. if 'just' is so, that 'unjust' will be so too.

Now 'justice' and 'injustice' seem to be ambiguous, but because their different meanings approach near to one another the ambiguity escapes notice and is not obvious as it is, comparatively, when the meanings are far apart, e.g. (for here the difference in outward form is great) as the ambiguity in the use of kleis for the collar-bone of an animal and for that with which we lock a door. Let us take as a starting-point, then, the various meanings of 'an unjust man'. Both the lawless man and the grasping and unfair man are thought to be unjust, so that evidently both the law-abiding and the fair man will be just. The just, then, is the lawful and the fair, the unjust the unlawful and the unfair.

¹¹ Source: *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book V, Aristotle; <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.5.v.html>.

1 Since the unjust man is grasping, he must be concerned with goods-not all goods, but those with which prosperity and
2 adversity have to do, which taken absolutely are always good, but for a particular person are not always good. Now men
3 pray for and pursue these things; but they should not, but should pray that the things that are good absolutely may also be
4 good for them, and should choose the things that are good for them. The unjust man does not always choose the greater, but
5 also the less-in the case of things bad absolutely; but because the lesser evil is itself thought to be in a sense good, and
6 graspingness is directed at the good, therefore he is thought to be grasping. And he is unfair; for this contains and is
7 common to both.

8 Since the lawless man was seen to be unjust and the law-abiding man just, evidently all lawful acts are in a sense just acts;
9 for the acts laid down by the legislative art are lawful, and each of these, we say, is just. Now the laws in their enactments
10 on all subjects aim at the common advantage either of all or of the best or of those who hold power, or something of the
11 sort; so that in one sense we call those acts just that tend to produce and preserve happiness and its components for the
12 political society. And the law bids us do both the acts of a brave man (e.g. not to desert our post nor take to flight nor throw
13 away our arms), and those of a temperate man (e.g. not to commit adultery nor to gratify one's lust), and those of a good-
14 tempered man (e.g. not to strike another nor to speak evil), and similarly with regard to the other virtues and forms of
15 wickedness, commanding some acts and forbidding others; and the rightly-framed law does this rightly, and the hastily
16 conceived one less well. This form of justice, then, is complete virtue, but not absolutely, but in relation to our neighbour.
17 And therefore justice is often thought to be the greatest of virtues, and 'neither evening nor morning star' is so wonderful;
18 and proverbially 'in justice is every virtue comprehended'. And it is complete virtue in its fullest sense, because it is the
19 actual exercise of complete virtue. It is complete because he who possesses it can exercise his virtue not only in himself but
20 towards his neighbour also; for many men can exercise virtue in their own affairs, but not in their relations to their
21 neighbour. This is why the saying of Bias is thought to be true, that 'rule will show the man'; for a ruler is necessarily in
22 relation to other men and a member of a society. For this same reason justice, alone of the virtues, is thought to be 'another's
23 good', because it is related to our neighbour; for it does what is advantageous to another, either a ruler or a copartner. Now
24 the worst man is he who exercises his wickedness both towards himself and towards his friends, and the best man is not he
25 who exercises his virtue towards himself but he who exercises it towards another; for this is a difficult task. Justice in this
26 sense, then, is not part of virtue but virtue entire, nor is the contrary injustice a part of vice but vice entire. What the
27 difference is between virtue and justice in this sense is plain from what we have said; they are the same but their essence is
28 not the same; what, as a relation to one's neighbour, is justice is, as a certain kind of state without qualification, virtue.

29 2

30 But at all events what we are investigating is the justice which is a part of virtue; for there is a justice of this kind, as we
31 maintain. Similarly it is with injustice in the particular sense that we are concerned.

32 That there is such a thing is indicated by the fact that while the man who exhibits in action the other forms of wickedness
33 acts wrongly indeed, but not graspingly (e.g. the man who throws away his shield through cowardice or speaks harshly
34 through bad temper or fails to help a friend with money through meanness), when a man acts graspingly he often exhibits
35 none of these vices,-no, nor all together, but certainly wickedness of some kind (for we blame him) and injustice. There is,
36 then, another kind of injustice which is a part of injustice in the wide sense, and a use of the word 'unjust' which answers to
37 a part of what is unjust in the wide sense of 'contrary to the law'. Again if one man commits adultery for the sake of gain
38 and makes money by it, while another does so at the bidding of appetite though he loses money and is penalized for it, the
39 latter would be held to be self-indulgent rather than grasping, but the former is unjust, but not self-indulgent; evidently,
40 therefore, he is unjust by reason of his making gain by his act. Again, all other unjust acts are ascribed invariably to some
41 particular kind of wickedness, e.g. adultery to self-indulgence, the desertion of a comrade in battle to cowardice, physical
42 violence to anger; but if a man makes gain, his action is ascribed to no form of wickedness but injustice. Evidently,
43 therefore, there is apart from injustice in the wide sense another, 'particular', injustice which shares the name and nature of
44 the first, because its definition falls within the same genus; for the significance of both consists in a relation to one's
45 neighbour, but the one is concerned with honour or money or safety-or that which includes all these, if we had a single
46 name for it-and its motive is the pleasure that arises from gain; while the other is concerned with all the objects with which
47 the good man is concerned.

48 It is clear, then, that there is more than one kind of justice, and that there is one which is distinct from virtue entire; we must
49 try to grasp its genus and differentia.

50 The unjust has been divided into the unlawful and the unfair, and the just into the lawful and the fair. To the unlawful
51 answers the afore-mentioned sense of injustice. But since unfair and the unlawful are not the same, but are different as a

part is from its whole (for all that is unfair is unlawful, but not all that is unlawful is unfair), the unjust and injustice in the sense of the unfair are not the same as but different from the former kind, as part from whole; for injustice in this sense is a part of injustice in the wide sense, and similarly justice in the one sense of justice in the other. Therefore we must speak also about particular justice and particular and similarly about the just and the unjust. The justice, then, which answers to the whole of virtue, and the corresponding injustice, one being the exercise of virtue as a whole, and the other that of vice as a whole, towards one's neighbour, we may leave on one side. And how the meanings of 'just' and 'unjust' which answer to these are to be distinguished is evident; for practically the majority of the acts commanded by the law are those which are prescribed from the point of view of virtue taken as a whole; for the law bids us practise every virtue and forbids us to practise any vice. And the things that tend to produce virtue taken as a whole are those of the acts prescribed by the law which have been prescribed with a view to education for the common good. But with regard to the education of the individual as such, which makes him without qualification a good man, we must determine later whether this is the function of the political art or of another; for perhaps it is not the same to be a good man and a good citizen of any state taken at random.

Of particular justice and that which is just in the corresponding sense, (A) one kind is that which is manifested in distributions of honour or money or the other things that fall to be divided among those who have a share in the constitution (for in these it is possible for one man to have a share either unequal or equal to that of another), and (B) one is that which plays a rectifying part in transactions between man and man. Of this there are two divisions; of transactions (1) some are voluntary and (2) others involuntary- voluntary such transactions as sale, purchase, loan for consumption, pledging, loan for use, depositing, letting (they are called voluntary because the origin of these transactions is voluntary), while of the involuntary (a) some are clandestine, such as theft, adultery, poisoning, procuring, enticement of slaves, assassination, false witness, and (b) others are violent, such as assault, imprisonment, murder, robbery with violence, mutilation, abuse, insult.

3

(A) We have shown that both the unjust man and the unjust act are unfair or unequal; now it is clear that there is also an intermediate between the two unequals involved in either case. And this is the equal; for in any kind of action in which there's a more and a less there is also what is equal. If, then, the unjust is unequal, just is equal, as all men suppose it to be, even apart from argument. And since the equal is intermediate, the just will be an intermediate. Now equality implies at least two things. The just, then, must be both intermediate and equal and relative (i.e. for certain persons). And since the equal intermediate it must be between certain things (which are respectively greater and less); equal, it involves two things; qua just, it is for certain people. The just, therefore, involves at least four terms; for the persons for whom it is in fact just are two, and the things in which it is manifested, the objects distributed, are two. And the same equality will exist between the persons and between the things concerned; for as the latter the things concerned-are related, so are the former; if they are not equal, they will not have what is equal, but this is the origin of quarrels and complaints-when either equals have and are awarded unequal shares, or unequals equal shares. Further, this is plain from the fact that awards should be 'according to merit'; for all men agree that what is just in distribution must be according to merit in some sense, though they do not all specify the same sort of merit, but democrats identify it with the status of freeman, supporters of oligarchy with wealth (or with noble birth), and supporters of aristocracy with excellence.

The just, then, is a species of the proportionate (proportion being not a property only of the kind of number which consists of abstract units, but of number in general). For proportion is equality of ratios, and involves four terms at least (that discrete proportion involves four terms is plain, but so does continuous proportion, for it uses one term as two and mentions it twice; e.g. 'as the line A is to the line B, so is the line B to the line C'; the line B, then, has been mentioned twice, so that if the line B be assumed twice, the proportional terms will be four); and the just, too, involves at least four terms, and the ratio between one pair is the same as that between the other pair; for there is a similar distinction between the persons and between the things. As the term A, then, is to B, so will C be to D, and therefore, alternando, as A is to C, B will be to D. Therefore also the whole is in the same ratio to the whole; and this coupling the distribution effects, and, if the terms are so combined, effects justly. The conjunction, then, of the term A with C and of B with D is what is just in distribution, and this species of the just is intermediate, and the unjust is what violates the proportion; for the proportional is intermediate, and the just is proportional. (Mathematicians call this kind of proportion geometrical; for it is in geometrical proportion that it follows that the whole is to the whole as either part is to the corresponding part.) This proportion is not continuous; for we cannot get a single term standing for a person and a thing.

This, then, is what the just is-the proportional; the unjust is what violates the proportion. Hence one term becomes too great, the other too small, as indeed happens in practice; for the man who acts unjustly has too much, and the man who is unjustly treated too little, of what is good. In the case of evil the reverse is true; for the lesser evil is reckoned a good in comparison

1 with the greater evil, since the lesser evil is rather to be chosen than the greater, and what is worthy of choice is good, and
2 what is worthier of choice a greater good.

3 This, then, is one species of the just.

4 4

5 (B) The remaining one is the rectificatory, which arises in connexion with transactions both voluntary and involuntary. This
6 form of the just has a different specific character from the former. For the justice which distributes common possessions is
7 always in accordance with the kind of proportion mentioned above (for in the case also in which the distribution is made
8 from the common funds of a partnership it will be according to the same ratio which the funds put into the business by the
9 partners bear to one another); and the injustice opposed to this kind of justice is that which violates the proportion. But the
10 justice in transactions between man and man is a sort of equality indeed, and the injustice a sort of inequality; not according
11 to that kind of proportion, however, but according to arithmetical proportion. For it makes no difference whether a good
12 man has defrauded a bad man or a bad man a good one, nor whether it is a good or a bad man that has committed adultery;
13 the law looks only to the distinctive character of the injury, and treats the parties as equal, if one is in the wrong and the
14 other is being wronged, and if one inflicted injury and the other has received it. Therefore, this kind of injustice being an
15 inequality, the judge tries to equalize it; for in the case also in which one has received and the other has inflicted a wound,
16 or one has slain and the other been slain, the suffering and the action have been unequally distributed; but the judge tries to
17 equalize by means of the penalty, taking away from the gain of the assailant. For the term 'gain' is applied generally to such
18 cases, even if it be not a term appropriate to certain cases, e.g. to the person who inflicts a wound and 'loss' to the sufferer;
19 at all events when the suffering has been estimated, the one is called loss and the other gain. Therefore the equal is
20 intermediate between the greater and the less, but the gain and the loss are respectively greater and less in contrary ways;
21 more of the good and less of the evil are gain, and the contrary is loss; intermediate between them is, as we saw, equal,
22 which we say is just; therefore corrective justice will be the intermediate between loss and gain. This is why, when people
23 dispute, they take refuge in the judge; and to go to the judge is to go to justice; for the nature of the judge is to be a sort of
24 animate justice; and they seek the judge as an intermediate, and in some states they call judges mediators, on the
25 assumption that if they get what is intermediate they will get what is just. The just, then, is an intermediate, since the judge
26 is so. Now the judge restores equality; it is as though there were a line divided into unequal parts, and he took away that by
27 which the greater segment exceeds the half, and added it to the smaller segment. And when the whole has been equally
28 divided, then they say they have 'their own'-i.e. when they have got what is equal. The equal is intermediate between the
29 greater and the lesser line according to arithmetical proportion. It is for this reason also that it is called just (sikaion),
30 because it is a division into two equal parts (sicha), just as if one were to call it sikaion; and the judge (sikastes) is one who
31 bisects (sichastes). For when something is subtracted from one of two equals and added to the other, the other is in excess
32 by these two; since if what was taken from the one had not been added to the other, the latter would have been in excess by
33 one only. It therefore exceeds the intermediate by one, and the intermediate exceeds by one that from which something was
34 taken. By this, then, we shall recognize both what we must subtract from that which has more, and what we must add to
35 that which has less; we must add to the latter that by which the intermediate exceeds it, and subtract from the greatest that
36 by which it exceeds the intermediate. Let the lines AA', BB', CC' be equal to one another; from the line AA' let the segment
37 AE have been subtracted, and to the line CC' let the segment Cd have been added, so that the whole line DCC' exceeds the
38 line EA' by the segment CD and the segment CF; therefore it exceeds the line Bb' by the segment CD. (See diagram.)

39 These names, both loss and gain, have come from voluntary exchange; for to have more than one's own is called gaining,
40 and to have less than one's original share is called losing, e.g. in buying and selling and in all other matters in which the law
41 has left people free to make their own terms; but when they get neither more nor less but just what belongs to themselves,
42 they say that they have their own and that they neither lose nor gain.

43 Therefore the just is intermediate between a sort of gain and a sort of loss, viz. those which are involuntary; it consists in
44 having an equal amount before and after the transaction.

45 5

46 Some think that reciprocity is without qualification just, as the Pythagoreans said; for they defined justice without
47 qualification as reciprocity. Now 'reciprocity' fits neither distributive nor rectificatory justice-yet people want even the
48 justice of Rhadamanthus to mean this:

1 Should a man suffer what he did, right justice would be done -for in many cases reciprocity and rectificatory justice are not
2 in accord; e.g. (1) if an official has inflicted a wound, he should not be wounded in return, and if some one has wounded an
3 official, he ought not to be wounded only but punished in addition. Further (2) there is a great difference between a
4 voluntary and an involuntary act. But in associations for exchange this sort of justice does hold men together-reciprocity in
5 accordance with a proportion and not on the basis of precisely equal return. For it is by proportionate requital that the city
6 holds together. Men seek to return either evil for evil-and if they cannot do so, think their position mere slavery-or good for
7 good-and if they cannot do so there is no exchange, but it is by exchange that they hold together. This is why they give a
8 prominent place to the temple of the Graces-to promote the requital of services; for this is characteristic of grace-we should
9 serve in return one who has shown grace to us, and should another time take the initiative in showing it.

10 Now proportionate return is secured by cross-conjunction. Let A be a builder, B a shoemaker, C a house, D a shoe. The
11 builder, then, must get from the shoemaker the latter's work, and must himself give him in return his own. If, then, first
12 there is proportionate equality of goods, and then reciprocal action takes place, the result we mention will be effected. If
13 not, the bargain is not equal, and does not hold; for there is nothing to prevent the work of the one being better than that of
14 the other; they must therefore be equated. (And this is true of the other arts also; for they would have been destroyed if what
15 the patient suffered had not been just what the agent did, and of the same amount and kind.) For it is not two doctors that
16 associate for exchange, but a doctor and a farmer, or in general people who are different and unequal; but these must be
17 equated. This is why all things that are exchanged must be somehow comparable. It is for this end that money has been
18 introduced, and it becomes in a sense an intermediate; for it measures all things, and therefore the excess and the defect-
19 how many shoes are equal to a house or to a given amount of food. The number of shoes exchanged for a house (or for a
20 given amount of food) must therefore correspond to the ratio of builder to shoemaker. For if this be not so, there will be no
21 exchange and no intercourse. And this proportion will not be effected unless the goods are somehow equal. All goods must
22 therefore be measured by some one thing, as we said before. Now this unit is in truth demand, which holds all things
23 together (for if men did not need one another's goods at all, or did not need them equally, there would be either no exchange
24 or not the same exchange); but money has become by convention a sort of representative of demand; and this is why it has
25 the name 'money' (nomisma)-because it exists not by nature but by law (nomos) and it is in our power to change it and
26 make it useless. There will, then, be reciprocity when the terms have been equated so that as farmer is to shoemaker, the
27 amount of the shoemaker's work is to that of the farmer's work for which it exchanges. But we must not bring them into a
28 figure of proportion when they have already exchanged (otherwise one extreme will have both excesses), but when they
29 still have their own goods. Thus they are equals and associates just because this equality can be effected in their case. Let A
30 be a farmer, C food, B a shoemaker, D his product equated to C. If it had not been possible for reciprocity to be thus
31 effected, there would have been no association of the parties. That demand holds things together as a single unit is shown
32 by the fact that when men do not need one another, i.e. when neither needs the other or one does not need the other, they do
33 not exchange, as we do when some one wants what one has oneself, e.g. when people permit the exportation of corn in
34 exchange for wine. This equation therefore must be established. And for the future exchange-that if we do not need a thing
35 now we shall have it if ever we do need it-money is as it were our surety; for it must be possible for us to get what we want
36 by bringing the money. Now the same thing happens to money itself as to goods-it is not always worth the same; yet it
37 tends to be steadier. This is why all goods must have a price set on them; for then there will always be exchange, and if so,
38 association of man with man. Money, then, acting as a measure, makes goods commensurate and equates them; for neither
39 would there have been association if there were not exchange, nor exchange if there were not equality, nor equality if there
40 were not commensurability. Now in truth it is impossible that things differing so much should become commensurate, but
41 with reference to demand they may become so sufficiently. There must, then, be a unit, and that fixed by agreement (for
42 which reason it is called money); for it is this that makes all things commensurate, since all things are measured by money.
43 Let A be a house, B ten minae, C a bed. A is half of B, if the house is worth five minae or equal to them; the bed, C, is a
44 tenth of B; it is plain, then, how many beds are equal to a house, viz. five. That exchange took place thus before there was
45 money is plain; for it makes no difference whether it is five beds that exchange for a house, or the money value of five
46 beds.

47 We have now defined the unjust and the just. These having been marked off from each other, it is plain that just action is
48 intermediate between acting unjustly and being unjustly treated; for the one is to have too much and the other to have too
49 little. Justice is a kind of mean, but not in the same way as the other virtues, but because it relates to an intermediate
50 amount, while injustice relates to the extremes. And justice is that in virtue of which the just man is said to be a doer, by
51 choice, of that which is just, and one who will distribute either between himself and another or between two others not so as
52 to give more of what is desirable to himself and less to his neighbour (and conversely with what is harmful), but so as to
53 give what is equal in accordance with proportion; and similarly in distributing between two other persons. Injustice on the
54 other hand is similarly related to the unjust, which is excess and defect, contrary to proportion, of the useful or hurtful. For
55 which reason injustice is excess and defect, viz. because it is productive of excess and defect-in one's own case excess of

1 what is in its own nature useful and defect of what is hurtful, while in the case of others it is as a whole like what it is in
2 one's own case, but proportion may be violated in either direction. In the unjust act to have too little is to be unjustly
3 treated; to have too much is to act unjustly.

4 Let this be taken as our account of the nature of justice and injustice, and similarly of the just and the unjust in general.

5 6

6 Since acting unjustly does not necessarily imply being unjust, we must ask what sort of unjust acts imply that the doer is
7 unjust with respect to each type of injustice, e.g. a thief, an adulterer, or a brigand. Surely the answer does not turn on the
8 difference between these types. For a man might even lie with a woman knowing who she was, but the origin of his might
9 be not deliberate choice but passion. He acts unjustly, then, but is not unjust; e.g. a man is not a thief, yet he stole, nor an
10 adulterer, yet he committed adultery; and similarly in all other cases.

11 Now we have previously stated how the reciprocal is related to the just; but we must not forget that what we are looking for
12 is not only what is just without qualification but also political justice. This is found among men who share their life with a
13 view to self sufficiency, men who are free and either proportionately or arithmetically equal, so that between those who do
14 not fulfil this condition there is no political justice but justice in a special sense and by analogy. For justice exists only
15 between men whose mutual relations are governed by law; and law exists for men between whom there is injustice; for
16 legal justice is the discrimination of the just and the unjust. And between men between whom there is injustice there is also
17 unjust action (though there is not injustice between all between whom there is unjust action), and this is assigning too much
18 to oneself of things good in themselves and too little of things evil in themselves. This is why we do not allow a man to
19 rule, but rational principle, because a man behaves thus in his own interests and becomes a tyrant. The magistrate on the
20 other hand is the guardian of justice, and, if of justice, then of equality also. And since he is assumed to have no more than
21 his share, if he is just (for he does not assign to himself more of what is good in itself, unless such a share is proportional to
22 his merits-so that it is for others that he labours, and it is for this reason that men, as we stated previously, say that justice is
23 'another's good'), therefore a reward must be given him, and this is honour and privilege; but those for whom such things
24 are not enough become tyrants.

25 The justice of a master and that of a father are not the same as the justice of citizens, though they are like it; for there can be
26 no injustice in the unqualified sense towards thing that are one's own, but a man's chattel, and his child until it reaches a
27 certain age and sets up for itself, are as it were part of himself, and no one chooses to hurt himself (for which reason there
28 can be no injustice towards oneself). Therefore the justice or injustice of citizens is not manifested in these relations; for it
29 was as we saw according to law, and between people naturally subject to law, and these as we saw are people who have an
30 equal share in ruling and being ruled. Hence justice can more truly be manifested towards a wife than towards children and
31 chattels, for the former is household justice; but even this is different from political justice.

32 7

33 Of political justice part is natural, part legal, natural, that which everywhere has the same force and does not exist by
34 people's thinking this or that; legal, that which is originally indifferent, but when it has been laid down is not indifferent,
35 e.g. that a prisoner's ransom shall be a mina, or that a goat and not two sheep shall be sacrificed, and again all the laws that
36 are passed for particular cases, e.g. that sacrifice shall be made in honour of Brasidas, and the provisions of decrees. Now
37 some think that all justice is of this sort, because that which is by nature is unchangeable and has everywhere the same force
38 (as fire burns both here and in Persia), while they see change in the things recognized as just. This, however, is not true in
39 this unqualified way, but is true in a sense; or rather, with the gods it is perhaps not true at all, while with us there is
40 something that is just even by nature, yet all of it is changeable; but still some is by nature, some not by nature. It is evident
41 which sort of thing, among things capable of being otherwise, is by nature, and which is not but is legal and conventional,
42 assuming that both are equally changeable. And in all other things the same distinction will apply; by nature the right hand
43 is stronger, yet it is possible that all men should come to be ambidextrous. The things which are just by virtue of convention
44 and expediency are like measures; for wine and corn measures are not everywhere equal, but larger in wholesale and
45 smaller in retail markets. Similarly, the things which are just not by nature but by human enactment are not everywhere the
46 same, since constitutions also are not the same, though there is but one which is everywhere by nature the best. Of things
47 just and lawful each is related as the universal to its particulars; for the things that are done are many, but of them each is
48 one, since it is universal.

1 There is a difference between the act of injustice and what is unjust, and between the act of justice and what is just; for a
2 thing is unjust by nature or by enactment; and this very thing, when it has been done, is an act of injustice, but before it is
3 done is not yet that but is unjust. So, too, with an act of justice (though the general term is rather 'just action', and 'act of
4 justice' is applied to the correction of the act of injustice).

5 Each of these must later be examined separately with regard to the nature and number of its species and the nature of the
6 things with which it is concerned.

7 8

8 Acts just and unjust being as we have described them, a man acts unjustly or justly whenever he does such acts voluntarily;
9 when involuntarily, he acts neither unjustly nor justly except in an incidental way; for he does things which happen to be
10 just or unjust. Whether an act is or is not one of injustice (or of justice) is determined by its voluntariness or
11 involuntariness; for when it is voluntary it is blamed, and at the same time is then an act of injustice; so that there will be
12 things that are unjust but not yet acts of injustice, if voluntariness be not present as well. By the voluntary I mean, as has
13 been said before, any of the things in a man's own power which he does with knowledge, i.e. not in ignorance either of the
14 person acted on or of the instrument used or of the end that will be attained (e.g. whom he is striking, with what, and to
15 what end), each such act being done not incidentally nor under compulsion (e.g. if A takes B's hand and therewith strikes C,
16 B does not act voluntarily; for the act was not in his own power). The person struck may be the striker's father, and the
17 striker may know that it is a man or one of the persons present, but not know that it is his father; a similar distinction may
18 be made in the case of the end, and with regard to the whole action. Therefore that which is done in ignorance, or though
19 not done in ignorance is not in the agent's power, or is done under compulsion, is involuntary (for many natural processes,
20 even, we knowingly both perform and experience, none of which is either voluntary or involuntary; e.g. growing old or
21 dying). But in the case of unjust and just acts alike the injustice or justice may be only incidental; for a man might return a
22 deposit unwillingly and from fear, and then he must not be said either to do what is just or to act justly, except in an
23 incidental way. Similarly the man who under compulsion and unwillingly fails to return the deposit must be said to act
24 unjustly, and to do what is unjust, only incidentally. Of voluntary acts we do some by choice, others not by choice; by
25 choice those which we do after deliberation, not by choice those which we do without previous deliberation. Thus there are
26 three kinds of injury in transactions between man and man; those done in ignorance are mistakes when the person acted on,
27 the act, the instrument, or the end that will be attained is other than the agent supposed; the agent thought either that he was
28 not hitting any one or that he was not hitting with this missile or not hitting this person or to this end, but a result followed
29 other than that which he thought likely (e.g. he threw not with intent to wound but only to prick), or the person hit or the
30 missile was other than he supposed. Now when (1) the injury takes place contrary to reasonable expectation, it is a
31 misadventure. When (2) it is not contrary to reasonable expectation, but does not imply vice, it is a mistake (for a man
32 makes a mistake when the fault originates in him, but is the victim of accident when the origin lies outside him). When (3)
33 he acts with knowledge but not after deliberation, it is an act of injustice-e.g. the acts due to anger or to other passions
34 necessary or natural to man; for when men do such harmful and mistaken acts they act unjustly, and the acts are acts of
35 injustice, but this does not imply that the doers are unjust or wicked; for the injury is not due to vice. But when (4) a man
36 acts from choice, he is an unjust man and a vicious man.

37 Hence acts proceeding from anger are rightly judged not to be done of malice aforethought; for it is not the man who acts in
38 anger but he who enraged him that starts the mischief. Again, the matter in dispute is not whether the thing happened or
39 not, but its justice; for it is apparent injustice that occasions rage. For they do not dispute about the occurrence of the act-as
40 in commercial transactions where one of the two parties must be vicious-unless they do so owing to forgetfulness; but,
41 agreeing about the fact, they dispute on which side justice lies (whereas a man who has deliberately injured another cannot
42 help knowing that he has done so), so that the one thinks he is being treated unjustly and the other disagrees.

43 But if a man harms another by choice, he acts unjustly; and these are the acts of injustice which imply that the doer is an
44 unjust man, provided that the act violates proportion or equality. Similarly, a man is just when he acts justly by choice; but
45 he acts justly if he merely acts voluntarily.

46 Of involuntary acts some are excusable, others not. For the mistakes which men make not only in ignorance but also from
47 ignorance are excusable, while those which men do not from ignorance but (though they do them in ignorance) owing to a
48 passion which is neither natural nor such as man is liable to, are not excusable.

49 9

1 Assuming that we have sufficiently defined the suffering and doing of injustice, it may be asked (1) whether the truth in
2 expressed in Euripides' paradoxical words:

3 I slew my mother, that's my tale in brief.

4 Were you both willing, or unwilling both?

5 Is it truly possible to be willingly treated unjustly, or is all suffering of injustice the contrary involuntary, as all unjust
6 action is voluntary? And is all suffering of injustice of the latter kind or else all of the former, or is it sometimes voluntary,
7 sometimes involuntary? So, too, with the case of being justly treated; all just action is voluntary, so that it is reasonable that
8 there should be a similar opposition in either case—that both being unjustly and being justly treated should be either alike
9 voluntary or alike involuntary. But it would be thought paradoxical even in the case of being justly treated, if it were always
10 voluntary; for some are unwillingly treated justly. (2) One might raise this question also, whether every one who has
11 suffered what is unjust is being unjustly treated, or on the other hand it is with suffering as with acting. In action and in
12 passivity alike it is possible to partake of justice incidentally, and similarly (it is plain) of injustice; for to do what is unjust
13 is not the same as to act unjustly, nor to suffer what is unjust as to be treated unjustly, and similarly in the case of acting
14 justly and being justly treated; for it is impossible to be unjustly treated if the other does not act unjustly, or justly treated
15 unless he acts justly. Now if to act unjustly is simply to harm some one voluntarily, and 'voluntarily' means 'knowing the
16 person acted on, the instrument, and the manner of one's acting', and the incontinent man voluntarily harms himself, not
17 only will he voluntarily be unjustly treated but it will be possible to treat oneself unjustly. (This also is one of the questions
18 in doubt, whether a man can treat himself unjustly.) Again, a man may voluntarily, owing to incontinence, be harmed by
19 another who acts voluntarily, so that it would be possible to be voluntarily treated unjustly. Or is our definition incorrect;
20 must we to 'harming another, with knowledge both of the person acted on, of the instrument, and of the manner' add
21 'contrary to the wish of the person acted on'? Then a man may be voluntarily harmed and voluntarily suffer what is unjust,
22 but no one is voluntarily treated unjustly; for no one wishes to be unjustly treated, not even the incontinent man. He acts
23 contrary to his wish; for no one wishes for what he does not think to be good, but the incontinent man does do things that he
24 does not think he ought to do. Again, one who gives what is his own, as Homer says Glaucus gave Diomedes

25 Armour of gold for brazen, the price of a hundred beeves for nine, is not unjustly treated; for though to give is in his power,
26 to be unjustly treated is not, but there must be some one to treat him unjustly. It is plain, then, that being unjustly treated is
27 not voluntary.

28 Of the questions we intended to discuss two still remain for discussion; (3) whether it is the man who has assigned to
29 another more than his share that acts unjustly, or he who has the excessive share, and (4) whether it is possible to treat
30 oneself unjustly. The questions are connected; for if the former alternative is possible and the distributor acts unjustly and
31 not the man who has the excessive share, then if a man assigns more to another than to himself, knowingly and voluntarily,
32 he treats himself unjustly; which is what modest people seem to do, since the virtuous man tends to take less than his share.
33 Or does this statement too need qualification? For (a) he perhaps gets more than his share of some other good, e.g. of
34 honour or of intrinsic nobility. (b) The question is solved by applying the distinction we applied to unjust action; for he
35 suffers nothing contrary to his own wish, so that he is not unjustly treated as far as this goes, but at most only suffers harm.

36 It is plain too that the distributor acts unjustly, but not always the man who has the excessive share; for it is not he to whom
37 what is unjust appertains that acts unjustly, but he to whom it appertains to do the unjust act voluntarily, i.e. the person in
38 whom lies the origin of the action, and this lies in the distributor, not in the receiver. Again, since the word 'do' is
39 ambiguous, and there is a sense in which lifeless things, or a hand, or a servant who obeys an order, may be said to slay, he
40 who gets an excessive share does not act unjustly, though he 'does' what is unjust.

41 Again, if the distributor gave his judgement in ignorance, he does not act unjustly in respect of legal justice, and his
42 judgement is not unjust in this sense, but in a sense it is unjust (for legal justice and primordial justice are different); but if
43 with knowledge he judged unjustly, he is himself aiming at an excessive share either of gratitude or of revenge. As much,
44 then, as if he were to share in the plunder, the man who has judged unjustly for these reasons has got too much; the fact that
45 what he gets is different from what he distributes makes no difference, for even if he awards land with a view to sharing in
46 the plunder he gets not land but money.

47 Men think that acting unjustly is in their power, and therefore that being just is easy. But it is not; to lie with one's
48 neighbour's wife, to wound another, to deliver a bribe, is easy and in our power, but to do these things as a result of a
49 certain state of character is neither easy nor in our power. Similarly to know what is just and what is unjust requires, men

think, no great wisdom, because it is not hard to understand the matters dealt with by the laws (though these are not the things that are just, except incidentally); but how actions must be done and distributions effected in order to be just, to know this is a greater achievement than knowing what is good for the health; though even there, while it is easy to know that honey, wine, hellebore, cautery, and the use of the knife are so, to know how, to whom, and when these should be applied with a view to producing health, is no less an achievement than that of being a physician. Again, for this very reason men think that acting unjustly is characteristic of the just man no less than of the unjust, because he would be not less but even more capable of doing each of these unjust acts; for he could lie with a woman or wound a neighbour; and the brave man could throw away his shield and turn to flight in this direction or in that. But to play the coward or to act unjustly consists not in doing these things, except incidentally, but in doing them as the result of a certain state of character, just as to practise medicine and healing consists not in applying or not applying the knife, in using or not using medicines, but in doing so in a certain way.

Just acts occur between people who participate in things good in themselves and can have too much or too little of them; for some beings (e.g. presumably the gods) cannot have too much of them, and to others, those who are incurably bad, not even the smallest share in them is beneficial but all such goods are harmful, while to others they are beneficial up to a point; therefore justice is essentially something human.

10

Our next subject is equity and the equitable (to *epieikes*), and their respective relations to justice and the just. For on examination they appear to be neither absolutely the same nor generically different; and while we sometime praise what is equitable and the equitable man (so that we apply the name by way of praise even to instances of the other virtues, instead of 'good' meaning by *epieikestebon* that a thing is better), at other times, when we reason it out, it seems strange if the equitable, being something different from the just, is yet praiseworthy; for either the just or the equitable is not good, if they are different; or, if both are good, they are the same.

These, then, are pretty much the considerations that give rise to the problem about the equitable; they are all in a sense correct and not opposed to one another; for the equitable, though it is better than one kind of justice, yet is just, and it is not as being a different class of thing that it is better than the just. The same thing, then, is just and equitable, and while both are good the equitable is superior. What creates the problem is that the equitable is just, but not the legally just but a correction of legal justice. The reason is that all law is universal but about some things it is not possible to make a universal statement which shall be correct. In those cases, then, in which it is necessary to speak universally, but not possible to do so correctly, the law takes the usual case, though it is not ignorant of the possibility of error. And it is none the less correct; for the error is in the law nor in the legislator but in the nature of the thing, since the matter of practical affairs is of this kind from the start. When the law speaks universally, then, and a case arises on it which is not covered by the universal statement, then it is right, where the legislator fails us and has erred by oversimplicity, to correct the omission-to say what the legislator himself would have said had he been present, and would have put into his law if he had known. Hence the equitable is just, and better than one kind of justice-not better than absolute justice but better than the error that arises from the absoluteness of the statement. And this is the nature of the equitable, a correction of law where it is defective owing to its universality. In fact this is the reason why all things are not determined by law, that about some things it is impossible to lay down a law, so that a decree is needed. For when the thing is indefinite the rule also is indefinite, like the leaden rule used in making the Lesbian moulding; the rule adapts itself to the shape of the stone and is not rigid, and so too the decree is adapted to the facts.

It is plain, then, what the equitable is, and that it is just and is better than one kind of justice. It is evident also from this who the equitable man is; the man who chooses and does such acts, and is no stickler for his rights in a bad sense but tends to take less than his share though he has the law oft his side, is equitable, and this state of character is equity, which is a sort of justice and not a different state of character.

11

Whether a man can treat himself unjustly or not, is evident from what has been said. For (a) one class of just acts are those acts in accordance with any virtue which are prescribed by the law; e.g. the law does not expressly permit suicide, and what it does not expressly permit it forbids. Again, when a man in violation of the law harms another (otherwise than in retaliation) voluntarily, he acts unjustly, and a voluntary agent is one who knows both the person he is affecting by his action and the instrument he is using; and he who through anger voluntarily stabs himself does this contrary to the right rule of life, and this the law does not allow; therefore he is acting unjustly. But towards whom? Surely towards the state, not

1 towards himself. For he suffers voluntarily, but no one is voluntarily treated unjustly. This is also the reason why the state
2 punishes; a certain loss of civil rights attaches to the man who destroys himself, on the ground that he is treating the state
3 unjustly.

4 Further (b) in that sense of 'acting unjustly' in which the man who 'acts unjustly' is unjust only and not bad all round, it is
5 not possible to treat oneself unjustly (this is different from the former sense; the unjust man in one sense of the term is
6 wicked in a particularized way just as the coward is, not in the sense of being wicked all round, so that his 'unjust act' does
7 not manifest wickedness in general). For (i) that would imply the possibility of the same thing's having been subtracted
8 from and added to the same thing at the same time; but this is impossible-the just and the unjust always involve more than
9 one person. Further, (ii) unjust action is voluntary and done by choice, and takes the initiative (for the man who because he
10 has suffered does the same in return is not thought to act unjustly); but if a man harms himself he suffers and does the same
11 things at the same time. Further, (iii) if a man could treat himself unjustly, he could be voluntarily treated unjustly. Besides,
12 (iv) no one acts unjustly without committing particular acts of injustice; but no one can commit adultery with his own wife
13 or housebreaking on his own house or theft on his own property,

14 In general, the question 'can a man treat himself unjustly?' is solved also by the distinction we applied to the question 'can a
15 man be voluntarily treated unjustly?'

16 (It is evident too that both are bad, being unjustly treated and acting unjustly; for the one means having less and the other
17 having more than the intermediate amount, which plays the part here that the healthy does in the medical art, and that good
18 condition does in the art of bodily training. But still acting unjustly is the worse, for it involves vice and is blameworthy-
19 involves vice which is either of the complete and unqualified kind or almost so (we must admit the latter alternative,
20 because not all voluntary unjust action implies injustice as a state of character), while being unjustly treated does not
21 involve vice and injustice in oneself. In itself, then, being unjustly treated is less bad, but there is nothing to prevent its
22 being incidentally a greater evil. But theory cares nothing for this; it calls pleurisy a more serious mischief than a stumble;
23 yet the latter may become incidentally the more serious, if the fall due to it leads to your being taken prisoner or put to
24 death the enemy.)

25 Metaphorically and in virtue of a certain resemblance there is a justice, not indeed between a man and himself, but between
26 certain parts of him; yet not every kind of justice but that of master and servant or that of husband and wife. For these are
27 the ratios in which the part of the soul that has a rational principle stands to the irrational part; and it is with a view to these
28 parts that people also think a man can be unjust to himself, viz. because these parts are liable to suffer something contrary
29 to their respective desires; there is therefore thought to be a mutual justice between them as between ruler and ruled.

30 Let this be taken as our account of justice and the other, i.e. the other moral, virtues.

31 **4 Biblical Justice**

32 **4.1 Biblical definition of "justice": God's law is the ONLY measure for whether "justice" is in** 33 **deed and in fact served by any secular judge**

34 The following Bible dictionary establishes that the only true measure for whether "justice" is in fact served by any judge or
35 prosecutor is the entirety of God's law:

36 **JUSTICE.** The word 'justice' occurs 115 times in RSV OT, usually for *mišpāt*, 'judgment', the rule that should
37 guide *JUDGES. In the AV, however, it represents *mišpāt* only once (Jb. 36:17); elsewhere it translates *seḏeq*
38 or *ṣeḏāqā*. The more frequent rendering of these latter nouns is 'righteousness'; but when *mišpāt* and *ṣeḏāqā*
39 appear together AV translates the whole phrase as 'judgment and justice' (e.g. 2 Sa. 8:15; cf. Gn. 18:19),
40 though RSV renders the same combination as 'justice and righteousness'. In AV, therefore, 'justice' must be
41 understood as being the same word as *'RIGHTEOUSNESS', and **seldom as denoting the specialized concept**
42 **of 'fair play', or legal equity, with which the term justice is presently associated.** The expression, 'to do
43 (someone) justice', occurs twice, being taken from the corresponding Heb. verbal root *šādaq*, causative, which
44 means 'to declare one right' (2 Sa. 15:4; Ps. 82:3). Similarly, the adjective *šaddīq*, 'righteous', is over 40 times
45 rendered by the adjective 'just', in both vss. In RSV NT, the noun 'justice' represents both *krisis*, 'judgment',
46 and *dikaïosynē*, 'righteousness'. In AV it does not appear; but at over 30 points the adjective *dikaïos*,
47 'righteous', is likewise translated by the English term 'just'.

48 This biblical concept of justice exhibits development through nine, generally chronological stages.

1. Etymologically, it appears that the root of *ṣedāqā*, like that of its kindred noun *yōṣer*, 'uprightness' (Dt. 9:5), signifies 'straightness', in a physical sense (BDB, p. 841).

2. But already in the patriarchal age *ṣedāqā* has the abstract meaning of conformity, by a given object or action, to an accepted standard of values, e.g. Jacob's 'honest' living up to the terms of his sheep-contract with Laban (Gn. 30:33). Moses thus speaks of just balances, weights and measures (Lv. 19:36; Dt. 25:15) and insists that Israel's *JUDGES pronounce 'just (AV; righteous, RSV) judgment' (Dt. 16:18, 20). Arguments that are actually questionable may seem, at first glance, to be 'just' (Pr. 18:17; RSV, 'right'); and Christian masters are cautioned to treat their slaves 'justly and fairly' (Col. 4:1). Even inanimate objects may be described as *ṣedeq*, if they measure up to the appropriate standards. The phrase, 'paths of *ṣedeq*' (Ps. 23:3), for example, designates walkable paths.

3. Since life's highest standard is derived from the character of deity, 'justice', from the time of Moses and onwards (cf. Dt. 32:4), comes to distinguish that which is God's will and those activities which result from it. Heavenly choirs proclaim, 'Just and true are thy ways' (Rev. 15:3). Recognizing the ultimacy of the will of the Lord, Job therefore asks, 'How can a man be just before God?' (Jb. 9:2; cf. 4:17; 33:12). But even though God stands answerable to no man, still 'to justice he doeth no violence' (37:23, RVmg.); for the actions of the God who acts in harmony with his own standard are always perfect and right (Zp. 3:5; Ps. 89:14). *ṣedāqā* may thus describe Yahweh's preservation of both human and animal life (Ps. 36:6) or his dissociation from vain enterprise (Is. 45:19). In both of the latter verses the EVV translate *ṣedāqā* as 'righteousness'; but it might with greater accuracy be rendered 'regularity' or 'reliability'.

4. By a natural transition, 'justice' then comes to identify that moral standard by which God measures human conduct (Is. 26:7). Men too must 'do justice' (Gn. 18:19) as they walk with deity (Gn. 6:9; Mt. 5:48); for not the hearers, but the doers of the law, are 'just (AV; righteous, RSV) before God' (Rom. 2:13). The attribute of justice is to be anticipated only in the hearts of those who fear God (Lk. 18:2), because justice in the biblical sense begins with holiness (Mi. 6:8; Mk. 6:20; 1 Thes. 2:10) and with sincere devotion (Lk. 2:25; Acts 10:22). Positively, however, the whole-hearted participation of the Gadites in the divinely ordered conquest of Canaan is described as 'executing the just decrees of the Lord' (Dt. 33:21; cf. S. R. Driver, ICC). The need for earnest conformity to the moral will of God lies especially incumbent upon kings (2 Sa. 8:15; Je. 22:15), princes (Pr. 8:15), and judges (Ec. 5:8); but every true believer is expected to 'do justice' (Ps. 119:121, AV; Pr. 1:3; cf. its personification in Is. 59:14). Justice constitutes the opposite of sin (Ec. 7:20) and serves as a marked characteristic of Jesus the Messiah (Is. 9:7; Zc. 9:9; Mt. 27:19; Acts 3:14). In the poetry of the OT there do arise affirmations of self-righteousness by men like David ('Judge me according to my righteousness, and establish the just', Ps. 7:8–9, AV; cf. 18:20–24) or Job ('I am ... just and blameless' Jb. 12:4; cf. 1:1), that might appear incongruous when considered in the light of their acknowledged iniquity (cf. Jb. 7:21; 13:26). The poets' aims, however, are either to exonerate themselves from particular crimes that enemies have laid to their charge (cf. Ps. 7:4) or to profess a genuine purity of purpose and single-hearted devotion to God (Ps. 17:1). 'They breathe the spirit of simple faith and childlike trust, which throws itself unreservedly on God ... and they disclaim all fellowship with the wicked, from whom they may expect to be distinguished in the course of His Providence' (A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms*, 1906, I, p. lxxxvii). As Ezekiel described such a man, 'He walks in my statutes ... he is righteous (AV, just), he shall surely live, says the Lord God' (Eck. 18:9).

5. In reference to divine government, justice becomes descriptive in a particular way of punishment for moral infraction. Under the lash of heaven-sent plagues, Pharaoh confessed, 'The Lord is *ṣaddiq*, and I and my people are wicked' (Ex. 9:27; cf. Ne. 9:33); and the one thief cried to the other as they were crucified, 'We indeed justly ...' (Lk. 23:41). For God cannot remain indifferent to evil (Hab. 1:13; cf. Zp. 1:12), nor will the Almighty pervert justice (Jb. 8:3; cf. 8:4; 36:17). Even the pagans of Malta believed in a divine nemesis, so that when they saw Paul bitten by a viper they concluded, 'This man is a murderer ... justice has not allowed him to live' (Acts 28:4). God's punitive righteousness is as a consuming fire (Dt. 32:22; Heb. 12:29; *WRATH), and condemnation is just (Rom. 3:8).

6. From the time of the judges and onward, however, *ṣedāqā* comes also to describe his deeds of vindication for the deserving, 'the triumph of the Lord' (Jdg. 5:11). Absalom thus promised a petitioner he 'would give him justice' (2 Sa. 15:4; cf. Ps. 82:3), and Solomon proclaimed that God 'blesses the abode of the righteous (AV, just)' (Pr. 3:33; cf. Ps. 94:15). Divine vindication became also the plea of Isaiah's contemporaries, 'They ask of me the ordinances of justice' (Is. 58:2–3, AV); for though God's intervention might have been delayed (Ec. 7:15; 8:14; cf. Is. 40:27), he yet 'became jealous for his land, and had pity on his people' (Joel 2:18).

7. Such words, however, introduce another aspect, in which divine justice ceases to constitute an expression of precise moral desert and partakes rather of divine pity, love and grace. This connotation appears first in David's prayer for the forgiveness of his crimes over Bathsheba, when he implored, 'Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, thou God of my salvation, and my tongue will sing aloud of thy *ṣedāqā* (deliverance)' (Ps. 51:14). But what David sought was not vindication; for he had just acknowledged his heinous sin and, indeed, his depravity from birth (Ps. 51:5). His petition sought rather for undeserved pardon; and *ṣedāqā* may be translated by simple repetition—O God of my salvation: my tongue shall sing of thy 'salvation'. *ṣedāqā*, in other words, has become redemptive; it is God's fulfilling of his own graciously promised salvation, irrespective of the merits of men (cf. David's same usage in Pss. 31:1; 103:17; 143:1). David's counsellor Ethan thus moves, in the space of two verses, from a reference to God's 'justice [*ṣedeq* according to sense 4 above] and judgment' (Ps. 89:14, AV) to the joyful testimony, 'In thy *ṣedāqā* [promised grace] shall Israel be

exalted' (Ps. 89:16, AV; cf. a similar contrast within Is. 56:1). When Isaiah, therefore, speaks of 'a just [AV; righteous, RSV; ṣāddiq] God and a Saviour' (Is. 45:21), his thought is not, 'A just God, and yet at the same time a Saviour', but rather, 'A ṣāddiq God, and therefore a Saviour' (cf. the parallelism of *RIGHTEOUSNESS' with salvation in Is. 45:8; 46:13). Correspondingly, we read in the NT that 'if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just [dikaíos=faithful to his gracious promise, not, demanding justice] and will forgive our sins' (1 Jn. 1:9). Such concepts of non-judicial 'justice', however, must be limited to those passages in which this usage is specifically intended. In Rom. 3, on the contrary, with its contextual emphasis upon the wrath of God against sin and upon the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ for the satisfaction of the Father's justice, we must continue to understand dikaíos (Rom. 3:26) in its traditional sense: 'That he [God] might be just [exacting punishment, according to sense 5 above], and [yet at the same time] the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus' (AV; see Sanday and Headlam, ICC; *JUSTIFICATION).

8. As a condition that arises out of God's forgiving 'justice', there next appears in Scripture a humanly possessed ṣedāqā, which is simultaneously declared to have been God's own moral attribute (ṣedāqā in sense 4 above), but which has now been imparted to those who believe on his grace. Moses thus describes how Abraham's faith served as a medium for imputed righteousness (Gn. 15:6), though one must, of course, observe that his faith did not constitute in itself the meritorious righteousness but was merely 'reckoned' so. He was justified through faith, not because of it (cf. John Murray, *Redemption, Accomplished and Applied*, 1955, p. 155). Habakkuk likewise declared, 'The just shall live by his faith' (Hab. 2:4, AV), though here too the justification derives, not from man's own, rugged 'faithfulness' (RSVmg.), but from his humble dependence upon God's mercy (contrast the self-reliance of the Babylonians, which the same context condemns; and cf. Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11). It was God's prophet Isaiah, however, who first spoke directly of 'the heritage of the servants of the Lord ... their ṣedāqā from me' (Is. 54:17). Of this 'righteousness', A. B. Davidson accurately observed, 'It is not a Divine attribute. It is a Divine effect ... produced in the world by God' (*The Theology of the Old Testament*, 1925, p. 143). That is to say, there exists within Yahweh a righteousness which, by his grace, becomes the possession of the believer (Is. 45:24). Our own righteousness is totally inadequate (Is. 64:6); but 'in Yahweh' we 'are righteous' (ṣādaq) (Is. 45:25), having been made just by the imputed merit of Christ (Phil. 3:9). A century later, Jeremiah thus speaks both of Judah and of God himself as a 'habitation of justice' (Je. 31:23; 50:7, AV), i.e. a source of justification for the faithful (cf. Je. 23:6; 33:16, 'Yahweh our righteousness', Theo. Laetsch, *Biblical Commentary, Jeremiah*, 1952, pp. 191–192, 254).

9. But even as God in his grace bestows righteousness upon the unworthy, so the people of God are called upon to 'seek justice' (Is. 1:17) in the sense of pleading for the widow and 'judging the cause of the poor and needy' (Je. 22:16). 'Justice' has thus come to connote goodness (Lk. 23:50) and loving consideration (Mt. 1:19). Further, from the days of the Exile onward, Aram. ṣidqā, 'righteousness', becomes specialized into a designation for alms or charity (Dn. 4:27), an equivalent expression for 'giving to the poor' (Ps. 112:9; cf. Mt. 6:1). One might therefore be led to conceive of biblical 'justice', particularly in these last three, supra-judicial senses, as involving a certain tension or even contradiction: e.g. ṣedāqā in its 7th, gracious sense seems to forgive the very crimes that it condemns in its 5th, punitive sense. The ultimate solution, however, appears in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. The ethical example furnished by his sinless life (Heb. 4:15) constitutes the climax of biblical revelation on the moral will of God and far exceeds the perverted though seemingly lofty justice of the scribes and Pharisees (Mt. 5:20). Yet he who commanded men to be perfect, even as their heavenly Father is perfect (Mt. 5:48), exhibited at the same time that love which has no equal, as he laid down his life for his undeserving friends (Jn. 15:13). Here was revealed ṣedāqā, 'justice', in its ethical stage 5, in its redemptive stage 7, and in its imputed stage 8, all united in one. He came that God might be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus (Rom. 3:26) and that we might be found in him, who is made our righteousness and sanctification and redemption (1 Cor. 1:30).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. H. Conzelmann, 'Current Problems in Pauline Research', in R. Batey (ed.), *New Testament Issues*, 1970, pp. 130–147; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1, 1961, pp. 239–249; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*, 1967, pp. 82–162; J. Jeremias, *The Central Message of the New Testament*, 1965, pp. 51–70; G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 1975, pp. 437–450; J. B. Payne, *Theology of the Older Testament*, 1962, pp. 155–161, 165f.; G. Quell and G. Schrenk, TDNT 2, pp. 174–225; Norman H. Snaith, *Mercy and Sacrifice*, 1953, pp. 70–79; and *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 1946; J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*, 1972; H. Seebass, C. Brown, NIDNTT 3, pp. 352–377.

Payne, J. B. (1996). *Justice*. In D. R. W. Wood, I. H. Marshall, A. R. Millard, J. I. Packer, & D. J. Wiseman (Eds.), *New Bible dictionary* (3rd ed., pp. 634–636). Leicester, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
[The New Bible Dictionary, Third Edition]

Below is what God expects of ALL judges, including secular judges:

Unjust Judgments Rebuked.

A Psalm of Asaph.

God stands in the congregation of the mighty;
He judges among the gods.

1 *How long will you judge unjustly*
2 *And show partiality to the wicked? Selah.*
3 *Defend the poor and fatherless;*
4 *Do justice to the afflicted and needy.*
5 *Deliver the poor and needy;*
6 *Free them from the hand of the wicked.*

7 *They do not know, nor do they understand;*
8 *They walk about in darkness;*
9 *All the foundations of the earth [the fundamental principles of the administration of justice] are unstable.*

10 *I said, "You are gods;*
11 *And all of you are children of the Most High.*
12 *"Nevertheless you will die like men*
13 *And fall like one of the princes."*

14 *Arise, O God, judge the earth;*
15 *For You shall inherit all nations.*
16 *[Psalm 82:1-8, Bible, NKJV]*

18 **The Messiah's Triumph and Kingdom**

19 *Why do the nations rage,*
20 *And the people plot a vain thing?*
21 *The kings of the earth set themselves,*
22 *And the rulers take counsel together,*
23 *Against the Lord and against His Anointed, saying,*
24 *"Let us break Their bonds in pieces*
25 *And cast away Their cords from us."*

26 *He who sits in the heavens shall laugh;*
27 *The Lord shall hold them in derision.*
28 *Then He shall speak to them in His wrath,*
29 *And distress them in His deep displeasure:*
30 *"Yet I have set My King*
31 *On My holy hill of Zion."*

32 *"I will declare the decree:*
33 *The Lord has said to Me,*
34 *'You are My Son,*
35 *Today I have begotten You.*
36 *Ask of Me, and I will give You*
37 *The nations for Your inheritance,*
38 *And the ends of the earth for Your possession.*
39 *You shall break[a] them with a rod of iron;*
40 *You shall dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel. '"*

41 *Now therefore, be wise, O kings;*
42 *Be instructed, you judges of the earth.*
43 *Serve the Lord with fear,*
44 *And rejoice with trembling.*
45 *Kiss the Son, lest He be angry,*
46 *And you perish in the way,*
47 *When His wrath is kindled but a little.*
48 *Blessed are all those who put their trust in Him.*
49 *[Psalm 2:1-12, Bible, NKJV]*

50 **4.2 "Biblical Justice" v. "Social/Political Justice"**

51 Before discussing the Christian view of social justice, we need to define terms. Social justice is such a politically charged
52 concept that it can't really be divorced from its modern-day context. Social justice is often used as a rallying cry for many
53 on the left side of the political spectrum. This excerpt from the "Social Justice" entry on Wikipedia is a good definition of
54 this concept:

1 “Social justice is also a concept that some use to describe the movement towards a socially just world. In this
2 context, social justice is based on the concepts of human rights and equality and involves a greater degree of
3 economic egalitarianism through progressive taxation, income redistribution, or even property redistribution.
4 These policies aim to achieve what developmental economists refer to as more equality of opportunity than may
5 currently exist in some societies, and to manufacture equality of outcome in cases where incidental inequalities
6 appear in a procedurally just system.”
7 [Wikipedia: Social Justice; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice]

8 The key word in this definition is the word “egalitarianism.” This word, coupled with the phrases “income redistribution,”
9 “property redistribution,” and “equality of outcome,” says a great deal about social justice. Egalitarianism as a political
10 doctrine essentially promotes the idea that all people should have the same (equal) political, social, economic, and civil
11 rights. This idea is based on the foundation of inalienable human rights enshrined in such documents as the Declaration of
12 Independence.

13 Social justice advocates refer to their fallacious pursuit of wealth redistribution as egalitarianism, meaning equality.
14 However, such equality is not realistically possible unless there is absolute equality between humans and the government
15 both under the law and in court. As an economic doctrine, such egalitarianism OF OUTCOME is the driving force behind
16 [socialism](#) and [communism](#). It is economic egalitarianism that seeks to remove the barriers of economic inequality by means
17 of redistribution of wealth and, by implication, redistribution of PROPERTY. To understand the fallacies inherent in this
18 thinking, we must therefore understand the laws of property. We see social justice implemented in social [welfare](#) programs
19 where progressive tax policies take proportionately more money from wealthy individuals in order to raise the standard of
20 living for people who lack the same means. In other words, the government takes from the rich and gives to the poor.

21 The problem with the fallacious doctrine of social justice is twofold:

- 22 1. First, there is a mistaken premise in economic egalitarianism that the rich have become wealthy by exploiting the poor.
23 Much of the socialist literature of the past 150 years promotes this premise. This may have been primarily the case
24 back when Karl Marx first wrote his *Communist Manifesto*, and even today it may be the case some of the time, but
25 certainly not all of the time.
- 26 2. Second, socialist programs tend to create more problems than they solve, meaning that they have many unintended
27 consequences. In other words, they don’t work. Welfare, which uses public tax revenue to supplement the income of
28 the underemployed or unemployed, typically has the effect of recipients becoming dependent on the government
29 handout rather than trying to improve their situation. Every place where socialism/communism has been tried on a
30 national scale, it has failed to remove the class distinctions in society. Instead, all it does is replace the
31 nobility/common man distinction with a working-class/political class distinction.

32 What, then, is the Christian view of social justice? The Bible teaches that God is a God of justice. In fact, “all his ways are
33 justice” ([Deuteronomy 32:4](#)). Furthermore, the Bible supports the notion of social justice in which concern and care are
34 shown to the plight of the poor and afflicted ([Deuteronomy 10:18](#); [24:17](#); [27:19](#)). The Bible often refers to the fatherless,
35 the widow and the sojourner – that is, people who were not able to fend for themselves or had no support system. The
36 nation of Israel was commanded by God to care for society’s less fortunate, and their eventual failure to do so was partly
37 the reason for their judgment and expulsion from the land. Below is the Biblical reason that brought on their expulsion and
38 discipline by God Himself:

39 “Because you did not serve the Lord your God with joy and gladness of heart [[gratitude and thankfulness and](#)
40 [even generosity](#)], for the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your enemies [foreigners], whom
41 the Lord will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in need of everything; and He will put a
42 [legal] yoke of iron on your neck [[government franchises, Form #05.030](#)] until He has destroyed you. The Lord
43 will bring a nation [[the District of Criminals](#)] against you from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the
44 eagle flies, a nation whose language [[legalese, Form #05.014](#)] you will not understand, a nation of fierce
45 countenance [[narcissistic psychopath lawyers](#)], which does not respect the elderly [they die on the healthcare
46 waiting list] nor show favor to the young [legalized abortion]. And they shall eat the increase of your livestock
47 and the produce of your land [the [Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302](#)], until you are destroyed; they shall not leave
48 you grain or new wine or oil, or the increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have
49 destroyed you.”
50 [[Deut. 28:47-51](#), Bible, NKJV]

51 See also [Matt. 25:31-46](#) for a message similar to the above direct from Jesus. Watch the following for a sermon by Tim
52 Keller on the above verse entitled “Generous Justice”.

<i>Generous Justice</i> , Tim Keller

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

68 of 102

EXHIBIT: _____

The reason the above judgment happens is described in [Form #05.016, Section 5.4](#). The “Beast” and his “Mark” in [Revelations \(Form #11.407\)](#) are metaphors created by God to help explain what ultimately is exactly the above situation. The “Beast” is a [psychopathic socialist government](#) that wants to become like God and trample everyone underfoot. We must therefore be very selective about who we can or will help because we are so people and resource and donation constrained. The purpose of this warning page is to solicit your help in facilitating that selectivity.

In Jesus’ Olivet Discourse, He mentions caring for the “least of these” ([Matthew 25:40](#)), and in James’ epistle he expounds on the nature of “true religion” ([James 1:27](#)). So, if by “social justice” we mean that society has a moral obligation to care for those less fortunate, then that is correct. God knows that, due to the fall, there will be widows, fatherless, and sojourners in society, and He made provisions in the old and new covenants to care for these outcasts of society. The model of such behavior is Jesus Himself, who reflected God’s sense of justice by bringing the gospel message to even the outcasts of society.

However, the Christian notion of social justice is different from the contemporary notion of social justice. The biblical exhortations to care for the poor are more individual than societal.

“Then they also will answer Him, saying, ‘Lord, when did we see You hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison, and did not minister to You?’ Then He will answer them, saying, ‘Assuredly, I say to you, inasmuch as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to Me.’ And these will go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.”
[Matt. 25:44-46, Bible, NKJV]

In other words, each Christian is individually and personally encouraged to do what he can to help the “least of these.” Jesus spoke the above words NOT to a “government” but to private individuals. Never did He command GOVERNMENTS to engage in charity or wealth redistribution. Nowhere did God recognize or convey rights to governments or civil rulers. The Ten Commandments in Exodus 20, for instance, NEVER even mention governments. They are all about the individual. Governments are not judged at the final judgment for their FAILURE to engage in charity or welfare. The basis for such biblical commands is found in the second of the two greatest commandments—love your neighbor as yourself ([Matthew 22:39](#)).

Today’s notion of social justice replaces the individual with the government, which, through taxation and other means, redistributes wealth. This policy doesn’t encourage giving out of love, but resentment from those who see their hard-earned wealth being taken away. These problems point out a bigger rational conflict, which is that charity and force are completely incompatible in the biblical conception of justice. Frederic Bastiat explains why:

The Law and Charity

You say: “There are persons who have no money,” and you turn to the law, but the law is not a breast that fills itself with milk. Nor are the lacteal veins of the law supplied with milk from a source outside the society. Nothing can enter the public treasury for the benefit of one citizen or one class unless other citizens and other classes have been forced to send it in. If every person draws from the treasury the amount that he has put in it, it is true that the law then plunders nobody. But this procedure does nothing for the persons who have no money. It does not promote equality of income. The law can be an instrument of equalization only as it takes from some persons and gives to other persons. When the law does this, it is an instrument of plunder [THEFT].
[*The Law*, Frederic Bastiat, 1850; SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/TheLaw/TheLaw.htm>]

The type of equalization that Bastiat is describing above is equality of OUTCOME, not equality of OPPORTUNITY. The purpose of biblical justice is to protect equality of opportunity and the restoration of PRIVATE property that is stolen. Therefore, biblical justice is incompatible with social/political justice precisely because charity and force are incompatible and because law is only an instrument of force.

Another difference is that the Christian worldview of social justice doesn’t assume the wealthy are the beneficiaries of ill-gotten gain. Wealth is not evil in a Christian worldview, but there is a responsibility and an expectation to be a good steward of one’s wealth (because all wealth comes from God). In fact, wealth is viewed by God as a reward or blessing for those who are obedient to His law. Without such a reward or blessing because the government essentially STEALS it through taxation, the result is that there is no incentive to obey God’s law and the government essentially disestablishes the church by destroying its foundation. Today’s social/political justice operates under the usually FALSE presumption that

the wealthy exploit the poor. All such presumptions are both a biblical sin and a violation of “due process of law” in the context of legal justice:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

A third difference between biblical justice and social/political justice is that, under the Christian concept of stewardship, the Christian can INDIVIDUALLY give to the charities he/she wants to support. For example, if a Christian has a heart for the unborn, he can support pro-life agencies with his time, talent and treasure. Under the contemporary form of social justice, it is those in power within the government who COLLECTIVELY decide who receives the redistributed wealth. We have no control over what the government does with our tax money, and, more often than not, that money goes to charities we might not deem worthy.

Traditionally there have been several main views of legal “justice”. Let us concentrate on just two: retributive justice and distributive justice. Retributive justice goes back at least to Aristotle and means simply, “to each man his due”. It has to do with giving people what they deserve. Thus, we speak about ‘just deserts’ and so on.

Retributive justice is a theory of *justice* that holds that the best response to a crime is a *punishment* proportional to the offense, inflicted because the offender deserves the punishment. Prevention of future crimes (*deterrence*) or *rehabilitation* of the offender are not considered in determining such punishments. The theory holds that when an offender breaks the law, justice requires that he or she suffer in return. Retribution is different from *revenge* because retributive justice is only directed at wrongs, has inherent limits, is not personal, involves no pleasure at the suffering of others^[1] and employs procedural standards.^{[2][3]} Classical texts advocating the retributive view include *De Legibus*, (106 BC), *Kant's Science of Right*^[4] (1790), and *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*^[5] (1821).

[Wikipedia: Retributive justice; Downloaded 5/21/18; SOURCE:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Retributive_justice]

FOOTNOTES:

1. See: *Schadenfreude, sadism*
2. Nozick, Robert (1981). *Philosophical Explanations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 366–368. ISBN 9780674664791.
3. *"Positive' Retributivism and the Meaning of Desert"*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved June 2, 2014.
4. Kant, Immanuel. *Science of Right*.

Under our legal definition of justice earlier in section 2, “justice” really means the right to simply be left alone because Aristotle’s definition leaves the door open for people to define anything and everything owned by others as “what is due”. We prove this earlier in section 2.3.

“Social justice” and its modern counterpart, distributive justice, on the other hand, is a more recent concept. It has to do with equality of OUTCOME, and redistributing certain goods, including wealth, to ostensibly help out the less fortunate. It is what is most often meant when the left – both secular and religious – speak about “social justice”.

At the risk of oversimplifying matters, it seems that the notion of retributive justice is more closely aligned with biblical notions of justice, while distributive justice is further afield from Scriptural principles primarily because it violates the rights of private property found in the Ten Commandments. But this can hardly be defended adequately in a brief article, even in a most superficial fashion.

We would need to closely examine biblical terms such as justice, righteousness and the like. We would need to look at contemporary economic options as well. And we would need to study the historical record to see whether wealth redistribution has in fact worked, and really helped the poor. But let us tease things out just a bit more here.

Equality of OPPORTUNITY is one thing, but equality of OUTCOME is quite another. To enforce equality of outcome, you have to treat unequals equally, which is neither fair nor just. Given that we are all different (not equal in talents, giftings, motivations, etc), you have to use unequal treatment to get equal results. Many have written on this obvious point. Dr Mark Cooray is as good as anyone here.

1 In 1988 the Australian law professor wrote an important book entitled, *The Australian Achievement: From Bondage To*
2 *Freedom*. While the entire volume is quite helpful, I draw your attention to ch. 20: “Equality of Opportunity and Equality
3 of Outcome”. Says Cooray,

4 “Equality of opportunity is best expressed in the phrase – career open to talents. No arbitrary obstacles should
5 prevent people from achieving those public positions which their talents fit and which their values lead them to
6 seek. Neither birth, nationality, colour, religion, sex nor any other equivalent characteristic should determine
7 the public opportunities that are open to a person – only talent and achievement.

8 “Thus, equality of opportunity simply spells out the concept of equality before the law. And it has meaning and
9 importance precisely because people are different in their genetic and cultural characteristics, and hence both
10 want to and can pursue different careers. It is important to note that such equality of opportunity does not
11 present any conflict with freedom. Quite the opposite. Equality of opportunity and freedom are two facets of the
12 same basic concept.”

13 [*The Australian Achievement: From Bondage To Freedom*, LJM Cooray, 1996; SOURCE:
14 <http://www.ourcivilisation.com/cooray/btof/chap20.htm>]

15 He continues,

16 “Equality of outcome is a radically different concept. Equality of opportunity provides in a sense that all start
17 the race of life at the same time. Equality of outcome attempts to ensure that everyone finishes at the same time.
18 To slightly change what the Dodo said in Alice in Wonderland, ‘Everybody must win and all must have prizes’.
19 That is the goal of radical socialism. Everyone must be a winner, everyone must be equal. Socialists do not
20 really point towards absolute equality but they point to vague ideas of fairness and justness.”

21 [*The Australian Achievement: From Bondage To Freedom*, LJM Cooray, 1996; SOURCE:
22 <http://www.ourcivilisation.com/cooray/btof/chap20.htm>]

23 Such policies decrease equality and stymie economic growth:

24 “This is not merely because they directly attack equality of opportunity in the sense of freedom to pursue an
25 interest or vocation, but because by destroying incentive they inhibit that individual initiative which has been
26 responsible for modern economic progress, growth and development. Modern economic development has
27 systematically raised the lot of the ordinary man to a level of prosperity undreamed of in past ages, when such
28 prosperity was confined to a few.

29 “This development was the direct result of individual initiative and endeavour within a system which allowed
30 individual incentive and free activity. By directly impinging upon individual incentive and free activity,
31 egalitarian policies and programmes actually inhibit the process of economic growth and development, thus
32 inhibiting the only mechanism in history by which inequality has been systematically, successfully and
33 continuously ameliorated on a large scale.”

34 [*The Australian Achievement: From Bondage To Freedom*, LJM Cooray, 1996; SOURCE:
35 <http://www.ourcivilisation.com/cooray/btof/chap20.htm>]

36 Jewish commentator Michael Medved has just penned a piece on similar themes. He begins this way:

37 “For more than a hundred years liberals and conservatives have been arguing over the true meaning of justice.
38 The left emphasizes just outcomes – seeking smaller gaps between rich and poor, and a comparably dignified
39 standard of living for all members of society.

40 “The right stresses just procedures – making sure that individuals keep the fruits of their own labors and
41 remain secure in their property, without seizure by their neighbors or by government. Liberals accept unequal,
42 potentially unfair treatment by government in order to achieve fair results; conservatives accept unequal,
43 potentially unfair results so long as every citizen receives fair and comparable treatment by government.

44 “These arguments have raged for generations without definitive resolution, but that doesn’t mean that both
45 sides are right, or that the questions that divide them offer no final answers. In fact, key Biblical passages
46 provide a strong indication that conservative concepts of economic justice comport far more closely to the
47 religious and philosophical foundations of western civilization.”

48 [*Which Side is God On?*, Michael Medved; SOURCE:
49 <https://townhall.com/columnists/michaelmedved/2010/09/01/which-side-is-god-on-n1104336/>]

50 He explores various biblical texts, and draws upon some commentary by Jewish thinkers:

51 “For instance, a key passage in the Book of Leviticus (19:15) declares: ‘You shall not commit a perversion of
52 justice; you shall not favor the poor and you shall not honor the great; with righteousness (Tzedek) shall you

judge your fellow.' Amazingly, the Bible warns us not to 'favor the poor' even before we're instructed 'not to honor the great,' because partiality for the unfortunate counts as an even stronger human temptation.

"And what about all the Biblical demands, in both Old and New Testaments, to show compassion to widows, orphans and the poor? Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki (Rashi), the 11th century giant who became the most influential of all Torah expositors, explains that the verse in Leviticus draws an all-important, eternal distinction between charity and justice: 'Do not say that since the wealthy man is obligated to help the poor one, it is proper for a judge to rule in favor of the poor litigant so that he will be supported in dignity. The Torah insists that justice be rendered honestly; charity may not interfere with it.'

"In other words, assistance for the destitute remains an individual obligation on God-fearing individuals, but should not bring a tilt to the law to favor the less fortunate. It is no coincidence, surely, that this crucial verse in Leviticus appears just two sentences away from the most famous declaration in all the Bible: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself' (19:18). This famous line makes clear that the same God who wants us to deal kindly with our fellow human beings, also requires that we respect and honor ourselves.

"You don't demean or damage yourself for the sake of your fellow; the Bible consistently backs the conservative supposition that we help others best when we help ourselves. If such Biblical passages strongly support the conservative conception of justice, then why are so many churches, synagogues and divinity schools filled with outspokenly liberal clergy?"

[Which Side is God On?, Michael Medved; SOURCE:

<https://townhall.com/columnists/michaelmedved/2010/09/01/which-side-is-god-on-n1104336/>

Far more needs to be said about this difficult subject. But this may help to clear up some muddled thinking, and help us to be clearer on what biblical justice is all about. It is at least far more than the usual notions of social justice being peddled today. And it certainly is more than just state-enforced wealth redistribution or equality of OUTCOME enforced by law.

Basically, there is a tension between a God-centered approach to social justice and a man-centered approach to social justice. The man-centered approach sees the government in the role of savior, bringing in a utopia through government policies. In short, it advocates religious idolatry, where rulers are endowed by fiat and absent God's authority with superior or supernatural powers above ordinary natural biological men. This approach, in fact, was Satan's sin: Seeking to be equal to or above God, and therefore to be above the authority of any single man or woman.

The God-centered approach, on the other hand, sees Christ as Savior, bringing heaven to earth when He returns. At His return, Christ will restore all things and execute perfect justice. Until then, Christians express God's love and justice by showing kindness and mercy to those less fortunate on a personal and individual basis, but NEVER compelled by any "law" or collective or secular organization. In fact, if such compulsion is attempted, then we claim that the source of such compulsion:

1. Is not "law" as classically defined. See section 2.2 earlier and:

What is "law"?, Form #05.048

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2. Is private law, special law, and a civil franchise to which you must personally and individually and EXPRESSLY consent. See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. Is being ILLEGALLY and/or unconstitutionally enforced if the ENFORCER proceeds to enforce on a mere PRESUMPTION instead of having to prove BEFORE enforcement that you consented to it in writing and were present or domiciled in a place NOT protected by the Constitution where your PRIVATE rights are "unalienable" according to the Declaration of Independence.
4. Is being misrepresented if it is called "law" or given the "force of law" without putting the words "private" or "special" in front of it. See:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

That is why our official position is that charity and grace are limited EXCLUSIVELY to the individual, the family, and the church and NEVER the government.

5 Corruption of the government: Turning “Legal Justice” into “Social Justice”

The following subsections describe how “legal justice” is illegally and unconstitutionally and even criminally converted to “social justice” within a governmental system.

The main engine of corruption is government franchises. We discuss government franchises in the following courses:

1. Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. The Government “Benefits” Scam, Form #05.040
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

For more on government corruption, see the following resources on our site:

1. Corruption, Scams, and Frauds, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Scams/scams.htm>
2. Government Corruption, Form #11.401-detailed evidence on how our government has become corrupted.
<https://sedm.org/home/government-corruption/>
3. Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course, Form #12.026
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
4. How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>

5.1 “Legal justice” v. “Social/Political justice”

Let’s now compare “Legal justice” with “Social/Political justice”:

Table 1: Legal justice v. Social/Political Justice

#	Characteristic	“Legal Justice”	“Social/Political Justice”
1	Equality between government and governed under the civil law	Yes	No
2	Promotes equality of RESULT	No	Yes
3	Promotes equality UNDER THE LAW for ALL	Yes	No. Government has “superior or supernatural” powers.
4	Type of equality promoted	Equality of OPPORTUNITY	Equality of RESULT (See communist manifesto)
5	Ownership/control of all property	Individuals	Government
6	Private property permitted	Yes	No
7	Sovereign within the system of government	Individual	Democratic majority
8	Biblical idolatry of individual in relation to government?	No	Yes
9	Implemented through what law system	Common law and equity	Civil statutory law that behaves as a franchise. Everyone is PRIVILEGED under the franchise .
10	Participation in the collective is	Voluntary and must be consented to	Coerced
11	Rights	Are unalienable and require consent to give away in relation to government.	Are revocable “privileges” that can be taken away by the majority. Hence they are PUBLIC PRIVILEGES, rather than REAL, unalienable rights.
12	Source of “rights”	God	Government grantor/creator

#	Characteristic	“Legal Justice”	“Social/Political Justice”
13	Contribution to paying for any and all rights	Absolute and exclusive	Zero. Completely irresponsible and insist on STEALING from another person or group or the rich.
14	Political issues and personal commitment to those issues defined mainly by	Morality, religion, and rationality (the spirit).	Personal economic expediency/need (the flesh).

1 A fascinating scientific study comparing conservatives to liberals validates the above table. See:

The Moral Roots of Liberals and Conservatives, Jonathan Haidt, TED
http://www.ted.com/talks/jonathan_haidt_on_the_moral_mind.html

2 For collectivists and statists, “rights” really mean the following:

the notion of "rights" is a mere term of entitlement, indicative of a claim for any possible desirable good, no matter how important or trivial, abstract or tangible, recent or ancient. It is merely an assertion of desire, and a declaration of intention to use the language of rights to acquire said desire.

In fact, since the program of social justice inevitably involves claims for government provision of goods, paid for through the efforts of others, the term actually refers to an intention to use force to acquire one's desires. Not to earn desirable goods by rational thought and action, production and voluntary exchange, but to go in there and forcibly take [STEAL] goods from those who can supply them!
 [O'Neill, Ben (2011-03-16) [The Injustice of Social Justice](#), [Mises Institute](#)]

11 Don't allow “statists” or “collectivists” to pervert your language or redefine “justice” in the courtroom to mean “social justice”. Don't allow them to perpetuate the superiority of the collective or government over the individual by this perversion of the definition. When you hear the term “social justice” from any politician, NEVER vote for him. “Social justice”= SOCIALISM. Insist on absolute equality at all times between the government and the governed, which we describe as the FOUNDATION of all your freedom in:

Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction
 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 VIDEO: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P3ggFibd5hk>

16 If you allow them to redefine justice, you will ultimately become a human sacrifice to a pagan civil religion or “collective”.
 17 The “altar” where the sacrifice will occur is the judge's bench, which is the altar of “Baal”. Hence “Bailiff”.

18 For a fascinating short video that demonstrates how the meaning of “justice” is perverted by adding the word “social” in
 19 front of it, see:

What is Social Justice?, Prager University
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rtBvQj2k6xo>

20 The above video concludes about “Social Justice” the following:

- 21 1. “Social justice” is incompatible with freedom or a free society where all are equal under the law.
- 22 2. Social justice requires an elite set of privileged few in the government to decide how to redistribute wealth, and the
- 23 concentration of power this creates is dangerous to freedom.
- 24 3. The only institution capable of imposing or coercing “social justice” is the state.
- 25 4. Its advocates have no concrete definition for “social justice”, because if they defined what it meant, they would
- 26 discredit themselves.
- 27 5. It means whatever its champions want it to mean.
- 28 6. “Social Justice”= “good things” no one needs to ARGUE for and No one DARE be against.
- 29 7. “Social Justice” targets its conservative opponents as people who want to ENFORCE or COERCE THEIR values onto
- 30 others. The opposite is the real truth, because “social justice” requires a coercive state in every area of life, while with
- 31 LEGAL justice, the state only gets involved when there is a real, quantifiable injury to a RIGHT rather than a
- 32 PRIVILEGE.

8. Those who oppose “social justice” are inevitably branded as “greedy”. The most frequent social group who are unjustly branded as “greedy” are conservatives or the right.
9. “Social Justice” is a tool of propaganda used by collectivists to get otherwise conservative people to unknowingly accept socialism and collectivism.
10. The use of the term is most appealing to the lower class as a method to mobilize and engage them into a commercial war against the upper class in the jury box and the ballot box. The commercialization of either the jury box or the ballot box creates a CRIMINAL conflict of interest and is illegal. It is essentially used as a recruitment mechanism for socialist organizers to recruit those who will abuse their voting power and jury service to STEAL from the rich and fill their pocket with the plunder by whatever means necessary.

“Here I close my opinion. I could not say less in view of questions of such gravity that go down to the very foundation of the government. If the provisions of the constitution can be set aside by an act of congress, where is the course of usurpation [abuse of taxation power for THEFT and wealth transfer] to end? The present assault [WAR!] upon capital [PRIVATE property] is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping-stone to others, larger and more sweeping, till our political contests [in the jury box and the ballot box between the HAVES and the HAVE NOTS] will become a war of the poor against the rich,-a war constantly growing in intensity and bitterness. 'If the court sanctions the power of discriminating [UNEQUAL or GRADUATED] taxation, and nullifies the uniformity mandate of the constitution,' as said by one who has been all his life a student of our institutions, 'it will mark the hour when the sure decadence of our present government will commence.'”
[Pollock v. Farmers Loan and Trust Co., 157 U.S. 429 (1895)]

For an article that deals more with the subject of “social justice”, see:

Wikipedia: Social Justice; Downloaded 8/21/2014
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice

For a complete treatment of the legal definition of “justice”, see:

Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 3
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5.2 “Justice” in your interactions with government

Let’s apply these concepts of justice to the way the government interacts with you personally. The minute that anyone does any of the following without your EXPRESS WRITTEN consent absent duress:

1. Interferes with or administratively penalizes the exercise of any constitutional right. In the constitution, this kind of penalty is called a “Bill of Attainder” and it is unconstitutional.
2. Treats you unequally. See Form #05.033.
3. Forces any status upon you such as “taxpayer”, “citizen”, “resident”, “spouse”, “driver”, etc.
4. Procures your consent to anything by any method you did not authorize. For instance, they PRESUME you consented rather than procure your consent in writing, even though you told them that the ONLY method by which you can or will consent is IN WRITING.
5. Compels you to contract with them or makes you a party to a contract or government franchise that you do not expressly consent to.
6. Calls anything voluntary while REFUSING to defend your ABSOLUTE RIGHT NOT to volunteer. This is FRAUD and it’s a crime.
7. Imputes or assumes any kind of fiduciary duty on your part towards anyone else absent express written consent. All such presumptions are a violation of due process of law that we call “theft by presumption”.
8. Enforces civil statutory laws of any jurisdiction that you are not domiciled within and therefore protected by. This is criminal identity theft. See Form #05.046.
9. Demands or takes any kind of property without rendering its equivalent in value. This is theft in violation of the Fifth Amendment takings clause. Due process of law requires a court trial before any taking of property. Taking it administratively can only be done WITHIN government and against public officers.
10. Enforces any obligation associated with any civil status upon you, such as franchisee, public officer, etc. They FIRST have the obligation to produce evidence in writing in court that you consented to the civil status and that you are serving on federal territory where the status is domiciled before they can take it under the Fifth Amendment. If they don’t, they are engaging in criminal identity theft as documented in Form #05.046.

11. As a government:
- 11.1. Refuses to recognize or protect private rights.
 - 11.2. Insists that ALL your property is public property that the government has title to and you are a transferee or trustee over.
 - 11.3. Refuses to offer a status on government forms of “not subject but not exempt” or “other”, and thus compels you to choose a status that is within their jurisdiction as a public officer.
12. Converts private property or RIGHTS to property to a public use, public office, or public purpose without your EXPRESS consent, INCLUDING through the process of taxation. Yes, “taxes” are involuntary for “taxpayers”, but only AFTER you VOLUNTEER to become a statutory “taxpayer” by signing up for a government franchise while physically situated in a place not protected by the constitution, and AFTER they protect your right to NOT participate or volunteer. Otherwise, we are really dealing with what the U.S. Supreme Court calls “robbery in the name of taxation”. See Form #12.025.
13. Abuses its taxation power to redistribute wealth between private humans:

“To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.”

“Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.”
[[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 \(1874\)](#)]

. then an act of terrorism, theft, and possibly even slavery or involuntary servitude has occurred, all of which are torts cognizable under the state or federal constitutions and the common law.

The way that governments ensure that they are not the object of civil injustice and are “let alone” is by enforcing the requirement that whenever anyone wants to sue them, they must produce consent to be sued published as a positive law statute. This is called “sovereign immunity”:

A state's freedom from litigation was established as a constitutional right through the Eleventh Amendment. The inherent nature of sovereignty prevents actions against a state by its own citizens without its consent. [491 U.S. 39] In *Atascadero*, 473 U.S. at 242, we identified this principle as an essential element of the constitutional checks and balances:

The “constitutionally mandated balance of power” between the States and the Federal Government was adopted by the Framers to ensure the protection of “our fundamental liberties.” [Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority, 469 U.S. 528, 572 (Powell, J., dissenting)]. By guaranteeing the sovereign immunity of the States against suit in federal court, the Eleventh Amendment serves to maintain this balance.
[[Great Northern Ins. Co. v. Read, 322 U.S. 47, 51 \(1944\)](#)]

Likewise, all the authority possessed by both the state and federal governments is delegated by We The People to them. The people cannot delegate an authority collectively that they individually do not ALSO possess.

“The question is not what power the federal government ought to have, but what powers, in fact, have been given by the people... **The federal union is a government of delegated powers. It has only such as are expressly conferred upon it, and such as are reasonably to be implied from those granted.** In this respect, we differ radically from nations where all legislative power, without restriction or limitation, is vested in a parliament or other legislative body subject to no restriction except the discretion of its members.” (Congress)
[[U.S. v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 \(1936\)](#)]

Both the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence require that “all men are created equal” and that all “persons”, including governments, are treated equally IN EVERY RESPECT. That means that no creation of men, including a government, can have any more authority than a single man. All “persons”, whether human or artificial are, in fact, EQUAL in every respect, with the possible exception that artificial entities are not protected by the Bill of Rights. This is covered further in:

[Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment](#), Form #05.033
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

No government can or should therefore have or be able to enforce any more authority than a single human being. This means that if the government claims “sovereign immunity” and insists that it cannot be sued without its express written consent, then the government, in turn, when it is enforcing any civil liability against ANY American, has the EQUAL burden to produce evidence of THEIR consent IN WRITING to be sued. That consent must, in turn, be given by a person domiciled in a place OTHER than that protected by the U.S.A. Constitution, because the Declaration of Independence says the rights of people in states of the Union are “unalienable”, which means they CANNOT be sold, bargained away, or transferred by ANY process, including a franchise or contract, even WITH consent.

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, -”*
[Declaration of Independence]

“Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693]

Therefore, the only people who can lawfully “alienate” any Constitutional right in relation to a real, de jure government by exercising their right to contract, are those **NOT** protected by the Constitution and who therefore are either domiciled on federal territory or situated abroad, which also is not protected by the Constitution.

Any attempt to treat any government as having more power, authority, or rights than a single human, in fact, constitutes idolatry. The source of all government power in America is The Sovereign People as individuals, who are human beings and no civil statutory “persons”. Any power that did not come from this “natural” source is, therefore “supernatural”, and all religions are based on the worship of such “supernatural beings” or “superior beings”.

*“**Religion.** Man’s relation to Divinity, to reverence, **worship**, obedience, and **submission to mandates and precepts of supernatural or superior beings.** In its broadest sense includes all forms of **belief in the existence of superior beings exercising power over human beings by volition, imposing rules of conduct, with future rewards and punishments. Bond uniting man to God, and a virtue whose purpose is to render God worship due him as source of all being and principle of all government of things.** Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663.”*
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1292]

By “worship”, we really mean “obedience” to the dictates of the supernatural or superior being.

*“**worship** 1. chiefly Brit: a person of importance—used as a title for various officials (as magistrates and some mayors) 2: **reverence [obedience] offered a divine being or supernatural power**; also: an act of expressing such reverence 3: a form of religious practice with its creed and ritual 4: extravagant respect or admiration for or devotion to an object of esteem <~ the dollar>.”*
[Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1361]

In these respects, both law and religion are twin sisters, because the object of BOTH is “obedience” and “submission” to a “sovereign” of one kind or another. Those in such “submission” are called “subjects” in the legal field. The only difference between REAL religion and state worship is WHICH sovereign: God or man:

“Obedientia est legis essentia.
Obedience is the essence of the law. 11 Co. 100.”
[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;
SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

A quick way to determine whether you are engaging in idolatry is to look at whether the authority being exercised by a so-called “government” has a “natural” source, meaning whether any human being who is not IN the government can lawfully exercise such authority. If they cannot, you are dealing with a state-sponsored religion and a de facto government rather than a REAL, de jure government. The nature of that de facto government is described in:

[Socialism: The New American Civil Religion](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.016
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1 Lastly, we discuss the concept of “justice” in the context of franchises and your right to contract later in:

Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 9.10.4: Justice in the context of franchises and your right to contract
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2 **5.3 The Criminality and Injustice of Turning Legal Justice into a Statutory Franchise or** 3 **Privilege**

4 *“The **practice of law, sir, is a privilege, especially in Federal Court**. You’re close to losing that privilege in this*
5 *court, Mr. Stillely.”*
6 *[Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 4.4.12 and 6.11.1. From the trial of Dr. Phil Roberts]*

7 This section will prove that it is not only unconstitutional but illegal and even criminal to turn “justice” into a statutory
8 franchise or privilege. In any legal system of justice, the most important methods of ensuring the integrity and fairness of
9 the process is:

- 10 1. Equality between the government and all litigants. See Form #05.033.
- 11 2. Impartial judges and juries free of conflict of interest.

12 These elements are the foundation of “due process”, in fact, as we exhaustively explain in Form #05.045. Many legal,
13 philosophical, and logical problems result from turning justice into a for-profit business because of the conflict of interest
14 that it creates that can destroy due process. The main method of turning justice into a for-profit business is government
15 franchises, so we must examine how franchises can cause “justice” to not only become “injustice”, but to produce crime as
16 well.

17 The main method of turning a PRIVATE right into a PUBLIC privilege is by imposing the ability to take it away from the
18 party without their express consent free of coercion of any kind. Ownership, after all, is the right to EXCLUDE any and
19 ALL others, including governments, from using or benefitting from the use of the property. Anyone in the legal profession
20 or the government who insists that they have the ability to deny you the service or property you seek without denying it to
21 everyone else equally is, in effect, STEALING the property and violating the constitutional requirement for equal
22 protection and equal treatment. This kind of discrimination produces and encourages extortion and/or usury because if the
23 thing needed is especially important and even essential to your survival or well-being, there is a limitless number of things
24 they could demand from you in exchange for the right to restore the thing you seek or need. The thing the government
25 demands in return to restore the thing they are threatening to take away is called a “benefit” in franchise parlance. The
26 British Magna Carta recognizes the denial of justice and turning it into a profitable franchise as follows:

27 *“**To no-one will we sell or deny of delay right or justice.**”*
28 *[Magna Carta, National Archives; SOURCE: [https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/magna-](https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/magna-carda/translation.html)*
29 *[carda/translation.html](https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/magna-carda/translation.html)]*

30 We discuss franchises at length in the following memorandum of law:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

31 As we point out in the above document over and over, all government franchises involve grants of government property
32 with conditions or strings attached. The “strings” attached require you to surrender some type of valuable property in order
33 to procure the government property you seek. Under the Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.), government franchises turn
34 the government into the “Merchant” (U.C.C. §2-104(1)) offering property and you become the “Buyer” (U.C.C. §2-
35 103(1)(a)) seeking and “bidding” to exchange their otherwise private property for the property sought. Under such
36 circumstances, the Merchant always prescribes the terms of the sale and has the right to refuse sale if the Buyer either does
37 not accept the terms or wants to modify them.

38 In the case of “justice”, the government property sought are “judicial services”, “court services”, “police protection”, and
39 “jails”. The cost of delivering all of these forms of property must be paid for in a way that does not jeopardize or
40 undermine the chief characteristics of justice itself. There are lots of ways that justice can be undermined or denied in the

process of raising revenue to pay for administering it. The following list identifies a few of these ways that we have personally observed, but the list is in fact ENDLESS:

1. Threatening any litigant with sanctions if they attempt to relitigate any issue in the future, and especially in the case of issues the court REFUSES its constitutional duty to even address. This approach by any judge in fact amounts to criminal obstruction of justice, threatening a protected witness, and witness tampering. These types of issues are what we call "Third Rail Issues":

Third rail of politics

The **third rail** of a nation's politics is a metaphor for any issue so controversial that it is "charged" and "untouchable" to the extent that any politician or public official who dares to broach the subject will invariably suffer politically.

It is most commonly used in North America. Though commonly attributed to Tip O'Neill,^[1] Speaker of the United States House of Representatives during the Reagan presidency, it seems to have been coined by O'Neill aide Kirk O'Donnell in 1982 in reference to Social Security.^[2]

The metaphor comes from the high-voltage third rail in some electric railway systems. Stepping on this usually results in electrocution, and the use of the term in politics relates to the risk of "political death" that a politician would face by tackling certain issues.

[Wikipedia: "Third rail of politics", Downloaded 6/6/2018; SOURCE: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third_rail_of_politics]

FOOTNOTES:

1. Rick Shenkman. "When Did Social Security Become the Third Rail of American Politics?". George Mason University. Retrieved 21 October 2014.

2. William Safire (8 February 2007). "On Language: Third Rail". The New York Times. Retrieved 21 October 2014.

2. Denying justice as a service to specific classes or groups of people based on some arbitrary criteria such as ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religious beliefs, etc.
3. Charging so much for the service that the people at the bottom of the economic ladder can't afford it. Thus, the poor are discriminated against and can easily be abused by the rich without legal consequence.
4. Prosecuting people for failing to pay taxes that pay for police protection, while not prosecuting officers who fail to render the protection paid for. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 8
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5. Appointing and paying a court-appointed and court-selected attorney who is licensed and therefore beholden to the court at the expense of the best interests of the client. See:

Petition for Admission to Practice, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/PetForAdmToPractice-USDC.pdf>

6. The judge orders the court reporter to withhold the court transcript and then orders the text changed to remove something that he said that would undermine the government, or get him in trouble. That way, you as the litigant discriminated upon or treated illegally by the judge do not have proof that he is doing it. This is criminal obstruction of justice and also criminally tampers with the court reporter as a witness.
7. Allowing judges to serve over both CONSTITUTIONAL issues and FRANCHISE issues and to decide which of the two types of law to apply. That choice is called "choice of law" and it is discussed in Form #05.018, Section 3. Judges whose pay and benefits derive from franchises will always try to switch the choice of law from CONSTITUTIONAL to STATUTORY FRANCHISE as a way to increase their own revenues or lower the taxes they pay for those franchises. For instance, allowing a state criminal judge whose revenues or commissions derive from traffic tickets to preside over a case involving unlicensed driving against someone who is PRIVATE and not a franchisee and who has CONSTITUTIONAL rights but wants not STATUTORY PRIVILEGES. This causes the judge to PRETEND that the party is subject to the statute when they are not in order to unlawfully enlarge government revenue and his own pay and benefits. This is a criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §208 and a civil violation of 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455.

8. Instituting a commission program to reward police officers for writing tickets that produce revenue. This is an illegal abuse of the police power for civil or revenue purposes. See:
- [Sovereignty for Police Officers Course](https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #12.022
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
9. Censoring the court record by:
- 9.1. Telling you what to say in a pleading.
 - 9.2. Denying the filing of specific types of pleadings.
 - 9.3. Rejecting the pleading because it is too long.
 - 9.4. Publishing court rules that limit the size of pleadings and thus criminally suborning perjury by preventing you from telling the WHOLE truth.
10. Hearing a case where one of the litigants before the court is a friend of the judge or has a commercial relationship with him/her. Judges are required to recuse themselves in such a case.
11. Sanctioning people OTHER than licensed attorneys for any of their activities in the court other than contempt relating to disobeying court orders. Court rules pertain only to officers of the court, including those relating to sanctions. Private humans are not officers of the court. See Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
12. Causing a surrender of any right, and especially constitutional right, against the government or a specific government actor in exchange for the ability to file suit. Examples might include:
- 12.1. Waiving the right of trial by jury in exchange for the PRIVILEGE of being able to file a suit. Traffic court, Tax Court, and Family Court don't have a jury or a jury box and you aren't even allowed to request one. You are presumed to have waived those rights when you signed up for the franchise, even though those rights are UNALIENABLE, according to the Declaration of Independence.
 - 12.2. Making the rules of court arbitrary or not publishing them. This deprives litigants of the constitutional requirement for "reasonable notice" of what is expected of them and allows court officers to arbitrarily discriminate. See Form #05.022.
13. Instituting a conflict of interest, usually financial, among those judging the case, acting as witnesses, or serving as jurists. This would include:
- 13.1. Allowing judges or jurors to serve on trials involving taxes where they are either taxpayers or tax consumers.
 - 13.2. Allowing judges to preside over trials involving companies they invested in.
 - 13.3. Subsidizing judges with financial incentives for a specific outcome of the case, such as commissions for convictions.
 - 13.4. Subsidizing court witnesses to testify in a way that produces a specific outcome of the case. For instance, paying witnesses a money award if their testimony produces a conviction.
 - 13.5. Tampering with or bribing jurists by telling them, for instance, that they will or will not be audited by the IRS for testifying in a certain way.
 - 13.6. Telling juries hearing tax cases that their tax bill will go up if they don't convict the defendant and thereby FORCE him or her to "pay their fair share".
 - 13.7. Recruiting witnesses against you who are in jail and who are told they will be released if they testify in a certain way.
 - 13.8. Telling a party among a group of people being convicted that they will get immunity and not be prosecuted if they testify against their cohorts.
14. Destroying all constitutional rights and replacing them with privileges by:
- 14.1. Forcing you to invoke the statutory law in order to get a remedy INSTEAD of the Constitution. See Form #05.037.
 - 14.2. Dismissing or penalizing cases that invoke the Constitution as a remedy INSTEAD of the statutes. See Form #05.010.
 - 14.3. Refusing to hear cases of people present on land but not domiciled on that land. See Form #05.002.
15. Censoring people from filing future actions in court. This happens all the time with people who use arguments in court that the courts don't want to deal with and which expose and prosecute government corruption.
16. Making the ruling unpublished in cases against the government where the government loses. Thus, you and other litigants may not use the win as an authority to win in future cases. This prejudices all cases in favor of the government and usually involves criminal obstruction of justice by the judge who made his ruling unpublished. See:
- <http://Nonpublication.com>
17. Making presumptions about the litigant or his status without evidence on the record of the proceeding which prejudice the litigant and favor the government. For instance, PRESUMING that they are a statutory "U.S. citizen" instead of a non-resident state national, thus making them liable for every act of Congress instead of immune from acts of Congress. See:
- 17.1. [Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen](#), Form #05.006

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

17.2. Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

17.3. Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

All of the above examples involve interfering with justice or the ability to litigate of specific litigants to advantage usually the government at the expense of the litigant. The biblical term for the above tactics is “usury”, and the Bible forbids it. The types of activities turn “justice” into a franchise and are often litigated in franchise courts:

“franchise court. Hist. A privately held court that (usu.) exists by virtue of a royal grant [privilege], with jurisdiction over a variety of matters, depending on the grant and whatever powers the court acquires over time. In 1274, Edward I abolished many of these feudal courts by forcing the nobility to demonstrate by what authority (quo warranto) they held court. If a lord could not produce a charter reflecting the franchise, the court was abolished. - Also termed courts of the franchise.

Dispensing justice was profitable. Much revenue could come from the fees and dues, fines and amercements. This explains the growth of the second class of feudal courts, the Franchise Courts. They too were private courts held by feudal lords. Sometimes their claim to jurisdiction was based on old pre-Conquest grants ... But many of them were, in reality, only wrongful usurpations of private jurisdiction by powerful lords. These were put down after the famous Quo Warranto enquiry in the reign of Edward I.” W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949).”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 668]

Notice the above language: “private courts held by feudal lords”. Judges who enforce their own franchises within the courtroom by imputing a franchise status against those protected by the Constitution but who are not lawfully allowed to alienate their rights or give them away are acting in a private capacity to benefit themselves personally. That private capacity is associated with a de facto government in which greed is the only uniting factor. Contrast this with love for our neighbor, which is the foundation of a de jure government. When judges act in such a private, de facto capacity, the following results:

1. The judge is the “feudal lord” and you become his/her personal serf.
2. Rights become privileges, and the transformation usually occurs at the point of a gun held by a corrupt officer of the government intent on enlarging his/her paycheck or retirement check. And he/she is a CRIMINAL for proceeding with such a financial conflict of interest:

TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 11 > § 208
§ 208. Acts affecting a personal financial interest

(a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, whoever, being an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States Government, or of any independent agency of the United States, a Federal Reserve bank director, officer, or employee, or an officer or employee of the District of Columbia, including a special Government employee, participates personally and substantially as a Government officer or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in a judicial or other proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, general partner, organization in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, general partner or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial [or personal/private] interest—

Shall be subject to the penalties set forth in section 216 of this title.

3. Equality and equal protection are replaced with the following consequences under a franchise:
 - 3.1. Privilege.
 - 3.2. Partiality.
 - 3.3. Bribes.
 - 3.4. Servitude and slavery.
4. The franchise statutes are the “bible” of a pagan state-sponsored religion. The bible isn’t “law” for non-believers, and franchise statutes aren’t “law” for those who are not consensually occupying a public office in the government as a public officer representing statutory public offices such as “citizen”, “resident”, “taxpayer”, “driver”, etc. See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5. You join the religion by “worshipping”, and therefore obeying what are actually voluntary franchises. The essence of “worship”, in fact, is obedience to the dictates of a superior being. Franchises make your public servants into superior beings and replace a republic with a dulocracy. “Worship” and obedience become legal evidence of consent to the franchise.

“And the Lord said to Samuel, ‘Heed the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have rejected Me [God], that I should not reign over them.’ According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt, even to this day—with which they have forsaken Me and served [as PUBLIC OFFICERS/FRANCHISEES] other gods [Rulers or Kings, in this case]—so they are doing to you also [government becoming idolatry].”
[1 Sam 8:4-20, Bible, NKJV]

6. “Presumption” serves as a substitute for religious “faith” and is employed to create an unequal relationship between you and your public servants. It turns the citizen/public servant relationship into the employer/employee relationship, where you are the employee of your public servant. See:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

7. “Taxes” serve as a substitute for “tithes” to the state-sponsored church of socialism that worships civil rulers, men, and creations of men instead of the true and living God.

8. The judge’s bench becomes:

8.1. An altar for human sacrifices, where YOU and your property are the sacrifice. All pagan religions are based on sacrifice of one kind or another.

8.2. What the Bible calls a “throne of iniquity”:

“Shall the throne of iniquity, which devises evil by law, have fellowship with You? They gather together against the life of the righteous, and condemn innocent blood. But the Lord has been my defense, and my God the rock of my refuge. He has brought on them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; the Lord our God shall cut them off.”
[Psalm 94:20-23, Bible, NKJV]

9. All property belongs to this pagan god and you are just a custodian over it as a public officer. You have EQUITABLE title but not LEGAL title to the property you FALSELY BELIEVE belongs to you. The Bible franchise works the same way, because the Bible says the Heavens and the Earth belong to the LORD and NOT to believers. Believers are “trustees” over God’s property under the Bible trust indenture. Believers are the “trustees”:

“Indeed heaven and the highest heavens belong to the LORD your God, also the earth with all that is in it.”
[Deut. 10:15, Bible, NKJV]

“The ultimate ownership of all property is in the State; individual so-called “ownership” is only by virtue of Government, i.e., law, amounting to mere user; and use must be in accordance with law and subordinate to the necessities of the State.”
[Senate Document #43, Senate Resolution No. 62, p. 9, paragraph 2, 1933
SOURCE: <http://www.famguardian.org/Subjects/MoneyBanking/History/SenateDoc43.pdf>]

10. The court building is a “church” where you “worship”, meaning obey, the pagan idol of government.

“Now, Mr. Speaker, this Capitol is the civic temple of the people, and we are here by direction of the people to reduce the tariff tax and enact a law in the interest of all the people. This was the expressed will of the people at the polls, and you promised to carry out that will, but you have not kept faith with the American people.”
[44 Cong.Rec. 4420, July 12, 1909; Congressman Heflin talking about the enactment of the Sixteenth Amendment]

11. The licensed attorneys are the “deacons” of the state-sponsored civil religion who conduct the “worship services” directed at the judge at his satanic altar/bench. They are even ordained by the “chief priests” of the state supreme court, who are the chief priests of the civil religion.

12. Pleadings are “prayers” to this pagan deity. Even the U.S. Supreme Court still calls pleadings “prayers”, and this is no accident.

13. Like everything that SATAN does, the design of this state-sponsored satanic church of socialism that worships men instead of God is a cheap IMITATION of God’s design for de jure government found throughout the Holy Bible.

NOW do you understand why in Britain, judges are called “your worship”? Because they are like gods:

1 *"worship 1. chiefly Brit: a person of importance—used as a title for various officials (as magistrates and*
2 *some mayors) 2: reverence offered a divine being or supernatural power; also: an act of expressing such*
3 *reverence 3: a form of religious practice with its creed and ritual 4: extravagant respect or admiration for or*
4 *devotion to an object of esteem <~ the dollar>."*
5 *[Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1361]*

6
7 *Psalm 82 (Amplified Bible)*
8 *A Psalm of Asaph.*

9 **GOD STANDS** *in the assembly [of the representatives] of God; **in the midst of the magistrates or judges** He*
10 *gives judgment [as] among the gods.*

11 **How long will you [magistrates or judges] judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked?** *Selah [pause,*
12 *and calmly think of that]!*

13 *Do justice to the weak (poor) and fatherless; maintain the rights of the afflicted and needy.*

14 *Deliver the poor and needy; rescue them out of the hand of the wicked.*

15 **[The magistrates and judges] know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in the darkness [of**
16 **complacent satisfaction]; all the foundations of the earth [the fundamental principles upon which rests the**
17 **administration of justice] are shaking.**

18 **I said, You are gods [since you judge on My behalf, as My representatives]; indeed, all of you are children of**
19 **the Most High.**

20 *But you shall die as men and fall as one of the princes.*

21 *Arise, O God, judge the earth! For to You belong all the nations.*
22 *[Psalm 82, Amplified Bible]*

23 The above is not only unethical, but it has also been declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court:

24 *"It has long been established that a State may not impose a penalty upon those who exercise a right guaranteed*
25 *by the Constitution." Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n of California, 271 U.S. 583.*
26 *"Constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be indirectly denied," Smith v. Allwright, 321 US.*
27 *649, 644, or manipulated out of existence,' Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339, 345."*
28 *[Harman v. Forssenius, 380 U.S. 528 at 540, 85 S.Ct. 1177, 1185 (1965)]*

29 The above ruling recognizes what is called "The Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine" of the U.S. Supreme Court. That
30 doctrine is further explored in:

31 Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 28.2: Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine
32 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

31 If you would like to know more about legal ethics and how it can be used to prevent and prosecute the enfranchisement of
32 "justice" itself, see:

33 Law and Government Page, Section 14, Family Guardian Fellowship
34 <https://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LawAndGovt.htm>

33 **5.4 Equality of Opportunity v. Equality of Outcome**

34 A free government is based on equality of OPPORTUNITY. A socialist government is based on equality of OUTCOME.
35 These two approaches are the basis for LEGAL justice and SOCIAL justice respectively. The table below compares the
36 two approaches:

37 **Table 2 Equality of Opportunity v. Equality of Outcome**

#	Characteristic	Equality of OUTCOME	Equality of OPPORTUNITY
---	----------------	---------------------	-------------------------

What Is "Justice"?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

83 of 102

EXHIBIT: _____

#	Characteristic	Equality of <i>OUTCOME</i>	Equality of <i>OPPORTUNITY</i>
1	Type of justice	Social Justice	Legal Justice
2	Political party	Democrat (left)	Republican (right)
3	Sovereign power in government derives from	The Collective	The Individual
4	Legal system based mainly on	Government franchises	Common law/constitution
5	Absolute property ownership is mainly in	Government/Collective	Individual
6	Abuse of taxation system to redistribute wealth from rich to poor? (unconstitutional)	Yes	No
7	Incentive to work	Minimum (state handouts discourage work)	Maximum
8	Private property allowed?	No. All property is owned by the state and its distribution is controlled and regulated	Yes
9	Competition in the marketplace?	No	Yes
10	Degree of personal freedom	Minimum	Maximum
11	State power	Maximum	Minimum
12	Civil status of those regulated	PUBLIC officer (e.g. STATUTORY “citizen”, “resident”, “taxpayer”, “U.S. Person”, etc.)	Private non-resident non-person
13	People attracted to this approach	Low income, low ability, low motivation, low self-confidence	Rich, high ability
14	Age group with political majority usually	Younger	Older
15	Effective domicile of participants (citizens, residents)	Federal territory not protected by the Constitution	Constitutional state

The reason that equality of OUTCOME takes root in a society is because losers petition government to STEAL from the winners. Those who can win a race don't want equality of outcome. Losers want equality of outcome because they benefit more from it. When the number of losers who are voters outnumbers the number of winners, then democracy forces the political system toward the Left in the above table. Lobbying by the winners using money and PACs pulls the political approach to the right of the above table.

The great failing of equality of OUTCOME is that:

1. The state is the only one with absolute ownership of property. Everyone else has only equitable ownership shared with the state.
 - 1.1. The sharing of property ownership is called “moiety” in the legal field.
 - 1.2. If the government did NOT have a monopoly on absolute ownership of all property, property redistribution with the taxation system would be illegal and impossible and could be prosecuted as theft.
2. There is no separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE because there is no PRIVATE. Everyone is a public officer receiving the benefits and privileges of government franchises. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. There is no happiness. The Declaration of Independence identifies absolute ownership of property as the origin of ALL happiness. “pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration of Independence has been equated by the courts as the right to ABSOLUTELY OWN property. Only the collective can have absolute ownership in a system based on equality of OPPORTUNITY, which leaves everyone else at the mercy of the state literally as CHATTEL of the state.

“The provision [Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1], it is to be observed, places property under the same protection as life and liberty. Except by due process of law, no State can deprive any person of either. The provision has been supposed to secure to every individual the essential conditions for the pursuit of happiness; and for that reason has not been heretofore, and should never be, construed in any narrow or restricted sense.”
[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1877)]

4. Legal justice is impossible, because there is no absolute equality of absolute ownership of property between the state and the individual. Legal justice DEMANDS that ALL are equal, which means INDIVIDUALS are equal in all rights with the GOVERNMENT in court and under the law.

- 1 5. The political system under equality of outcome devolves to socialism, statism, and idolatry, because of the inequality
2 created by the inability of the individual to absolutely own anything. See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 3 6. The government inevitably becomes tyrannical, because it can use its monopoly over absolute ownership of all
4 property to control any and every aspect of personal behavior, leaving the individual with little freedom or autonomy.

5 Because of all of the problems listed above that result from abusing law to implement equality of OUTCOME, those who
6 try to abuse the legal system to implement it are the ULTIMATE hypocrites: They produce equality of all cows, but they
7 turn the country into a big farm, make the government into the farm owner, and turn all cows into property of the farmer, as
8 we show in the video below:

How to Leave the Government Farm, Form #12.020
<https://youtu.be/Mp1gJ3iF2Ik>

9 The following video explains how this works:

The Truth About Equality: Outcome vs. Opportunity, Stefan Molyneux
<https://youtu.be/cGGn9rwIYG0>

10 Lastly, here is what the U.S. Supreme Court said about the abuse of the legal system or the courts to effect equality of
11 OUTCOME rather than equality of OPPORTUNITY:

12 "It being self-evident that, unless all things are held in common, some persons must have more property than
13 others, it is from the nature of things impossible to uphold freedom of contract and the right of private
14 property without at the same time recognizing as legitimate those inequalities of fortune that are the
15 necessary result of the exercise of those rights.

16 "The Fourteenth Amendment recognizes "liberty" and "property" as coexistent human rights, and debars the
17 states from any unwarranted interference with either.

18 "Since a state may not strike down the rights of liberty or property directly, it may not do so indirectly, as by
19 declaring in effect that the public good requires the removal of those inequalities that are but the normal and
20 inevitable result of the exercise of those rights, and then invoking the police power in order to remove the
21 inequalities, without other object in view.

22 "The Fourteenth Amendment debars the states from striking down personal liberty or property rights or
23 materially restricting their normal exercise excepting so far as may be incidentally necessary for the
24 accomplishment of some other and paramount object, and one that concerns the public welfare. The mere
25 restriction of liberty or of property rights cannot, of itself, be denominated "public welfare" and treated as a
26 legitimate object of the police power, for such restriction is the very thing that is inhibited by the Amendment.
27 [236 U.S. 31]"
28 [Coppage v. Kansas, 236 U.S. 1 (1915)]

29 Notice the very telling phrase "unless all things are held in common". What they are saying is that the only way to make
30 equality of OUTCOME legal is for the government to absolutely own EVERYTHING. In other words, that all property is
31 PUBLIC property and there is no PRIVATE property. That is the essence of socialism and collectivism:

32 Collectivism: a political or economic theory advocating collective control [e.g. OWNERSHIP] esp. over
33 production and distribution or a system marked by such control.
34 [Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 259]

35 Socialism n (1839) **1**: any of various economic and political theories advocating collective or governmental
36 ownership and administration of the means of production and distribution of goods **2 a**: a system of society or
37 group living in which there is no private property **b**: a system or condition of society in which the means of
38 production are owned and controlled by the state **3**: a stage of society in Marxist theory transitional between
39 capitalism and communism and distinguished by unequal distribution of goods and pay according to work done.
40 [Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1118]

41 For more information on socialism, read:

6 What Justice is NOT or what is “injustice”

On the opening page of our website, we define INJUSTICE in item 12 as follows:

SEDM Website Opening Page

Welcome to our religious fellowship and ministry. We are a [First Amendment](#), not-for-profit, unincorporated, unregistered, non-privileged, non-denominational religious fellowship and ministry. Our [Mission](#) is to honor, to love, and to obey our Lord and God by teaching, reading, learning, and obeying [His Holy Law and Word](#), putting Him first, and loving our neighbor by keeping the government as our servant and His steward for truth and [justice](#). As described in [Heb. 4:12](#) and like Jesus in [Rev. 1:16](#), we seek to use the [word and law of God](#) as a sharp sword to expose and cut off [corruption](#) wherever it is found, and ESPECIALLY in government. [His word and law](#) is also our armor and shield as we combat the corruption as described in [Eph. 6:11-20](#) and [Psalm 91](#). See the following for authorities on why we, and [especially Christians](#), must learn law:

Authorities on why we must PERSONALLY learn, follow, and enforce man’s law and God’s law

Our goal is to inspire, empower, motivate, and educate mainly those born or naturalized in the [USA \(and NOT “U.S.”\)](#) and who are Members in how to love, honor, obey, glorify, and lift up our Sovereign Lord above every king, ruler, government, and [Earthly law](#) at a personal and very practical level and in every area of our lives. This is the essence of our religious worship and the essence, according to the Bible, of how we love our God. Our ministry accomplishes the above goals by emphasizing:

1. [Legal education](#) focused on both [God’s law](#) and [man’s law](#).
2. [Religious liberty, faith and worship](#).
3. Law enforcement and legal activism.
4. [Self government](#): Internal rather than external government.
5. [Personal responsibility](#), good citizenship, [human sovereignty \(as an agent of the only sovereign, who is God\)](#).
6. Nonviolent, lawful exercise of non-partisan [activism](#) in pursuit of [ONLY religious goals](#).
7. A return of a lawful, limited, accountable, and Constitutional government which is God’s servant, rather than His enemy or His competitor for the allegiance, obedience, affections and worship of the Sovereign People, “We the People”
8. Exposing, publicizing, and opposing [socialism, corruption, and violations of the Constitution](#) and the law by government employees and officials.
9. [Exercising our First Amendment right of self-government exclusively under the civil laws of our God](#).
10. Protecting and expanding the [separation of powers doctrine](#), and especially the [separation of church, which is believers](#), from state, which is the unbelieving people and governments around them.
11. [Emphasizing and restoring the role of PRIVATE property](#) in the freedom of each individual and [its use as a defense against government oppression or corruption](#).
12. The pursuit of legal “[justice](#)”, which means absolutely owned private property, and equality of TREATMENT and OPPORTUNITY under [REAL LAW \(Form #05.048\)](#). The following would be INJUSTICE, not JUSTICE:
 - 12.1 Outlawing or refusing to recognize or enforce [absolutely owned private property \(Form #12.025\)](#).
 - 12.2 Imposing equality of OUTCOME by law, such as by abusing taxing powers to redistribute wealth. See [Form #11.302](#).
 - 12.3 Any attempt by government to use judicial process or administrative enforcement to enforce any civil obligation derived from any source OTHER than express written consent or to an injury against the equal rights of others demonstrated with court admissible evidence. See [Form #05.003](#).
 - 12.4 Implementing or enforcing any [civil franchise \(Form #05.030\)](#). This enforces superior powers on the part of the government as a form of inequality and results in religious idolatry. This includes making justice into a civil public privilege or turning CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVATE citizens into STATUTORY PUBLIC citizens engaged in a public office and a franchise ([Form #05.006](#)).

Not only would the above be INJUSTICE, it would outlaw HAPPINESS, because the right to absolutely own private property is equated with “the pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration of Independence, according to the U.S. Supreme Court. See [Form #05.050](#) for the definition of “justice”. [Click here](#) to view a video on why all franchises produce selfishness, unhappiness, inequality, and ingratitude.

All of our worship, educational materials, and classes focus on the above goals. This is a fulfillment of the commandments of the Lord governing the relationship of believers to the world available below:

Commandments About Relationship of Believers to the World

What Is “Justice”?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

For more on the main source of INJUSTICE, read the following referenced in item 12 above:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

FORMS PAGE: <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

DIRECT LINK: <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

7 Abuses of the term “justice” to accomplish “injustice”¹²



A new Pro-government legal principle has been released from Vorkutlag labor camp.

You are familiar with the liberals screaming “collusion” and “obstruction of justice” in relation to the president, but did you know that YOU may be charged with obstruction of justice at any time by the super police.

If you criticize a cop, that is obstruction of justice.

If you ask a cop why he stopped you, that is obstruction of justice.

If you refuse to get out of your car when the cop starts shouting orders at you, that is obstruction of justice.

Eric Peters Auto reports:

“A new principle forms the basis of American criminal justice. It is that innocence is irrelevant. More accurately, it is an obstruction.

It gets in the way of what government wants – which is to bully and control *everyone*.

The former requirement in law – and general custom – that *conviction* had to precede *punishment* and that *evidence* to suggest wrongdoing had to precede *investigation* has been thrown in the woods – so to speak – in favor of making things easier for the criminal justice system by assuming *everyone* is a criminal.”

As the *Boston Herald* [reports](#) about Roger Stone:

“After his arraignment on witness tampering, obstruction and lying to Congress, a rattled Stone was quoted as saying [29 agents pounded on the door,](#) [pointed automatic weapons at him and](#) [‘terrorized’ his wife and dogs.](#) Stone was taken away in handcuffs, the sixth associate of President Trump to be indicted in Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s probe into Russian meddling in the 2016 election. All the charges have been related to either lying or tax evasion, with no evidence of so-called ‘collusion’ with Russia emerging to date.”

[Roger Stone, *Boston Herald*, 1/26/2019; SOURCE: <https://www.bostonherald.com/2019/01/26/fbis-roger-stone-raid-sends-chilling-message/>]

¹² Source: *Are You Obstructing Justice?*, Nike Insights, 6/15/2019; SOURCE: <https://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/are-you-obstructing-justice/>.

1 In case you haven't noticed. The touchy-feely democrats with the help of Republicans in Name Only (RINOS) are
2 redefining obstruction of justice:

3 If you remain silent, that is obstruction of justice.

4 If you say, "I don't know" that is obstruction of justice.

5 If you say, "I haven't been drinking," or "I don't do drugs," that's obstruction of justice.

6 If you demand to see a warrant, that is obstruction of justice.

7 If you claim you are innocent, that is obstruction of justice.

8 If you demand your due process rights, that is obstruction of justice.

9 If you believe you are innocent until proven guilty, that is obstruction of justice.

10 If you demand evidence or proof of claim, that is obstruction of justice.

11 If you claim you your 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, or 10th Amendment rights, that is obstruction of justice.

12 If you demand a trial by jury that is obstruction of justice.

13 If you demand a fair and impartial jury, that is obstruction of justice.

14 If you demand to see a writ of probable cause, that is obstruction of justice.

15 If you demand to know what law you broke, that is obstruction of justice.

16 If you want to know by what authority the officer stopped you, that is obstruction of justice.

17 If you don't submit to a urine test, blood test, drug test, DNA test, fingerprinting, or don't pull your pants down so that can
18 search you for contraband, that is obstruction of justice.

19 If you plead "innocent" of a traffic violation in magistrate court, that is obstruction of justice.

20 If you don't incriminate yourself, that is obstruction of justice.

21 If you don't submit to a strip and body cavity search, that is obstruction of justice.

22 If you say you don't owe the IRS \$67,000 in past due taxes, that is obstruction of justice.

23 If you resist a beating, whipping, cussing, criticism, or grand slam body slam on the pavement in front of your children, that
24 is obstruction of justice.

25 If you don't allow a cop to come in and search your home without a warrant, that is obstruction of justice.

26 If you refuse a breathalyzer test, that is obstruction of justice

27 If you don't say "I'm guilty" and jump into the leg irons and cuffs, that is obstruction of justice.

28 If you don't do what the cop orders, give him all your cash, and get down on your knees and say "baaa, baaa, baaa blue
29 lives matter, but mine doesn't" then you are obstructing justice.

30 This is a country run by mafia-like figures that believe in the total subjection of the total man to total government.

1 Prosecutors aim at only one thing: discouraging dissent, and reminding the populace that resistance to tyranny of the police
2 state is futile, and that it is a mark of good citizenship to be totally compliant and to give the government everything it
3 wants.

4 **8 God's Biblical Prescription to Restore "Legal Justice"**

5 It should interest the reader to know that God prescribes EXACTLY how to restore justice to our society and put
6 government back in its ten mile square legal box or "district" in the District of Columbia. We explain how this is done in
7 the following document on our site.

Sovereignty and Freedom Points and Authorities, Litigation Tool #10.018, Preface
<https://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

8 Everything after the line below derives from the Preface in the above document. It explains how to restore justice from a
9 biblical perspective.

10 _____

11 **PREFACE**

12 Litigation to fight corruption is time consuming and risk prone. Most people do not have time in their busy schedule to
13 devote to disciplined and sustained litigation or lack the discipline to do accurate credible research. The most pressing
14 problem in the freedom community is therefore to equip God's Gideon Army to fight government corruption efficiently,
15 effectively, and to avoid being discredited or undermined in the process. The most frequent method for undermining these
16 activities by corrupt government actors is to attack the authorities relied upon in pleadings and label inaccurate or erroneous
17 authorities as the product of an idiot or deranged mind.

18 ***Points and Authorities***

19 *Points and authorities in general refer to the important points that are discussed in a case and the authorities*
20 *that are relied on. A memorandum of points and authorities is often filed along with a motion, and brief in*
21 *support of the motion. Points and authorities explain why the law authorizes the judge [should desire] to take*
22 *the requested action. The term points and authorities comes from the fact that the legal discussion makes*
23 *certain points followed by citations to legal authority (usually a court decision or statute) supporting each*
24 *point. Basically this memorandum provides an outline of the various points or counts that plaintiff or defendant*
25 *wishes to raise and the authorities for the same.*
26 *[USLegal.com: Points and Authorities; SOURCE: <https://definitions.uslegal.com/p/points-and-authorities/>]*

27 This document is therefore intended to prevent malicious or slanderous accusations, protect the credibility of the freedom
28 community, and to save tremendous amounts of time doing legal research so that more and better litigation can be
29 accomplished and won in the fight against corruption.

30 This document contains quotes from the very people who are the instigators of the corruption this document fights. The
31 best way to disarm your opponent is with his own statements and tactics. This is a fulfillment of the Sun Tzu proverbs of
32 war:

33 *"If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know*
34 *yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy*
35 *nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle."*
36 *[Sun Tzu, The Art of War; SOURCE: https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/1771.Sun_Tzu/]*

37 This document is free and not protected by a "pay wall". While it is sorely needed and could potentially produce enormous
38 revenue, we decided to offer it for free so that it will receive the widest possible dissemination and benefit from the widest
39 audience of not our critics, but our members. We welcome your CONSTRUCTIVE feedback on how to improve this
40 document or make it useful in the widest possible range of situations faced by freedom fighters. You may submit that
41 feedback at the following location. You must be a Basic Member and be logged in to submit such feedback:

SEDM Forum 9.4: Errata reports
<https://sedm.org/forums/forum/9-sedm-ministry-members-only/94-errata-reports/>

What Is "Justice"?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>
Form 05.050, Rev. 6-13-2017

1 This document is not intended as a marketing tool and it would not be trustworthy under God's law if the main motivation
2 for producing it was filthy lucre:

3 *And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given, he offered*
4 *them money, saying, "Give me this power also, that anyone on whom I lay hands may receive the Holy Spirit."*

5 *But Peter said to him, "Your money perish with you, because you thought that the gift of God could be*
6 *purchased with money! You have neither part nor portion in this matter, for your heart is not right in the sight*
7 *of God. Repent therefore of this your wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of your heart may be*
8 *forgiven you. For I see that you are poisoned by bitterness and bound by iniquity."*

9 *Then Simon answered and said, "Pray to the Lord for me, that none of the things which you have spoken may*
10 *come upon me."*
11 [[Acts 8:18-24](#), Bible, NKJV]

12 The ULTIMATE way of studying and knowing your opponent is to study his own words and tactics. This document is
13 intended as the ultimate codification and organization of such study.

14 This book started out several years ago as a simple project to identify and collect a few statements of legal import from the
15 public record that might determine the veracity of the theory that the American governments are to have limited authority
16 over the lives of the American people, and that the states of the Union and the federal government are separate, distinct, and
17 foreign to each other and have separate and distinct sovereignties and jurisdictions. We originally thought we might find as
18 many as thirty or forty citations in support of this understanding. As we reviewed various historical, legal, and otherwise
19 authoritative documents, we were led from one source to another so that we soon had collected many more citations than
20 what we had originally thought existed. As we continued to chase references, our total grew to more than 1700 citations-
21 with no end in sight! Nearly all of these cites support some aspect of the theory that forms the basis of our investigation.
22 And our investigation is not exhaustive by any means.

23 Early in the collection process, we decided to create a computer file that would contain some of the best statements as
24 extracts from these sources. Many of the statements are so strongly and beautifully worded that we became convinced that
25 they should be preserved in a new format for the benefit of those who love the historical understanding of freedom in
26 America and especially for those who may not have ready access to the library resources of a metropolitan area. This
27 document is the result of that effort. We have meticulously copied these authorities exactly as the issues have been stated in
28 this document.

29 Our investigation shows that American society is drifting away from government by constitutional limitation and toward
30 government by administrative privilege and franchises. Despite the constitutional requirement that all governments in
31 America must be republican in form, and all officials must be democratically elected, in reality our governments are neither
32 republics nor democracies. Except for a few rare instances, the American governments, both state and federal, function as
33 dulocracies. From Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, a dulocracy is:

34 *"a government where servants and slaves have [so much license and privilege \[franchises\]](#) that they domineer."*

35 The Bible describes this inversion of political affairs where PUBLIC servants become rulers instead of servants:

36 *There is an evil I have seen under the sun,*
37 *As an error proceeding from the ruler:*
38 *Folly is set in great dignity,*
39 *While the rich sit in a lowly place.*
40 *I have seen servants on horses,*
41 *While princes walk on the ground like servants.*
42 [[Eccl. 10:5-7](#), Bible, NKJV]

43 The Bible and the U.S. Supreme Court both describe EXACTLY, from a legal perspective, WHEN AND HOW you
44 personally facilitate this inversion of public servants. It is done with grants of government property that have legal strings
45 attached. This grant and the legal obligations attached to the grant are collectively what we call "government franchises"
46 on our website. The word "privilege" in fact is synonymous with grants of property and the legal strings attached to the
47 loan.

48 *"The rich rules over the poor,*
49 *And **the borrower is servant to the lender.**"*

[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]

“The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the compensation for it.”

[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1877)]

Curses of Disobedience [to God’s Laws]

“The alien [Washington, D.C. is legislatively “alien” in relation to states of the Union] who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower [malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT by abusing FRANCHISES]. He shall lend to you [Federal Reserve counterfeiting franchise], but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.

“Moreover all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which He commanded you. And they shall be upon you for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.

“Because you did not serve [ONLY] the LORD your God with joy and gladness of heart, for the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [covetous thieving lawyer] enemies, whom the LORD will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [franchise codes] on your neck until He has destroyed you. The LORD will bring a nation against you from afar [the District of CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [the American Eagle], a nation whose language [LEGALESE] you will not understand, a nation of fierce [coercive and fascist] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [assassinates them by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an Obamacare waiting list] nor show favor to the young [destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL system]. And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land [with “trade or business” franchise taxes], until you [and all your property] are destroyed [or STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you.
[Deut. 28:43-51, Bible, NKJV]

The problem with all such loans or grants is that they can theoretically attach ANY condition they want to the loan or grant. If the property is something that is life-threatening to do without, then they can destroy ALL of your constitutional rights and you will have no remedy.

“But when Congress creates a statutory right [a “privilege” or “public right” in this case, such as a “trade or business”], it clearly has the discretion, in defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to that right. FN35 Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial power, but they are also incidental to Congress’ power to define the right that it has created. No comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated is not of congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions that have traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely as incidental extensions of Congress’ power to define rights that it has created. Rather, such inroads suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United States, which our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.”
[Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983)]

The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision. They are:

[. . .]

6. The Court will not pass upon the constitutionality of a statute at the instance of one who has availed himself of its benefits. FN7 Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527; Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229; St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.

FN7 Compare *Electric Co. v. Dow*, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088; *Pierce v. Somerset Ry.*, 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316; *Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co.*, 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108.
[*Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law. Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption."
[*The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship*, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10;
SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf]

See *Magill v. Browne*, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, vol. 54, p. 31.

James Madison, whose notes were used to draft the Bill of Rights, predicted this perversion of the Constitutional design, when he said the following:

"With respect to the words general welfare, I have always regarded them as qualified by the detail of powers connected with them. To take them in a literal and unlimited sense would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution into a character which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its creator."

"If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in every State, county and parish and pay them out of their public treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may assume the provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-roads; in short, every thing, from the highest object of state legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress.... Were the power of Congress to be established in the latitude contended for, it would subvert the very foundations, and transmute the very nature of the limited Government established by the people of America."

"If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the general welfare, the government is no longer a limited one possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one subject to particular exceptions."
[James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod Fishery Bill, granting Bounties]

The term "general welfare" as used above is, in fact, the basis for the entire modern welfare state that will eventually lead to a massive financial collapse crisis worldwide.¹³ Anyone who therefore supports such a system is ultimately an anarchist intent on destroying our present dysfunctional government and thereby committing the crime of Treason:¹⁴

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>

The Bible also describes how to REVERSE this inversion, how to restore our constitutional rights, and how to put public servants back in their role as servants rather than masters. Note that accepting custody or "benefit" or grants of government

¹³ For details on the devastating political effects of the modern welfare state, see: *Communism, Socialism, Collectivism Page*, Section 10: Welfare State, Family Guardian Fellowship, https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Communism/Communism.htm#Welfare_State.

¹⁴ In the landmark case of *Steward Machine Co. v. Davis*, 310 U.S. 548 (1937) legalizing social security, the U.S. Supreme Court had the following to say about the treason of inverting the relationship of the states to the federal government:

"If the time shall ever arrive when, for an object appealing, however strongly, to our sympathies, the dignity of the States shall bow to the dictation of Congress by conforming their legislation thereto, when the power and majesty and honor of those who created shall become subordinate to the thing of their creation, I but feebly utter my apprehensions when I express my firm conviction that we shall see 'the beginning of the end.'"
[*Steward Machine Co. v. Davis*, 310 U.S. 548, 606 (1937)]

property in effect behaves as an act of contracting, because it accomplishes the same effect, which is to create implied “obligations” in a legal sense:

"For the Lord your God will bless you just as He promised you; you shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow; you shall reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over you."
[Deut. 15:6, Bible, NKJV]

"The Lord will open to you His good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain to your land in its season, and to bless all the work of your hand. You shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow."
[Deut. 28:12, Bible, NKJV]

"You shall make no covenant [contract or franchise] with them [foreigners, pagans], nor with their [pagan government] gods [laws or judges]. They shall not dwell in your land [and you shall not dwell in theirs by becoming a "resident" or domiciliary in the process of contracting with them], lest they make you sin against Me [God]. For if you serve their [government] gods [under contract or agreement or franchise], it will surely be a snare to you."
[Exodus 23:32-33, Bible, NKJV]

"I [God] brought you up from Egypt [slavery] and brought you to the land of which I swore to your fathers; and I said, 'I will never break My covenant with you. And you shall make no covenant [contract or franchise or agreement of ANY kind] with the inhabitants of this [corrupt pagan] land; you shall tear down their [man/government worshipping socialist] altars.' But you have not obeyed Me. Why have you done this?"

"Therefore I also said, I will not drive them out before you; but they will become as thorns [terrorists and persecutors] in your side and their gods will be a snare [slavery!] to you."

So it was, when the Angel of the LORD spoke these words to all the children of Israel, that the people lifted up their voices and wept.
[Judges 2:1-4, Bible, NKJV]

Following the above commandments requires not signing up for and quitting any and all government benefits and services you may have consensually signed up for or retained eligibility for. All such applications and/or eligibility is called “special law” in the legal field.

"special law. One relating to particular persons or things; one made for individual cases or for particular places or districts; one operating upon a selected class, rather than upon the public generally. A private law. A law is "special" when it is different from others of the same general kind or designed for a particular purpose, or limited in range or confined to a prescribed field of action or operation. A "special law" relates to either particular persons, places, or things or to persons, places, or things which, though not particularized, are separated by any method of selection from the whole class to which the law might, but not such legislation, be applied. Utah Farm Bureau Ins. Co. v. Utah Ins. Guaranty Ass'n, Utah, 564 P.2d. 751, 754. A special law applies only to an individual or a number of individuals out of a single class similarly situated and affected, or to a special locality. Board of County Com'rs of Lemhi County v. Swensen, Idaho, 80 Idaho 198, 327 P.2d. 361, 362. See also Private bill; Private law. Compare General law; Public law."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1397-1398]

We also prove that all such “special law” is not “law” in a classical sense, but rather an act of contracting, because it does not apply equally to all. It is what the U.S. Supreme Court referred to as “class legislation” in Pollock v. Farmers Loan and Trust in which they declared the first income tax unconstitutional:

"The income tax law under consideration is marked by discriminating features which affect the whole law. It discriminates between those who receive an income of four thousand dollars and those who do not. It thus vitiates, in my judgment, by this arbitrary discrimination, the whole legislation. Hamilton says in one of his papers, (the Continentalist.) "the genius of liberty reprobates everything arbitrary or discretionary in taxation. It exacts that every man, by a definite and general rule, should know what proportion of his property the State demands; whatever liberty we may boast of in theory, it cannot exist in fact while [arbitrary] assessments continue." 1 Hamilton's Works, ed. 1885, 270. The legislation, in the discrimination it makes, is class legislation. Whenever a distinction is made in the burdens a law imposes or in the benefits it confers on any citizens by reason of their birth, or wealth, or religion, it is class legislation, and leads inevitably to oppression and abuses, and to general unrest and disturbance in society [e.g. wars, political conflict, violence, anarchy]. It was hoped and believed that the great amendments to the Constitution which followed the late civil war had rendered such legislation impossible for all future time. But the objectionable legislation reappears in the act under consideration. It is the same in essential character as that of the English income statute of 1691, which taxed Protestants at a certain rate, Catholics, as a class, at double the rate of Protestants, and Jews at another and separate rate. Under wise and constitutional legislation every citizen

1 *should contribute his proportion, however small the sum, to the support of the government, and it is no kindness*
2 *to urge any of our citizens to escape from that obligation. If he contributes the smallest mite of his earnings to*
3 *that purpose he will have a greater regard for the government and more self-respect 597*597 for himself*
4 *feeling that though he is poor in fact, he is not a pauper of his government. And it is to be hoped that, whatever*
5 *woes and embarrassments may betide our people, they may never lose their manliness and self-respect. Those*
6 *qualities preserved, they will ultimately triumph over all reverses of fortune."*
7 *[Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 157 U.S. 429 (Supreme Court 1895)]*

8 To realistically apply the above biblical prohibitions against contracting with any government so as to eliminate the reversal
9 of roles and destroy the dulocracy, see:

Path to Freedom, Form #09.015
<https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/PathToFreedom.pdf>

10 Section 5 of the above document in particular deals with how to eliminate the dulocracy. Section 5.6 also discusses the
11 above mechanisms.

12 The idea of a present-day dulocracy is entirely consistent with the theme of our website, which is the abuse of government
13 franchises and privileges to destroy PRIVATE rights, STEAL private property, promote unhappiness, and inject malice and
14 vitriol into the political process, as documented in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
FORMS PAGE: <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
DIRECT LINK: <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

15 The U.S. Supreme Court and the Bible both predicted these negative and unintended consequences of the abuse of
16 government franchises, when they said:

17 *"Here I close my opinion. I could not say less in view of questions of such gravity that they go down to the **very***
18 ***foundations of the government**. If the provisions of the Constitution can be set aside by an act of Congress,*
19 *where is the course of usurpation to end?"*

20 *The present **assault upon capital** [THEFT! and WEALTH TRANSFER by unconstitutional CONVERSION of*
21 *PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property] is but the beginning. **It will be but the stepping stone to others larger***
22 ***and more sweeping**, until our political contest will become war of the poor against the rich; a war of growing*
23 *intensity and bitterness."*

24 *[Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co., 157 U.S. 429, 158 U.S. 601 (1895), hearing the case against the first*
25 *income tax passed by Congress that included people in states of the Union. They declared that first income tax*
26 *UNCONSTITUTIONAL, by the way]*

27
28 *"Where do wars and fights come from among you? **Do they not come from your desires for pleasure [unearned***
29 ***money or "benefits", privileges, or franchises, from the government] that war in your members [and your***
30 ***democratic governments]? You lust [after other people's money] and do not have.** You murder [the unborn to*
31 *increase your standard of living] and covet [the unearned] and cannot obtain [except by empowering your*
32 *government to STEAL for you!]. You fight and war [against the rich and the nontaxpayers to subsidize your*
33 *idleness]. Yet you do not have because you do not ask [the Lord, but instead ask the **deceitful government**]. You*
34 *ask and do not receive, because you ask amiss, that you may spend it on your pleasures. **Adulterers and***
35 ***adulteresses! Do you not know that friendship [statutory "citizenship"] with the world [for the governments of***
36 ***the world] is enmity with God?** Whoever therefore wants to be a friend [STATUTORY "citizen", "resident",*
37 *"inhabitant", "person" franchisee] of the world [or **the governments of the world**] makes himself an enemy of*
38 *God."*

39 *[James 4:4, Bible, NKJV]*

40 The "foundations of the government" spoken of above are PRIVATE property, separation between public and private, and
41 equality of treatment and opportunity, which collectively are called "legal justice", as we point out on our opening page:

42 *Our ministry accomplishes the above goals by emphasizing:*

43 12. The pursuit of legal "justice" (Form #05.050), which means absolutely owned private property (Form
44 #10.002), and equality of TREATMENT and OPPORTUNITY (Form #05.033) under REAL LAW (Form
45 #05.048). The following would be INJUSTICE, not JUSTICE:

12.1 Outlawing or refusing to recognize or enforce [absolutely owned private property \(Form #12.025\)](#).

12.2 Imposing equality of OUTCOME by law, such as by abusing taxing powers to redistribute wealth. See [Form #11.302](#).

12.3 Any attempt by government to use judicial process or administrative enforcement to enforce any civil obligation derived from any source OTHER than express written consent or to an injury against the equal rights of others demonstrated with court admissible evidence. See [Form #09.073](#) and [Form #12.040](#).

12.4 Offering, implementing, or enforcing any [civil franchise \(Form #05.030\)](#). This enforces superior powers on the part of the government as a form of inequality and results in religious idolatry. This includes making justice into a civil public privilege ([Form #05.050, Section 13](#)) or turning CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVATE citizens into STATUTORY PUBLIC citizens engaged in a public office and a franchise ([Form #05.006](#)).

Not only would the above be INJUSTICE, it would outlaw HAPPINESS, because the right to absolutely own private property is equated with “the pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration of Independence, according to the U.S. Supreme Court. See [Form #05.050](#) for the definition of “justice”. [Click here](#) to view a video on why all franchises produce selfishness, unhappiness, inequality, and ingratitude.
[SEDM Website, Opening Page; SOURCE: <http://sedm.org>]

Too many public servants have assumed absolute authority over the people they are supposed to serve. This REVERSAL of roles and making the SERVANTS into the MASTERS was never the intent of the Founding Fathers who established the American governments as republics where the rights of the people are to be paramount and the sovereignty of the governments are limited by the rights of the people. Sovereignty in America is not based on the same premise as sovereignty in Europe. Sovereignty in Europe was based on the notion of the Divine Right of Kings where the king's sovereignty was absolute and the people were his subjects. Sovereignty in America is based on the notion that citizens are endowed by the Creator with unalienable rights and then lend their permission to the governments to carry out certain, limited responsibilities on their behalf. In a republican form of government, the government is never allowed to overstep its authority or trample on the rights of the citizen no matter how egalitarian the political arguments may be.

Jesus Himself also emphasized that public SERVANTS should never become RULERS or have superior authority to the people they are supposed to SERVE when He said the following.

“You know that the rulers of the Gentiles [unbelievers] lord it over them [govern from ABOVE as pagan idols] , and those who are great exercise authority over them [supernatural powers that are the object of idol worship]. Yet it shall not be so among you; but whoever desires to become great among you, let him be your servant [serve the sovereign people from BELOW rather than rule from above]. And whoever desires to be first among you, let him be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many.”
[[Matt. 20:25-28](#), Bible, NKJV]

Notice the word “ransom for many” in the above. This is an admission that Jesus acknowledges that cunning public servant lawyers have KIDNAPPED our legal identity from the protection of God’s law and that legal identity has been transported to a legislatively foreign jurisdiction, the District of Criminals. We exhaustively prove this with evidence in the following memorandum of law:

[Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

Jesus also states in Matt. 20:25-28 that it is the DUTY and obligation of every Christian to fight this corruption of our political system. The Holy Bible is our Delegation of Authority to do precisely this, in fact, and to restore God to His proper role as the ruler of ALL nations and ALL politicians and the only rightful Lawgiver of all human law. That delegation of authority is described in:

[Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007](https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf>

This book is a compilation of extracts from many sources dealing with the role of the American governments in American society. The extracts are taken from both federal and state authorities establishing the jurisdictional authority of the federal and state governments with special attention to sovereignty, citizenship, federal taxation, and remedies for the innocent. These quotations span the entire time of the American experience and represent the fundamental understanding that serves

as the basis for the American legal system. The majority of the quotations are from the United States Supreme Court, other federal courts, and the state supreme courts and other state courts of record. (We have also relied heavily on California statutes since we both live in California. Those who live in some other state will have to search the statute books in that jurisdiction to find similar statutes.) The quotations do not originate with any particular political party or political movement, but represent the fundamental nature of the American legal system from the beginning of American society to the present. And because we have been careful to quote the exact wording, including the apparent mistakes, none of what is presented in this book represents the opinions of anyone outside of some official capacity or learned legal scholars.

In some instances, bureaucrats have argued against the notion that the individual could rely on these fundamental rights against the government, thus creating the impression that these sources should be classified as frivolous or "top secret". We have facetiously placed those words on the cover of this book. Fortunately, all of the sources quoted herein are part of the public record. And they must be part of the public record because it is the fundamental right of the people of America to both know what their governments are doing and to control their governments for the benefit of the individual as well as society. Honest government cannot operate in secret.

This document is a research tool to assist the reader in learning more about the history and limited authority of the American governments.

"The only thing new under the sun is the history you do not know."
[SEDM]

We submit this material to the reader carefully preserved in the original words with virtually no comments of our own, but with liberal cross-references to other citations, and three indexes for researching the original citations, topics of interest, and terms. Hopefully, this will assist in researching issues of interest and allow the reader to arrive at one's own conclusions based upon what the "authorities" have stated from the beginning of the American experience through to the present. We believe this research demonstrates the time-worn notion that there is a seamless web of the law.

However, there are a few cases, certainly less than 100 of those we could find, that seem to be somewhat in conflict with the historical theme that the American governments have limited authority, and that the states of the Union and the federal government are separate and distinct governments and have separate and distinct sovereignties and jurisdictions. The reader should be aware that the cites presented herein are merely the citations that deal with the issues under investigation. Throughout American history the truth about the fundamental nature of American society and the rights and responsibilities of the American people have occasionally been marred and distorted by perverted teachings shrouded in the most egalitarian language. This has been done even by those who claim to know the truth and sometimes even by those whose responsibility it is to interpret the law. This misinformation shows disrespect for and works against the people and against the best and highest ideals of a free society. It is the reader's responsibility to carefully determine whether or not the context for any particular citation applies to one's own circumstance.

We entered this investigation with a high respect for the words of history and the American legal system, and this research confirms that the American legal system, when properly used, has worked in favor of the individual and against the bureaucracies of the governments. This document is our contribution in helping to educate Americans who wish to rely on their unalienable, God-given, common-law rights as opposed to some governmentally granted, administrative privilege. In writing this book it is our intention to help make a difference in the lives of those who struggle against a monolithic bureaucracy gone sour on the American dream. We believe that those who serve the people must be required to obey the law, for beyond the line of due process and law lies the domain of usurpation and tyranny. We believe that the greatest need in the world today is that individuals should choose to do what is right simply because it is the right thing to do even though taking a stand for the truth may cost one some suffering and sacrifice. One of the lessons of history is that freedom is costly and that each generation must be prepared to meet the cost of preserving freedom.

We gratefully acknowledge the vision of the following people and organizations in the production of this document:

1. Charles V. Darnell, DhSc., who contributed several of the cites in this book. He is author of the following:

The Fundamental Nature of the Federal Income Tax, Form #05.035
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/FundNatureOfFIT.pdf>

2. Gerald Allan Brown, Ed.D. He is author of the following:

The Legal Basis for the Term "Nonresident Alien", Form #05.036
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalBasisForTermNRAlien.pdf>

- 1 3. Robert E. Schaefer who helped us begin our search for truth in this field of knowledge.
2 4. Robert F. Huntsman who through his vision and invaluable research assistance, helped in locating many of the citations
3 contained in this document.
4 5. Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM), which:
5 5.1. Provided several quotes in Section 4.
6 5.2. Provided the entire content of Section 11, which originated from the following document:

Famous Quotes About Rights and Liberty, Form #08.001

<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/FamousQuotes.pdf>

- 7 6. Family Guardian Fellowship, whose citizenship research is found in Section 3.1 and derives from the following
8 document on their website:

Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Family Guardian Fellowship

<https://famguardian.org/Publications/WhyANational/WhyANational.pdf>

9 Without their assistance the scope of this book would not be nearly so broad nor as complete.

10 This document is a work in progress. We would appreciate your generous donations in order that it can be maintained,
11 improved, and reach the widest possible audience. You can make your donations at the link below:

12 <https://sedm.org/product/donation/>

13 **9 Biblical Hope for Justice**¹⁵

14 What godly man is not stunned by the evil in this age?

15 Christians are often bewildered by God's delay in judging wicked men pulling the strings behind the corruption of our time.
16 They carry a private grief in their soul as they see officials promoting evil in the apparatus of government.

17 What shall we do?

18 *Psalm 46:10 Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the*
19 *earth.*

20 *Psalm 27:13-14 I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the LORD in the land of the*
21 *living. Wait on the LORD: be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the LORD.*

22 *Psalm 91:1 The LORD reigneth; let the people tremble: he sitteth between the cherubims; let the earth be*
23 *moved.*

24 What shall we pray?

25 We pray for the salvation of our friends and neighbors, but we also pray for judgment to be poured down on the wicked.
26 We pray imprecatory prayers and rest our hope for justice on the following grounds:

27 *Psalm 1:4 The ungodly are not so: but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.*

28 *Psalm 21:8-9 Thine hand shall find out all thine enemies; thy right hand shall find out those that hate*
29 *thee. Thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the LORD shall swallow them up in his*
30 *wrath, and the fire shall devour them.*

31 *Psalm 33:10 The LORD bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought: he maketh the devices of the people of*
32 *none effect.*

33 *Psalm 33:1-2 Fret not thyself because of evildoers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity. For*
34 *they shall soon be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb.*

35 *Psalm 36:11-12 Let not the foot of pride come against me, and let not the hand of the wicked remove me. There*
36 *are the workers of iniquity fallen: they are cast down, and shall not be able to rise.*

¹⁵ SOURCE: *The Hope for Justice*, Nike Insights; <https://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-hope-for-justice/>.

Psalm 76:10 Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain.

Psalm 94:22-23 But the LORD is my defence; and my God is the rock of my refuge. And he shall bring upon them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; yea, the LORD our God shall cut them off.

Psalm 97:1, 3 The Lord reigneth . . . A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about.

Psalm 109:8, 28 Let his days be few; and let another take his office . . . Let mine adversaries be clothed with shame, and let them cover themselves with their own confusion, as with a mantle.

Psalm 145:20 The Lord keeps all who love Him, But all the wicked He will destroy.

Isaiah 1:24 Therefore saith the Lord, the LORD of hosts, the mighty One of Israel, Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of mine enemies:

Jeremiah 17:17-18 Be not a terror unto me: thou art my hope in the day of evil. Let them be confounded that persecute me, but let not me be confounded: let them be dismayed, but let not me be dismayed: bring upon them the day of evil, and destroy them with double destruction.

1 Peter 3:12 For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.

2 Peter 2:9 The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished:

10 Conclusions

We will now concisely summarize the findings of this document:

1. The rationale for all advocates of “justice” is equality of all.
2. Legal justice is defined as the “right to be left alone”. It carries with it the notion of equality:
 - 2.1. Between and among all humans AND
 - 2.2. Between humans and the government that SERVES them both under REAL law and in court.
3. The foundation of legal justice is the right of ABSOLUTELY OWNED, PRIVATE property. The right to absolutely own and control private property is the ORIGIN of your right to own yourself and to exclude all others from using or benefitting from your body or your labor.
4. The right to ABSOLUTELY own PRIVATE property is the origin of the phrase “pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration of Independence.
5. The right of PRIVATE property recognized in the Declaration of Independence is an INALIENABLE right, which means a right that a REAL government can NEVER take away, and which we cannot lawfully even CONSENT to give away to a REAL de jure government.

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, -“*
[Declaration of Independence]

“Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693]

6. “Social Justice” advocates equality of OUTCOME, whereas “Legal Justice” advocates equality of OPPORTUNITY and equality of TREATMENT under the law.
7. The result of “Social Justice” is that it advocates EXTREME INEQUALITY between humans and governments in a legal sense. This inconvenient fact is avoided and suppressed by Social Justice warriors because it undermines their public support and their credibility. It therefore:
 - 7.1. Violates the principle of equality of all because it places the government above all humans in rights and privileges and turns the government into a “dulocracy”.

1 "A government where servants and slaves have so much license and privilege that they domineer;
2 predominance of slaves"
3 [Wikipedia: Dulocracy, Downloaded 9/28/17; SOURCE: <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/dulocracy>]

4 Notice the use of the word "license" and "privilege": They betray the abuse of franchises to place the
5 government above the governed in the eyes of the law. See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6 7.2. Advocates HYPOCRISY and should be resolutely criticized, just as Jesus resolutely criticized the Pharisees for
7 the same reason.

8 8. The ONLY way that inequality between humans and governments can be implemented without violating the
9 constitution is using voluntarily civil franchises and your explicit or implied consent that make their enforcement
10 lawful. Learn how they work! See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

11 9. Social justice is defined as the power to abuse government and the law to redistribute property and wealth. It depends
12 on:

13 9.1. No PRIVATE property ownership.

14 9.2. Absolute ownership of all property by government.

15 9.3. Converting all private property ownership from ABSOLUTE to QUALIFIED.

16 9.4. Sharing ownership of all private property with the government.

17 10. Social justice is entirely incompatible with legal justice because social justice requires the ELIMINATION of all
18 private property. Since private property is the foundation of legal justice, then the two cannot coexist.

19 11. The reason politicians like to promote social justice INSTEAD of legal justice is because it artificially,
20 unconstitutionally, and ILLEGALLY expands their power beyond what the founding documents, the Constitution, and
21 the Founding Fathers intended. The lust for political power and money is behind all such ILLEGAL efforts.

22 12. The poor and the indigent are not entitled to legal justice. The founders referred to them as "paupers and vagabonds"
23 under the original Articles of Confederation. Indigents are not entitled to rights and everything is a privilege for such
24 parties. They are "wards of the state".

25 13. The purpose of the Ten Commandments found in the Bible at Exodus 20 is to protect PRIVATE property.

26 13.1. These commandments do NOT recognize ANY kind of government ownership of ANYTHING.

27 13.2. Most of these commandments are violated by instituting "social justice", because it eliminates private property
28 and therefore undermines just about every commandment.

29 14. Biblical justice requires that PEOPLE, FAMILIES, and CHURCHES are the only entities allowed to administer charity
30 and welfare. The Bible NEVER authorizes governments to engage in such activities. In fact, Christ is described as the
31 JUDGE and REMEDY for government corruption, not a GOVERNMENT advocate or protector. In fact, God
32 describes GOVERNMENTS as "LESS THAN NOTHING AND WORTHLESS":

33 *The Son of Man Will Judge the Nations*

34 ³¹"When the Son of Man comes in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then He will sit on the throne
35 of His glory. ³²All the nations will be gathered before Him, and He will separate them one from
36 another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats. ³³And He will set the sheep on His right
37 hand, but the goats on the left. ³⁴Then the King will say to those on His right hand, 'Come, you blessed of
38 My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: ³⁵for I was hungry and
39 you gave Me food; I was thirsty and you gave Me drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; ³⁶I was naked
40 and you clothed Me; I was sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to Me.'
41 [Matt. 25:31-36, Bible, NKJV]

42 "Arise, O God, judge the earth; For You [God] shall inherit all nations [and governments of nations]."
43 [Psalm 82:8, Bible, NKJV]

44 "Behold, the nations [and governments and politicians of the nations] are as a drop in the bucket, and are
45 counted as the small dust on the scales."
46 [Isaiah 40:15, Bible, NKJV]

47 "All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; He does according to His will in the army of heaven
48 And among the inhabitants of the earth. No one can restrain His hand Or say to Him, 'What have You done?'"
49 [Daniel 4:35, Bible, NKJV]

1 "All nations [and governments] before Him [God] are as nothing, and they are counted by Him less than
2 nothing and worthless."
3 [Isaiah 40:17, Bible, NKJV]

4 "He [God] brings the princes [and Kings and Presidents] to nothing; He makes the judges of the earth
5 useless."
6 [Isaiah 40:23, Bible, NKJV]

7 "Indeed they [the governments and the men who make them up in relation to God] are all worthless; their
8 works are nothing; their molded images [and their bureaus and agencies and usurious "codes" that are not
9 law] are wind [and vanity] and confusion."
10 [Isaiah 41:29, Bible, NKJV]

- 11 15. Biblical justice and social justice are entirely incompatible because social justice requires the government to supplant
12 individuals, families, and churches as the ONLY source of charity and grace authorized by God Himself. The founders
13 described the result of doing this below. The man who said the following, in fact, was the scribe who personally
14 penned the ENTIRE constitution and from whose notes the constitution was assembled:

15 *"With respect to the words general welfare, I have always regarded them as qualified by the detail of powers*
16 *connected with them. To take them in a literal and unlimited sense would be a metamorphosis of the*
17 *Constitution into a character which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its creator."*

18 "If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of
19 the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in
20 every State, county and parish and pay them out of their public treasury; they may take into their own hands
21 the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may assume the
22 provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-roads; in short, every
23 thing, from the highest object of state legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown
24 under the power of Congress.... Were the power of Congress to be established in the latitude contended for,
25 it would subvert the very foundations, and transmute the very nature of the limited Government established
26 by the people of America."

27 *"If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the general welfare,*
28 *the government is no longer a limited one possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one subject to*
29 *particular exceptions."*
30 *[James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod Fishery Bill, granting Bounties;*
31 *More quotes like this can be found in Form #05.020, Section 5.1]*

- 32 16. The proper purpose of law is to organize and centralize the protection of PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights.
33 Any OTHER use:
34 16.1. Replaces equality and justice with INEQUALITY and privilege.
35 16.2. Amounts to abuse, slavery, and THEFT.
36 16.3. Organizes INJUSTICE.
37 16.4. Disestablishes government and replaces a DE JURE government with a DE FACTO government. See

De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 38 16.5. Replaces a DE JURE government with a private, for-profit corporation that cannot exercise official, judicial, or
39 sovereign immunity. See:

Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 40 16.6. Results in the establishment of an unconstitutional civil religion in which government has superior or supernatural
41 powers. See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

42 The above are confirmed and explained by:

The Law, Frederic Bastiat
<https://famguardian.org/Publications/TheLaw/TheLaw.htm>

- 43 17. The purpose of establishing government is to protect ABSOLUTELY owned PRIVATE property of individual human
44 beings.
45 17.1. That protection BEGINS with preventing such property from being converted to PUBLIC property or from being
46 REDISTRIBUTED without the EXPRESS LAWFUL consent of the owner.
47 17.2. Without that kind of protection, there IS:

17.2.1. No real government. The government is replaced by a terrorist mafia and the country turns into a “farm” and the people into “farm animals”:

How to Leave the Government Farm, SEDM
<https://youtu.be/Mp1gJ3iF2Ik>

17.2.2. No real “law”. See:

What is “law”?, Form #05.048
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

17.2.3. No “happiness”, because “pursuit of happiness” is defined by the Declaration of Independence as the right to ABSOLUTELY OWN private property not subject to control or regulation by the government.

17.3. The Declaration of Independence FORBIDS human consent to the conversion of PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property by calling property rights “unalienable”. Therefore, there is no way to lawfully convert ABSOLUTELY owned private property to PUBLIC property, franchises, privileges, charity, or “benefits”. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

18. The main legal mechanism by which PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights are converted to PUBLIC property and the mechanism that facilitates wealth redistribution is through the use of government franchises. For details, see:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

19. The ONLY way to overcome all of the above legal and constitutional limitations is to:

19.1. Confuse language to hide or protect the perpetrators of CRIMINAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL activity. The following document on our site describes HOW that confusion is perpetrated:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

19.2. Abuse the confusion in legal language to engage in criminal identity theft:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

20. If you want to be entirely immune from legal abuse, property theft of social justice warriors, you must:

20.1. Abandon all government franchises.

20.2. Remove yourself from legal domicile.

20.3. Abandon all civil statuses, such as “citizen”, “resident”, “taxpayer”, “person”, “individual”, “spouse”, “driver”, etc.

20.4. Become a statutory “non-resident non-person”, as described in:

Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

21. You have an absolute, First Amendment right to be a “non-resident non-person”. See:

Your Exclusive Right to Declare and Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

22. If you want to avoid arguments with social justice warriors and always win arguments with them, ensure that:

22.1. You understand the various contexts in which legal terms can be used and are able to distinguish the contexts.

22.2. You define all terms and their contexts carefully before any discussion or debate.

22.3. Ask them the definition of words they are using if they introduce new words.

22.4. Make it IMPOSSIBLE for them to use “equivocation” to confuse contexts so that they can stealthily try to STEAL from you.

See:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

11 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal

If you would like to study the subjects covered in this short memorandum in further detail, may we recommend the following authoritative sources, and also welcome you to rebut any part of this pamphlet after you have read it and studied the subject carefully yourself just as we have:

1. Sovereignty and Freedom Page, Section 7.4: Justice, Family Guardian Website

<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Freedom/Freedom.htm#Justice>

2. Wisdom, Philosophy, and Morality Page, Section 3: Ethics and Morality, Family Guardian Fellowship

- <https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Wisdom/Wisdom.htm>
3. *The Truth About Equality: Outcome vs. Opportunity* (OFFSITE LINK) -Stefan Molyneux
<https://lbry.tv/@freedomain:b/the-truth-about-equality-outcome-vs:4?t=0>
 4. *The Law*, Form #11.403-book by Frederic Bastiat about the proper purpose of law
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 5. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by topic: “justice”.
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/justice.htm>
 6. *Foundations of Freedom Course*, Form #12.021, Video 2: Freedom, Sovereignty, and Justice
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 7. *What is “law”?*, Form #05.048-law is the vehicle used to produce or enforce “justice”. This short memorandum defines what true “law” really is. This subject is widely misunderstood because law is not taught in public schools.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 8. *Justice and Compassion in Biblical Law*, Richard Hiers, Scribd (OFFSITE LINK) -detailed treatment of Biblical justice
<https://id.scribd.com/document/83851708/Justice-and-Compassion-in-Biblical-Law>
 9. *This Evil Social Justice Mindset Threatens All*-Jordan Peterson
<https://youtu.be/KDu1xoQY140>
 10. *Socialism: The New American Civil Religion*, Form #05.016, Section 11.1.1: "Social Justice" as the justification for the transformation – SEDM
<http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>
 11. *Social Security: Mark of the Beast*, Form #11.407-establishes that government benefits, wealth redistribution, and socialism are unconstitutional and violate the Bible.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 12. *Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security*, Form #06.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 13. *Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee*, Form #06.002-how to stop ILLEGAL and UNCONSTITUTIONAL participation in Social Security.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 14. *Policy Document: Members Who Reenter the Franchise System*, Form #08.017-notice to those who become compliant members and later go back to the government system of franchises and benefits.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 15. *Laws of the Bible*, Form #13.001-this memorandum organizes and describes God’s law, which is the foundation of justice and righteousness in the western world. Some people refer to its laws as “natural law” and it is the foundation of the common law.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 16. *What Happened to Justice?*, Form #06.012 -why you can't get justice in federal court and what you can do about it.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 17. *Michael Sandel Course on Justice*, Harvard University
<http://justiceharvard.org/>
 18. *What is Social Justice?*, Prager University
<https://youtu.be/rtBvQj2k6xo>
 19. *Doing Justice and Mercy*, Pastor Tim Keller
<https://youtu.be/u8Fn4vTTXHM>
 20. *Social Justice: Not What You Think It Is*, Heritage Foundation
<http://www.heritage.org/poverty-and-inequality/report/social-justice-not-what-you-think-it>
 21. *Thomas Jefferson on Politics and Government*, Section 30: The Justice System
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Politics/ThomasJefferson/jeff1275.htm>
 22. *Wester Theories of Justice*, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/justwest/>
 23. *Aristotle's Conception of Justice*, Anton-Hermann Chroust, David L. Osborn, Notre Dame Law Review, Volume 17, Issue 2, Article 2
<http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3967&context=ndlr>
 24. *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle-The authoritative statement of Aristotle’s ethical system
<http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.html>
 25. *Law and Government Page*, Family Guardian Fellowship-discusses how the government operates and how it becomes corrupted.
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LawAndGovt.htm>