

## WHO WERE THE PHARISEES AND SADUCEES?



"What right have you to declare *My [God's] statutes* [write *man's vain law*], or take *My covenant [the Bible]* in your mouth, seeing you hate instruction and cast *My words behind you*? *When you saw a thief, you consented with him, and have been a partaker with adulterers. You give your mouth to evil, and your tongue frames deceit. You sit and speak against your brother; you slander your own mother's son.* These things you have done, and I kept silent; you thought that I was altogether like you; but I will reprove you, and set them in order before your eyes. *Now consider this, you who forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver: Whoever offers praise glorifies Me; and to him who orders his conduct aright [and bases it on *God's laws*] I will show the salvation of God.*"  
[[Psalms 50:16-23](#), Bible, NKJV]

*"Politicians Prefer Unarmed and Illiterate Peasants!"* [SEDM]

*"POLITICS": (Greek "POLY"= many) + ("TICS"= blood sucking parasites)* [SEDM]

## DEDICATION

*“For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and seeking to establish their [the Pharisees] own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God.”  
[Rom. 10:3, Bible, NKJV]*

---

*“Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we do not wrestle with flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the [political] rulers of the darkness of this age, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Therefore take up the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.*

*“Stand therefore, having girded your waist with Truth, having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith with which you will be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one [corrupt employees of the government]. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; praying, always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, being watchful to the end with all perseverance and supplication for all the saints—and for me, that utterance may be given to me, that I may open my mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in chains; that in it I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.”  
[Ephesians 6:11-20, Bible, NKJV]*

---

*“And now you know what is restraining, that he may be revealed in his own time. For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work; only He who now restrains will do so until He is taken out of the way. And then the lawless one [Satan, the ANARCHIST] will be revealed, whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming. The coming of the lawless one [Satan, the ANARCHIST] is according to the working of Satan, with all power, signs, and lying wonders, and with all unrighteous deception among those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this reason God will send them strong delusion, that they should believe the [LEGAL] lie, that they all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness.*  
[2 Thess. 2:6-12, Bible, NKJV]

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>DEDICATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2. Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees? .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3. Differences Between the Pharisees and Saducees .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4. Antinomian Christians .....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 The Problem of Hyper-Grace .....	27
4.2 How to Help Hyper-Grace Enthusiasts .....	29
4.3 Questions for Christians who claim the Old Testament Law doesn't apply to them .....	32
<b>5. Specific Subset of Old Testament Biblical Law that has been repealed .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>6. The THREE types of Biblical laws: GOVERNMENT law, HUMAN law, Church law .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>7. Defenses against Modern Pharisee Lawyer Tactics .....</b>	<b>41</b>
7.1 Tools to rebut Government, Legal, and Tax Profession Deception and False Propaganda of Modern Pharisee .....	41
7.2 Tools to rebut Private Sector Deception and False Propaganda of Modern Pharisees .....	41
7.3 How choice of law rules are illegally circumvented by corrupted government officials to illegally enforce franchises, kidnap your legal identity, and STEAL from You .....	42
7.4 Forcing governments to disclose when and how PRIVATE property was converted to PUBLIC property .....	45
7.5 Remedies against illegal franchise enforcement .....	49
7.6 Franchise enforcement outside of federal territory is a criminal act of "simulating legal process" .....	53
<b>8. Why there aren't any honorable Pharisee lawyers willing to expose and fix this fraud .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>9. Are You Anti-Semitic? .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>10. Rebutted False Arguments Against This Memorandum .....</b>	<b>57</b>
10.1 ARGUMENT: You ought to consider other religious texts. The Bible is not the inerrant word of God .....	57
<b>11. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>12. Resources for further study and rebuttal .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>13. Questions that Readers, Grand Jurors, and Petit Jurors Should be Asking the Government .....</b>	<b>60</b>
13.1 Introduction .....	60
13.2 Findings and Conclusions .....	60
13.3 Section Summary .....	60
13.4 Further Study On Our Website: .....	61
13.5 Open-ended questions .....	61
13.6 Admissions .....	62

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Three Categories of Biblical Law .....	40
Table 2: "National" v. "Federal" .....	44
Table 3: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office .....	47
Table 4: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office .....	49

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Constitutional Provisions**

Art. 4, 4 .....	51
-----------------	----

### ***Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?***

3 of 68

Art. 4, Sect. 3, Clause 2.....	44
Const., Art. I, 8.....	66
Constitution of the United States.....	68
Federalist Paper #45.....	61
Fifth Amendment Takings Clause.....	45
Fifth and Sixth Amendments.....	60
First Amendment.....	49, 54
Ninth and Tenth Amendments.....	61
Sixth Amendments.....	63
The Federalist No. 45, pp. 292-293 (C. Rossiter ed. 1961).....	66
The Federalist No. 51, p. 323. (C. Rossiter ed. 1961).....	67
USA Constitution.....	43

## Statutes

18 U.S.C. §208.....	42
26 U.S.C. §3121(e).....	44
26 U.S.C. §3401(c).....	66
26 U.S.C. §6020(b).....	48
26 U.S.C. §7701.....	63
4 U.S.C. §110.....	66
8 U.S.C. §1401.....	43, 44, 48
California Civil Code, §§678-680.....	47
California Civil Code, §655.....	47
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C.....	44
Texas Penal Code Annotated, §32.48(a)(2).....	53
U.C.C. §1-201(11).....	52
U.C.C. §2-106(a).....	52

## Regulations

26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c).....	44
Treasury Regulations.....	68

## Rules

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).....	62
Hearsay Rule, Federal Rule of Evidence 802.....	52

## Cases

Bailey v. Alabama, 219 U.S. 219 , 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145.....	48, 65
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 118 -137 (1976).....	67
Budd v. People of State of New York, 143 U.S. 517 (1892).....	47, 48
Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821).....	43
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979).....	64
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10.....	64
Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 759 (1991).....	67
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).....	51
Gould v. Gould, 245 U.S. 151 (1917).....	68
Grayned v. City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104, 108 (1972).....	65
Gregory v. Ashcroft, 501 U.S. 452, 458 (1991).....	66
Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991).....	49
In re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 11 S.Ct. 573, 36 L.Ed. 219.....	15
In re Godwin, 293 S.W.3d. 742, 748 (Tex.App.—San Antonio 2009, orig. proceeding).....	53
INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919, 944 -959 (1983).....	67

Jordan v. De George, 341 U.S. 223 .....	63
Kolender v. Lawson, 461 U.S. 352, 103 S.Ct. 1855 (1983) .....	62
Lamoureaux v. Burrillville Racing Ass'n, 91 R.I. 94, 161 A.2d. 213, 215 .....	52
Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U.S. 451 .....	63
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866) .....	50
Luther v. Borden, 48 U.S. 1 (1849) .....	68
Manley v. Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215 .....	48
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803) .....	22, 61, 65
Michael Runningwolf v. State of Texas, 317 S.W.3d. 829 (2010) .....	53, 54
Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 162, 22 L.Ed. 627 .....	15
National League of Cities v. Usery, 426 U.S., at 842 , n. 12 .....	67
New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144 (1992) .....	67
Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663 .....	15
Piqua Branch Bank v. Knoup, 6 Ohio.St. 393 .....	43
Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. (N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005) .....	49
Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91 .....	63
Serbian E. Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevich, 426 U.S. 696, 708–09, 724–25, 96 S.Ct. 2372, 49 L.Ed.2d. 151 (1976) .....	53
U.S. v. De Cadena, 105 F.Supp. 202, 204 (1952) .....	63
U.S. v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936) .....	50
Williams v. United States, 341 U.S. 97 .....	63
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) .....	62, 65

## Other Authorities

2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327 .....	37
A Jewish Defector Warns America About Zionism, Nike Insights .....	56
About SSNs and TINs On Government Forms and Correspondence, Form #05.012 .....	44
Age of Reason, Thomas Paine .....	57
Antinomian Christians .....	12, 27, 32
Antinomian Christians: The Problem of Hyper-Grace, Brook Stockton .....	27
Are You Antisemitic?, Nike Insights .....	56
Black's Law Dictionary Sixth Edition, p. 695 .....	15
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693 .....	52
Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, 1968, p. 1176 .....	43
Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, 1968, p. 740 .....	43
Black's Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 668 .....	54
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1106 .....	47
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 322 .....	52
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500 .....	62
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 763 .....	64
Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856 .....	14
Brother Nathaniel Kapner .....	57
Christian Zionism: The New Heresy that Undermines Middle East Peace, Nike Insights .....	57
Christians for a Test Oath, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	20
Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume (p. 1732). Peabody: Hendrickson .....	13
Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume (p. 1733-1734). Peabody: Hendrickson .....	22
Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume (p. 1734). Peabody: Hendrickson .....	20
Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume (pp. 1732–1733). Peabody: Hendrickson .....	18
Dare to Disagree, Margaret Heffernan .....	55
De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043 .....	44, 59
Definition of a Jew, Nike Insights .....	56
Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007 .....	37
Exposing Judaism Video .....	58

Family Guardian Forum 6.5: Words of Art.....	59
Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004.....	41
Forget Russia! Look at the Jewish Lobby in D.C., Nike Insights .....	57
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction.....	15
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 4: Willful Government Deception and Propaganda .....	41
Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023 .....	42
Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course, Form #12.026 .....	59
Government Establishment of Religion, Form #05.038 .....	15
Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046 .....	23
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030.....	15, 45
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 29.2 .....	42
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 29.4 .....	45
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 29.5 .....	49
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 29.6.....	53
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 2.8.2: Presumption.....	59
How to Enrage Hypocrites and Pharisees, Pastor John Weaver.....	20
How to Help Hyper-Grace Enthusiasts, Brook Stockton .....	29
In Defense of Brother Nathanael Kapner, Nike Insights.....	57
Index of Biblical Law, Section IX, Subsections A through D.....	35
Internal Revenue Service.....	60
IRS Forms 1040 or 1040NR.....	48
IRS Forms W-4 or W-8.....	48
Jesus Was Not a Jew, Nike Insights .....	57
Jewish Myths Among Us, Nike Insights .....	56
Josephus. The Antiquities of the Jews. pp. 13.5.9 .....	21
Josephus .....	21
JudeOne3Four .....	59
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001 .....	59
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001, Section 3 .....	36
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001, Section 5 .....	20
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014 .....	41, 42, 59, 60
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Section 3 .....	12
Mark Twain .....	41
Martin Luther .....	21
Mishnah.....	20
Neusner, Jacob Invitation to the Talmud: a Teaching Book (1998): 8.....	21
Origin of the Term “Anti-Semitism”, Nike Insights .....	56
Pastor John Weaver.....	20
Peterson, E. H. (2005). The Message: the Bible in contemporary language (Mt 23:13–39). Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.....	13
Petition for Admission to Practice, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	55
Pharisee .....	55
Pilgrims .....	29
Policy Document: Pete Hendrickson’s “Trade or Business” Approach, Form #08.003.....	42
Policy Document: Problems with Atheistic Anarchism, Form #08.020.....	36, 42, 59
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018 .....	41
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against This Website, Form #08.011 .....	41
Policy Document: UCC Redemption, Form #08.002 .....	41
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017 .....	59
Rabbi Gamaliel.....	27
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007.....	42
Rebutted Version of “Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions”, Form #08.007 .....	41
Rebutted Version of the CRS Report 97-59A: “Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Federal Income Tax”, Form #08.006.....	41
Rebutted Version of the IRS Pamphlet “The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments”, Form #08.005.....	41
Redefining Religion Sermon Series, Newbreak.org.....	23
Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002.....	45

Restatement 2d, Contracts §3 .....	52
Rousas Rushdoony .....	58
Saint Paul .....	21
SEDM Liberty University, Section 8 .....	41
SEDM Liberty University, Section 9 .....	41
Sheldon Emry Library Disclaimer.....	57
Sheldon Emry Memorial Library .....	58
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016.....	12, 54
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: Includes .....	59, 61
Statutes and Statutory Construction, Second Edition, Jabez Sutherland, 1904 .....	59
Statutory Interpretation: General Principles and Recent Trends, Congressional Research Service, Report 97-589 .....	59
Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201 .....	45
The Church of Latter Day Saints (Mormons).....	23
The Excommunication of Christ, Nike Insights .....	57
The Jewish Connection to Slavery, Nike Insights .....	57
The Jewish Slaughter of Christians, Nike Insights.....	57
The Jews are NOT God’s Chosen People, Nike Insights .....	56
The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Alfred Edersheim, 1883 .....	59
The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Alfred Edersheim, 1883, p. 324 .....	23
The Open Bible, New King James Version, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Copyright 1997, pp. 340-341 .....	22
The Talmud Unmasked, Rev. I.B. Pranaitis .....	57
Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Virginia Q.XIV, 1782. ME 2:207 .....	58
Truth in Taxation Hearing, Section 9, Ambiguity of Law, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	59
Two Political Jurisdictions: “National” government v. “Federal” government, Family Guardian Fellowship .....	44
U.S. Department of Justice.....	48, 60
Urantia book.....	57
W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949) .....	54
We the People Foundation for Constitutional Education .....	60
What is Wrong with Christian Zionism?, Nike Insights.....	57
What is Zionism?, Nike Insights .....	57
Why “Faith Alone” Salvation is Wrong (From a Protestant), LizzieAnswers .....	27
Why All Man-Made Law is Religious in Nature, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	14, 58
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002.....	32, 42, 43, 54
Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a “Taxpayer Identification Number”, Form #04.205 .....	44
Why Jesus Was NOT a Jew, Nike Insights .....	57
Why The Fourteenth Amendment is NOT a Threat to Your Freedom, Form #08.015 .....	41
Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006 .....	42
Why You Don’t Want to Hire an Attorney, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	55
Wikipedia: Pharisees; Downloaded on 9/30/2016.....	21
Words and Phrases: “includes” .....	59

## Scriptures

1 Co. 4:14 .....	17
1 Co. 4:15 .....	17
1 Co. 7:28; 9:12.....	16
1 Co. 9:19 .....	18
1 Cor. 6:18.....	37
1 Corinthians 14:34 .....	30
1 John 2:3-6.....	35
1 John 4:16.....	35
1 John 5:1-3 .....	29, 31
1 Peter 1:14; 5:5 .....	30
1 Peter 1:18-20 .....	30
1 Peter 1:2 .....	30
1 Sam. 8.....	37
1 Thessalonians 1:1 .....	30

1 Thessalonians 2:15 .....	56
1 Thessalonians 4:1 .....	29
2 Chr. 17:7, 9 .....	12
2 Chr. 19:5, 6, 8 .....	12
2 Sam. 11-12 .....	37
2 Thess. 2:6-12 .....	2
2 Tim. 3:16-17 .....	33
3 Jn. 9 .....	16
Acts 15:10 .....	16
Acts 15:28 .....	16
Acts 17:1-7 .....	28
Barachiah .....	13
Bible .....	57
Book of Nehemiah .....	37
Christ .....	27, 30
Dan. 12:2 .....	18
Dan. 4:35 .....	12
Daniel 3 .....	37
David .....	29
Deu. 6:13 .....	20
Deut. 10 .....	40
Deut. 11 .....	40
Deut. 12 .....	40
Deut. 28 .....	37
Deut. 28:1-14 .....	12, 33
Deut. 28:15-68 .....	39
Deut. 4-6 .....	40
Deut. 7 .....	40
Deut. 8 .....	40
Deut. 9 .....	40
Deuteronomy 28 .....	32
Eccl. 12:9-14 .....	34
Eph. 4:6 .....	18
Ephesians 6:11-20 .....	2
Ex. 13:2-11; 13:11-16 .....	16
Ex. 13:9 .....	16
Ex. 18:26 .....	12
Exodus 1 .....	40
Exodus 19 .....	40
Exodus 20 .....	40
Exodus 21-25 .....	40
Exodus 3:1 .....	40
Exodus 32 .....	40
Exodus 35 .....	40
Exodus 4-5 .....	40
Exodus 7-14 .....	40
Eze. 34:4 .....	16
First Commandment .....	14
Galatians 1:13 .....	30
Gen. 11 .....	40
Gen. 1-10 .....	40
Gen. 12-18 .....	40
Gen. 19 .....	40
Gen. 39 .....	40
Gen. 41 .....	40
Gen. 47 .....	40
Golden Calf .....	15

Heaven.....	37
Heb. 12:9 .....	17
Herod.....	29
Isa. 56:10 .....	20
Isa. 9:15 .....	18
Isa. 9:16.....	20
Isaiah 1:1-26.....	37
Isaiah 14 .....	58
Isaiah 33:22 .....	14, 32
Jam. 1:17 .....	18
James 1:1 .....	12
James 1:27 .....	32
James 1:7-8.....	32
Jehovah.....	27
Jer 7:4 .....	15
Jesus .....	12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 57
John 14:21 .....	35
John 7:49 .....	34
John the Baptist.....	29
Jude 1:4 .....	28
Judges.....	40
King David.....	37
King Nebuchadnezzar .....	37
Kings .....	40
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001, Section 2.6 .....	32
Lev. 11.....	40
Lev. 12.....	40
Lev. 13-14 .....	40
Lev. 15-27 .....	40
Lev. 6-7 .....	40
Lu. 18:11, 12 .....	15
Luke 6:46 .....	34
Luke 8:21 .....	34
Mal. 2:9 .....	18
Mark 7:1-13.....	19
Matt. 16:5-12.....	18
Matt. 19:16-22.....	34, 36
Matt. 23 .....	15, 36
Matt. 23:1-12.....	15
Matt. 23:28.....	19
Matt. 7:21 .....	34
Matt. 7:21-23.....	19, 36
Matthew.....	31
Matthew 5:17; 15:1ff.....	30
Messiah .....	21
Mt 3:9 .....	15
New Testament.....	36
New Testament.....	25, 26, 36
Num. 15.....	40
Num. 1-5, 6-14 .....	40
Num. 15:38.....	16
Num. 18.....	40
Num. 19.....	40
Num. 27.....	40
Num. 28-30 .....	40
Num. 6.....	40
Numbers 15:30 .....	32

Pharaoh.....	15
Pharisees.....	12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 36, 37, 40, 41, 58, 59
Phil. 10 .....	17
Prov. 1:10-19.....	37
Prov. 27:14.....	16
Prov. 28:9 .....	34
Prov. 7:3 .....	16
Ps. 31:23 .....	18
Ps. 84:10.....	17
Psalms 119:155.....	34
Psalms 47:7 .....	14, 32
Psalms 82 .....	23
Psalms 50:16-23 .....	1, 14, 36
Rabbi .....	17, 18, 25, 27
Rev. 12:17 .....	11, 35
Rev. 14:12 .....	11, 35
Rev. 14:1-5.....	11, 35
Rev. 22:12-15.....	12, 35
Rom. 10:3 .....	2, 12, 14
Rom. 2:17-24.....	15
Rom. 8:29.....	17
Roman 6:15 .....	27
Romans 13:8.....	30, 31
Romans 3:21-5:11 .....	30
Romans 6:1.....	27
Romans 6:23.....	30
Romans 8:4.....	30
Sadducees.....	23
Saducees .....	20
Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego .....	37
St. Paul .....	17
Talmud .....	20
Ten Commandments .....	14, 36, 41
Zechariah.....	13

1                   *"The taxpayer-- that's someone who works for the federal government but doesn't have to take the civil service*  
2                   *examination."*  
3                   *[President Ronald W. Reagan]*

## 4     **1. Introduction**

5     There is much controversy in modern society about exactly who the Pharisees were and exactly what they did that  
6     displeased God. Understanding the answer to this controversy will enable the reader to apply the answer to the present  
7     legal field and understand that history is repeating itself in our day. This will enable them to politically fix the problem to  
8     prevent the fate of the Jews because of the corruption (leaven) introduced by the Pharisees.

9     The Bible identifies TWO aspects of Christianity that are important:

- 10    1. Faith in Jesus.
- 11    2. Keeping the commandments of God.

12    That last item above could be misinterpreted as being subjective when in fact it is not. Which commandments? This  
13    document will explain EXACTLY which commandments.

14    The following scriptures identify the above two aspects of Christianity as determining not only your ability to enter  
15    Heaven, which is called "salvation", but also the DEGREE OF REWARD you will get based on your works after you go  
16    there:

- 17    1. Rev. 12:17: The dragon (beast) made war with the "offspring, who keep the commandments of God and have the  
18    testimony of Jesus Christ". Everyone ELSE he DOESN'T make war with because they are on his (Satan's) side.

19                   *"And the dragon was enraged with the woman, and he went to make war with the rest of her offspring, who*  
20                   *keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."*  
21                   *[Rev. 12:17, Bible, NKJV]*

- 22    2. Rev. 14:12: The only people in Heaven at that time were the 144,000, and an angel describes who these people are:

23                   *"Here [in Heaven] is the patience of the saints; here are those who keep the commandments of God and the*  
24                   *faith of Jesus."*  
25                   *[Rev. 14:12, Bible, NKJV]*

26    The people above are described earlier as follows:

### 27    **The Lamb and the 144,000**

28                   *"Then I looked, and behold, a Lamb standing on Mount Zion, and with Him one hundred and forty-four*  
29                   *thousand, having His Father's name written on their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, like the voice*  
30                   *of many waters, and like the voice of loud thunder. And I heard the sound of harpists playing their harps. They*  
31                   *sang as it were a new song before the throne, before the four living creatures, and the elders; and no one could*  
32                   *learn that song except the hundred and forty-four thousand who were redeemed from the earth. **These are the***  
33                   ***ones who were not defiled with women, for they are virgins. These are the ones who follow the Lamb***  
34                   ***wherever He goes. These were redeemed from among men, being firstfruits to God and to the Lamb. And in***  
35                   ***their mouth was found no deceit, for they are without fault before the throne of God.**"*  
36                   *[Rev. 14:1-5, Bible, NKJV]*

- 37    3. Rev. 22:12-15: Establishes that your REWARD will be based on your works and obedience to God's commandments  
38    and laws.

### 39    **Jesus Testifies to the Churches**

40                   *"And behold, I am coming quickly, and **My reward is with Me, to give to every one according to his work.** <sup>13</sup>**I***  
41                   ***am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last.**"*

**Blessed are those who do His commandments, that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city.** But outside are dogs and sorcerers and sexually immoral and murderers and idolaters, and whoever loves and practices a lie.”  
[Rev. 22:12-15, Bible, NKJV]

Corruption of God’s word by specific faiths happens when at least one of these two elements is missing from the faith. The Pharisees were missing the first, which is faith in Jesus. Dispensational or antinomian Christians who think that the Old Testament is not law for them are missing the second element, which is obedience to ALL the commandments of God.

Since the Pharisees didn’t believe in Jesus and tried to crucify Him, they won’t attain salvation. Antinomian Christians who believe in Jesus will attain salvation, but because they don’t think they have to obey the Old Testament, they will miss the blessings identified in Deut. 28:1-14.

Both the Pharisees and Antinomian Christians are guilty of the same sin, which is adding to or repealing selected scriptures and thereby disobeying God indirectly. Anyone who adds to or takes away from the scripture is guilty of heresy and in effect, makes themselves into an idol. Anyone who can define what God is, keeping in mind that God is “the word” (James 1:1), is redefining God in their own image to benefit themselves.

*“For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and seeking to establish their [the Pharisees] own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God.”*  
[Rom. 10:3, Bible, NKJV]

*For His dominion is an everlasting dominion,  
And His kingdom is from generation to generation.  
All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing;  
He does according to His will in the army of heaven  
And among the inhabitants of the earth.  
No one can restrain His hand  
Or say to Him, “What have You done?”*  
[Dan. 4:35, Bible, NKJV]

This document will discuss the problems with both groups, and then apply modern legal maxims and rules to present society to show that the same kind of legal corruption is happening today that the Pharisees implemented. We will end with a series of questions PROVING that the modern secular legal profession is following closely in the path of the Pharisees. Ironically, both of these two groups were responsible for the same thing, which was or is to run the government. The Pharisees ran a true theocracy using biblical law while modern lawyers run a similar state sponsored religion. That state sponsored religion is described in the following:

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

## **2. Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?<sup>1</sup>**

The abuse of language to undermine the intent of the law is not a new phenomenon. The most famous instance of it was described in the Bible, when Jesus criticized the Pharisees in the Bible. The Pharisees were the interpreters of law:

*Christ allows their office as expositors of the law; The scribes and Pharisees (that is, the whole Sanhedrim, who sat at the helm of church government, who were all called scribes, and were some of them Pharisees), they sit in Moses’ seat (v. 2), as public teachers and interpreters of the law; and, the law of Moses being the municipal law of their state, they were as judges, or a bench of justices; teaching and judging seem to be equivalent, comparing 2 Chr. 17:7, 9, with 2 Chr. 19:5, 6, 8. They were not the itinerant judges that rode the circuit, but the standing bench, that determined on appeals, special verdicts, or writs of error by the law; they sat in Moses’s seat, not as he was Mediator between God and Israel, but only as he was chief justice, Ex. 18:26. Or, we may apply it, not to the Sanhedrim, but to the other Pharisees and scribes, that expounded the law, and taught the people how to apply it to particular cases.*

[...]

<sup>1</sup> Source: *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014, Section 3; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

Hence he infers (v. 3), "Whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do As far as they sit in Moses's seat, that is, read and preach the law that was given by Moses" (which, as yet, continued in full force, power, and virtue), "and judge according to that law, so far you must hearken to them, as remembrances to you of the written word." The scribes and Pharisees made it their business to study the scripture, and were well acquainted with the language, history, and customs of it, and its style and phraseology. Now Christ would have the people to make use of the helps they gave them for the understanding of the scripture, and do accordingly. As long as their comments did illustrate the text and not pervert it; did make plain, and not make void, the commandment of God; so far they must be observed and obeyed, but with caution and a judgment of discretion. [Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume (p. 1732). Peabody: Hendrickson]

Back then, the Jews had a theocracy and the Bible was their law book, so the term "religion scholars" meant the lawyers of that time who were the Pharisees and Saducees, not the pastors of today's time. In effect, the Pharisees seemed to be the equivalent of our modern administrators in the Executive Branch, while the Saducees seemed to be the elites in the Judicial Branch:

*I've had it with you! You're hopeless, you religion scholars, you Pharisees! Frauds! Your lives are roadblocks to God's kingdom. You refuse to enter, and won't let anyone else in either.*

*"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You go halfway around the world to make a convert, but once you get him you make him into a replica of yourselves, double-damned.*

*"You're hopeless! What arrogant stupidity! You say, 'If someone makes a promise with his fingers crossed, that's nothing; but if he swears with his hand on the Bible, that's serious.' What ignorance! Does the leather on the Bible carry more weight than the skin on your hands? And what about this piece of trivia: 'If you shake hands on a promise, that's nothing; but if you raise your hand that God is your witness, that's serious'? What ridiculous hairsplitting! What difference does it make whether you shake hands or raise hands? A promise is a promise. What difference does it make if you make your promise inside or outside a house of worship? A promise is a promise. God is present, watching and holding you to account regardless.*

*"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You keep meticulous account books, tithing on every nickel and dime you get, but on the meat of God's Law, things like fairness and compassion and commitment—the absolute basics!—you carelessly take it or leave it. Careful bookkeeping is commendable, but the basics are required. Do you have any idea how silly you look, writing a life story that's wrong from start to finish, nitpicking over commas and semicolons?*

*"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You burnish the surface of your cups and bowls so they sparkle in the sun, while the insides are maggoty with your greed and gluttony. Stupid Pharisee! Scour the insides, and then the gleaming surface will mean something.*

*"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You're like manicured grave plots, grass clipped and the flowers bright, but six feet down it's all rotting bones and worm-eaten flesh. People look at you and think you're saints, but beneath the skin you're total frauds.*

*"You're hopeless, you religion scholars and Pharisees! Frauds! You build granite tombs for your prophets and marble monuments for your saints. And you say that if you had lived in the days of your ancestors, no blood would have been on your hands. You protest too much! You're cut from the same cloth as those murderers, and daily add to the death count.*

*"Snakes! Reptilian sneaks! Do you think you can worm your way out of this? Never have to pay the piper? It's on account of people like you that I send prophets and wise guides and scholars generation after generation—and generation after generation you treat them like dirt, greeting them with lynch mobs, hounding them with abuse.*

*"You can't squirm out of this: Every drop of righteous blood ever spilled on this earth, beginning with the blood of that good man Abel right down to the blood of Zechariah, Barachiah's son, whom you murdered at his prayers, is on your head. All this, I'm telling you, is coming down on you, on your generation.*

*"Jerusalem! Jerusalem! Murderer of prophets! Killer of the ones who brought you God's news! How often I've ached to embrace your children, the way a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you wouldn't let me. And now you're so desolate, nothing but a ghost town. What is there left to say? Only this: I'm out of here soon. The next time you see me you'll say, 'Oh, God has blessed him! He's come, bringing God's rule!'"*  
[Peterson, E. H. (2005). The Message: the Bible in contemporary language (Mt 23:13–39). Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.]

Why did Jesus get angry? The scriptures below give us a clue:

### Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>  
Form 05.047, Rev. 10-4-2016

But to the wicked, God says:

**"What right have you to declare My [God's] statutes [write man's vain law], or take My covenant [the Bible] in your mouth, seeing you hate instruction and cast My words behind you? When you saw a thief, you consented with him, and have been a partaker with adulterers. You give your mouth to evil, and your tongue frames deceit. You sit and speak against your brother; you slander your own mother's son. These things you have done, and I kept silent; you thought that I was altogether like you; but I will reprove you, and set them in order before your eyes. Now consider this, you who forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver: Whoever offers praise glorifies Me; and to him who orders his conduct aright [and bases it on God's laws] I will show the salvation of God."**  
[Psalms 50:16-23, Bible, NKJV]

"For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their [the Pharisees] own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God."  
[Rom. 10:3, Bible, NKJV]

In effect, by establishing their own substitute or addition to God's law using "oral tradition", the Pharisees and Saducees were establishing a man-made religion in which THEY, and not the true and living God, were being "worshipped", in violation of the First Commandment of the Ten Commandments. For proof, see the following:

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

The First Commandment forbids "worshipping" (serving) other gods. Anyone who can "make" law is the god of the society that they make law FOR, and especially if that law applies to everyone BUT the law maker or law giver. God is the king of the earth, and to recognize any OTHER king or any other law is to engage in religious idolatry.

**"For God is the King of all the earth. Sing praises with understanding."**  
[Psalm 47:7, Bible, NKJV]

"For the LORD is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will save [and protect] us."  
[Isaiah 33:22, Bible, NKJV]

A god, after all, is anyone or anything that has SUPERIOR or SUPERNATURAL powers or exemptions GREATER than those who are "natural", meaning human. Governments and churches are what lawyers call "legal fictions" or "artificial entities" that can have no more rights than those who delegated them their power.

*Nemo dat qui non habet. No one can give who does not possess. Jenk. Cent. 250.*

*Nemo plus juris ad alienum transfere potest, quam ispe habent. One cannot transfer to another a right which he has not. Dig. 50, 17, 54; 10 Pet. 161, 175.*

*Nemo potest facere per alium quod per se non potest. No one can do that by another which he cannot do by himself.*

*Qui per alium facit per seipsum facere videtur. He who does anything through another, is considered as doing it himself. Co. Litt. 258.*

*Quicquid acquiritur servo, acquiritur domino. Whatever is acquired by the servant, is acquired for the master. 15 Bin. Ab. 327.*

*Quod per me non possum, nec per alium. What I cannot do in person, I cannot do by proxy. 4 Co. 24.*

*What a man cannot transfer, he cannot bind by articles.*

[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856; SOURCE:  
<http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

That's the basis for what a "republic" is legally defined as.

1           “Republican government. One in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised  
2 by the people, either directly, or through representatives chosen by the people, to whom those powers are  
3 specially delegated. In re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 11 S.Ct. 573, 36 L.Ed. 219; Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (21  
4 Wall.) 162, 22 L.Ed. 627.”  
5           [Black’s Law Dictionary Sixth Edition, p. 695]

6       When the man-made law imputes more rights to governments or other artificial entities than ordinary humans, a man-made  
7       religion has been created. We cover this in Government Establishment of Religion, Form #05.038.

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

15       Keep in mind that the term “hypocrite” used by Jesus in Matt. 23 is defined in the following passages as “trusting in  
16       privileges”, meaning franchises: Jer 7:4; Mt 3:9. The focus of hypocrites is to apply DIFFERENT rules to themselves than  
17       to everyone else, and to elevate their own importance ABOVE everyone else. In essence, they seek to destroy equality of  
18       treatment under the law and replace it with privileges and franchises. We discuss this corrupting aspect of franchises in:

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

19       We prove in Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction that absolute equality under the law is  
20       the foundation of all your freedom. Therefore, the Pharisees sought indirectly to make everyone into THEIR slave and to  
21       make themselves the object of idol worship not unlike the Golden Calf or like Pharaoh. Below is a popular commentary on  
22       Matt. 23:1-12 which proves this:

23           II. He condemns the men. He had ordered the multitude to do as they taught; but here he annexeth a caution not  
24       to do as they did, to beware of their leaven; Do not ye after their works. Their traditions were their works, were  
25       their idols, the works of their fancy. Or, “Do not according to their example.” Doctrines and practices are  
26       spirits that must be tried, and where there is occasion, must be carefully separated and distinguished; and as we  
27       must not swallow corrupt doctrines for the sake of any laudable practices of those that teach them, so we must  
28       not imitate any bad examples for the sake of the plausible doctrines of those that set them. The scribes and  
29       Pharisees boasted as much of the goodness of their works as of the orthodoxy of their teaching, and hoped to be  
30       justified by them; it was the plea they put in (Lu. 18:11, 12); and yet these things, which they valued themselves  
31       so much upon, were an abomination in the sight of God.

32           Our Saviour here, and in the following verses, specifies divers particulars of their works, wherein we must not  
33       imitate them. In general, they are charged with hypocrisy, dissimulation, or double-dealing in religion; a crime  
34       which cannot be enquired of at men’s bar, because we can only judge according to outward appearance; but  
35       God, who searcheth the heart, can convict of hypocrisy; and nothing is more displeasing to him, for he desireth  
36       truth.

37           Four things are in these verses charged upon them.

38           1. Their saying and doing were two things.

39           Their practice was no way agreeable either to their preaching or to their profession; for they say, and do not;  
40       they teach out of the law that which is good, but their conversation gives them the lie; and they seem to have  
41       found another way to heaven for themselves than what they show to others. See this illustrated and charged  
42       home upon them, Rom. 2:17–24. Those are of all sinners most inexcusable that allow themselves in the sins they  
43       condemn in others, or in worse. This doth especially touch wicked ministers, who will be sure to have their  
44       portion appointed them with hypocrites (ch. 24:51); for what greater hypocrisy can there be, than to press that  
45       upon others, to be believed and done, which they themselves disbelieve and disobey; pulling down in their  
46       practice what they build up in their preaching; when in the pulpit, preaching so well that it is a pity they should  
47       ever come out; but, when out of the pulpit, living so ill that it is a pity they should ever come in; like bells, that  
48       call others to church, but hang out of it themselves; or Mercurial posts, that point the way to others, but stand  
49       still themselves? Such will be judged out of their own mouths. It is applicable to all others that say, and do not;  
50       that make a plausible profession of religion, but do not live up to that profession; that make fair promises, but  
51       do not perform their promises; are full of good discourse, and can lay down the law to all about them, but are  
52       empty of good works; great talkers, but little doers; the voice is Jacob’s voice, but the hands are the hands of  
53       Esau. Vox et praeterea nihil—mere sound. They speak fair, I go, sir; but there is no trusting them, for there are  
54       seven abominations in their heart.

2. They were very severe in imposing upon others those things which they were not themselves willing to submit to the burden of (v. 4); They bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne; not only insisting upon the minute circumstances of the law, which is called a yoke (Acts 15:10), and pressing the observation of them with more strictness and severity than God himself did (whereas the maxim of the lawyers, is *Apices juris son sunt jura*—Mere points of law are not law), but by adding to his words, and imposing their own inventions and traditions, under the highest penalties. They loved to show their authority and to exercise their domineering faculty, lording it over God's heritage, and saying to men's souls, Bow down, that we may go over; witness their many additions to the law of the fourth commandment, by which they made the sabbath a burden on men's shoulders, which was designed to be the joy of their hearts. Thus with force and cruelty did those shepherds rule the flock, as of old, Eze. 34:4.

But see their hypocrisy; They themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. (1.) They would not exercise themselves in those things which they imposed upon others; they pressed upon the people a strictness in religion which they themselves would not be bound by; but secretly transgressed their own traditions, which they publicly enforced. They indulged their pride in giving law to others; but consulted their ease in their own practice. Thus it has been said, to the reproach of the popish priests, that they fast with wine and sweetmeats, while they force the people to fast with bread and water; and decline the penances they enjoin the laity. (2.) They would not ease the people in these things, nor put a finger to lighten their burden, when they saw it pinched them. They could find out loose constructions to put upon God's law, and could dispense with that, but would not bate an ace of their own impositions, nor dispense with a failure in the least punctilio of them. They allowed no chancery to relieve the extremity of their common law. How contrary to this was the practice of Christ's apostles, who would allow to others that use of Christian liberty which, for the peace and edification of the church, they would deny themselves in! They would lay no other burden than necessary things, and those easy, Acts 15:28. How carefully doth Paul spare those to whom he writes! 1 Co. 7:28; 9:12.

3. They were all for show, and nothing for substance, in religion (v. 5); All their works they do, to be seen of men. We must do such good works, that they who see them may glorify God; but we must not proclaim our good works, with design that others may see them, and glorify us; which our Saviour here chargeth upon the Pharisees in general, as he had done before in the particular instances of prayer and giving of alms. All their end was to be praised of men, and therefore all their endeavour was to be seen of men, to make a fair show in the flesh. In those duties of religion which fall under the eye of men, none ere so constant and abundant as they; but in what lies between God and their souls, in the retirement of their closets, and the recesses of their hearts, they desire to be excused. The form of godliness will get them a name to live, which is all they aim at, and therefore they trouble not themselves with the power of it, which is essential to a life indeed. He that does all to be seen does nothing to the purpose.

He specifies two things which they did to be seen of men.

(1.) They made broad their phylacteries. Those were little scrolls of paper or parchment, wherein were written, with great niceness, these four paragraphs of the law, Ex. 13:2–11; 13:11–16; Deu. 6:4–9; 11:13–21. These were sewn up in leather, and worn upon their foreheads and left arms. It was a tradition of the elders, which had reference to Ex. 13:9, and Prov. 7:3, where the expressions seem to be figurative, intimating no more than that we should bear the things of God in our minds as carefully as if we had them bound between our eyes. Now the Pharisees made broad these phylacteries, that they might be thought more holy, and strict, and zealous for the law, than others. It is a gracious ambition to covet to be really more holy than others, but it is a proud ambition to covet to appear so. It is good to excel in real piety, but not to exceed in outward shows; for overdoing is justly suspected of design, Prov. 27:14. It is the guise of hypocrisy to make more ado than needs in external service, more than is needful either to prove, or to improve, the good affections and dispositions of the soul.

(2.) They enlarged the borders of their garments. God appointed the Jews to make borders or fringes upon their garments (Num. 15:38), to distinguish them from other nations, and to be a memorandum to them of their being a peculiar people; but the Pharisees were not content to have these borders like other people's, which might serve God's design in appointing them; but they must be larger than ordinary, to answer their design of making themselves to be taken notice of; as if they were more religious than others. But those who thus enlarge their phylacteries, and the borders of their garments, while their hearts are straitened, and destitute of the love of God and their neighbour, though they may now deceive others, will in the end deceive themselves.

4. They much affected pre-eminence and superiority, and prided themselves extremely in it. Pride was the darling reigning sin of the Pharisees, the sin that did most easily beset them and which our Lord Jesus takes all occasions to witness against.

(1.) He describes their pride, v. 6, 7. They courted, and coveted,

[1.] Places of honour and respect. In all public appearances, as at feasts, and in the synagogues, they expected, and had, to their hearts' delight, the uppermost rooms, and the chief seats. They took place of all others, and precedence was adjudged to them, as persons of the greatest note and merit; and it is easy to imagine what a complacency they took in it; they loved to have the preeminence, 3 Jn. 9. It is not possessing the uppermost rooms, nor sitting in the chief seats, that is condemned (somebody must sit uppermost), but loving them; for men

to value such a little piece of ceremony as sitting highest, going first, taking the wall, or the better hand, and to value themselves upon it, to seek it, and to feel resentment if they have it not; what is that but making an idol of ourselves, and then falling down and worshipping it—the worst kind of idolatry! It is bad any where, but especially in the synagogues. There to seek honour to ourselves, where we appear in order to give glory to God, and to humble ourselves before him, is indeed to mock God instead of serving him. David would willingly lie at the threshold in God's house; so far was he from coveting the chief seat there, Ps. 84:10. It savours much of pride and hypocrisy, when people do not care for going to church, unless they can look fine and make a figure there.

[2.] Titles of honour and respect. They loved greetings in the markets, loved to have people put off their hats to them, and show them respect when they met them in the streets. O how it pleased them, and fed their vain humour, digito monstrari et dicier, Hic est—to be pointed out, and to have it said, This be he, to have way made for them in the crowd of market people; "Stand off, here is a Pharisee coming!" and to be complimented with the high and pompous title of Rabbi, Rabbi! This was meat and drink and dainties to them; and they took as great a satisfaction in it as Nebuchadnezzar did in his palace, when he said, Is not this great Babylon that I have built? The greetings would not have done them half so much good, if they had not been in the markets, where every body might see how much they were respected, and how high they stood in the opinion of the people. It was but a little before Christ's time, that the Jewish teachers, the masters of Israel, had assumed the title of Rabbi, Rab, or Rabban, which signifies great or much; and was construed as Doctor, or My lord. And they laid such a stress upon it, that they gave it for a maxim that "he who salutes his teacher, and does not call him Rabbi, provokes the divine Majesty to depart from Israel;" so much religion did they place in that which was but a piece of good manners! For him that is taught in the word to give respect to him that teaches is commendable enough in him that gives it; but for him that teaches to love it, and demand it, and affect it, to be puffed up with it, and to be displeased if it be omitted, is sinful and abominable; and, instead of teaching, he has need to learn the first lesson in the school of Christ, which is humility.

(2.) He cautions his disciples against being herein like them; herein they must not do after their works; "But be not ye called so, for ye shall not be of such a spirit," v. 8, etc.

Here is, [1.] A prohibition of pride. They are here forbidden,

First, To challenge titles of honour and dominion to themselves, v. 8–10. It is repeated twice; Be not called Rabbi, neither be ye called Master or Guide: not that it is unlawful to give civil respect to those that are over us in the Lord, nay, it is an instance of the honour and esteem which it is our duty to show them; but, 1. Christ's ministers must not affect the name of Rabbi or Master, by way of distinction from other people; it is not agreeable to the simplicity of the gospel, for them to covet or accept the honour which they have that are in kings' palaces. 2. They must not assume the authority and dominion implied in those names; they must not be magisterial, nor domineer over their brethren, or over God's heritage, as if they had dominion over the faith of Christians: what they received of the Lord, all must receive from them; but in other things they must not make their opinions and wills a rule and standard to all other people, to be admitted with an implicit obedience. The reasons for this prohibition are,

(1.) One is your Master, even Christ, v. 8, and again, v. 10. Note, [1.] Christ is our Master, our Teacher, our Guide. Mr. George Herbert, when he named the name of Christ, usually added, My Master. [2.] Christ only is our Master, ministers are but ushers in the school. Christ only is the Master, the great Prophet, whom we must hear, and be ruled and overruled by; whose word must be an oracle and a law to us; Verily I say unto you, must be enough to us. And if he only be our Master, then for his ministers to set up for dictators, and to pretend to a supremacy and an infallibility, is a daring usurpation of that honour of Christ which he will not give to another.

(2.) All ye are brethren. Ministers are brethren not only to one another, but to the people; and therefore it ill becomes them to be masters, when there are none for them to master it over but their brethren; yea, and we are all younger brethren, otherwise the eldest might claim an excellency of dignity and power, Gen. 49:3. But, to preclude that, Christ himself is the first-born among many brethren, Rom. 8:29. Ye are brethren, as ye are all disciples of the same Master. School-fellows are brethren, and, as such, should help one another in getting their lesson; but it will by no means be allowed that one of the scholars step into the master's seat, and give law to the school. If we are all brethren, we must not be many masters. Jam. 3:1.

Secondly, They are forbidden to ascribe such titles to others (v. 9); "Call no man your father upon the earth; constitute no man the father of your religion, that is, the founder, author, director, and governor, of it." The fathers of our flesh must be called fathers, and as such we must give them reverence; but God only must be allowed as the Father of our spirits, Heb. 12:9. Our religion must not be derived from, or made to depend upon, any man. We are born again to the spiritual and divine life, not of corruptible seed, but by the word of God; not of the will of the flesh, or the will of man, but of God. Now the will of man, not being the rise of our religion, must not be the rule of it. We must not jurare in verba magistri—swear to the dictates of any creature, not the wisest or best, nor pin our faith on any man's sleeve, because we know not whither he will carry it. St. Paul calls himself a Father to those whose conversion he had been an instrument of (1 Co. 4:15; Phil. 10); but he pretends to no dominion over them, and uses that title to denote, not authority, but affection: therefore he calls them not his obliged, but his beloved, sons, 1 Co. 4:14.

The reason given is, One is your Father, who is in heaven. God is our Father, and is All in all in our religion. He is the Fountain of it, and its Founder; the Life of it, and its Lord; from whom alone, as the Original, our spiritual life is derived, and on whom it depends. He is the Father of all lights (Jam. 1:17), that one Father, from whom are all things, and we in him, Eph. 4:6. Christ having taught us to say, Our Father, who art in heaven; let us call no man Father upon earth; no man, because man is a worm, and the son of man is a worm, hewn out of the same rock with us; especially not upon earth, for man upon earth is a sinful worm; there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not, and therefore no one is fit to be called Father.

[2.] Here is a precept of humility and mutual subjection (v. 11); He that is greatest among you shall be your servant; not only call himself so (we know of one who styles himself *Servus servorum Dei*—Servant of the servants of God, but acts as Rabbi, and father, and master, and *Dominus Deus noster*—The Lord our God, and what not), but he shall be so. Take it as a promise; “He shall be accounted greatest, and stand highest in the favour of God, that is most submissive and serviceable;” or as a precept; “He that is advanced to any place of dignity, trust, and honour, in the church, let him be your servant” (some copies read *estō* for *estai*), “let him not think that his patent of honour is a writ of ease; no; he that is greatest is not a lord, but a minister.” St. Paul, who knew his privilege as well as duty, though free from all, yet made himself servant unto all (1 Co. 9:19); and our Master frequently pressed it upon his disciples to be humble and self-denying, mild and condescending, and to abound in all offices of Christian love, though mean, and to the meanest; and of this he hath set us an example.

[3.] Here is a good reason for all this, v. 12. Consider,

First, The punishment intended for the proud; Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased. If God give them repentance, they will be abased in their own eyes, and will abhor themselves for it; if they repent not, sooner or later they will be abased before the world. Nebuchadnezzar, in the height of his pride, was turned to be a fellow-commoner with the beasts; Herod, to be a feast for the worms; and Babylon, that sat as a queen, to be the scorn of nations. God made the proud and aspiring priests contemptible and base (Mal. 2:9), and the lying prophet to be the tail, Isa. 9:15. But if proud men have not marks of humiliation set upon them in this world, there is a day coming, when they shall rise to everlasting shame and contempt (Dan. 12:2); so plentifully will he reward the proud doer! Ps. 31:23.

Secondly, The preferment intended for the humble; He that shall humble himself shall be exalted. Humility is that ornament which is in the sight of God of great price. In this world the humble have the honour of being accepted with the holy God, and respected by all wise and good men; of being qualified for, and often called out to, the most honourable services; for honour is like the shadow, which flees from those that pursue it, and grasp at it, but follows those that flee from it. However, in the other world, they that have humbled themselves in contrition for their sin, in compliance with their God, and in condescension to their brethren, shall be exalted to inherit the throne of glory; shall be not only owned, but crowned, before angels and men.

[Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). *Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume* (pp. 1732–1733). Peabody: Hendrickson]

Jesus also criticized what he called “the leaven” of the Pharisees:

*The Leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees*

Now when His disciples had come to the other side, they had forgotten to take bread. <sup>6</sup> Then Jesus said to them, **“Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees.”**

And they reasoned among themselves, saying, “It is because we have taken no bread.”

But Jesus, being aware of it, said to them, “O you of little faith, why do you reason among yourselves because you have brought no bread? Do you not yet understand, or remember the five loaves of the five thousand and how many baskets you took up? Nor the seven loaves of the four thousand and how many large baskets you took up? How is it you do not understand that I did not speak to you concerning bread?—but to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.” **Then they understood that He did not tell them to beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees.**  
[Matt. 16:5-12, Bible, NKJV]

The “doctrine” Jesus is speaking of is the legal publications, rules, teachings, and beliefs of the lawyers at that time under a theocracy, who were abusing the law and legal process to:

1. Expand the power and influence of those interpreting or enforcing the law to elevate their own importance, rights, or privileges to be ABOVE everyone else. In other words, to destroy equality under the law.
2. Expand the definition or meaning of a words in the law to ADD things not expressly included. Today this is done by abusing the word “includes”.

- 1 3. Undermine or circumvent the INTENT of the law and replace it with something more “beneficial” to the lawmaker.  
2 Today this is done primarily by:  
3 3.1. “equivocation”, meaning confusing the multiple contexts of usually geographic words to expand those the area or  
4 group membership covered by the law.  
5 3.2. Abuse of judicial precedent to extend the reach of a law to an unmentioned group. Also called “judicial activism”  
6 or “legislating from the bench”.

7 The effect of the above sinister legal treachery is to replace God’s law with man’s law, and to do what the Founding Fathers  
8 called “turn a society of law into a society of men”.

9 **Defilement Comes from Within**

10 *Then the Pharisees and some of the scribes came together to Him, having come from Jerusalem. Now when*  
11 *they saw some of His disciples eat bread with defiled, that is, with unwashed hands, they found fault. For the*  
12 *Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they wash their hands in a special way, holding the tradition of the*  
13 *elders. When they come from the marketplace, they do not eat unless they wash. And there are many other*  
14 *things which they have received and hold, like the washing of cups, pitchers, copper vessels, and couches.*

15 *Then the Pharisees and scribes asked Him, “Why do Your disciples not walk according to the tradition of the*  
16 *elders, but eat bread with unwashed hands?”*

17 *He answered and said to them, “Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written:*

18 **‘This people honors Me with their lips,**  
19 **But their heart is far from Me,**  
20 **And in vain they worship Me,**  
21 **Teaching as doctrines [LAW] the commandments of men.’**

22 *For laying aside the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men—the washing of pitchers and cups,*  
23 *and many other such things you do.”*

24 **He said to them, “All too well you reject the commandment of God, that you may keep your tradition.”** *For*  
25 *Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and, ‘He who curses father or mother, let him be put to*  
26 *death.’ But you say, ‘If a man says to his father or mother, “Whatever profit you might have received from*  
27 *me is Corban”—’ (that is, a gift to God), then you no longer let him do anything for his father or his mother,*  
28 *making the word of God of no effect through your tradition which you have handed down. And many such*  
29 *things you do.”*  
30 *[Mark 7:1-13, Bible, NKJV]*

31 The irony is that under the pretence of being law abiding, the Pharisees in fact were what Jesus called “lawless”.

32 *“Even so you also outwardly appear righteous to men, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.”*  
33 *[Matt. 23:28, Bible, NKJV]*

34 Contemporary Christianity largely misses this important point. They portray as Pharisaical any attempt to quote or enforce  
35 ANY Biblical law and in so doing themselves acquire the same condemnation for “lawlessness” as the Pharisees.

36 *“Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My*  
37 *Father in heaven.*

38 *Many will say to Me in that day, ‘Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your name, cast out demons in Your*  
39 *name, and done many wonders in Your name?’*

40 *And then I will declare to them, ‘**I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness!**’*  
41 *[Matt. 7:21-23, Bible, NKJV]*

42 In modern theology, the “lawlessness” of Christians who insist that the Old Testament has been repealed and that they don’t  
43 have to obey it is called “dispensationalism”, “antinomianism”, “hyper-grace”, and even “anarchism under God’s law  
44 order”. It is an attempt to justify and protect sin and to use “compartmentalization” or even “equivocation” to defend  
45 lawlessness. The “equivocation” happens because they identify the Bible not as a single law book, but two separate books,  
46 Old and New Testament, only one of which is REAL “law” that they must follow. For an interesting discussion of this  
47 subject of lawless corrupted Christianity, refer to the following:

To put the above in a more contemporary context, Jesus is saying to lawyers that they are hypocrites and elitists if they try expand or redefine or misapply any provision of the written law in such a way as to benefit themselves personally at others expense:

**“Their seeking their own worldly gain and honour more than God’s glory put them upon coining false and unwarrantable distinction, with which they led the people into dangerous mistakes, particularly in the matter of oaths; which, as an evidence of a universal sense of religion, have been by all nations accounted sacred (v. 16);** Ye blind guides. Note, 1. It is sad to think how many are under the guidance of such as are themselves blind, who undertake to show others that way which they are themselves willingly ignorant of. His watchmen are blind (Isa. 56:10); and too often the people love to have it so, and say to the seers, See not. But the case is bad, when the leaders of the people cause them to err, Isa. 9:16. 2. Though the condition of those whose guides are blind is very sad, yet that of the blind guides themselves is yet more woeful. Christ denounces a woe to the blind guides that have the blood of so many souls to answer for.”

Now, to prove their blindness, he specifies the matter of swearing, and shows what corrupt casuists they were.

(1.) He lays down the doctrine they taught.

[1.] They allowed swearing by creatures, provided they were consecrated to the service of God, and stood in any special relation to him. They allowed swearing by the temple and the altar, though they were the work of men’s hands, intended to be the servants of God’s honour, not sharers in it. An oath is an appeal to God, to his omniscience and justice; and to make this appeal to any creature is to put that creature in the place of God. See Deu. 6:13.

[2.] They distinguished between an oath by the temple and an oath by the gold of the temple; an oath by the altar and an oath by the gift upon the altar; making the latter binding, but not the former. Here was a double wickedness; First, That there were some oaths which they dispensed with, and made light of, and reckoned a man was not bound by to assert the truth, or perform a promise. They ought not to have sworn by the temple or the altar; but, when they had so sworn, they were taken in the words of their mouth. That doctrine cannot be of the God of truth which gives countenance to the breach of faith in any case whatsoever. Oaths are edge-tools and are not to be jested with. Secondly, That they preferred the gold before the temple, and the gift before the altar, to encourage people to bring gifts to the altar, and gold to the treasures of the temple, which they hoped to be gainers by. Those who had made gold their hope, and whose eyes were blinded by gifts in secret, were great friends to the Corban; and, gain being their godliness, by a thousand artifices they made religion truckle to their worldly interests. Corrupt church-guides make things to be sin or not sin as it serves their purposes, and lay a much greater stress on that which concerns their own gain than on that which is for God’s glory and the good of souls.

(2.) He shows the folly and absurdity of this distinction (v. 17–19); Ye fools, and blind. It was in the way of a necessary reproof, not an angry reproach, that Christ called them fools. Let it suffice us from the word of wisdom to show the folly of sinful opinions and practices: but, for the fastening of the character upon particular persons, leave that to Christ, who knows what is in man, and has forbidden us to say, Thou fool.  
[Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). *Matthew Henry’s commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume* (p. 1734). Peabody: Hendrickson]

Notice that the Pharisees maliciously led people into a pattern of dangerous oaths. In modern times, this refers to the perjury statements on government forms that you should NEVER sign. See:

Christians for a Test Oath, Family Guardian Fellowship  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/ChurchVState/TestOath/contents.htm>

Pastor John Weaver gave an almost whimsical sermon about the Pharisees and hypocrites criticized by Jesus as follows:

How to Enrage Hypocrites and Pharisees, Pastor John Weaver  
<http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?SID=68151428130>

From the above sermon, we can see that the Pharisees were replacing God’s law with “the commandments of men”, and the men who were making those “commandments of men” were the Pharisees themselves instead of God. The “oral traditions” of the Pharisees and Saducees is HOW they expanded upon God’s law word to add their own leaven, as Jesus called it. That leaven was found in the early Mishnah. The Mishnah eventually morphed into what is now the Talmud. The oral tradition of the Jewish rabbis criticized by Jesus is therefore embodied in both the Talmud and its predecessor, the Mishnah:

**Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?**

20 of 68

As Jacob Neusner has explained, the schools of the Pharisees and rabbis were and are holy

"because there men achieve sainthood through study of Torah and imitation of the conduct of the masters. In doing so, they conform to the heavenly paradigm, the Torah believed to have been created by God "in his image," revealed at Sinai, and handed down to their own teachers ... If the masters and disciples obey the divine teaching of Moses, "our rabbi," then their society, the school, replicates on earth the heavenly academy, just as the disciple incarnates the heavenly model of Moses, "our rabbi." The rabbis believe that Moses was (and the Messiah will be) a rabbi, God dons phylacteries, and the heavenly court studies Torah precisely as does the earthly one, even arguing about the same questions. These beliefs today may seem as projections of rabbinical values onto heaven, but the rabbis believe that they themselves are projections of heavenly values onto earth. The rabbis thus conceive that on earth they study Torah just as God, the angels, and Moses, "our rabbi," do in heaven. The heavenly schoolmen are even aware of Babylonian scholastic discussions, so they require a rabbi's information about an aspect of purity taboos.<sup>2</sup>

The commitment to relate religion to daily life through the law has led some (notably, [Saint Paul](#) and [Martin Luther](#)) to infer that the Pharisees were more legalistic than other sects in the Second Temple Era. The authors of the Gospels present Jesus as speaking harshly against some Pharisees (Josephus does claim that the Pharisees were the "strictest" observers of the law, but he likely meant "most accurate"<sup>3</sup>). It is more accurate to say they were legalistic in a different way.

In some cases Pharisaic values led to an extension of the law — for example, the Torah requires priests to bathe themselves before entering the Temple. The Pharisees washed themselves before Sabbath and festival meals (in effect, making these holidays "temples in time"), and, eventually, before all meals. Although this seems burdensome compared to the practices of the Sadducees, in other cases, Pharisaic law was less strict. For example, Jewish law [prohibits Jews from carrying objects](#) from a private domain ("reshut ha-yachid") to a public domain ("reshut ha-rabim") on Sabbath. This law could have prevented Jews from carrying cooked dishes to the homes of friends for Sabbath meals. The Pharisees ruled that adjacent houses connected by lintels or fences could become connected by a legal procedure creating a partnership among homeowners; thereby, clarifying the status of those common areas as a private domain relative to the members of the partnership. In that manner people could carry objects from building to building.

[Wikipedia: Pharisees; Downloaded on 9/30/2016; SOURCE: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pharisees>]

The "sainthood" spoken of above is how the Pharisees elevated themselves ABOVE all others, destroyed equality, and thereby became hypocrites and pagan idols. Such people want their way, not God's way and seek to INJECT their approach into the law through "divine revelation" where THEY and ONLY THEY are the only authorized source of "revelation". Weaver above concludes that Pharisees and hypocrites get angry with those who want God's laws followed.

"They were sworn enemies to the gospel of Christ, and consequently to the salvation of the souls of men (v. 13); They shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, that is, they did all they could to keep people from believing in Christ, and so entering into his kingdom. Christ came to open the kingdom of heaven, that is, to lay open for us a new and living way into it, to bring men to be subjects of that kingdom. Now the scribes and Pharisees, who sat in Moses's seat, and pretended to the key of knowledge, ought to have contributed their assistance herein, by opening those scriptures of the Old Testament which pointed at the Messiah and his kingdom, in their true and proper sense; they that undertook to expound Moses and the prophets should have showed the people how they testified of Christ; that Daniel's weeks were expiring, the sceptre was departed from Judah, and therefore now was the time for the Messiah's appearing. Thus they might have facilitated that great work, and have helped thousands to heaven; but, instead of this, they shut up the kingdom of heaven; they made it their business to press the ceremonial law, which was now in the vanishing, to suppress the prophecies, which were now in the accomplishing, and to beget and nourish up in the minds of the people prejudices against Christ and his doctrine.

1. They would not go in themselves; Have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees, believed on him? Jn. 7:48. No; they were too proud to stoop to his meanness, too formal to be reconciled to his plainness; they did not like a religion which insisted so much on humility, self-denial, contempt of the world, and spiritual worship. Repentance was the door of admission into this kingdom, and nothing could be more disagreeable to the Pharisees, who justified and admired themselves, than to repent, that is, to accuse and abase and abhor themselves; therefore they went not in themselves; but that was not all.

2. They would not suffer them that were entering to go in. It is bad to keep away from Christ ourselves, but it is worse to keep others from him; yet that is commonly the way of hypocrites; they do not love that any should go beyond them in religion, or be better than they. Their not going in themselves was a hindrance to many; for, they having so great an interest in the people, multitudes rejected the gospel only because their leaders did; but, besides that, they opposed both Christ's entertaining of sinners (Lu. 7:39), and sinners'

<sup>2</sup> Neusner, Jacob Invitation to the Talmud: a Teaching Book (1998): 8.

<sup>3</sup> Josephus. The Antiquities of the Jews. pp. 13.5.9.

entertaining of Christ; they perverted his doctrine, confronted his miracles, quarrelled with his disciples, and represented him, and his institutes and economy, to the people in the most disingenuous, disadvantageous manner imaginable; they thundered out their excommunications against those that confessed him, and used all their wit and power to serve their malice against him; and thus they shut up the kingdom of heaven, so that they who would enter into it must suffer violence (ch. 11:12), and press into it (Lu. 16:16), through a crowd of scribes and Pharisees, and all the obstructions and difficulties they could contrive to lay in their way. How well is it for us that our salvation is not entrusted in the hands of any man or company of men in the world! If it were, we should be undone. They that shut out of the church would shut out of heaven if they could; but the malice of men cannot make the promise of God to his chosen of no effect; blessed be God, it cannot.

II. They made religion and the form of godliness a cloak and stalking-horse to their covetous practices and desires, v. 14.

[Commentary on Matt. 23:1-12, Henry, M. (1994). *Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: complete and unabridged in one volume* (p. 1733-1734). Peabody: Hendrickson]

Today, the rulings of corrupt covetous judges are the equivalent of the “oral tradition” of the Pharisees. The only people who our Constitution allows to CREATE law under our system of government is the legislative branch. Judges are NOT supposed to make law, but judicial activism and “legislating from the bench” has, for all intents and purposes, resurrected the legal equivalent of the “oral traditions of the Pharisees”.

“The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve that high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right.”  
[Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)]

A “government of judges” instead of “law” is also called a “kritarchy”. This kritarchy (government of judges) approach is doomed to failure and our copy of the Bible explains why:

The Book of Judges stands in stark contrast to Joshua. In Joshua an obedient people conquered the land through trust in the power of God. *In Judges, however, a disobedient and idolatrous people are defeated time and time again because of their rebellion against God.*

In seven distinct cycles of sin to salvation, Judges shows how Israel had set aside God’s law and in its place substituted “what was right in his own eyes” (21:25). *The recurring result of abandonment from God’s law is corruption from within and oppression from without.* During the nearly four centuries spanned by this book, God raises up military champions to throw off the yoke of bondage and to restore the nation to pure worship. But all too soon the “sin cycle” begins again as the nation’s spiritual temperance grows steadily colder.

...

The Book of Judges could also appropriately be titled “The Book of Failure.”

**Deterioration** (1:1-3:4). Judges begins with short-lived military successes after Joshua’s death, but quickly turns to the repeated failure of all the tribes to drive out their enemies. The people feel the lack of a unified central leader, but the primary reasons for their failure are a lack of faith in God and lack of obedience to Him (2:1-2). Compromise leads to conflict and chaos. Israel does not drive out the inhabitants (1:21, 27, 29, 30); instead of removing the moral cancer [IRS, Federal Reserve?] spread by the inhabitants of Canaan, they contract the disease. The Canaanite gods [money, sex, covetousness] literally become a snare to them (2:3). Judges 2:11-23 is a microcosm of the pattern found in Judges 3-16.

**Deliverance** (3:5-16:31). In verses 3:5 through 16:31 of the Book of Judges, seven apostasies (fallings away from God) are described, seven servitudes, and seven deliverances. *Each of the seven cycles has five steps: sin, servitude, supplication, salvation, and silence. These also can be described by the words rebellion, retribution, repentance, restoration, and rest. The seven cycles connect together as a descending spiral of sin (2:19).* Israel vacillates between obedience and apostasy as the people continually fail to learn from their mistakes. Apostasy grows, but the rebellion is not continual. The times of rest and peace are longer than the times of bondage. The monotony of Israel’s sins can be contrasted with the creativity of God’s methods of deliverance.

**Depravity** (17:1-21:25). Judges 17:1 through 21:25 illustrate (1) religious apostasy (17 and 18) and (2) social and moral depravity (19-21) during the period of the judges. Chapters 19-21 contain one of the worst tales of degradation in the Bible. *Judges closes with a key to understanding the period: “everyone did what was right in his own eyes” (21:25) [a.k.a. “what FEELS good”].* The people are not doing what is wrong in their own eyes, but what is “evil in the sight of the Lord” (2:11).  
[The Open Bible, New King James Version, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Copyright 1997, pp. 340-341]

It is precisely the above type of corruption and “government by judges”, or “government by saints” in the case of the Pharisees, that is the very reason why Jesus got angry at the Pharisees. The Bible further explains why Jesus got angry:

**Unjust Judgments Rebuked.**

*A Psalm of Asaph.*

*God stands in the divine assembly;  
He judges among the gods (divine beings).*

*How long will you judge unjustly  
And show partiality to the wicked? Selah. [stop and think about it]*

*Vindicate the weak and fatherless;  
Do justice and maintain the rights of the afflicted and destitute.*

***Rescue the weak and needy;  
Rescue them from the hand of the wicked.***

***The rulers do not know nor do they understand;  
They walk on in the darkness [of complacent satisfaction];  
All the foundations of the earth [the fundamental principles of the administration of justice] are shaken.***

***I said, “You are gods;  
Indeed, all of you are sons of the Most High.***

***“Nevertheless you will die like men  
And fall like any one of the princes.”***

***Arise, O God, judge the earth!  
For to You belong all the nations.  
[Psalm 82, Bible, Amplified Version]***

Other religions also have this kind of stratification as well, such as The Church of Latter Day Saints (Mormons), who have THREE levels of reward depending on your works: Celestial, Telestial, and Terrestrial. This type of stratification and enfranchisement of any religion is just as dangerous and malicious as that of the Pharisees.

To put the character of the Pharisees in modern context, today’s lawyers abuse word games to keep people from obeying the law as written, instead preferring that they obey laws from a foreign jurisdiction so that the largess produced can pad the pocket and enlarge the importance of lawyers. In short, they misinterpret, misrepresent, and misapply foreign law to people who aren’t subject so as to commit identity theft, and then use the proceeds of the identity theft to pad their pockets. That identity theft is described below:

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

Remedies for government identity theft through the illegal enforcement of franchises are discussed later in section 6.

An entire sermon series has been developed which summarizes the sin of the Pharisees of “redefining the law of God” if you are interested:

Redefining Religion Sermon Series, Newbreak.org  
<http://newbreak.org/resources/messages/redefining-religion/character-redescribed>

### **3. Differences Between the Pharisees and Saducees<sup>4</sup>**

The origin of the two great parties of Pharisees and Sadducees has already been traced.<sup>5</sup> They mark, not sects, but mental directions, such as in their principles are natural and universal, and, indeed, appear in connection with all metaphysical<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Alfred Edersheim, 1883, p. 324.

1 questions. They are the different modes in which the human mind views supersensuous problems, and which afterwards,  
2 when one-sidedly followed out, harden into diverging schools of thought. If Pharisees and Sadducees were not 'sects' in the  
3 sense of separation from the unity of the Jewish ecclesiastical community, neither were theirs 'heresies' in the conventional,  
4 but only in the original sense of tendency, direction, or, at most, views, differing from those commonly entertained.<sup>7</sup> Our  
5 sources of information here are: the New Testament, Josephus, and Rabbinic writings. The New Testament only marks, in  
6 broad outlines and popularly, the peculiarities of each party; but from the absence of bias it may safely be regarded<sup>8</sup> as the  
7 most trustworthy authority on the matter. The inferences which we derive from the statements of Josephus,<sup>9</sup> though always  
8 to be qualified by our general estimate of his *animus*,<sup>10</sup> accord with those from the New Testament. In regard to Rabbinic  
9 writings, we have to bear in mind the admittedly unhistorical character of most of their notices, the strong party-bias which  
10 coloured almost all their statements regarding opponents, and their constant tendency to trace later views and practices to  
11 earlier times.

12 Without entering on the principles and supposed practices of 'the fraternity' or 'association' (*Chebher*, *Chabhurah*,  
13 *Chabhurta*) of Pharisees, which was comparatively small, numbering only about 6,000 members,<sup>11</sup> the following particulars  
14 may be of interest. The object of the association was twofold: to observe in the strictest manner, and according to traditional  
15 law, all the ordinances concerning Levitical purity, and to be extremely punctilious in all connected with religious dues  
16 (tithes and all other dues). A person might undertake only the second, without the first of these obligations. In that case he  
17 was simply a *Neeman*, an 'accredited one' with whom one might enter freely into commerce, as he was supposed to have  
18 paid all dues. But a person could not undertake the vow of Levitical purity without also taking the obligation of all religious  
19 dues. If he undertook both vows he was a *Chabher*, or associate. Here there were four degrees, marking an ascending scale  
20 of Levitical purity, or separation from all that was profane.<sup>12</sup> In opposition to these was the *Am ha-arets*, or 'country  
21 people' (the people which knew not, or cared not for the Law, and were regarded as 'cursed'). But it must not be thought  
22 that every *Chabher* was either a learned Scribe, or that every Scribe was a *Chabher*. On the contrary, as a man might be a  
23 *Chabher* without being either a Scribe or an elder,<sup>13</sup> so there must have been sages, and even teachers, who did not belong  
24 to the association, since special rules are laid down for the reception of such.<sup>14</sup> Candidates had to be formally admitted into  
25 the 'fraternity' in the presence of three members. But every accredited public 'teacher' was, unless anything was known to  
26 the contrary, supposed to have taken upon him the obligations referred to.<sup>15</sup> The family of a *Chabher* belonged, as a matter  
27 of course, to the community;<sup>16</sup> but this ordinance was afterwards altered.<sup>17</sup> The *Neeman* undertook these four obligations: to  
28 tithe what he ate, what he sold, and what he bought, and not to be a guest with an *Am ha-arets*.<sup>18</sup> The full *Chabher*  
29 undertook not to sell to an 'Am ha-arets' any fluid or dry substance (nutriment or fruit), not to buy from him any such fluid,  
30 not to be a guest with him, not to entertain him as a guest in his own clothes (on account of their possible impurity) - to  
31 which one authority adds other particulars, which, however, were not recognised by the Rabbis generally as of primary  
32 importance.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Comp. Book I. ch. viii.

<sup>6</sup> I use the term metaphysical here in the sense of all that is above the natural, not merely the speculative, but the supersensuous generally.

<sup>7</sup> The word αἵρεσις has received its present meaning chiefly from the adjective attaching to it in 2 Pet. ii. 1. In Acts xxiv. 5, 14, xxviii. 22, it is vituperatively applied to Christians; in 1 Cor. xi. 19, Gal. v. 20, it seems to apply to diverging practices of a sinful kind; in Titus iii. 10, the 'heretic' seems one who held or taught diverging opinions or practices. Besides, it occurs in the N.T. once to mark the Sadducees, and twice the Pharisees (Acts v. 17; xv. 5, and xxvi. 5).

<sup>8</sup> I mean on historical, not theological grounds.

<sup>9</sup> I here refer to the following passages: Jewish War ii. 8. 14; Ant. xiii. 5. 9; 10. 5, 6; xvii. 2. 4; xviii. 1, 2, 3, 4.

<sup>10</sup> For a full discussion of the character and writings of Josephus, I would refer to the article in Dr. *Smith's* Dict. of Chr. Biogr. vol. iii.

<sup>11</sup> Jos. Ant. xvii. 2. 4.

<sup>12</sup> Chag. ii. 5, 7; comp. Tohor. vii. 5.

<sup>13</sup> For ex. Kidd. 33 b.

<sup>14</sup> Bekh. 30.

<sup>15</sup> Abba Saul would also have freed all students from that formality.

<sup>16</sup> Bekhor. 30.

<sup>17</sup> Comp. the suggestion as to the significant time when this alteration was introduced, in 'Sketches of Jewish Social Life,' pp. 228, 229.

<sup>18</sup> Dem. ii. 2.

<sup>19</sup> Demai ii. 3.

1 These two great obligations of the 'official' Pharisee, or 'Associate' are pointedly referred to by Christ - both that in regard  
2 to *tithing* (the vow of the *Neeman*);<sup>20</sup> and that in regard to Levitical purity (the special vow of the *Chabher*).<sup>21</sup> In both cases  
3 they are associated with a want of corresponding inward reality, and with hypocrisy. These charges cannot have come upon  
4 the people by surprise, and they may account for the circumstance that so many of the learned kept aloof from the  
5 'Association' as such. Indeed, the sayings of some of the Rabbis in regard to Pharisaism and the professional Pharisee are  
6 more withering than any in the New Testament. It is not necessary here to repeat the well-known description, both in the  
7 Jerusalem and the Babylon Talmud, of the seven kinds of 'Pharisees,' of whom six (the 'Shechemite,' the 'stumbling,' the  
8 'bleeding,' the 'mortar,' the 'I want to know what is incumbent on me,' and 'the Pharisee from fear') mark various kinds of  
9 unreality, and only one is 'the Pharisee from love.'<sup>22</sup> Such an expression as 'the plague of Pharisaism' is not uncommon;  
10 and a silly pietist, a clever sinner, and a female Pharisee, are ranked among 'the troubles of life.'<sup>23</sup> 'Shall we then explain a  
11 verse according to the opinions of the Pharisees?' asks a Rabbi, in supreme contempt for the arrogance of the fraternity.<sup>24</sup>  
12 'It is as a tradition among the Pharisees<sup>25</sup> to torment themselves in this world, and yet they will gain nothing by it in the  
13 next.' The Sadducees had some reason for the taunt, that 'the Pharisees would by-and-by subject the globe of the sun itself  
14 to their purifications,'<sup>26</sup> the more so that their assertions of purity were sometimes conjoined with Epicurean maxims,  
15 betokening a very different state of mind, such as, 'Make haste to eat and drink, for the world which we quit resembles a  
16 wedding feast;' or this: 'My son, if thou possess anything, enjoy thyself, for there is no pleasure in Hades,<sup>27</sup> and death  
17 grants no respite. But if thou sayest, What then would I leave to my sons and daughters? Who will thank thee for this  
18 appointment in Hades?' Maxims these to which, alas! too many of their recorded stories and deeds form a painful  
19 commentary.<sup>28</sup>

20 But it would be grossly unjust to identify Pharisaism, as a religious direction, with such embodiments of it or even with the  
21 official 'fraternity.' While it may be granted that the tendency and logical sequence of their views and practices were such,  
22 their system, as opposed to Sadduceeism, had very serious bearings: dogmatic, ritual, and legal. It is, however, erroneous to  
23 suppose, either that their system represented traditionalism itself, or that Scribes and Pharisees are convertible terms,<sup>29</sup>  
24 while the Sadducees represented the civil and political element. The Pharisees represented only the prevailing system of,  
25 not traditionalism itself; while the Sadducees also numbered among them many learned men. They were able to enter into  
26 controversy, often protracted and fierce, with their opponents, and they acted as members of the Sanhedrin, although they  
27 had diverging traditions of their own, and even, as it would appear, at one time a complete code of canon-law.<sup>30 31</sup>  
28 Moreover, the admitted fact, that when in office the Sadducees conformed to the principles and practices of the Pharisees,  
29 proves at least that they must have been acquainted with the ordinances of traditionalism.<sup>32</sup> Lastly, there were certain  
30 traditional ordinances on which both parties were at one.<sup>33</sup> Thus it seems Sadduceeism was in a sense rather a speculative  
31 than a practical system, starting from simple and well-defined principles, but wide-reaching in its possible consequences.  
32 Perhaps it may best be described as a general reaction against the extremes of Pharisaism, springing from moderate and  
33 rationalistic tendencies; intended to secure a footing within the recognised bounds of Judaism; and seeking to defend its  
34 principles by a strict literalism of interpretation and application. If so, these interpretations would be intended rather for

<sup>20</sup> In St. Luke xi.42; xviii. 12; St. Matt. xxiii. 23.

<sup>21</sup> In St. Luke xi. 39, 41; St. Matt. xxiii. 25, 26.

<sup>22</sup> Sot. 22 b; Jer. Ber. ix. 7.

<sup>23</sup> Sot. iii. 4.

<sup>24</sup> Pes. 70 b.

<sup>25</sup> Abhoth de R. Nathan 5.

<sup>26</sup> Jer. Chag. 79 d; Tos. Chag. iii.

<sup>27</sup> Erub. 54 a. I give the latter clause, not as in our edition of the Talmud, but according to a more correct reading (*Levy, Neuhebr. Wörterb.* vol. ii. p. 102).

<sup>28</sup> It could serve no good purpose to give instances. They are readily accessible to those who have taste or curiosity in that direction.

<sup>29</sup> So, erroneously, *Wellhausen*, in his treatise 'Pharisäer u. Sadduc.'; and partially, as it seems to me, even *Schürer* (*Neutest. Zeitgesch.*). In other respects also these two learned men seem too much under the influence of *Geiger* and *Kuenen*.

<sup>30</sup> Megill. Taan. Per. iv. ed. Warsh. p. 8 a.

<sup>31</sup> *Wellhausen* has carried his criticisms and doubts of the Hebrew *Scholion* on the Megill. Taan. (or 'Roll of Fasts') too far.

<sup>32</sup> Even such a book as the Meg. Taan. does not accuse them of absolute ignorance, but only of being unable to prove their *dicta* from Scripture (comp. Pereq x. p. 15 b, which may well mark the extreme of Anti-Sadduceeism).

<sup>33</sup> Sanh. 33 t Horay 4 a.

1 defensive than offensive purposes, and the great aim of the party would be after rational freedom - or, it might be, free  
2 rationality. Practically, the party would, of course, tend in broad, and often grossly unorthodox, directions.

3 The fundamental *dogmatic* differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees concerned: the rule of faith and practice; the  
4 'after death;' the existence of angels and spirits; and free will and pre-destination. In regard to the first of these points, it has  
5 already been stated that the Sadducees did not lay down the principle of absolute rejection of all traditions as such, but that  
6 they were opposed to traditionalism as represented and carried out by the Pharisees. When put down by sheer weight of  
7 authority, they would probably carry the controversy further, and retort on their opponents by an appeal to Scripture as  
8 against their traditions, perhaps ultimately even by an attack on traditionalism; but always as represented by the  
9 Pharisees.<sup>34</sup><sup>83</sup> A careful examination of the statements of Josephus on this subject will show that they convey no more than  
10 this.<sup>35</sup><sup>84</sup> The Pharisaic view of this aspect of the controversy appears, perhaps, most satisfactorily because indirectly, in  
11 certain sayings of the Mishnah, which attribute all national calamities to those persons, whom they adjudge to eternal  
12 perdition, who interpret Scripture 'not as does the *Halakhah*,' or established Pharisaic rule.<sup>36</sup> In this respect, then, the  
13 commonly received idea concerning the Pharisees and Sadducees will require to be seriously modified. As regards the  
14 *practice* of the Pharisees, as distinguished from that of the Sadducees, we may safely treat the statements of Josephus as the  
15 exaggerated representations of a partisan, who wishes to place his party in the best light. It is, indeed, true that the  
16 Pharisees, 'interpreting the legal ordinances with rigour,'<sup>37</sup> <sup>38</sup> imposed on themselves the necessity of much self-denial,  
17 especially in regard to food,<sup>39</sup><sup>88</sup> but that their practice was under the guidance of *reason*, as Josephus asserts, is one of those  
18 bold mis-statements with which he has too often to be credited. His vindication of their special reverence for age and  
19 authority<sup>40</sup><sup>89</sup> must refer to the honours paid by the party to 'the Elders,' not to the old. And that there was sufficient ground  
20 for Sadducean opposition to Pharisaic traditionalism, alike in principle and in practice, will appear from the following  
21 quotation, to which we add, by way of explanation, that the wearing of phylacteries was deemed by that party of Scriptural  
22 obligation, and that the phylactery for the head was to consist (according to tradition) of four compartments. 'Against the  
23 words of the Scribes is more punishable than against the words of Scripture. He who says, No phylacteries, so as to  
24 transgress the words of Scripture, is not guilty (free); five compartments - to add to the words of the Scribes - he is guilty.'<sup>41</sup>  
25 <sup>42</sup>

26 The second doctrinal difference between Pharisees and Sadducees concerned the 'after death.' According to the New  
27 Testament,<sup>43</sup> the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, while Josephus, going further, imputes to them denial of  
28 reward or punishment after death,<sup>44</sup> and even the doctrine that the soul perishes with the body.<sup>45</sup> The latter statement may be  
29 dismissed as among those inferences which theological controversialists are too fond of imputing to their opponents. This is  
30 fully borne out by the account of a later work,<sup>46</sup> to the effect, that by successive misunderstandings of the saying of  
31 Antigonus of Socho, that men were to serve God without regard to reward, his *later* pupils had arrived at the inference that  
32 there was no other world - which, however, *might* only refer to the Pharisaic ideal of 'the world to come,' not to the denial

<sup>34</sup> Some traditional explanation of the Law of Moses was absolutely necessary, if it was to be applied to existing circumstances. It would be a great historical inaccuracy to imagine that the Sadducees rejected the whole *παρ.δοσιν* *ν* *πρεσβυτ.ρων* (St. [Matt. xv. 2](#)) from Ezra downwards.

<sup>35</sup> This is the meaning of Ant. xiii. 10. 6, and clearly implied in xviii. 1,3,4, and War ii. 8. 14.

<sup>36</sup> Ab. iii. 11; v 8.

<sup>37</sup> Jos. War i. 5. 2.

<sup>38</sup> M. *Derenbourg* (Hist. de la Palest., p. 122, note) rightly remarks, that the Rabbinic equivalent for Josephus' *κρηβεια* is {hebrew}, heaviness, and that the Pharisees were the {hebrew} or 'makers heavy.' What a commentary this on the charge of Jesus about 'the heavy burdens' of the Pharisees! St. Paul uses the same term as Josephus to describe the Pharisaic system, where our A.V. renders 'the perfect manner' ([Acts xxii. 3](#)). Comp. also [Acts xxvi. 5](#): *κατ' τὴν κρηβεστικὴν ἀρεσιν*.

<sup>39</sup> Ant. xviii. 1. 3.

<sup>40</sup> Ant. xviii. 1. 3.

<sup>41</sup> Sanh. xi. 3.

<sup>42</sup> The subject is discussed at length in Jer. Ber. i. 7 (p. 3 *b*), where the superiority of the Scribe over the Prophet is shown (1) from [Mic. ii. 6](#) (without the words in *italics*), the one class being *the Prophets* ('prophesy not'), the other the Scribes ('prophesy'); (2) from the fact that the Prophets needed the attestation of miracles. (Duet. xiii. 2), but not the Scribes ([Deut. xvii. 11](#)).

<sup>43</sup> St. [Matt xxii. 23](#), and parallel passages; [Acts iv. 1, 2](#); xxiii. 8.

<sup>44</sup> War ii. 8. 14.

<sup>45</sup> Ant. xviii 1. 4.

<sup>46</sup> Ab. d. R. Nath.5.

1 of the immortality of the soul - and no resurrection of the dead. We may therefore credit Josephus with merely reporting the  
2 common inference of his party. But it is otherwise in regard to their denial of the resurrection of the dead. Not only  
3 Josephus, but the New Testament and Rabbinic writings attest this. The Mishnah expressly states<sup>47</sup> that the formula 'from  
4 age to age,' or rather 'from world to world,' had been introduced as a protest against the opposite theory; while the Talmud,  
5 which records disputations between Gamaliel and the Sadducees<sup>48</sup> on the subject of the resurrection, expressly imputes the  
6 denial of this doctrine to the 'Scribes of the Sadducees.' In fairness it is perhaps only right to add that, in the discussion, the  
7 Sadducees seem only to have actually denied that there was proof for this doctrine in the Pentateuch, and that they  
8 ultimately professed themselves convinced by the reasoning of Gamaliel.<sup>49</sup> Still the concurrent testimony of the New  
9 Testament and of Josephus leaves no doubt, that in this instance their views had not been misrepresented. Whether or not  
10 their opposition to the doctrine of the Resurrection arose in the first instance from, or was prompted by, Rationalistic views,  
11 which they endeavoured to support by an appeal to the letter of the Pentateuch, as the source of traditionalism, it deserves  
12 notice that in His controversy with the Sadducees Christ appealed to the Pentateuch in proof of His teaching.<sup>50</sup>

## 13 **4. Antinomian Christians**

14 Antinomian Christians are the opposite of the Pharisees. They are all grace and no or little law. The following subsections  
15 describe them, the consequences of their philosophy, and how to help them. The following video summarizes their  
16 problem:

*Why "Faith Alone" Salvation is Wrong (From a Protestant)*, LizzieAnswers  
<https://sedm.org/why-faith-alone-salvation-is-wrong-from-a-protestant/>

### 17 **4.1 The Problem of Hyper-Grace**<sup>51</sup>

18 *"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?"*  
19 *[Romans 6:1, Bible]*

20 *"What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid."*  
21 *[Roman 6:15, Bible]*

22 The principle truth of the gospel is that it not only saves the believer from the penalty of sin, but the power of sin. These  
23 two sides of the gospel gold bullion are affectionately called justification and sanctification.

24 But, there is a movement afoot called hyper-grace which merges the principles of justification and sanctification together.  
25 Such a blend ends up twisting the gospel which then leads to an imbalance in Christian life.

#### 26 **General Characteristic of Hyper-grace:**

#### 27 **Our text above mentions abuses of grace.**

28 But, let's not confuse hyper-grace with amazing grace. Amazing grace that saves a wretch like me is the heart-throb of  
29 every believer. We need grace to repent, to be saved, and to take up our cross to follow Christ. We are utterly dependent on

---

<sup>47</sup> Ber ix. 5.

<sup>48</sup> This is admitted even by *Geiger* (Urschr. u. Uebers. p. 130, note), though in the passage above referred to he would emendate: 'Scribes of the Samaritans.' The passage, however, implies that these were *Sadducean Scribes*, and that they were both willing and able to enter into theological controversy with their opponents.

<sup>49</sup> Rabbi Gamaliel's proof was taken from *Deut. i. 8*: 'Which Jehovah sware unto your fathers to give unto them.' It is not said 'unto you,' but unto '*them*,' which implies the resurrection of the dead. The argument is kindred in character, but far inferior in solemnity and weight, to that employed by our Lord, *St. Matt. xxii. 32*, from which it is evidently taken. (See book v. ch. iv., the remarks on that passage.)

<sup>50</sup> It is a curious circumstance in connection with the question of the Sadducees, that it raised another point in controversy between the Pharisees and the 'Samaritans,' or, as I would read it, the Sadducees, since 'the Samaritans' (Sadducees?) only allowed marriage with the *betroted*, not the actually *wedded* wife of a deceased childless brother (*Jer Yebam. i. 6, p. 3 a*). The Sadducees in the Gospel argue on the Pharisaic theory, apparently for the twofold object of casting ridicule on the doctrine of the Resurrection, and on the Pharisaic practice of marriage with the *espoused* wife of a deceased brother.

<sup>51</sup> Source: *Antinomian Christians: The Problem of Hyper-Grace*, Brook Stockton; <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-problem-of-hyper-grace/>.

1 grace for salvation and for sanctification. Grace is our victory shout and we do not want anything to damper one's zeal for  
2 grace. Our concern is not with true, Biblical doctrines of grace, but with its perversions. Hyper-grace is difficult to  
3 recognize because there are tinges of truth in what they teach.

4 *For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly*  
5 *men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus*  
6 *Christ.*  
7 *[Jude 1:4, Bible]*

8 Note the word "turning." As wonderful as grace is, it is possible to twist, transpose, turn the doctrine into justifying  
9 "lasciviousness," an old English word for stirring up sensuality, sexual desires, and lust.

10 Note the key truth denied by the hyper-grace teachers. They "**deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.**" The  
11 fact that dispensation grace teachers oppose Lordship salvation ought to raise an alarm here. They deny him by exalting  
12 faith and by denigrating His authority, sovereignty, supremacy, and dominion. Kings command; and, subjects are required  
13 to obey. Obedience is not an option. Regardless, of how you feel on a certain day, kings require obedience. And, it is not  
14 legalistic for them to do so.

15 The gospel is catapulted through the known world not by teaching sugar-plum concepts of love, but by proclaiming another  
16 king to whom all are responsible to submit (Acts 17:1-7). That King Jesus had arrived in history to take dominion shook the  
17 pillars of Caesar's palace.

#### 18 **Hyper-grace people confuse justification with sanctification.**

19 It is true that justification is by faith alone! But, sanctification requires faith plus works, the work of the Spirit plus our  
20 consent. There is no work that can add to justification, a status in God's court, but sanctification, the process of becoming  
21 Christ-like, is another matter. Sanctification requires divine aide and human responsibility.

22 The bottom line is this: Hyper-grace contains teachings that justifies sin without justifying the sinner; that advocates  
23 freedom without responsibility; that assures membership in the family of God without chore charts; that offers eternal  
24 security without separation from sin; that highlights justification by faith without justification by works; that talks about  
25 love without law; that pitches fire insurance without repentance from sin; that promises entrance into the kingdom without  
26 acknowledging Christ as Lord; that propounds citizenship in the kingdom without submission to the King; and, that  
27 guarantees glory without a cross.

#### 28 **Hyper-grace is grace on steroids, uppers, and emotional stimulants.**

29 It is the belief that God requires nothing from the man to be saved—not even repentance. It contains euphemisms hostile to  
30 repentance and the Lordship of Christ.

31 Because hyper-grace preachers confuse justification and sanctification hyper-grace is resistant to the pursuit of holiness,  
32 confession of sins, the Kingship of Christ, the kingdom of God, obedience to law, and justification by works. In the mind of  
33 hyper-grace adherents actions springing obligation must be replaced with love. To these people, God forbid any of us  
34 should do anything for God out of duty without feeling good about it. Anything but an emotional, touchy-feely love is seen  
35 as legalistic, harsh, strict, intolerant, mean, severe, tough, stuffy, ultra-conservative, puritanical and draconian. Pleasing  
36 God smacks with performance-based theologies and must be replaced by doctrines of non-obligatory feelings springing  
37 from who God says you are.

#### 38 **The hyper-grace movement express hostility towards Lordship, sin, holiness, and the fear of God.**

39 Terms like "ought," "should," and "must" are mowed down like weeds. Concepts of law, duty, and obedience are branded  
40 as "legalistic." Motivations like, "nevertheless at **thy word** I will let down the net," are frowned upon and replaced with  
41 mushy concepts of love and trust.

#### 42 **The hyper-grace movement is antinomian to the core.**

1 It is true there is no law that a man has to keep in order to be justified excepting the law of faith. But, it is not possible to be  
2 sanctified without law because law defines love (1 John 5:1-3).

3 David could say, “Oh, how I love Thy law,” but hyper-grace adherents cannot. The movement pits law against grace  
4 implying that there is no room for law in the Christian life or society.

5 Consequently, these people tend to be antinomian fearing any kind of law that is binding upon them. Emotional love and  
6 good-feelings replace “Thou shall,” and “Thou shall not.” Radical permissiveness and love replace the doctrine of “law and  
7 order.” Love, not law, is the cure for all that ails mankind.

8 **The hyper-grace movement has nothing to offer society except ooey-goovey love.**

9 The movement cannot say with the Pilgrims we are here for “the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith.”  
10 Their pastors are reluctant to take a public stand against abortion, Sodomy, or immigration. They offer no law, no absolutes,  
11 and no rebukes to society.

12 Hyper-grace people would never do what John the Baptist did saying to King Herod, “It is not lawful for you to have your  
13 brother’s wife.” Rather, they are more prone to psychoanalyze Herod to discover his inner wounded child and why he felt  
14 like giving the order to have John beheaded.

15 Hyper-grace people are more likely to see a social problem like the riots in Ferguson or Baltimore as a lack of “self-  
16 esteem,” or “love,” than acts of terrorism, arson, vandalism, theft, and thuggery worthy of punishment. To them love is the  
17 answer to all things. God forbid the strong arm of justice should fall on these criminals.

18 Generally speaking these people believe in private religion, not public religion; in personal pietism, not public  
19 responsibility; in tolerance rather than rugged, personal toughness.

20 **The hyper-grace movement expresses hostility towards seeking to please God.**

21 You will hear in these circles things like “Pleasing God is a good desire. It just can’t be our primary motivation or it will  
22 imprison our hearts” or “pleasing God is not a means to godliness. It is the fruit of godliness, for it’s the fruit of trust” (the  
23 Cure); or “Jesus never asks us to perform to experience his freedom.”

24 The problem here is not that there is not some truth in these statements, but that the movement often sets up false  
25 dichotomies pitting law against grace, or obedience against grace, or the desire to please God against grace. Paul does not  
26 denigrate a desire to please God as some kind of grace deformity. The desire to please God is a doctrine of grace (1  
27 Thessalonians 4:1).

28 It is good for a heart to be strengthened by grace, but its misuse can end up justifying sin and not the sinner.

29 **4.2 How to Help Hyper-Grace Enthusiasts<sup>52</sup>**

30 **Don’t despise grace.**

31 The grace of God is our joy, our crown, and our means of triumph. Grace is the answer to our guilt and by it our sins are  
32 removed. We are only concerned about the abuse of grace or extremes of grace.

33 People in this movement do not see themselves as victims of hyper-grace teachings. You will have to listen carefully, and  
34 only contest extreme, unbiblical statements.

35 **Expose their narrow, limited focus.**

---

<sup>52</sup> Source: *How to Help Hyper-Grace Enthusiasts*, Brook Stockton; <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/how-to-help-hyper-grace-enthusiastes/>.

1 Hyper-grace people put on their grace glasses and interpret everything in light of their system. We must force them to  
2 exegete passages in the context and not to lift verses out of context to provide proof of claim.

3 Avoid jumping all over the Bible. Stay in a passage and look at the context. What does the passage say? What are the  
4 limitations of the passage? Does the interpretation fit into the whole of Scripture?

5 **Don't permit enthusiasts to confuse sanctification with justification.**

6 Justification is by faith alone without works, but sanctification is by faith plus works. God justifies the sinner based on the  
7 substitutionary work of Christ on behalf of the believer; but, there is nothing substitutionary about the Spirit's work in the  
8 process of sanctification.

9 While it may be true that salvation means "to let go, and trust God," there is no such thing as "to let go, let God" in the  
10 work of sanctification. Sanctification is not substitutionary.

- 11 • Justification saves the sinner from judgment, but sanctification saves the sinner from the power of sin.
- 12 • Justification is essential for salvation; sanctification is essential for holiness. The former grants a man new status before  
13 God; the latter changes the man and beautifies him before men.
- 14 • Justification changes a man's status before God, but sanctification changes the man to be God-like; and, being God-  
15 like requires man's willful, obedient co-operation.
- 16 • Justification is not personally earned. It is a gift. Sanctification is not a gift. It requires personal decision, effort, and  
17 assistant grace from God (Romans 3:21-5:11; 1 Peter 1:14; 5:5).
- 18 • There is no command to "be born again," or "to be justified." These are gifts of God. But, there are commands to "be  
19 holy as he is holy" which requires obedience.
- 20 • Justification is painless; but sanctification is painfully hard. While salvation is a free gift of God, sanctification requires  
21 work, decision, sacrifice, character, determination, obedience, and taking up the cross to follow Christ (Romans 6:23; 1  
22 Peter 1:18-20).
- 23 • There is no requirement for the believer to obey the law to become God's child; but, there are many commands to obey  
24 the law as God's obedient children (Romans 8:4; Romans 13:8; 1 Peter 1:2; 1 Corinthians 14:34)

25 **Don't allow preachers to pit law against grace.**

26 The opposite of law is not grace, but lawlessness; the opposite of grace is not law but human merit. While a man is not  
27 saved by law keeping, he certainly is saved and empowered by God to keep His law (Romans 8:4). The failure to see  
28 commands as law is the product of more than a little evil. Commands are not optional. They are not good suggestions. They  
29 are legal requirements and household rules to be kept and not ignored.

30 Jesus came to exonerate the law, not destroy it. The conflict in His ministry was not law verses grace, but law versus the  
31 traditions of Judaism (Matthew 5:17; 15:1ff). Paul pit Judaism and their works of law against justification by faith, but not  
32 grace against moral law. Any seeming tension between grace and law in Paul's writings must be seen in light of Judaism  
33 (Galatians 1:13). James pits justification by faith against justification by works, but not grace against law. If law is not  
34 important, there would be no need for Christ to die for our sins; and, if there was no grace, there would be no Savior. To  
35 say I believe in grace by not law is like saying I believe in north but not south.

36 **Don't permit false dichotomies.**

37 One hyper-grace author contrast "pleasing God with trusting God;" that is, in order to gain victory over sin, one must  
38 switch his attitude of trying to please God (performance), to trusting God for how He sees you in Christ (acceptance). Yes,  
39 we should believe God about our union with Christ, but seeking to please God is not opposed to grace. Those impacted by  
40 grace are motivated to please Him . . . not to be saved in the court of Almighty God, but to please their new heavenly  
41 Father.

42 Take the phrase, "Ye received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God." Notice that 1 Thessalonians begins with  
43 "grace be to you" (1:1); that is, the commands in Pauline epistles are not disassociated from grace—they express the  
44 obligations of one who has experience the love of God. Second, notice the verb "ought." A demand is being place on the

1 grace community in Thessalonica. This is not an option. It is a duty of the redeemed. If one is not motivated to please God,  
2 others have a right to question their salvation.

3 **Emphasize the kingdom of God more.**

4 John, Christ, Peter, and Paul preached the gospel of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God is not “pie in the sky when  
5 you die, but about the rule of God, the law of God, and the blessedness of being in the kingdom. The gospel is not about  
6 going to heaven when you die, but about entering the kingdom of God. The apostles did not sell “fire insurance,” they  
7 preached King Jesus, the need to repent, and to surrender to the authority of Christ.

8 How is one saved in Matthew—the kingdom gospel? There is no command to believe, but there are plenty of commands  
9 having to do with accepting His authority and submitting to it in order to enter the kingdom. Take for example, “Take my  
10 yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls” (11:29). How do  
11 people find rest for their souls? Ans: By acknowledging that Christ is Lord and King; by changing one’s government and  
12 allowing Him to have control of your life.

13 When we pray, “Thy kingdom come,” we are not asking for some alleged millennial kingdom to appear, but that men  
14 would surrender to His rule, His authority, His law, and His will now!

15 **Do not permit doctrines of love to be turned into an emotional, touchy-feely love fest.**

16 One of the reasons hyper-grace is so effective is because we live in a feel-good society. Every experience is evaluated on  
17 whether you feel good or bad about a thing. Who evaluates good as to whether the experience conforms to Scripture?  
18 Thus, hyper-grace preachers perform in an emotional theater among people in touch with their own feelings. And,  
19 preachers who pull at the heart strings produce happy tunes.

20 Love is good, but it must be defined and guided. That guide is God’s law. The law defines love. When men keep God’s  
21 commandments, they fulfill the law of love (See Romans 13:8; 1 John 5:1-3).

22 Emotions are important, but not as important as action. If love is defined as some kind of happy feeling instead of an action  
23 in conformity to law, then hyper-grace therapist can have a field day fondling people’s emotions. If ethics is no longer  
24 defined by works in conformity to law but by reflections on sensations, then we might as well follow the advice of Obi-  
25 Wan Kenobi to Luke Skywalker, “Follow your feelings.”

26 **Help hyper-grace people to enlarge their understanding of Scripture.**

27 The Bible must be interpreted historically, geographically, politically, legally, prophetically, theologically, and not just  
28 salvically. It is about creation, law, covenants, relationship, politics, courage, war, character, Israel, the church, the kingdom  
29 of God and a host of other subjects.

30 This is never more true than the events on Mt. Sinai and the giving of the law. While it is true the law was not given to save  
31 men, *it was given to produce a civil society!* Salvation is not the issue on every page of holy writ. The reason God gave the  
32 Ten Commandments was to produce law and order. The law defines right and wrong, good and evil, righteousness and  
33 unrighteousness, morality and immorality. Every law had the power of force, and the possibility of law enforcement  
34 produced fear in men. Fear led to self-restraint; and self-restraint led to security and freedom in the community.

35 Hyper-grace people do not understand the law was given for the civil order of Israel. When individuals keep the law,  
36 society is free and safe. When they do not, chaos and crime rule the community. Law did not save and cannot save a nation,  
37 but when properly applied it can cull evil men from among us. Moreover, if God’s law is not the standard for our  
38 government, what is?

39 The purpose of law is to cleanse society of the criminal element. And, this is good. The purpose of the gospel is to save the  
40 sinner. A society needs civil government to punish criminals, and it needs gospel preaching to save sinners. Both the  
41 institution of government and the institution of the church are instruments of God. One administers justice, the other mercy.  
42 One focuses on executing the law; the latter focuses in on the care of souls. Both are necessary.

### 4.3 Questions for Christians who claim the Old Testament Law doesn't apply to them<sup>53</sup>

In the introduction we identified two groups that are corrupting the application of God's word in different ways: Pharisees and Antinomian Christians. Section 2 showed how the Pharisees corrupted God's word. This section is provided as a rhetorical device for Antinomian Christians who believe that the Old Testament is not law for them. By helping them resolve this issue, they will maximize the blessings and minimize the curses IN THEIR CASE that are described in Deuteronomy 28.

Christianity is NOT one dimensional. Grace and salvation are not the ONLY foundation of Christianity. Salvation brings justification, but there is still a need for law and sanctification. Sanctification is achieved ONLY by obeying God's law and separating oneself from a corrupted world by making God's laws OUR laws:

*"Pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father is this: to visit orphans and widows in their trouble, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world."*  
[James 1:27, Bible, NKJV]

Without law, there is anarchy and lawlessness. Law is how God protects us. He can't be our King UNLESS He protects us.

*Jesus - King Of All Kings - That's MY King!*-Youtube  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YRib3BGVZ84>

God's law requires that he is our ONLY civil protector, meaning that our civil domicile is in the Kingdom of Heaven and no place on Earth.<sup>54</sup> As we said in the previous section, the essence of what it means to be a Christian is someone who regards the Bible as a LAW BOOK that applies personally to them. Similarly, for those who are not Christians, the essence of being a follower of any faith is a conviction that the book upon which their faith is based is a law book. Any other approach corrupts the purposes of religion and promotes anarchy and lawlessness.<sup>55</sup>

For those die hard dispensationalist and antinomian Christians who hypocritically believe that Old Testament law doesn't apply to them, please answer the following questions:

1. Where specifically in the Bible does it EXPRESSLY say that any part of the Bible has been repealed or rendered ineffectual in any way?
2. Isn't it a SERIOUS SIN to PRESUME what the scripture says or to add our own misinterpretation to it if we can't find your approach to theology in scripture?

*"But the person who does anything presumptuously, whether he is native-born or a stranger, that one brings reproach on the LORD, and he shall be cut off from among his people."*  
[Numbers 15:30, Bible, NKJV]

*"For let not that man suppose [presume] that he will receive anything from the Lord; he is a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways."*  
[James 1:7-8, Bible, NKJV]

3. What is your definition of being a "Christian" if it ISN'T "someone who regards the Bible as a law book"?
4. How can the Lord be "our Lawgiver" or "King" or "Judge" if the Bible ISN'T a "law book"?

*"For the LORD is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will save [and protect] us."*  
[Isaiah 33:22, Bible, NKJV]

*"For God is the King of all the earth. Sing praises with understanding."*  
[Psalm 47:7, Bible, NKJV]

<sup>53</sup> Source: *Laws of the Bible*, Form #13.001, Section 2.6; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

<sup>54</sup> See: *Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent*, Form #05.002; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

<sup>55</sup> For a description of the corruption that results from NOT approaching the Bible as a law book, read: *Policy Document: Corruption Within Modern Christianity*, Form #08.012; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

- 1 5. If the wonderful stories and metaphors in the Bible are NOT “God’s case law” that applies His laws to specific people  
2 and specific times, then what else are they for? Entertainment?  
3 6. Where in the Bible does it say that the following scripture only applies to Christians or DOESN’T apply to the secular  
4 world or especially the actions of government or civil rulers?

5 *“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for  
6 instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work.”  
7 [2 Tim. 3:16-17, Bible, NKJV]*

- 8 7. What part of the above scripture EXPRESSLY disqualifies the Old Testament?  
9 8. Please reconcile your belief that the Old Testament is NOT law for YOU with the following scriptural references:  
10 8.1. Deut. 28:1-14: Establishes that there is a HUGE reward for good works and obedience to God’s laws.

11 And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe  
12 and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the LORD thy God will set thee on  
13 high above all nations of the earth [SOVEREIGN!]:

14 And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the  
15 LORD thy God.

16 Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field.  
17 Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy  
18 kine, and the flocks of thy sheep.  
19 Blessed shall be thy basket and thy store.  
20 Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out.  
21 The LORD shall cause thine enemies that rise up against thee to be smitten before thy face: they shall come out  
22 against thee one way, and flee before thee seven ways.  
23 The LORD shall command the blessing upon thee in thy storehouses, and in all that thou settest thine hand unto;  
24 and he shall bless thee in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.

25 The LORD shall establish thee an holy [sanctified] people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if  
26 thou shalt keep the commandments of the LORD thy God, and walk in his ways.  
27 And all people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the LORD; and they shall be  
28 afraid of thee.

29 And the LORD shall make thee plenteous in goods, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in  
30 the fruit of thy ground, in the land which the LORD sware unto thy fathers to give thee.

31 The LORD shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season, and to  
32 bless all the work of thine hand: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow.

33 And the LORD shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt  
34 not be beneath [SOVEREIGN!]; if that thou hearken unto the commandments of the LORD thy God,  
35 which I command thee this day, to observe and to do them:

36 And thou shalt not go aside from any of the words which I command thee this day, to the right hand, or  
37 to the left, to go after other [government/political] gods to serve them.  
38 [Deut. 28:1-14, Bible, NKJV]

39 8.2. Eccl. 12:9-14:

40 **The Whole Duty of Man**

41 *And moreover, because the Preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yes, he pondered and*  
42 *sought out and set in order many proverbs. The Preacher sought to find acceptable words; and what was*  
43 *written was upright—words of truth. The words of the wise are like goads, and the words of scholars<sup>[b]</sup> are like*  
44 *well-driven nails, given by one Shepherd. And further, my son, be admonished by these. Of making many books*  
45 *there is no end, and much study is wearisome to the flesh.*

46 *Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter:*

47 **Fear God and keep His commandments,**  
48 **For this is man’s all,**  
49 **For God will bring every work into judgment,**

**Including every secret thing,  
Whether good or evil.**  
[Eccl. 12:9-14, Bible, NKJV]

8.3. Prov. 28:9:

"One who turns his ear from hearing the law [[God's law](#) or [man's law](#)], even his prayer is an abomination."  
[Prov. 28:9, Bible, NKJV]

8.4. Psalm 119:155:

"Salvation is far from the wicked, For they do not seek [Your statutes](#)."  
[Psalm 119:155, Bible, NKJV]

8.5. John 7:49:

"But this crowd that does not know [and quote and follow and use] the law is accursed."  
[John 7:49, Bible, NKJV]

8.6. Matt. 19:16-22:

**Jesus Counsels the Rich Young Ruler**

Now behold, one came and said to Him, "Good Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?"

So He said to him, "Why do you call Me good? No one is good but One, that is, God. But **if you want to enter into life, keep the commandments.**"

**He said to Him, "Which ones?"**

**Jesus said, "'You shall not murder,' 'You shall not commit adultery,' 'You shall not steal,' 'You shall not bear false witness,' 'Honor your father and your mother,' and, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' "**

The young man said to Him, "All these things I have kept from my youth. What do I still lack?"

Jesus said to him, "If you want to be perfect, go, sell what you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me."

But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions.  
[Jesus in [Matt. 19:16-22](#), Bible, NKJV]

8.7. Matt. 7:21:

"Not everyone who **says** to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, **but he who does the will of My Father in heaven.**"  
[Jesus in [Matt. 7:21](#), Bible, NKJV]

8.8. Luke 6:46:

"But why do you call Me 'Lord, Lord,' and not do the things which I say?"  
[[Luke 6:46](#), Bible, NKJV]

8.9. Luke 8:21:

"My mother and My brothers are these who hear the word of God and do it."  
[[Luke 8:21](#), Bible, NKJV]

8.10. John 14:21:

**"He who has [understands and learns] My commandments [laws in the Bible (OFFSITE LINK)] and keeps them, it is he who loves Me.** And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself to him."

[John 14:21, Bible, NKJV]

8.11. 1 John 4:16:

*"And we have known and believed the love that God has for us. God is love, and he who abides in love [obedience to God's Laws] abides in [and is a FIDUCIARY of] God, and God in him."*  
[1 John 4:16, Bible, NKJV]

8.12. 1 John 2:3-6:

*"Now by this we know that we know Him [God], if we keep His commandments. He who says, "I know Him," and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoever keeps His word, truly the love of God is perfected in him. By this we know that we are in Him [His fiduciaries]. He who says he abides in Him [as a fiduciary] ought himself also to walk just as He [Jesus] walked."*  
[1 John 2:3-6, Bible, NKJV]

8.13. Rev. 12:17: The dragon (beast) made war with the "offspring, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ". Everyone ELSE he DOESN'T make war with because they are on his (Satan's) side.

*"And the dragon was enraged with the woman, and he went to make war with the rest of her offspring, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."*  
[Rev. 12:17, Bible, NKJV]

8.14. Rev. 14: 12: The only people in Heaven at that time were the 144,000, and an angel describes who these people are:

*"Here [in Heaven] is the patience of the saints; here are those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."*  
[Rev. 14:12, Bible, NKJV]

The people above are described earlier as follows:

**The Lamb and the 144,000**

*"Then I looked, and behold, a Lamb standing on Mount Zion, and with Him one hundred and forty-four thousand, having His Father's name written on their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, like the voice of many waters, and like the voice of loud thunder. And I heard the sound of harpists playing their harps. They sang as it were a new song before the throne, before the four living creatures, and the elders; and no one could learn that song except the hundred and forty-four thousand who were redeemed from the earth. These are the ones who were not defiled with women, for they are virgins. These are the ones who follow the Lamb wherever He goes. These were redeemed from among men, being firstfruits to God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no deceit, for they are without fault before the throne of God."*  
[Rev. 14:1-5, Bible, NKJV]

8.15. Rev. 22:12-15: Establishes that your REWARD will be based on your works and obedience to God's commandments and laws.

**Jesus Testifies to the Churches**

*"And behold, I am coming quickly, and My reward is with Me, to give to every one according to his work. <sup>13</sup> I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last."*

*Blessed are those who do His commandments, that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city. But outside are dogs and sorcerers and sexually immoral and murderers and idolaters, and whoever loves and practices a lie."*  
[Rev. 22:12-15, Bible, NKJV]

## **5. Specific Subset of Old Testament Biblical Law that has been repealed**

The following document contains an index of biblical laws. The subset of Biblical Laws which HAVE been repealed are found in Index of Biblical Law, Section IX, Subsections A through D.

The repealed Old Testament biblical laws deal with cultic or ceremonial laws. Everything else remains in full force and effect for modern day Christians, and even for dispensationalists. Those who refuse to acknowledge the applicability of Old Testament laws to modern life from among those that have NOT been repealed are described by Jesus as “lawless”. In legal terminology they would be called “anarchists” and in theological terms they would be called “antinomian”:

*I Never Knew You*

*“Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in heaven. Many will say to Me in that day, ‘Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your name, cast out demons in Your name, and done many wonders in Your name?’ And then I will declare to them, ‘I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness!’”  
[Matt. 7:21-23, Bible, NKJV]*

To “practice lawlessness” literally means to refuse to enforce Old Testament laws as a restraint upon one’s behavior, and especially as it regards the Ten Commandments. Of the Ten Commandments all remain in force EXCEPT the one dealing with the Sabbath. Jesus even reiterated the Ten Commandments as law in the New Testament EXCEPT the Sabbath provision:

*Jesus Counsels the Rich Young Ruler*

*Now behold, one came and said to Him, “Good Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?”*

*So He said to him, “Why do you call Me good? No one is good but One, that is, God. But if you want to enter into life, keep the commandments.”*

*He said to Him, “Which ones?”*

*Jesus said, “‘You shall not murder,’ ‘You shall not commit adultery,’ ‘You shall not steal,’ ‘You shall not bear false witness,’ ‘Honor your father and your mother,’ and, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’”*

*The young man said to Him, “All these things I have kept from my youth. What do I still lack?”*

*Jesus said to him, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell what you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me.”*

*But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions.  
[Matt. 19:16-22, Bible, NKJV]*

Any dispensationalist, Christian, or “antinomian” who would claim that Old Testament law such as the Ten Commandments has been repealed clearly is violating the very words of Jesus, not to mention the following:

*“What right have you to declare My [God’s] statutes [write man’s vain law], or take My covenant [the Bible] in your mouth, seeing you hate instruction and cast My words behind you? When you saw a thief, you consented with him, and have been a partaker with adulterers. You give your mouth to evil, and your tongue frames deceit. You sit and speak against your brother; you slander your own mother’s son. These things you have done, and I kept silent; you thought that I was altogether like you; but I will reprove you, and set them in order before your eyes. Now consider this, you who forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver: Whoever offers praise glorifies Me; and to him who orders his conduct aright [and bases it on God’s laws] I will show the salvation of God.”*  
[Psalms 50:16-23, Bible, NKJV]

The reproof mentioned above is EXACTLY the same reproof that Jesus leveled at the Pharisees in Matt. 23.

For details on what it means to be an “anarchist”, or what Jesus called “lawless” see:

## 6. The THREE types of Biblical laws: GOVERNMENT law, HUMAN law, Church law

The next important thing we must resolve is EXACTLY what types of laws were the Pharisees corrupting? In order to answer this, we must categorize the various types of laws to show EXACTLY what they were corrupting. The Bible contains laws for THREE SEPARATE and distinct categories: Governments, Humans, and Churches. Governments and Churches together represent legal fictions or associations for the benefit of the members ONLY. They are a product of what the U.S. Supreme Court calls “compact”, meaning CONSENT or contract.

The Bible places hard limits on what individual human believers are allowed to consent to. Therefore, it places limits on what types of fictions or groups the believers can join. Below are a few examples:

1. Can’t join a government that has a SECULAR king. 1 Sam. 8.
2. Can’t join a group receiving STOLEN money. Prov. 1:10-19.
3. Can’t join a corrupted government. Isaiah 1:1-26.
4. Can’t join a group involved in sexual immorality. 1 Cor. 6:18.

The entire Bible, in fact, is what we refer to as a delegation of authority order from God to Christians:

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

It is a maxim of law that anything you consent to cannot form the basis for a remedy in court or a judgment in court:

*“Volunt non fit injuria.*

*He who consents cannot receive an injury. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T.R. 657; Shelf. on mar. & Div. 449.*

*Consensus tollit errorem.*

*Consent removes or obviates a mistake. Co. Litt. 126.*

*Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo consentire.*

*It is better to suffer every wrong or ill, than to consent to it. 3 Co. Inst. 23.*

*Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.*

*One cannot complain of having been deceived when he knew the fact and gave his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 145.”*

*[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;*

*SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]*

Consequently, God cannot and does not judge you personally for the consequences of the actions of legal fictions like governments and churches that you never consented to join, subsidize, or participate in. In other words, He will not CURSE you or punish you for the actions of a government or a church that you are not a member of but which has harmed others. HOWEVER, if you DO consent to join a government or church, you are personally accountable to God to ensure that it does not violate the rights of other individual humans. Examples of personal accountability to God to confront government evil:

1. Book of Nehemiah: Jews returned from captivity in Babylon and confronted the evil of the secular government and people around them by building a wall and restoring their theocracy.
2. Daniel 3: The story of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego confronting King Nebuchadnezzar.

In addition to the above, King David was held personally accountable to God for his decision to kill the husband of a woman he wanted to commit adultery with by ordering the husband into battle to be killed. 2 Sam. 11-12.

The curses and blessings listed in Deut. 28, in fact, pertain ONLY to groups and fictions, not individual humans. The enforcement of the judgment by God is NOT AFFECTED by whether one achieves salvation or enters into Heaven. They in effect are “natural laws” like the law of gravity that pertain only to governments.

Blessings on Obedience

28 "Now it shall come to pass, if you diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God, to observe carefully all His commandments which I command you today, that the LORD your God will set you high above all nations of the earth. <sup>2</sup> And all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, because you obey the voice of the LORD your God:

<sup>3</sup> "Blessed shall you be in the city, and blessed shall you be in the country.

<sup>4</sup> "Blessed shall be the fruit of your body, the produce of your ground and the increase of your herds, the increase of your cattle and the offspring of your flocks.

<sup>5</sup> "Blessed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl.

<sup>6</sup> "Blessed shall you be when you come in, and blessed shall you be when you go out.

<sup>7</sup> "The LORD will cause your enemies who rise against you to be defeated before your face; they shall come out against you one way and flee before you seven ways.

<sup>8</sup> "The LORD will command the blessing on you in your storehouses and in all to which you set your hand, and He will bless you in the land which the LORD your God is giving you.

<sup>9</sup> "The LORD will establish you as a holy people to Himself, just as He has sworn to you, if you keep the commandments of the LORD your God and walk in His ways. <sup>10</sup> Then all peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of the LORD, and they shall be afraid of you. <sup>11</sup> And the LORD will grant you plenty of goods, in the fruit of your body, in the increase of your livestock, and in the produce of your ground, in the land of which the LORD swore to your fathers to give you. <sup>12</sup> 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. <sup>13</sup> And the LORD will make you the head and not the tail; you shall be above only, and not be beneath, if you heed the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you today, and are careful to observe them. <sup>14</sup> So you shall not turn aside from any of the words which I command you this day, to the right or the left, to go after other gods to serve them.

#### **Curses on Disobedience**

<sup>15</sup> "But it shall come to pass, if you do not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to observe carefully all His commandments and His statutes which I command you today, that all these curses will come upon you and overtake you:

<sup>16</sup> "Cursed shall you be in the city, and cursed shall you be in the country.

<sup>17</sup> "Cursed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl.

<sup>18</sup> "Cursed shall be the fruit of your body and the produce of your land, the increase of your cattle and the offspring of your flocks.

<sup>19</sup> "Cursed shall you be when you come in, and cursed shall you be when you go out.

<sup>20</sup> "The LORD will send on you cursing, confusion, and rebuke in all that you set your hand to do, until you are destroyed and until you perish quickly, because of the wickedness of your doings in which you have forsaken Me. <sup>21</sup> The LORD will make the plague cling to you until He has consumed you from the land which you are going to possess. <sup>22</sup> The LORD will strike you with consumption, with fever, with inflammation, with severe burning fever, with the sword, with scorching, and with mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish. <sup>23</sup> And your heavens which are over your head shall be bronze, and the earth which is under you shall be iron. <sup>24</sup> The LORD will change the rain of your land to powder and dust; from the heaven it shall come down on you until you are destroyed.

<sup>25</sup> "The LORD will cause you to be defeated before your enemies; you shall go out one way against them and flee seven ways before them; and you shall become troublesome to all the kingdoms of the earth. <sup>26</sup> Your carcasses shall be food for all the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth, and no one shall frighten them away. <sup>27</sup> The LORD will strike you with the boils of Egypt, with tumors, with the scab, and with the itch, from which you cannot be healed. <sup>28</sup> The LORD will strike you with madness and blindness and confusion of heart. <sup>29</sup> And you shall grope at noonday, as a blind man gropes in darkness; you shall not prosper in your ways; you shall be only oppressed and plundered continually, and no one shall save you.

<sup>30</sup> "You shall betroth a wife, but another man shall lie with her; you shall build a house, but you shall not dwell in it; you shall plant a vineyard, but shall not gather its grapes. <sup>31</sup> Your ox shall be slaughtered before your eyes, but you shall not eat of it; your donkey shall be violently taken away from before you, and shall not be restored to you; your sheep shall be given to your enemies, and you shall have no one to rescue them. <sup>32</sup> Your sons and

1 your daughters shall be given to another people, and your eyes shall look and fail with longing for them all day  
2 long; and there shall be no strength in your hand. <sup>33</sup> A nation whom you have not known shall eat the fruit of  
3 your land and the produce of your labor, and you shall be only oppressed and crushed continually. <sup>34</sup> So you  
4 shall be driven mad because of the sight which your eyes see. <sup>35</sup> The LORD will strike you in the knees and on the  
5 legs with severe boils which cannot be healed, and from the sole of your foot to the top of your head.

6 <sup>36</sup> "The LORD will bring you and the king whom you set over you to a nation which neither you nor your fathers  
7 have known, and there you shall serve other gods—wood and stone. <sup>37</sup> And you shall become an astonishment, a  
8 proverb, and a byword among all nations where the LORD will drive you.

9 <sup>38</sup> "You shall carry much seed out to the field but gather little in, for the locust shall consume it. <sup>39</sup> You shall  
10 plant vineyards and tend them, but you shall neither drink of the wine nor gather the grapes; for the worms  
11 shall eat them. <sup>40</sup> You shall have olive trees throughout all your territory, but you shall not anoint yourself with  
12 the oil; for your olives shall drop off. <sup>41</sup> You shall beget sons and daughters, but they shall not be yours; for they  
13 shall go into captivity. <sup>42</sup> Locusts shall consume all your trees and the produce of your land.

14 <sup>43</sup> "The alien who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and  
15 lower. <sup>44</sup> He shall lend to you, but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.

16 <sup>45</sup> "Moreover all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you are destroyed,  
17 because you did not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which  
18 He commanded you. <sup>46</sup> And they shall be upon you for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.

19 <sup>47</sup> "Because you did not serve the LORD your God with joy and gladness of heart, for the abundance of  
20 everything, <sup>48</sup> therefore you shall serve your enemies, whom the LORD will send against you, in hunger, in thirst,  
21 in nakedness, and in need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron on your neck until He has destroyed you.  
22 <sup>49</sup> The LORD will bring a nation against you from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies, a  
23 nation whose language you will not understand, <sup>50</sup> a nation of fierce countenance, which does not respect the  
24 elderly nor show favor to the young. <sup>51</sup> And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your  
25 land, until you are destroyed; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the increase of your cattle or  
26 the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you.

27 <sup>52</sup> "They shall besiege you at all your gates until your high and fortified walls, in which you trust, come down  
28 throughout all your land; and they shall besiege you at all your gates throughout all your land which the LORD  
29 your God has given you. <sup>53</sup> You shall eat the fruit of your own body, the flesh of your sons and your daughters  
30 whom the LORD your God has given you, in the siege and desperate straits in which your enemy shall distress  
31 you. <sup>54</sup> The sensitive and very refined man among you will be hostile toward his brother, toward the wife of his  
32 bosom, and toward the rest of his children whom he leaves behind, <sup>55</sup> so that he will not give any of them the  
33 flesh of his children whom he will eat, because he has nothing left in the siege and desperate straits in which  
34 your enemy shall distress you at all your gates. <sup>56</sup> The tender and delicate woman among you, who would not  
35 venture to set the sole of her foot on the ground because of her delicateness and sensitivity, will refuse<sup>[u]</sup> to the  
36 husband of her bosom, and to her son and her daughter, <sup>57</sup> her placenta which comes out from between her feet  
37 and her children whom she bears; for she will eat them secretly for lack of everything in the siege and desperate  
38 straits in which your enemy shall distress you at all your gates.

39 <sup>58</sup> "If you do not carefully observe all the words of this law that are written in this book, that you may fear this  
40 glorious and awesome name, THE LORD YOUR GOD, <sup>59</sup> then the LORD will bring upon you and your  
41 descendants extraordinary plagues—great and prolonged plagues—and serious and prolonged sicknesses.  
42 <sup>60</sup> Moreover He will bring back on you all the diseases of Egypt, of which you were afraid, and they shall cling  
43 to you. <sup>61</sup> Also every sickness and every plague, which is not written in this Book of the Law, will the LORD bring  
44 upon you until you are destroyed. <sup>62</sup> You shall be left few in number, whereas you were as the stars of heaven in  
45 multitude, because you would not obey the voice of the LORD your God. <sup>63</sup> And it shall be, that just as the LORD  
46 rejoiced over you to do you good and multiply you, so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you and bring  
47 you to nothing; and you shall be plucked from off the land which you go to possess.

48 <sup>64</sup> "Then the LORD will scatter you among all peoples, from one end of the earth to the other, and there you shall  
49 serve other gods, which neither you nor your fathers have known—wood and stone. <sup>65</sup> And among those nations  
50 you shall find no rest, nor shall the sole of your foot have a resting place; but there the LORD will give you a  
51 trembling heart, failing eyes, and anguish of soul. <sup>66</sup> Your life shall hang in doubt before you; you shall fear day  
52 and night, and have no assurance of life. <sup>67</sup> In the morning you shall say, 'Oh, that it were evening!' And at  
53 evening you shall say, 'Oh, that it were morning!' because of the fear which terrifies your heart, and because of  
54 the sight which your eyes see.

55 <sup>68</sup> "And the LORD will take you back to Egypt in ships, by the way of which I said to you, 'You shall never see it  
56 again.' And there you shall be offered for sale to your enemies as male and female slaves, but no one will buy  
57 you."  
58 [Deut. 28:15-68, Bible, NKJV]

59 Below is a tabular comparison of the three types of law systems:

### **Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?**

Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry, <http://sedm.org>  
Form 05.047, Rev. 10-4-2016

1 **Table 1: Three Categories of Biblical Law.**

#	Description	Government law	Human law	Church law
1	Subject of the law	Governments	Single humans or families	Entire church
2	Time of judgment	Continuous	The White Throne Judgment (the unsaved) Bema Judgment (works)	Bema Judgment (works)
3	Place of judgment	Earth	Heaven	Heaven
4	Judgment felt by	All consenting members of the state (citizens and residents)	Private humans	Private humans
5	Judgment nullified by salvation?	No	No	No
6	Blessings of obedience are	Temporary	Permanent	Permanent
7	Administration consists of	Public officers	Private humans	Priests
8	Scriptures where laws are found	Exodus 21-25: Gov. laws Exodus 32: Golden calf (federal reserve) Exodus 35: New Tablets of Testimony Lev. 11: Foods permitted Lev. 12: Childbirth Lev. 13-14: Leprosy Lev. 15-27: Various government laws Num. 15: Laws of grain and drink offerings Num. 27: Inheritance laws Num. 28-30: Various laws Deut. 12	Exodus 19: Mt Sinai Exodus 20: Ten Commandments Deut. 7: Blessings of obedience Deut. 8: Keep commandments Deut. 4-6: Command obedience and review Deut. 10: Essence of the law Deut. 11: Love and Obedience Rewarded	Exodus 3:1: Sabbath law Lev. 6-7: Law of offerings Num. 6: Law of the Nazirite Num. 18: Duties of Priests and Offerings Num. 19: Laws of purification Deut. 12: Prescribed place of worship
9	Case law found in	Gen. 11: Tower of Babel Gen. 19: Sodom Gen. 39: Joseph slave in Egypt Gen. 41: Pharaoh's dreams Gen. 47: Joseph and famine Exodus 1: Israelites suffering in Egypt Exodus 4-5: Pharaoh Exodus 7-14: Plagues Num. 1-5, 6-14 Judges Kings	Gen. 1-10 Gen. 12-18 Deut. 9	
10	Pharisees involved in administration?	Yes (theocracy)	No	Yes

Based on item 10, the Pharisees appeared to be corrupting mainly GOVERNMENT and CHURCH law, not laws for HUMANS that originate in the Ten Commandments. They corrupted the Sabbath Laws according to Jesus, but technically these laws were Church laws. The Ten Commandments are so simple that it would be difficult to corrupt them, in fact.

## **7. Defenses against Modern Pharisee Lawyer Tactics**

This document would be of little value if we didn't show you how to apply the information to defend yourself against tactics of the modern Pharisee legal profession designed to kidnap your legal identity and transport it against your consent to what Mark Twain called "The District of Criminals". The following subsections will deal briefly with this subject.

### **7.1 Tools to rebut Government, Legal, and Tax Profession Deception and False Propaganda of Modern Pharisee**

SEDM Liberty University , Section 8 contains a detailed list of resources you can use to rebut deception and propaganda from those in the government, legal, and tax profession:

SEDM Liberty University, Section 8  
<http://sedm.org/LibertyU/LibertyU.htm>

Below is an itemized list of the resources contained above:

1. *Foundations of Freedom Course*, Form #12.021, Video 4: Willful Government Deception and Propaganda  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. *Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid*, Form #08.004  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
4. *Rebutted Version of the IRS Pamphlet "The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments"*, Form #08.005  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
5. *Rebutted Version of "Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions"*, Form #08.007  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
6. *Rebutted Version of the CRS Report 97-59A: "Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Federal Income Tax"*, Form #08.006  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
7. *Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against This Website*, Form #08.011  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
8. *Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty*, Form #08.018  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

### **7.2 Tools to rebut Private Sector Deception and False Propaganda of Modern Pharisees**

SEDM Liberty University , Section 9 contains a detailed list of resources you can use to rebut deception and propaganda from those in the government, legal, and tax profession:

SEDM Liberty University, Section 9  
<http://sedm.org/LibertyU/LibertyU.htm>

Below is an itemized list of the resources contained above:

1. *Policy Document: Corruption Within Modern Christianity*, Form #08.012  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. *Policy Document: UCC Redemption*, Form #08.002  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. *Why The Fourteenth Amendment is NOT a Threat to Your Freedom*, Form #08.015  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4. Policy Document: Problems with Atheistic Anarchism, Form #08.020  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
5. Policy Document: Pete Hendrickson's "Trade or Business" Approach, Form #08.003  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

### **7.3 How choice of law rules are illegally circumvented by corrupted government officials to illegally enforce franchises, kidnap your legal identity, and STEAL from You<sup>56</sup>**

In cases against the government, corrupt judges and prosecutors employ several important tactics that you should be very aware of in order to:

1. Circumvent choice of law rules and thereby to illegally and unconstitutionally enforce federal law outside of federal territory within a foreign state called a state of the Union.
2. STEAL private property from you and use it for their own benefit, in what amounts to a criminal and financial conflict of interest per 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455.
3. Unlawfully enlarge their jurisdiction and importance in what amounts to treason in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2381.
4. Break down the constitutional separation between the states and the federal government that is the foundation of the Constitution and the MAIN protection for your PRIVATE rights. See:

Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023

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

The most frequent methods to circumvent choice of law rules are the following tactics:

1. Abuse "words of art" to deceive and undermine the sovereignty of the non-governmental opponent. This includes:
  - 1.1. Add things or classes of things to the meaning of statutory terms that do not EXPRESSLY appear in their definitions, in violation of the rules of statutory construction. See:
  - 1.2. Violate the rules of statutory construction by abusing the word "includes" to add things or classes of things to definitions of terms that do not expressly appear in the statutes and therefore MUST be presumed to be purposefully excluded.
  - 1.3. Refuse to allow the jury to read the definitions in the law and then give them a definition that is in conflict with the statutory definition. This substitutes the JUDGE'S will for what the law expressly says and thereby substitutes PUBLIC POLICY for the written law.
  - 1.4. Publish deceptive government publications that are in deliberate conflict with what the statutes define terms to mean and then tell the public that they CANNOT rely on the publication. The [IRS does this with ALL of their publications](#) and it is FRAUD. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableBelief.pdf>

- 1.5. PRESUME that ALL of the four contexts for "United States" are equivalent.

For details on this SCAM, see:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014

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

2. PRESUME that CONSTITUTIONAL citizens and STATUTORY citizens are EQUIVALENT under federal law. They are NOT. A CONSTITUTIONAL citizen is a "non-resident " under federal civil law and NOT a STATUTORY "national and citizen of the United States\*\* at birth" per 8 U.S.C. §1401. See the document below:

Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyANational.pdf>

3. PRESUME that "nationality" and "domicile" are equivalent. They are NOT. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

4. Use the word "citizenship" in place of "nationality" OR "domicile", and refuse to disclose WHICH of the two they mean in EVERY context.

<sup>56</sup> Source: Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 29.2; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

5. Confuse the POLITICAL/CONSTITUTIONAL meaning of words with the civil STATUTORY context. For instance, asking on government forms whether you are a POLITICAL/CONSTITUTIONAL citizen and then FALSELY PRESUMING that you are a STATUTORY citizen under 8 U.S.C. §1401.
6. Confuse the words "[domicile](#)" and "[residence](#)" or impute either to you without satisfying the burden of proving that you EXPRESSLY CONSENTED to it and thereby illegally kidnap your civil legal identity against your will. One can have only one "domicile" but many "residences" and BOTH require your consent. See:

*Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent*, Form #05.002

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

7. Confuse "federal" with "national" or use these words interchangeably. They are NOT equivalent and this lack of equivalence is a product of the separation of powers doctrine that is the foundation of the USA Constitution.

*"It is clear that Congress, as a legislative body, exercise two species of legislative power: the one, limited as to its objects, but extending all over the Union: the other, an absolute, exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia. The preliminary inquiry in the case now before the Court, is, by virtue of which of these authorities was the law in question passed?"*

*[Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821)]*

**"NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.** *The government of a whole nation, as distinguished from that of a local or territorial division of the nation, and also as distinguished from that of a league or confederation.*

*"A national government is a government of the people of a single state or nation, united as a community by what is termed the "social compact," and possessing complete and perfect supremacy over persons and things, so far as they can be made the lawful objects of civil government. A federal government is distinguished from a national government by its being the government of a community of independent and sovereign states, united by compact." Piqua Branch Bank v. Knoup, 6 Ohio.St. 393."*

*[Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, 1968, p. 1176]*

**"FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.** *The system of government administered in a state formed by the union or confederation of several independent or quasi independent states; also the composite state so formed.*

*In strict usage, there is a distinction between a confederation and a federal government. The former term denotes a league or permanent alliance between several states, each of which is fully sovereign and independent, and each of which retains its full dignity, organization, and sovereignty, though yielding to the central authority a controlling power for a few limited purposes, such as external and diplomatic relations. In this case, the component states are the units, with respect to the confederation, and the central government acts upon them, not upon the individual citizens. In a federal government, on the other hand, the allied states form a union,-not, indeed, to such an extent as to destroy their separate organization or deprive them of quasi sovereignty with respect to the administration of their purely local concerns, but so that the central power is erected into a true state or nation, possessing sovereignty both external and internal,-while the administration of national affairs is directed, and its effects felt, not by the separate states deliberating as units, but by the people of all, in their collective capacity, as citizens of the nation. The distinction is expressed, by the German writers, by the use of the two words "Staatenbund" and "Bundesstaat;" the former denoting a league or confederation of states, and the latter a federal government, or state formed by means of a league or confederation."*

*[Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, 1968, p. 740]*

Here is a table comparing the two:

**Table 2: "National" v. "Federal"**

#	Description	"National" government	"Federal" government
1	Legislates for	Federal territory and NOT states of the Union	Legislates for states of the Union and NOT federal territory
2	Social compact	None. Jurisdiction is unlimited per Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17	Those domiciled within states of the Union
3	Type of jurisdiction exercised	General jurisdiction	Subject matter jurisdiction (derived from Constitution)
4	Citizens	1. Statutory "nationals and citizens at birth" per 8 U.S.C. §1401. 2. "U.S. citizens" per 26 U.S.C. §3121(e) and 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c). 3. EXCLUDES constitutional "Citizens" or "citizens of the United States" per Fourteenth Amendment.	1. "Citizens". 2. Fourteenth Amendment "citizens of the United States". 3. EXCLUDES statutory citizens per 8 U.S.C. §1401 "U.S. citizens" per 26 U.S.C. §3121(e) and 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c).
5	Courts	Federal District and Circuit Courts (legislative franchise courts that can only hear disputes over federal territory and property per Art. 4, Sect. 3, Clause 2 of USA Constitution).	1. State courts. 2. U.S. Supreme Courts.
6	Those domiciled within this jurisdiction are	Statutory "aliens" in relation to states of the Union.	Statutory "aliens" in relation to the national government.
7	Those domiciled here are subject to Subtitles A through C of the Internal Revenue Code?	Yes	No

For further details on this SCAM, see:

*Two Political Jurisdictions: "National" government v. "Federal" government*, Family Guardian Fellowship  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/USvUSA.htm>

8. Abuse franchises such as the income tax, Social Security, Medicare, etc. to be used to UNLAWFULLY create new public offices in the U.S. government. This results in a de facto government in which there are no private rights or private property and in which EVERYONE is illegally subject to the whims of the government. See:

*De Facto Government Scam*, Form #05.043

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/DeFactoGov.pdf>

9. Connect the opponent to a government franchise or to PRESUME they participate and let the presumption go unchallenged and therefore agreed to. This is done:
- 9.1. PRESUMING that because someone connected ONE activity to a government franchise, that they elected to act in the capacity of a franchisee for ALL activities. This is equivalent to outlawing PRIVATE rights and PRIVATE property.
  - 9.2. Refusing to acknowledge or respect the method by which PRIVATE property is donated to a PUBLIC use, which is by VOLUNTARILY associating formerly PRIVATE property with a de facto license represent a public office in the government called a Social Security Number (SSN) or Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN).
  - 9.3. Calling use of SSNs and TINs VOLUNTARY and yet REFUSING to prosecute those who COMPEL their use. This results in a LIE.
  - 9.4. Compelling the use of Social Security Numbers or Taxpayer Identification Numbers. This is combated using the following:
    - 9.4.1. *Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a "Taxpayer Identification Number"*, Form #04.205  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
    - 9.4.2. *About SSNs and TINs On Government Forms and Correspondence*, Form #05.012

1 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
2 9.4.3. Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002  
3 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4 9.5. Using forms signed by the government opponent in which they claimed a status under a government franchise,  
5 such as statutory "taxpayer", "individual", "U.S. person", "U.S. citizen", etc. This is combated by attaching the  
6 following to all tax forms one fills out:

Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

## 7 **7.4 Forcing governments to disclose when and how PRIVATE property was converted to** 8 **PUBLIC property**<sup>57</sup>

9 It is very important to force the government to disclose when and how property they claim an interest in was lawfully  
10 converted from PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property. Recall that PRIVATE property is property that is exclusively  
11 owned by its owner and which the government may not tax, regulate, or derive any benefit from. Our Disclaimer provides  
12 a hint on this subject by saying the following:

### 13 **SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4: Meaning of Words**

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

- 16 1. *In possession of absolute, exclusive ownership and control over their own labor, body, and all their*  
17 *property. In Roman Law this was called "dominium".*
- 18 2. *On an EQUAL rather than inferior relationship to government in court. This means that have no*  
19 *obligations to any government OTHER than possibly the duty to serve on jury and vote. Otherwise, they*  
20 *are entirely free and unregulated.*
- 21 3. *A "nonresident" in relation to the state and federal government.*
- 22 4. *Not a PUBLIC entity defined within any state or federal statutory law. This includes but is not limited to*  
23 *statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any under any civil statute or*  
24 *franchise.*
- 25 5. *Not engaged in a public office or "trade or business" (per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)). Such offices include*  
26 *but are not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any civil*  
27 *statute or franchise.*
- 28 6. *Not consenting to contract with or acquire any public status, public privilege, or public right under any*  
29 *state or federal franchise. For instance, the phrase "private employee" means a common law worker that*  
30 *is NOT the statutory "employee" defined within 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) or 26 C.F.R. §301.3401(c)-1 or any*  
31 *other federal or state law or statute.*
- 32 7. *Not sharing ownership or control of their body or property with anyone, and especially a government. In*  
33 *other words, ownership is not "qualified" but "absolute".*
- 34 8. *Not subject to civil enforcement or regulation of any kind, except AFTER an injury to the equal rights of*  
35 *others has occurred. Preventive rather than corrective regulation is a taking of property under the Fifth*  
36 *Amendment Takings Clause.*

37 "Law" is defined to EXCLUDE any and all [civil statutory codes, franchises, or privileges](#) in relation to any and  
38 all governments and to include ONLY the COMMON law, the CONSTITUTION (if trespassing government  
39 actors ONLY are involved), and the CRIMINAL law. Civil statutory codes, franchises, or privileges are  
40 referred to on this website as "private law", but not "law". The word "public" precedes all uses of "law"  
41 when dealing with acts of government and hence, refers only to COMMON law and CRIMINAL law that applies  
42 equally to everyone, regardless of [their consent](#). Involvement in any and all "[private law](#)" [franchises or](#)  
43 [privileges](#) offered by any government ALWAYS undermines and threatens sovereignty, autonomy, and [equality](#),  
44 turns government into an [unconstitutional civil religion](#), and [corrupts even the finest of people](#). This is  
45 explained in:

### 46 [Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030](#)

47 Any use of the word "law" by any government actor directed at us or any member, if not clarified with the  
48 words "private" or "public" in front of the word "law" shall constitute:

- 49 1. A criminal attempt and conspiracy to recruit is to be a public officer called a "person", "taxpayer",  
50 "citizen", "resident", etc.
- 51 2. A solicitation of [illegal bribes called "taxes"](#) to treat us "AS IF" we are a public officer.

<sup>57</sup> Source: [Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises](#), Form #05.030, Section 29.4; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

3. A criminal conspiracy to convert PRIVATE rights into PUBLIC rights and to violate the Bill of Rights.

The protection of PRIVATE rights mandated by the Bill of Rights BEGINS with and requires:

1. ALWAYS keeping PRIVATE and PUBLIC rights separated and never mixing them together.
2. Using unambiguous language about the TYPE of "right" that is being protected: PUBLIC or PRIVATE in every use of the word "right". The way to avoid confusing PUBLIC and PRIVATE RIGHTS is to simply refer to PRIVATE rights as "privileges" and NEVER refer to them as "rights".
3. Only converting PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC rights with the express written consent of the HUMAN owner.
4. Limiting the conversion to geographical places where rights are NOT unalienable. This means the conversion occurred either abroad or on government territory not within the exclusive jurisdiction of a Constitutional state. Otherwise, the Declaration of Independence, which is organic law, would be violated.
5. Keeping the rules for converting PRIVATE to PUBLIC so simple, unambiguous, and clear that a child could understand them and always referring to these rules in every interaction between the government and those they are charged with protecting.
6. Ensuring that in every interaction (and ESPECIALLY ENFORCEMENT ACTION) between the government both administratively and in court, that any right the government claims to civilly enforce against, regulate, tax, or burden otherwise PRIVATE property is proven ON THE RECORD IN WRITING to originate from the rules documented in the previous step. This BURDEN OF PROOF must be met both ADMINISTRATIVELY and IN COURT BEFORE any enforcement action may be lawfully attempted by any government. It must be met by an IMPARTIAL decision maker with NO FINANCIAL interest in the outcome and not employed by the government or else a criminal financial conflict of interest will result. In other words, the government has to prove that it is NOT stealing before it can take property, that it is the lawful owner, and expressly HOW it became the lawful owner.
7. Enforcing the following CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION against government jurisdiction to enforce unless and until the above requirements are met:

"All rights and property are PRESUMED to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE and beyond the control of government or the CIVIL law unless and until the government meets the burden of proving, WITH EVIDENCE, on the record of the proceeding that:

1. A SPECIFIC formerly PRIVATE owner consented IN WRITING to convert said property to PUBLIC property.

2. The owner was either abroad, domiciled on, or at least PRESENT on federal territory NOT protected by the Constitution and therefore had the legal capacity to ALIENATE a Constitutional right or relieve a public servant of the fiduciary obligation to respect and protect the right. Those domiciled in a constitutional but not statutory state and who are "citizens" or "residents" protected by the constitution cannot alienate rights to a real, de jure government.

3. If the government refuses to meet the above burden of proof, it shall be CONCLUSIVELY PRESUMED to be operating in a PRIVATE, corporate capacity on an EQUAL footing with every other private corporation and which is therefore NOT protected by official, judicial, or sovereign immunity."

[SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4: Meaning of Words,  
SOURCE: <http://sedm.org/disclaimer.htm>]

The text below the line and following this paragraph shows how to force the government to disclose when and how property they claim an interest in was lawfully converted from PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property. You can use this information in a court pleading under the common law:

#### **Evidence required to meet the burden of proof to remove this action to federal court**

1. Proof of the lawful rules for converting PRIVATE, EXCLUSIVELY OWNED property to PUBLIC property have been honored by the Respondents.

"Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, - 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;' and to 'secure,' not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. That property [or income] which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of, subject to these limitations: First, that he shall not use it to his neighbor's injury, and that does not mean that he must use it

for his neighbor's benefit [e.g. SOCIAL SECURITY, Medicare, and every other public "benefit"]; second, that if he devotes it to a public use, he gives to the public a right to control that use; and third, that whenever the public needs require, the public may take it upon payment of due compensation."  
 [Budd v. People of State of New York, [143 U.S. 517](#) (1892)]

The above rules are summarized below:

**Table 3: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office**

#	Description	Requires consent of owner to be taken from owner?
1	The owner of property justly acquired enjoys full and exclusive use and control over the property. This right includes <u>the right to exclude government uses</u> or ownership of said property.	Yes
2	He may not use the property to injure the equal rights of his neighbor. For instance, when you murder someone, the government can take your liberty and labor from you by putting you in jail or your life from you by instituting the death penalty against you. Both your life and your labor are "property". Therefore, the basis for the "taking" was violation of the equal rights of a fellow sovereign "neighbor".	No
3	He cannot be compelled or required to use it to "benefit" his neighbor. That means he cannot be compelled to donate the property to any franchise that would "benefit" his neighbor such as Social Security, Medicare, etc.	Yes
4	If he donates it to a public use, he gives the public the right to control that use.	Yes
5	Whenever the public needs require, the public may take it without his consent upon payment of due compensation. E.g. "eminent domain".	No

2. Exactly WHICH one of the above options was employed to convert the property in question from EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE ABSOLUTE ownership to QUALIFIED SHARED ownership?
  - 2.1. The parties are advised that the purpose of founding governments is to protect ONLY private property, per the Declaration of Independence.
  - 2.2. The parties are reminded that the purpose of taxation itself is to convert PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property LAWFULLY. That conversion requires the express consent of the original PRIVATE nontaxpayer owner AT SOME POINT. Evidence of that consent MUST be produced by the Respondent or the taxation process is unconstitutional.
  - 2.3. The Plaintiff has a right to receive reasonable notice from any and all governments allegedly "protecting" said property of the nature of its ownership over any property held in his name, including whether ownership is ABSOLUTE or QUALIFIED.

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]

- 2.4. The Plaintiff has a constitutional right to receive reasonable notice of when and HOW his ABSOLUTE interest in a property becomes a QUALIFIED interest shared with the government, and the method of consent BY THE PLAINTIFF that makes that change in each and every instance.

- 2.5. If the rules identified above by the U.S. Supreme Court for converting PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property are deemed insufficient by the court, the party making such an assertion has a duty to define what the correct rules are. Otherwise, the Plaintiff is unconstitutionally deprived of reasonable notice of exactly WHAT property held in its name is ABSOLUTELY owned, EXCLUSIVELY private, and whose ownership is therefore not shared with any government and therefore not subject to taxation.
- 2.6. Without reasonable notice of the nature of the Plaintiff's interest in properties it holds, Respondent and court would be violating due process of law to PRESUME that the government is either the ABSOLUTE owner or has a QUALIFIED interest in the property absent evidence PROVING the creation of that interest directly from the original owner. Such a presumption would constitute an unconstitutional eminent domain in the property.

*"The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions."*  
[Bailey v. Alabama, [219 U.S. 219](#), 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v. Georgia, [279 U.S. 1](#), 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215]

3. Proof of the EXACT STEP in the taxation process that ownership of the real property in question transitioned from ABSOLUTE PRIVATE ownership to QUALIFIED SHARED ownership with the government. Below are the specific steps in the taxation process that might be candidates for the conversion:
- 3.1. \_\_\_\_ There is no private property. EVERYTHING belongs to us and we just "RENT" it to you through taxes. Hence, we are NOT a "government" because there is not private property to protect. Everything is PUBLIC property by default.
- 3.2. \_\_\_\_ When the Plaintiff became a CONSTITUTIONAL citizen?
- 3.3. \_\_\_\_ When the Plaintiff changed domicile to a CONSTITUTIONAL and not STATUTORY "State".
- 3.4. \_\_\_\_ When the Plaintiff indicated "U.S. citizen" or "U.S. resident" on a government form, and the agent accepting it FALSELY PRESUMED that meant I was a STATUTORY "national and citizen of the United States" per 8 U.S.C. §1401 rather than a CONSTITUTIONAL "citizen of the United States".
- 3.5. \_\_\_\_ When Plaintiff disclosed and used a Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identification Number to my otherwise PRIVATE employer?
- 3.6. \_\_\_\_ When Plaintiff submitted withholding documents for the properties in question, such as IRS Forms W-4 or W-8?
- 3.7. \_\_\_\_ When the information return was filed against the Plaintiff's otherwise PRIVATE earnings that connected my otherwise PRIVATE earnings to a PUBLIC office in the national government?
- 3.8. \_\_\_\_ When Plaintiff FAILED to rebut the false information return connecting my otherwise PRIVATE earnings to a PUBLIC office in the national government?
- 3.9. \_\_\_\_ When Plaintiff filed a "taxpayer" form, such as IRS Forms 1040 or 1040NR?
- 3.10. \_\_\_\_ When the IRS or state did an assessment under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6020(b). This document establishes that all such assessments against human beings or using the 1040 form are illegal.
- 3.11. \_\_\_\_ When Plaintiff failed to rebut a collection notice from the IRS?
- 3.12. \_\_\_\_ When the IRS levied monies from Plaintiff's EXCLUSIVELY private account, which must be held by a PUBLIC OFFICER per 26 U.S.C. §6331(a) before it can lawfully be levied?
- 3.13. \_\_\_\_ When the government decided they wanted to STEAL money of the Plaintiff and simply TOOK it, and were protected from the THEFT by a complicit U.S. Department of Justice, who split the proceeds with them?
- 3.14. \_\_\_\_ When Plaintiff demonstrated legal ignorance of the law to the government sufficient to overlook or not recognize that it is impossible to convert PRIVATE to PUBLIC without my consent, as the Declaration of Independence requires.
4. Proof of the lawful rules for converting PRIVATE, EXCLUSIVELY OWNED property to PUBLIC property have been honored by the Respondents.

*"Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, - 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;' and to 'secure,' not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. That property [or income] which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of, subject to these limitations: First, that he shall not use it to his neighbor's injury, and that does not mean that he must use it for his neighbor's benefit [e.g. SOCIAL SECURITY, Medicare, and every other public "benefit"]; second, that if he devotes it to a public use, he gives to the public a right to control that use; and third, that whenever the public needs require, the public may take it upon payment of due compensation."*

[Budd v. People of State of New York, [143 U.S. 517](#) (1892)]

The above rules are summarized below:

**Table 4: Rules for converting private property to a public use or a public office**

#	Description	Requires consent of owner to be taken from owner?
1	The owner of property justly acquired enjoys full and exclusive use and control over the property. This right includes <u>the right to exclude government uses</u> or ownership of said property.	Yes
2	He may not use the property to injure the equal rights of his neighbor. For instance, when you murder someone, the government can take your liberty and labor from you by putting you in jail or your life from you by instituting the death penalty against you. Both your life and your labor are “property”. Therefore, the basis for the “taking” was violation of the equal rights of a fellow sovereign “neighbor”.	No
3	He cannot be compelled or required to use it to “benefit” his neighbor. That means he cannot be compelled to donate the property to any franchise that would “benefit” his neighbor such as Social Security, Medicare, etc.	Yes
4	If he donates it to a public use, he gives the public the right to control that use.	Yes
5	Whenever the public needs require, the public may take it without his consent upon payment of due compensation. E.g. “eminent domain”.	No

## 7.5 Remedies against illegal franchise enforcement<sup>58</sup>

The following remedies are available when compelled to appear before a franchise court:

1. One should ALWAYS start from the following presumptions and make the GOVERNMENT prove the contrary:
  - 1.1. That all your property is EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE unless and until the government PROVES you expressly consented in writing to either donate it to them or surrender it.
  - 1.2. The only way a government can take away PRIVATE property is if you:
    - 1.2.1. Knowingly donated the property to the government can they lawfully acquire the right to regulate or control or tax or burden its use.
    - 1.2.2. Used it to hurts someone else in violation of the criminal law.
  - 1.3. You are presumed to be a NON-franchisee, NON-taxpayer, NON-driver, and NON-spouse unless and until the government proves WITH EVIDENCE that you lawfully consented to those statuses in writing and occupied a public office BEFORE you consented. Franchises cannot be used to CREATE new public offices, but only to add “benefits” to existing offices. This is a corollary to the “innocent until proven guilty rule”.
2. No federal court can DECLARE or DECIDE that you are a statutory “taxpayer”.
  - 2.1. They are prohibited from doing so by 28 U.S.C. §2201(a).

*Specifically, Rowen seeks a declaratory judgment against the United States of America with respect to "whether or not the plaintiff is a taxpayer pursuant to, and/or under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14)." (See Compl. at 2.) **This Court lacks jurisdiction to issue a declaratory judgment "with respect to Federal taxes other than actions brought under section 7428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986," a code section that is not at issue in the instant action. See 28 U.S.C. § 2201; see also Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991)** (affirming dismissal of claim for declaratory relief under § 2201 where claim concerned question of tax liability). Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is hereby GRANTED, and the instant action is hereby DISMISSED.*

*[Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. (N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005)]*

- 2.2. They also cannot MAKE you one by simply PRESUMING that you are one, because that would violate due process of law and turn legal process into an act of religion in violation of the First Amendment.
- 2.3. They cannot do INDIRECTLY that which they cannot do DIRECTLY. Hence, they cannot TREAT you like a franchisee if you are not one without exercising eminent domain over PRIVATE property.

<sup>58</sup> Source: *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030, Section 29.5; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

3. The status you voluntarily acquire under the civil law is how you contract with and associate with the rest of the world. The purpose of establishing all civil government to protect your right to NOT associate with and NOT contract with those around you. NO ONE in government can impose any civil statutory status upon you without your consent, and if they do, they are exercising eminent domain over PRIVATE property. The amount of property subject to the eminent domain is all the PUBLIC RIGHTS that attach to the status. Such statuses include “taxpayer” (under the tax code), “driver” (under the vehicle code), “spouse” (under the family code), etc. Eminent domain without compensation is THEFT and a “taking” under the Fifth Amendment. For details on this subject, see:

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

4. The ONLY THING that a party who is NOT a franchisee can do in a franchise court is challenge jurisdiction. Any attempt to invoke the “benefits” or “protections” of the franchise agreement is a tacit admission that you are subject to it and therefore a statutory “taxpayer” (under the tax code), “driver” (under the vehicle code), “spouse” (under the family code), etc.
5. Throughout the legal proceeding in the franchise court, it is important to insist on the absolute equality of all participants and to emulate the behavior of your opponent. The only way you can become UNEQUAL in relation to the government is to CONSENT, and that consent was procured when you sign up for the franchise by submitting an application that DOES NOT reserve all your rights:
- 5.1. If the government claims sovereign immunity, then you can too. The government is one of delegated powers ALONE, and the Sovereign People cannot truthfully delegate that which they personally and individually, as well as collectively 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)]*

- 5.2. If they claim the right to effectively “elect” you into a public office by allowing third parties to file knowingly false information returns against you and then refuse to correct them or prosecute the filers, then you have the SAME right to acquire rights against them by the same mechanism.

For further information on the above, see:

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

6. The national government MAY NOT lawfully establish any federal franchise within a constitutional state of the Union. The case below has NEVER been overruled:

*"Thus, Congress having power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, may, without doubt, provide for **granting** coasting **licenses**, licenses to pilots, licenses to trade with the Indians, and any other **licenses** necessary or proper for the exercise of that great and extensive power; and the same observation is applicable to every other power of Congress, to the exercise of which the granting of licenses may be incident. All such licenses confer authority, and give rights to the licensee.*

*But very different considerations apply to the **internal commerce** or **domestic trade** of the States. Over this commerce and trade Congress has no power of regulation nor any direct control. This power belongs exclusively to the States. No interference by Congress with the business of citizens transacted within a State is warranted by the Constitution, except such as is strictly incidental to the exercise of powers clearly granted to the legislature. The power to authorize a business within a State is plainly repugnant to the exclusive power of the State over the same subject. It is true that the power of Congress to tax is a very extensive power. It is given in the Constitution, with only one exception and only two qualifications. Congress cannot tax exports, and it must impose direct taxes by the rule of apportionment, and indirect taxes by the rule of uniformity. Thus limited, and thus only, it reaches every subject, and may be exercised at discretion. But, it reaches only existing subjects. Congress cannot authorize [e.g. LICENSE, using a Social Security Number (SSN) or Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)] a trade or business [per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)] within a State in order to tax it."*  
*[License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866) ]*

7. There are NO limitations upon the establishment of franchise on federal territory. However, such franchises are NATIONAL franchises rather than FEDERAL franchises that may not lawfully be either OFFERED or ENFORCED within a constitutional state of the Union:

1                   *"Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and*  
2 *uniform to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase*  
3 *or conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every*  
4 *state in this Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the*  
5 *definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people,*  
6 *and is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of*  
7 *the territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana,*  
8 *Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of*  
9 *government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America,*  
10 *and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by*  
11 *the President. It was not until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a*  
12 *legislature by vote of the people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the*  
13 *Mississippi, Congress thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over*  
14 *them, or to declare that the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the*  
15 *privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights."*  
16 *[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]*

- 17 8. The limitations imposed by the preceding two items are evaded and undermined primarily through the following  
18 techniques by the corrupt judge and government prosecutor. You should be on the lookout for these tactics, and those  
19 mentioned in the previous section:
  - 20 8.1. Confusing the STATUTORY, CONSTITUTIONAL, or COMMON contexts for the terms "State", "United  
21 States", "income", "employee", "gross income".
  - 22 8.2. Refusing to define WHICH of the TWO contexts are implied.
  - 23 8.3. Refusing to enforce the burden of proof on the part of the government to prove that the geographic area you are in  
24 is EXPRESSLY within the definition of the geographical terms.
- 25 9. A Bill of Attainder is a penalty administered or collected by OTHER than the judicial branch of the government. It is  
26 an unconstitutional "Bill of Attainder" for a franchise judge (all of whom are in the executive rather than judicial  
27 branch) or a franchise code to assess a penalty against:
  - 28 9.1. Exclusively private parties, because the U.S. Supreme Court held that the ability to regulate EXCLUSIVELY  
29 private conduct is repugnant to the Constitution.
  - 30 9.2. Those who are NOT consenting parties to the franchise and therefore NOT public officers.
  - 31 9.3. Those who are outside the branch of government that the judge is in. The separation of powers forbids branches  
32 from affecting or enforcing against OTHER branches of the government.
- 33 10. The party you are litigating against on the other side of the courtroom is a government attorney. He will claim to  
34 represent the "State of \_\_\_\_" but in fact there are TWO "States of \_\_\_\_"
  - 35 10.1. The body CORPORATE (the corporation). The "State" is defined in the STATUTORY law as a corporation, and  
36 all public officers within the government are officers of this corporation. Even the government attorney you are  
37 litigating against is a "franchisee" as a licensed attorney. He is even called an "officer of the court" and therefore  
38 of the government.
  - 39 10.2. The body POLITIC, which is the people. The "State" is defined in the COMMON law as The Sovereign People  
40 and NOT the government.
- 41 11. It is very important to get on the record WHICH of the above two separate and distinct "States of \_\_\_\_" the  
42 government attorney, AND by implication the judge, are representing. By admitting WHICH of the above two that is  
43 being represented in actions before a franchise court, the government attorney indirectly is admitting that he is  
44 enforcing a franchise AND that you must be a franchisee and public officer in order for the court to have any  
45 jurisdiction at all.
- 46 12. In proceedings within franchise courts, the government as your opponent has the burden of proving that:
  - 47 12.1. You expressly consented to the franchise and thereby waived your sovereign immunity. Otherwise the "public  
48 rights" or privileges enforced by the court are being STOLEN.
  - 49 12.2. You had the capacity to consent to the franchise because you were domicile on federal territory AT THE TIME  
50 you consented and CONTINUE to be domiciled there at the time of the alleged offense. Otherwise, you would  
51 not be a "person" or "individual" under the franchise contract but rather would be a nonresident and transient  
52 foreigner protected by the Longarm Statutes of the state and the Minimum Contacts Doctrine.
  - 53 12.3. That you were a public officer in the government BEFORE you consented, because you can't elect yourself into a  
54 public office by filling out a government form. It's a crime in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912.
- 55 13. It is a violation of due process of law for the judge or the government prosecutor to PRESUME anything.
  - 56 13.1. All presumptions that violate due process cause the judgment to be void.
  - 57 13.2. All presumptions that are not substantiated with supporting evidence:
    - 58 13.2.1. Are very injurious to your rights and liberty.
    - 59 13.2.2. Violate the separation of powers by allowing otherwise constitutional courts to unlawfully entertain  
60 "political questions".

- 13.2.3. Cause a violation of due process of law because decisions are not based on legally admissible evidence. Instead, presumptions unlawfully and prejudicially turn beliefs into evidence in violation of Federal Rule of Evidence 610 and the Hearsay Rule, Federal Rule of Evidence 802.
- 13.2.4. Can be abused to replace equal protection and constitutional rights with franchises, privileges, hypocrisy, and lawful discrimination.
- 13.2.5. Turn private law franchises "codes" into a state-sponsored bible upon which "worship services" are based and convey the "force of law" upon them through your implied consent.
- 13.2.6. Turn judges into "priests" of a civil religion.
- 13.2.7. Turn legal pleadings into "prayers" to the priest.
- 13.2.8. Turn legal process into an act of religion.
- 13.2.9. Transform "attorneys" into deacons of a state-sponsored religion.
- 13.2.10. Turn the courtroom into a church building.
- 13.2.11. Turn court proceedings into a "worship service" akin to that of a church.
- 13.2.12. Turn "taxes" into tithes to a state-sponsored church, if the controversy before the court involves taxation.

14. In proceedings within franchise courts, the government as your opponent has the burden of proving the following. A failure to meet that burden of proof constitutes the equivalent of what we call "eminent domain by presumption":
- 14.1. You expressly consented to the franchise. Otherwise the "public rights" or privileges enforced by the court are being STOLEN. This is the same requirement the government imposes on all litigants, which is that if you want to sue them, you have to produce a WRITTEN, STATUTORY evidence of their consent to be sued.
- 14.2. You had the capacity to consent to the franchise because you were domicile on federal territory AT THE TIME you consented and CONTINUE to be domiciled there at the time of the alleged offense. Otherwise, you would not be a "person" or "individual" under the franchise contract but rather would be a nonresident and transient foreigner protected by the Longarm Statutes of the state and the Minimum Contacts Doctrine.
- 14.3. That the consent took the form that YOU and not THEY specified.
- 14.4. That if they are enforcing a contract or compact, that THEY have an equal and opposite and mutual obligation and requirement to provide "consideration" not as THEY define it, but as YOU define it. Contracts are NOT valid unless there is MUTUAL consideration and MUTUAL obligation:

**Contract.** An agreement between two or more [sovereign] persons which creates an obligation to do or not to do a particular thing. As defined in Restatement, Second, Contracts §3: "A contract is a promise or a set of promises for the breach of which the law gives a remedy, or the performance of which the law in some way recognizes as a duty." A legal relationships consisting of the rights and duties of the contracting parties; a promise or set of promises constituting an agreement between the parties that gives each a legal duty to the other and also the right to seek a remedy for the breach of those duties. Its essentials are competent parties, subject matter, a legal consideration, mutuality of agreement, and mutuality of consideration. Lamoureux v. Burrillville Racing Ass'n, 91 R.I. 94, 161 A.2d. 213, 215.

*Under U.C.C., term refers to total legal obligation which results from parties' agreement as affected by the Code. Section 1-201(11). As to sales, "contract" and "agreement" are limited to those relating to present or future sales of goods, and "contract for sale" includes both a present sale of goods and a contract to sell goods at a future time. U.C.C. §2-106(a).*

*The writing which contains the agreement of parties with the terms and conditions, and which serves as a proof of the obligation*  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 322]*

- 14.5. That you were a public officer in the government BEFORE you consented, because you can't lawfully:
- 14.5.1. ALIENATE an UNALIENABLE right, even with your 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]*

- 14.5.2. Unilaterally "elect" yourself into a public office by filling out a government form. It's a crime in violation of 18 U.S.C. §912.

14.5.3. Can't consent to help or assist your public servants to VIOLATE the purpose of their creation, which is to protect PRIVATE rights. The FIRST step in protecting such rights is to PREVENT them from being converted to PUBLIC rights, even WITH the consent of the owner. Any attempt to make a profitable business or franchise out of destroying or undermining PRIVATE rights and PRIVATE property turns the civil temple into a whorehouse and a den of thieves. It doesn't matter what you CALL that "business", even if it is called a "trade or business", it's still a breach of the public trust and the fiduciary duty of all public officers to protect PRIVATE rights and PRIVATE property.

15. By enforcing or imposing the obligations of the public officer franchisee against you absent your express and lawful consent, you are:

15.1. A victim of eminent domain in violation of the state constitution, because you are not receiving compensation for the rights STOLEN from you.

15.2. Impersonating a public officer in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §912.

15.3. A victim of grand theft.

15.4. Participating in a violation of the Thirteenth Amendment prohibition against involuntary servitude. That amendment applies EVERYWHERE, including federal territory.

## 7.6 Franchise enforcement outside of federal territory is a criminal act of "simulating legal process"<sup>59</sup>

Readers should be interested to know that enforcement of franchises outside the territory they are created in amounts to a criminal act of "simulating legal process". Most states have statutes forbidding such activities. Below is a definition of "simulating legal process":

*"A person commits the offense of simulating legal process if he or she "recklessly causes to be delivered to another any document that simulates a summons, complaint, judgment, or other court process with the intent to . . . cause another to submit to the putative authority of the document; or take any action or refrain from taking any action in response to the document, in compliance with the document, or on the basis of the document."*  
[Texas Penal Code Annotated, §32.48(a)(2)]

Below is one ruling by a Texas court relating to a "simulating legal process" charge against an ecclesiastical court:

### Free Exercise of Religion

*Government action may burden the free exercise of religion, in violation of the First Amendment, [10] in two quite different ways: by interfering with a believer's ability to observe the commands or practices of his faith and by encroaching on the ability of a church to manage its internal affairs. Westbrook v. Penley, 231 S.W.3d. 389, 395 (Tex. 2007). In appellant's pro se motions, he refers to the "exercise of one's faith." More specifically, he raised the issue of ecclesiastical abstention in the trial court and cites to cases concerning this doctrine on appeal. His arguments are directed at the trial court's jurisdiction over this matter, not the constitutionality of section 32.48. So, it appears the judiciary's exercise of jurisdiction over the matter, rather than the Legislature's enactment of section 32.48, is the target of his challenge. We, then, will address that aspect of the constitutional issue he now presents on appeal; we will determine whether the trial court's exercise of jurisdiction violated appellant's right to free exercise of religion by encroaching on the ability of his church to manage its internal affairs.*

*The Constitution forbids the government from interfering with the right of hierarchical religious bodies to establish their own internal rules and regulations and to create tribunals for adjudicating disputes over religious matters. See Serbian E. Orthodox Diocese v. Milivojevic, 426 U.S. 696, 708–09, 724–25, 96 S.Ct. 2372, 49 L.Ed.2d. 151 (1976). Based on this constitutionally-mandated abstention, secular courts may not intrude into the church's governance of "religious" or "ecclesiastical" matters, such as theological controversy, church discipline, ecclesiastical government, or the conformity of members to standards of morality. See In re Godwin, 293 S.W.3d. 742, 748 (Tex.App.—San Antonio 2009, orig. proceeding).*

*The record shows that Coleman, to whom the "Abatement" was delivered, was not a member of appellant's church. That being so, the church's position on the custody matter is not a purely ecclesiastical matter over which the trial court should have abstained from exercising its jurisdiction. **This is not an internal affairs issue because the record conclusively establishes that the recipient is not a member of the church.** The ecclesiastical abstention doctrine does not operate to prevent the trial court from exercising its jurisdiction over this matter. We overrule appellant's final issue.*

[Michael Runningwolf v. State of Texas, 317 S.W.3d. 829 (2010);

SOURCE: [http://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_case?case=13768262149764043927](http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=13768262149764043927)]

<sup>59</sup> Source: *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030, Section 29.6; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

We take the same position as the court in the above ruling in protecting OUR members from secular courts as the secular courts take toward private courts. The First Amendment requires that you have a right to either NOT associate or to associate with any group you choose INCLUDING, but not limited to the “state” having general jurisdiction where you live. That means you have a RIGHT to NOT be a statutory:

1. A “citizen” or “resident” in the area where you physically are.
2. A “driver” under the vehicle code.
3. A “spouse” under the family code.
4. A “taxpayer” under the tax code.

The dividing line between who are “members” and who are NOT members is who has a domicile in that specific jurisdiction. The subject of domicile is extensively covered in the following insightful document:

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

We allege that secular franchise courts such as tax court, traffic court, family court, social security administrative court, and even civil court in your area are equally culpable for the SAME crime of “simulating legal process” if they serve legal process upon anyone who is NOT a “member” of their “state” and a public officer, and who has notified them of that fact. As such, any at least CIVIL process served upon them by secular courts of the de facto government is ALSO a criminal simulation of legal process because instituted against non-consenting parties who are non-residents and “non-members”, just as in the above case. Membership has to be consensual.

*The record shows that Coleman, to whom the “Abatement” was delivered, was not a member of appellant’s church. That being so, the church’s position on the custody matter is not a purely ecclesiastical matter over which the trial court should have abstained from exercising its jurisdiction. **This is not an internal affairs issue because the record conclusively establishes that the recipient is not a member of the church.** The ecclesiastical abstention doctrine does not operate to prevent the trial court from exercising its jurisdiction over this matter. We overrule appellant’s final issue.*  
[Michael Runningwolf v. State of Texas, 317 S.W.3d. 829 (2010);  
SOURCE: [http://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_case?case=13768262149764043927](http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=13768262149764043927)]

We also argue that just like the above ruling, the secular government in fact and in deed is ALSO a church, as described in the following exhaustive proof of that fact:

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

In support of the above, Black’s Law Dictionary defines “franchise courts” such as traffic court and family court as PRIVATE 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 warrant) 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]

As a BARE minimum, we think that if you get summoned into any franchise court for violations of the franchise, such as tax court, traffic court, and family court, then the government as moving party who summoned you should at LEAST have the burden of proving that you EXPRESSLY CONSENTED in writing to become a “member” of the group that created the court, such as “taxpayer”, “driver”, “spouse”, etc. and that if they CANNOT satisfy that burden of proof, then:

1. All charges should be dismissed.

- 1 2. The franchise judge and government prosecutor should BOTH be indicted and civilly sued for simulating legal process  
2 under the common law and not statutory civil law.

3 **8. Why there aren't any honorable Pharisee lawyers willing to expose and fix**  
4 **this fraud**

5 The reason so few of the modern Pharisee lawyers are willing to confront, expose, and prosecute the massive identity theft  
6 is because they don't want to risk their lucrative livelihood by pissing off a just as corrupted judge and end up disbarred.  
7 See the following authorities for proof that attorneys have a criminal conflict of interest and are destroyed if they speak up,  
8 and why they don't speak up about the corruption:

- 9 1. *Dare to Disagree*, Margaret Heffernan  
10 [http://www.ted.com/talks/margaret\\_heffernan\\_dare\\_to\\_disagree](http://www.ted.com/talks/margaret_heffernan_dare_to_disagree)  
11 2. *Petition for Admission to Practice*, Family Guardian Fellowship  
12 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/PetForAdmToPractice-USDC.pdf>  
13 3. *Why You Don't Want to Hire an Attorney*, Family Guardian Fellowship  
14 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/Corruption/WhyYouDontWantAnAtty/WhyYouDontWant>  
15 [AnAttorney.htm](http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/Corruption/WhyYouDontWantAnAtty/WhyYouDontWantAnAttorney.htm)

16 The implication of the above is that if the problem is going to get fixed, THE PEOPLE as individuals must learn and  
17 enforce the law. Everyone else who could do it in the legal profession has a criminal financial conflict of interest. An  
18 important purpose of our ministry is to educate and train people how to do this on their own.  
19

## 9. Are You Anti-Semitic?<sup>60</sup>

It is a fact that the Pharisees were Jews and they advocated the murder of Jesus Christ. Does that make anyone who is on Christ's side antisemitic?

The term "antisemitism" in our day and age has more explosive power than a Bradley tank. Let's not be deceived by anti "antisemitism" propaganda of the Jewish controlled media.

First, no good Christian man is antisemitic because his best friends are true Jews: Jesus, Paul, Peter, John, Isaiah, Jeremiah, David, Samuel, Moses, and Abraham. Moreover, Christians are true Jews in the Biblical sense because they have a circumcised heart (Romans 2:29). So, they cannot possibly be antisemitic.

Second, those calling themselves "Jews" today are vigorously anti-Christ, anti-Christian, and anti-humanity. The hostility and bias of the Jewish, Zionistic media towards Christianity stands out like an ice pick thrust at your eyes.

Third, the term "antisemitism" is a misnomer because modern day Jews are not genetically related to Abraham and Shem. Rather, they are of European, Ashkenazi descent; i.e., they do not have one drop of Semitic, Jewish blood in them (Genesis 10:1-3). They are *goy* (Gentiles) who call themselves "Jews." All of them. This is the hoax. This is the deception thrust down the throats of the uneducated, post-Christian West. And, this is the truth that Iranians and Egyptians know. Palestinians have more Semitic blood in them than any Jew living in the Holy Land.

Fourth, many, but not all Ashkenazi so called "Jews" are political Zionists; that is, they work together to dominate and control the west through their corporate money-banking-monopoly system. It is not a coincidence that the Jews control Hollywood, the media, the Federal Reserve, and the banking industry in the United States.

Fifth, it is not unchristian to hate lies, deception, and propaganda; nor is it unchristian to hate imposters, deceivers, and manipulators like Zionists who have sold themselves out to money and shout "antisemitism" every time they are criticized for their evil ways. They are, after all, members of the synagogue of Satan.

Finally, many, but not all Ashkenazi so called "Jews" are racists to the core colluding with other Jews on how to dominate, control, and conquer the *goy* in Germany, Britain, and the U.S.A.; that is, to disestablish Christianity, to demoralize the people through pornography, and to divide these countries by promoting globalism.

So, if we criticize today's "Jews," are we antisemitic? Absolutely not!

What Americans and Europeans need to do is to show how anti-Christian these so called "Jews" really are and to expose their racist, Zionist, money-monopoly agenda in the West. They have, after all identified themselves with the anti-Christ of the first century . . .

*"Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men"*  
[1 Thessalonians 2:15, Bible, NKJV]

For more information on this subject, see:

1. *Origin of the Term "Anti-Semitism"*, Nike Insights  
<http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/origin-of-the-term-anti-semitism/>
2. *Definition of a Jew*, Nike Insights  
<http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/definition-of-a-jew/>
3. *The Jews are NOT God's Chosen People*, Nike Insights  
<http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-jews-are-not-gods-chosen-people/>
4. *Jewish Myths Among Us*, Nike Insights  
<http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/jewish-myths-among-us/>
5. *A Jewish Defector Warns America About Zionism*, Nike Insights  
<http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-truth-about-wwi-and-wwii/>

<sup>60</sup> Adapted from: *Are You Antisemitic?*, Nike Insights; <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/are-you-antisemitic/>.

- 1 6. *Brother Nathanael Kapner*-a Jew turned Christian who exposes the agenda of modern Zionist Jews  
2 6.1. Website: <http://brothernathanaelfoundation.org/>  
3 6.2. Youtube Channel: <https://www.youtube.com/user/zionget>  
4 7. *Sheldon Emry Library Disclaimer*-clarifies the proper and Biblical Christian perspective on Jews  
5 <http://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/Ministry/Disclaimer.htm>  
6 8. *The Talmud Unmasked*, Rev. I.B. Pranaitis  
7 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-talmud-unmasked-rev-i-b-pranaitis/>  
8 9. *Myth of the Judeo-Christian Ethic*, Nike Insights  
9 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/myth-of-the-judeo-christian-ethic/>  
10 10. *What is Zionism?*, Nike Insights  
11 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/what-is-zionism-2/>  
12 11. *What is Wrong with Christian Zionism?*, Nike Insights  
13 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/what-is-zionism/>  
14 12. *Christian Zionism: The New Heresy that Undermines Middle East Peace*, Nike Insights  
15 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/christian-zionism-the-new-heresy-that-undermines-middle-east-peace/>  
16 13. *The Jewish Connection to Slavery*, Nike Insights  
17 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-jewish-connection-to-slavery/>  
18 14. *Jesus Was Not a Jew*, Nike Insights  
19 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/jesus-was-not-a-jew/>  
20 15. *Why Jesus Was NOT a Jew*, Nike Insights  
21 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/why-jesus-was-not-a-jew/>  
22 16. *The Jewish Slaughter of Christians*, Nike Insights  
23 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/christians-are-not-immune-to-the-lies-in-the-propaganda-war/>  
24 17. *The Excommunication of Christ*, Nike Insights  
25 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/the-excommunicated-christ/>  
26 18. *Forget Russia! Look at the Jewish Lobby in D.C.*, Nike Insights  
27 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/forget-russia-look-at-the-jewish-lobby-in-d-c/>  
28 19. *In Defense of Brother Nathanael Kapner*, Nike Insights  
29 <http://nikeinsights.famguardian.org/forums/topic/in-defense-of-brother-nathanael-kapner/>  
30

## 31 **10. Rebutted False Arguments Against This Memorandum**

### 32 **10.1 ARGUMENT: You ought to consider other religious texts. The Bible is not the inerrant** 33 **word of God**

34 **ARGUMENT:** You might incorporate The *Urantia* book into your studies and comments regarding the Bible's teachings.  
35 And you might consider the arguments of Thomas Paine in his *Age of Reason* volumes regarding the Bible. I believe it  
36 utterly irrational to see the bible as infallible, inerrant, or the word of God. Authors have quite clearly editorialized and  
37 harmonized its texts, and the editorial committees have hand-picked certain texts and rejected other texts, based on their  
38 prejudices.

39 Even from the text of the four "gospels", Jesus never taught the atonement doctrine. He taught that man can have a direct  
40 personal relationship with God, that sacrifices do not appease God, that one gets eternal life (with God) by loving one's  
41 fellows and loving God, that forgiving others opens the channel to receive God's forgiveness, and that salvation is a  
42 consequence of the faith-embrace of one's sonship with God, evidenced by loving God, delivering unselfish loving service  
43 to others, and having faith in the supreme human desire to become like God (to do his will).

44 "Be you therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect"

45 "Go and sin no more"

46 "Forgive 70 times 7"

47 "If you forgive the sins of others against you, your Heavenly Father will forgive your sins" (but if you don't, he  
48 won't).

**REBUTTAL:** There is only one MAJOR defect with your suggested approach: You become god and in effect practice idolatry in the process. Recall that Rousas Rushdoony rightfully declared that the source of law in any society is the god of that society.

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

By inventing your own approach, you make yourself into god or at least LIKE God, which was Satan's greatest sin. See Isaiah 14. Anyone that can subjectively define or redefine god by choosing which scriptures to believe and which ones not has made THEMSELVES into a pagan god and an object of idolatry. That's the ultimate and most important conclusion of this memorandum of law.

If you have no rational comeback for that, then we couldn't possibly follow your admonition, no matter how well intended. Its natural and all too commonplace to jump to quick conclusions (presumptions) without examining all the facts as explained here. We invite a reasoned, comprehensive solution for this FATAL problem and rational dissonance. Until then, platitudes such as what you provide that don't rationally reconcile all the facts or promote misunderstanding and a repetition of the corruption we find ourselves in don't help.

Nevertheless, thanks for the feedback anyway. A much closer look at this memorandum will keep the focus of the debate on facts and reason and away from emotions. We may be a religions ministry, but we still insist on reason and evidence as much as possible.

## 11. Conclusions

Some people like to say that those who refuse to learn history are doomed to repeat it. The Holy Bible provides a wealth of historical evidence from which to learn about the mistakes of the governments of history. The founding fathers clearly learned from those mistakes, based upon how they crafted the Constitution for the United States of America. However, even as good as their research was, they left a few imperfections that facilitated the corruption of our legal system. Of this corruption, Thomas Jefferson said:

*"In every government on earth is some trace of human weakness, some germ of corruption and degeneracy, which cunning will discover, and wickedness insensibly open, cultivate and improve."*  
[Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Virginia Q.XIV, 1782. ME 2:207]

The abuse and misinterpretation of legal language has become the vehicle to undermine, corrupt, and destroy the glorious system they engineered for our protection by turning a society of law into a society of men. That is why it is extremely important to study the rule statutory interpretation and the organic laws to uncover, prosecute, and eliminate the source of abuse.

The corruption of the current legal profession has provided the engine to execute and expand that abuse. It has morphed into the original role filled by the Pharisees and Saducees of Jesus' time. Jesus warned that this would happen, but He didn't tell us how to fight it, unfortunately.

This pamphlet provides tools to understand, expose, and fight it IN COURT, where it really counts. Otherwise, all of Jesus' criticisms of the Pharisees are but a clanging symbol that we can complain about but not really do anything to fight.

## 12. Resources for further study and rebuttal

If you would like to further investigate the matters discussed in this pamphlet beyond appears here, we refer you to the following FREE resources elsewhere on the Internet:

1. *Sheldon Emry Memorial Library* -extensive materials that expose the fraud of Christian Zionism and the true nature of Western Christians as the New Israel of the New Testament.  
<http://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/>
2. *Exposing Judaism Video*-details on how Judaism hates and persecutes Jesus  
<https://youtu.be/bRaRf4dMvhw>

- 1 3. *JudeOne3Four*-exposes corruption and persecution of various religions  
2 [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCaQERxvDX\\_pBPuIVmhalsEQ](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCaQERxvDX_pBPuIVmhalsEQ)
- 3 4. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Alfred Edersheim, 1883. Written by a Jew who converted to Christianity.  
4 The most comprehensive work ever written about the details of Jesus and the Pharisees.  
5 <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/edersheim/lifetimes>
- 6 5. *Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course*, Form #12.026 -how the Pharisee lawyers corrupted our  
7 modern government  
8 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 9 6. *De Facto Government Scam*, Form #05.043-detailed description of all the causes and symptoms of the corruption  
10 described in the previous item focused on the current government.  
11 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 12 7. *Laws of the Bible*, Form #13.001-detailed treatment on biblical law, choice of law, and legal corruption of the Bible.  
13 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 14 8. *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014 -detailed description of how modern Pharisees distort legal  
15 language to defeat the intent and requirements of the written law.  
16 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 17 9. *Policy Document: Problems with Atheistic Anarchism*, Form #08.020 -describes anarchism. Useful in applying it to  
18 antinomian Christians or atheists trying to promote freedom without the foundation of God's WHOLE law.  
19 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 20 10. *Statutes and Statutory Construction, Second Edition*, Jabez Sutherland, 1904. The book that most judges use to  
21 determine the rules of statutory construction.  
22 10.1. Volume 1: <http://books.google.com/books?id=Jw49AAAAIAAJ&printsec=titlepage>  
23 10.2. Volume 2: <http://books.google.com/books?id=4xA9AAAAIAAJ&printsec=titlepage>
- 24 11. *Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction*, Form #05.017  
25 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 26 12. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: Includes  
27 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/includes.htm>
- 28 13. *Family Guardian Forum 6.5: Words of Art*  
29 <http://famguardian.org/forums/index.php?s=0fcf93fd62295562eebe7951732e2f88&showforum=30>
- 30 14. *Truth in Taxation Hearing, Section 9, Ambiguity of Law*, Family Guardian Fellowship  
31 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Section%2009.htm>
- 32 15. *Words and Phrases: "includes"*  
33 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Include-WP.pdf>
- 34 16. *Great IRS Hoax*, Form #11.302, Section 2.8.2: Presumption  
35 <http://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm>
- 36 17. *Statutory Interpretation: General Principles and Recent Trends*, Congressional Research Service, Report 97-589  
37 <http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/CRS/Statutory%20Interpretation.General.Principles.MARCH.30.2006.CRS97-589.pdf>  
38

## 13. Questions that Readers, Grand Jurors, and Petit Jurors Should be Asking the Government<sup>61</sup>

This section contains some questions which are very effective at “shutting up” those who enjoy abuse legal language to deceive people and advantage the government or corrupt political leaders. It exposes not ALL lawyers, but only Pharisee lawyers for the FRAUDS that they are. It uses admissible, positive law evidence to prove each point where possible.

The We the People Foundation for Constitutional Education held a formal question and answer session on February 27-28, 2002 at the Washington Marriott in Washington D.C. The Internal Revenue Service and the U.S. Department of Justice were formally invited and absolutely refused to attend. Thirteen avenues of inquiry were conducted, one of which involved resolving ambiguity of law. The Ambiguity of Law area included 27 questions that shed much light on the subject of “includes”. You can review the questions and all accompanying evidence at:

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Section%2009.htm>

### 13.1 Introduction

In the tax code, the IRS formally redefines the word "includes" to effectively mean "includes everything". This deliberate misuse of the word "includes" leads the masses to falsely believe the IRS has jurisdiction over things, places and People that it does not.

This deliberately induced confusion and ambiguity is an act of tyranny against the People and a usurpation of power not authorized the IRS under the Constitution. Without well-defined words, the laws are meaningless, null, void, and unenforceable.

### 13.2 Findings and Conclusions

With the assistance of the following series of questions, we will show that the government has deliberately obfuscated and confused the laws on taxation to create "cognitive dissonance", uncertainty, confusion, and fear of citizens about the exact requirements of the laws on taxation and the precise jurisdiction of the U.S. government. This confusion has been exploited to violate the due process rights of the sovereign People and encourage lawless and abusive violations of due process protections guaranteed by the Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. We will also show that:

- Critical legal terms in the IRS code defy proper definition and interpretation because of the IRS’s misuse of the word "includes".
- This deliberate misuse of the word "includes" leads the masses to falsely believe the IRS has jurisdiction over things, places and People it does not.
- This deliberately induced confusion and ambiguity is an act of tyranny against the People and a usurpation of power not authorized the IRS under the Constitution.

**Bottom Line:** Without well-defined words, a law is meaningless and unenforceable. This is a basic principle of due process.

### 13.3 Section Summary

[Acrobat version of this section including questions and evidence](#) (large: 3.83 Mbytes)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Section%2009-All.pdf>

<sup>61</sup> Source: *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014, Section 16; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

## 13.4 Further Study On Our Website:

1. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: Includes  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/ChallJurisdiction/Definitions/DefinitionOfIncludes.htm>  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/ChallJurisdiction/Definitions/DefinitionOfIncludes.htm>
2. *Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302*:
  - 2.1. Section 3.9.1: "Words of Art": Lawyer Deception Using Definitions
  - 2.2. Section 3.9.1.8: "Includes" and "Including" ([26 U.S.C. §7701\(c\)](#))
  - 2.3. Section 5.10.6: Scams with the Word "includes"
  - 2.4. Section 5.10.9: Why the "Void for Vagueness Doctrine" Should be Invoked By The Courts to Render the Internal Revenue Code Unconstitutional in Total
  - 2.5. Section 6.9: Treasury/IRS Cover-Ups, Obfuscation and Scandals
  - 2.6. Section 6.12: Judicial Scandals Related to the Income Tax
  - 2.7. Section 6.13: Legal Profession Scandals
  - 2.8. Chapter 6: History of Federal Government Income Tax Fraud, Racketeering, and Extortion in the U.S.A.

## 13.5 Open-ended questions

1. How can a federal government of limited, delegated powers that is consistent with the requirements of the Ninth and Tenth Amendments be defined using words whose meaning can only be determined by subjective and changing interpretation?

*"The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external [to the States] objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part, be connected."*  
[Federalist Paper #45, James Madison]

2. How can we have a "society of laws and not of men" if the IRS insists that I must rely on their interpretation of the meaning of a word instead of what a person with average intelligence would conclude by reading enacted positive law for themselves? Isn't the law supposed to be written so that the man of average intelligence can clearly and unambiguously discern what is required of him without the aid of an "ordained priest" of the civil religion of socialism fostered by the IRS?

*"The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right..."*

*"The government of the United States is the latter description. The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction between a government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed, are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or, that the legislature may alter the constitution by an ordinary act."*

[Marbury v. Madison, [5 U.S. 137](#), 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)]

3. Aren't those who conclude that [26 U.S.C. §7701\(c\)](#) authorizes the extension of a meaning of a word beyond what is clearly shown in the code itself engaging in a statutory presumption which is unconstitutional if implemented against those who are covered by the Bill of Rights and not exercising any agency of the federal government or of a privileged federal corporation?

*This court has held more than once that a statute creating a presumption which operates to deny a fair opportunity to rebut it violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. For example, Bailey v. Alabama, [219 U.S. 219](#), 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v. Georgia, [279 U.S. 1](#), 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215.*

*'It is apparent,' this court said in the Bailey Case ( [219 U.S. 239](#) , 31 S.Ct. 145, 151) 'that a constitutional prohibition cannot be transgressed indirectly by the creation of a statutory presumption any more than it can be violated by direct enactment. The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.'*

4. If “includes” is used in its additive/expansive sense and not all things are described in a law that are added, then how can what is added be determined without the use of presumption and without leaving room for the play of “purely arbitrary power”. Isn’t this a violation of due process?

*“When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of government, the principles on which they are supposed to rest, and review the history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power. Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is, indeed, quite true that there must always be lodged somewhere, and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many cases of mere administration, the responsibility is purely political, no appeal lying except to the ultimate tribunal of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion, or by means of the suffrage. But the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language of the Massachusetts bill of rights, the government of the commonwealth ‘may be a government of laws and not of men.’ For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself.”*  
[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)]

## 13.6 Admissions

These admissions are included for the obstinate readers who just can’t believe the preceding analysis. If you fit into one of these categories and you find yourself in receipt of this pamphlet from one of your workers, you are demanded to rebut it within 10 days. Pursuant to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8\(b\)\(6\)](#), failure to deny within 10 days constitutes an admission to each question. This admission may form the basis for future litigation, should that be necessary in order to protect the rights of the person against whom you are attempting to unlawfully withhold. If you get other than an “Admit” answer, we would certainly like to see the proof of why from enacted law. Please send it to us!

1. Admit that when Supreme Court Justices, Judges of the Courts of Appeals, and Presidents of the United States are unable to agree on what a law says, that law is ambiguous.

- [Click here to see Kolender v. Lawson, 461 U.S. 352, 103 S.Ct. 1855 \(1983\)](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.001.htm>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

2. Admit that an ambiguous meaning for a word violates the requirement for due process of law by preventing a person of average intelligence from being able to clearly understand what the law requires and does not require of him, thus making it impossible at worst or very difficult at best to know if he is following the law.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

3. Admit that Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500, under the definition of “due process of law” states the following:

*“The concept of “due process of law” as it is embodied in Fifth Amendment demands that a law shall not be unreasonable, arbitrary, or capricious and that the means selected shall have a reasonable and substantial relation to the object being sought.”*  
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500]

- [Click here for evidence](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.013.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

4. Admit that when a law is ambiguous, it is unconstitutional and cannot be enforced under the "void for vagueness doctrine" because it violates due process protections guaranteed by the [Fifth](#) and [Sixth Amendments](#) as described by the Supreme Court in the following decisions:

*Origin of the doctrine (see Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U.S. 451)*

- [Click here for Lanzetta v. New Jersey, 306 U.S. 451](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.002a.pdf>
- *Development of the doctrine (see [Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91](#), [Williams v. United States, 341 U.S. 97](#), and [Jordan v. De George, 341 U.S. 223](#)).*
- [Click here for Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.002b.pdf>
- [Click here for Williams v. United States, 341 U.S. 97](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.002c.pdf>
- [Click here for Jordan v. De George, 341 U.S. 223](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.002d.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

5. Admit that the "void for vagueness doctrine" of the Supreme Court was described in *U.S. v. DeCadena* as follows:

*"The essential purpose of the "void for vagueness doctrine" with respect to interpretation of a criminal statute, is to warn individuals of the criminal consequences of their conduct. ... Criminal statutes which fail to give due notice that an act has been made criminal before it is done are unconstitutional deprivations of due process of law."  
[U.S. v. De Cadena, 105 F.Supp. 202, 204 (1952), emphasis added]*

- [Click here for U.S. v. De Cadena, 105 F.Supp. 202, 204 \(1952\)](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.003.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

6. Admit that the word "includes" is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(c\)](#) as follows:

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > Sec. 7701.  
*Sec. 7701. - Definitions*

(c) Includes and including

*The terms "includes" and "including" when used in a definition contained in this title shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined.*

- [Click here for 26 U.S.C. §7701](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.004.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

7. Admit that the word "includes" is defined by the Treasury in the Federal Register as follows:

*"(1) To comprise, comprehend, or embrace...(2) To enclose within; contain; confine...**But granting that the word 'including' is a term of enlargement, it is clear that it only performs that office by introducing the specific elements constituting the enlargement. It thus, and thus only, enlarges the otherwise more limited, preceding general language.**...The word 'including' is obviously used in the sense of its synonyms, comprising; comprehending; embracing."  
[Treasury Decision 3980, Vol. 29, January-December, 1927, pgs. 64 and 65, Definition of "includes"]*

- [Click here for Treasury Decision 3980](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.005.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

8. Admit that the definition of the word "includes" found in Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 763 is as follows:

*"**Include.** (Lat. Includere, to shut in. keep within.) To confine within, hold as an inclosure. Take in, attain, shut up, contain, inclose, comprise, comprehend, embrace, involve. Term may, according to context, express an enlargement and have the meaning of and or in addition to, or merely specify a particular thing already included within general words theretofore used. "Including" within statute is interpreted as a word of enlargement or of illustrative application as well as a word of limitation. Premier Products Co. v. Cameron, 240 Or. 123, 400 P.2d. 227, 228."*  
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 763]

- [Click here for evidence](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.006.pdf)  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.006.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

9. Admit that the ordinary or common definition of a word appearing within a revenue statute may only be implied when there is no governing statutory definition that might supersede it.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

10. Admit that when a statutory definition of a word is provided, that definition supersedes and replaces, rather than enlarges, the common or ordinary meaning of the word.

*"It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term. Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979). Congress' use of the term "propaganda" in this statute, as indeed in other legislation, has no pejorative connotation. As judges, it is our duty to [481 U.S. 485] construe legislation as it is written, not as it might be read by a layman, or as it might be understood by someone who has not even read it."*  
[Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987)]

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

11. Admit that the things or classes of things described in a statutory definition exclude all things not specifically identified somewhere within the statute or other related sections of the Title:

*"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term's ordinary meaning. Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term"); Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 ("As a rule, 'a definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated"); Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases). That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate the contrary."*  
[Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]

*"As a rule, 'a definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated'"*  
[Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379 (1979), n. 10]

*"Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded."*  
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

12. Admit that statutory presumptions which prejudice Constitutionally protected rights are unconstitutional.

his court has held more than once that a statute creating a presumption which operates to deny a fair opportunity to rebut it violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. For example, Bailey v. Alabama, [219 U.S. 219](#), 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v. Georgia, [279 U.S. 1](#), 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215.

'It is apparent,' this court said in the Bailey Case ( [219 U.S. 239](#), 31 S.Ct. 145, 151) 'that a constitutional prohibition cannot be transgressed indirectly by the creation of a statutory presumption any more than it can be violated by direct enactment. The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.'  
[\[Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312 \(1932\)\]](#)

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

13. Admit that vague laws or statutes which do not AS A WHOLE define all that is included have the tendency to compel presumption and to "politicize" the courts by forcing judges and juries to become policymakers instead of factfinders and law enforcers.

"It is a basic principle of due process that an enactment [435 U.S. 982 , 986] is void for vagueness if its prohibitions are not clearly defined. Vague laws offend several important values. First, because we assume that man is free to steer between lawful and unlawful conduct, we insist that laws give the person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited, so that he may act accordingly. Vague laws may trap the innocent by not providing fair warning. Second, if arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement is to be prevented, laws must provide explicit standards for those who apply them. A vague law impermissibly delegates basic policy matters to policemen, judges, and juries for resolution on an ad hoc and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and discriminatory application."  
[\[Grayned v. City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104, 108 \(1972\)\]](#)

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

14. Admit that the Constitution creates a "society of law and not men":

"The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right." Marbury v. Madison, [5 U.S. 137](#); 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

15. Admit that when a judge or jury add to the definition of a word that which does not appear somewhere in the statutes, we end up with a "society of men and not law", which is based on the play of "arbitrary power" which the U.S. Supreme Court describes as "the essence of slavery itself":

"When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of government, the principles on which they are supposed to rest, and review the history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power. Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is, indeed, quite true that there must always be lodged somewhere, and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many cases of mere administration, the responsibility is purely political, no appeal lying except to the ultimate tribunal of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion, or by means of the suffrage. But the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language of the Massachusetts bill of rights, the government of the commonwealth 'may be a government of laws and not of men.' For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself."  
[\[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 \(1886\)\]](#)

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

16. Admit that the Thirteenth Amendment outlaws slavery and involuntary servitude of every sort.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

17. Admit that the following definitions found within the Internal Revenue Code rely upon the meaning of the word "includes" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(c) .

- "State" found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(10) and 4 U.S.C. §110. [Click here for evidence http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007a.pdf](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007a.pdf)
- "United States" found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9). [Click here for evidence http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007a.pdf](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007a.pdf)
- "employee" found in 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) and 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(c)-1 Employee.
- [Click here for 26 U.S.C. §3401\(c\) http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007b.pdf](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007b.pdf)
- [Click here for 26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(c\)-1 http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007c.pdf](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007c.pdf)
- "person" found in 26 C.F.R. §301.6671-1 (which governs who is liable for penalties under Internal Revenue Code). [Click here for evidence \(WTP Exhibit 421\) http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007d.pdf](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.007d.pdf)

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

18. Admit that if the meaning of "includes" as used in the definitions in the previous question is "and" or "in addition to" and the statutes AS A WHOLE do not define *everything* that is added, then these statutes cannot define any of the words described, based on the definition of the word "definition" found in Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 423:

***definition:** A description of a thing by its properties; an explanation of the meaning of a word or term. **The process of stating the exact meaning of a word by means of other words.** Such a description of the thing defined, including all essential elements and excluding all nonessential, as to distinguish it from all other things and classes."*  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 423]*

- [Click here for evidence http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.008.pdf](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q09.008.pdf)

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

19. Admit that the Internal Revenue Code, IN TOTAL defines and describes all things which are included in the definition of the words above and that nothing is included in the definitions above which is not explicitly mentioned.

*That is to say, **the statute, read "as a whole,"** post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), **leads the reader to a definition.** That definition does not include the Attorney General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate the contrary.*  
*[Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]*

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

20. Admit that the phrase "read as a whole" in the previous section implies looking at all sections of a body of law to discern all things which might be added in order to discern everything that is included, but to assume nothing that is not explicitly mentioned.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

21. Admit that the U.S. Government is one of finite, delegated, enumerated powers.

*We start with first principles. The Constitution creates a Federal Government of enumerated powers. See U.S. Const., Art. I, § 8. As James Madison wrote, "[t]he powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite." The Federalist No. 45, pp. 292-293 (C. Rossiter ed. 1961). **This constitutionally mandated division of authority "was adopted by the Framers to ensure protection of our fundamental liberties."** Gregory v. Ashcroft, 501 U.S. 452, 458 (1991) (internal quotation marks omitted). **"Just as the separation and independence of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government serves to prevent the accumulation of***

excessive power in any one branch, a healthy balance of power between the States and the Federal Government will reduce the risk of tyranny and abuse from either front." Ibid.  
[U.S. v. Lopez, 514 U.S. 549 (1995)]

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

22. Admit that it is impossible to establish a government of finite, delegated, enumerated powers whose authority is not completely, unambiguously, and fully described in written law that is not open to subjective or arbitrary interpretation or presumption of any kind.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

23. Admit that the definition of "includes" provided in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(c\)](#) when used in its context of "in addition to" would create a statutory presumption if the Internal Revenue Code IN TOTAL or AS A WHOLE, did not define everything that is included in definitions that rely upon that word.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

24. Admit that Congress does not have the authority under the Constitution to delegate its basic and sole function of writing law or defining the terms in the law to a judge or jury, because the Separation of Powers Doctrine does not allow it to delegate any of its powers and this doctrine would be unlawfully violated by doing so.

"To the contrary, the Constitution divides authority between federal and state governments for the protection of individuals. State sovereignty is not just an end in itself: "Rather, federalism secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of sovereign power." Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 759 (1991) (BLACKMUN, J., dissenting). "Just as the separation and independence of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government serve to prevent the accumulation of excessive power in any one branch, a healthy balance of power between the States and the Federal Government will reduce the risk of tyranny and abuse from either front." Gregory v. [505 U.S. 144, 182] Ashcroft, 501 U.S., at 458. See The Federalist No. 51, p. 323. (C. Rossiter ed. 1961).

Where Congress exceeds its authority relative to the States, therefore, the departure from the constitutional plan cannot be ratified by the "consent" of state officials. An analogy to the separation of powers among the branches of the Federal Government clarifies this point. The Constitution's division of power among the three branches is violated where one branch invades the territory of another, whether or not the encroached-upon branch approves the encroachment. In Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 118-137 (1976), for instance, the Court held that Congress had infringed the President's appointment power, despite the fact that the President himself had manifested his consent to the statute that caused the infringement by signing it into law. See National League of Cities v. Usery, 426 U.S., at 842, n. 12. In INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919, 944-959 (1983), we held that the legislative veto violated the constitutional requirement that legislation be presented to the President, despite Presidents' approval of hundreds of statutes containing a legislative veto provision. See id., at 944-945. The constitutional authority of Congress cannot be expanded by the "consent" of the governmental unit whose domain is thereby narrowed, whether that unit is the Executive Branch or the States.

State officials thus cannot consent to the enlargement of the powers of Congress beyond those enumerated in the Constitution. Indeed, the facts of this case raise the possibility that powerful incentives might lead both federal and state officials to view departures from the federal structure to be in their personal interests. [New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144 (1992)]

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

25. Admit that no judge has the authority to enlarge or expand a definition to include things not explicitly stated in the statute itself.

YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

26. Admit that a judge who extends the meaning of a term beyond that clearly stated in the statute is effectively "legislating from the bench" and exceeding his or her Constitutionally delegated authority.

"But, allowing the people to make constitutions and unmake them, allowing their representatives to make laws and unmake them, and without our interference as to their principles or policy in doing it, yet, when constitutions and laws are made and put in force by others, then the courts, as empowered by the State or the Union, commence their functions and may decide on the rights which conflicting parties can legally set up

1 under them, rather than about their formation itself. Our power begins after theirs ends. Constitutions and  
2 laws precede the judiciary, and we act only under and after them, and as to disputed rights beneath them,  
3 rather than disputed points in making them. We speak what is the law, jus dicere, we speak or construe what  
4 is the constitution, after both are made, but we make, or revise, or control neither."  
5 [*Luther v. Borden, 48 U.S. 1 (1849)*]

6 27. Admit that when the word "include" is used within a statutory definition in its context of meaning "in addition to", the  
7 other things that it adds to must also be specified in another section of the statutes as well or the statute is void for  
8 vagueness.

9 YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

10 28. Admit that when the interpretation of a statute or regulation is unclear or ambiguous, then by the rules of statutory  
11 construction, the doubt must be resolved "most strongly against the government and in favor of the citizen" (not "taxpayer",  
12 but "citizen") as indicated in the cite from the Supreme Court below:

13 "In the interpretation of statutes levying taxes, it is the established rule not to extend their provisions by  
14 implication beyond the clear import of the language used, or to enlarge their operations so as to embrace  
15 matters not specifically pointed out. In case of doubt they are construed most strongly against the government  
16 and in favor of the citizen."  
17 [*Gould v. Gould, 245 U.S. 151 (1917)*]

18 YOUR ANSWER (circle one): Admit/Deny

19 **Affirmation:**

20 I declare under penalty of perjury as required under 26 U.S.C. §6065 that the answers provided by me to the foregoing  
21 questions are true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and ability, so help me God. I also declare that these  
22 answers are completely consistent with each other and with my understanding of both the Constitution of the United States,  
23 Internal Revenue Code, Treasury Regulations, the Internal Revenue Manual, and the rulings of the Supreme Court but not  
24 necessarily lower federal courts.

25 Name (print): \_\_\_\_\_

26 Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

27 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

28 Witness name (print): \_\_\_\_\_

29 Witness Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

30 Witness Date: \_\_\_\_\_