

Defense of Marriage, Part 2

Crimes against nature

A textbook of traditional values
for marriage advocates

Defense of Marriage
A textbook of traditional values for marriage advocates

Part 2: Crimes Against Nature

by [Steven D. Miller](#), copyright 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Preface](#)

[Introduction](#)

Section 1: Marriage Law.

[Summary of Undivorceable Marriage](#)

[Real marriage is not the lawyers' definition](#)

[From family status to government contract](#)

[Licentiousness](#)

[Civil unions are not real marriage](#)

Section 2: The Law of Nature

[What does the Bible say about homosex?](#)

[Messages to Christians](#)

[The Law of Nature](#)

[What does the law say about homosexuals?](#)

[Crimes against Nature](#)

[Gay "Marriage"](#)

[States Cannot define marriage](#)

Section 3: The Curse upon America

[Sodomy has not been legalized](#)

[The Planned Destruction of America](#)

[What does the Bible say about false doctrine?](#)

[What does history say about homosex Privacy?](#)

[What about Lawrence v. Texas?](#)

[Fourteenth Amendment protections](#)

[Punishment that fits the crime](#)

[Arguing against the foundation of all law](#)

[What could Lot do?](#)

[Is homosex activism an act of terrorism ? How about judicial activism?](#)

Section 4: Government corruption

[While evils are still sufferable](#)
[Corruption](#)
[Treason](#)
[Barbarism](#)

Section 5: Conclusions

[Can we still secure the blessings of liberty?](#)

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

Copyright 2015 by Steven D. Miller, all rights reserved.

One of the rights of a researcher is to seek the truth and then publish the truth.

I have a moral right to warn others about misuse of truth.

I have a moral right to restrict distribution of these truths, to not cast pearls before swine.
Matthew 7:6.

Your moral duty is to report any error.

William Penn (1693) Some Fruits of Solitude, pt. 1, no. 46:

“They have a Right to censure, that have a Heart to help: The rest is Cruelty, not Justice.”

Nothing in this book restricts my moral rights.

Nothing in this book is legal advice, except for this: obey your lawgiver and suffer the consequences.

When speaking to lawyers, Christ said Woe unto you lawyers, you den of vipers, you shall receive the greater damnation.

* ~ ~ ~ *

To the prospective reader:

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

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

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

Holy Matrimony was legitimate prior to any earthly government. It was not created by government. If you think a marriage is created or destroyed by a graven (manmade) government, then you are worshiping the wrong lord. The Lord himself will send you strong delusion in proportion to the multitude of graven idols that you worship.

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

The Lord gave you a free will. He will not protect you from the abominations that you tolerate in your society. Licentious "marriage", divorce, adultery and homosex all deny the unchanging Lord of the Bible.

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

The law of nature requires all creatures to obey their creator. If you cannot acknowledge that we are to obey our creator, then you will find yourself obeying the lawless one.

There can be no law other than the law of nature, for we are all created equal, with no other superior than God Almighty. The law of nature authorizes government to exist and is acknowledged in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

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

It is idolatry to invent a more permissive god of your own choosing.

It is blasphemy to redefine God's definition of marriage.

It is blasphemy to tolerate crimes against nature. And it is a crime to not report crimes.

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

Disclaimer:

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

* ~ ~ ~ *



Their Flag of Diversity

* ~ ~ ~ *

To the reprobate pervert: Embrace this diversity

- Ignorance of the law of nature, which every one is bound to know, excuses no man.¹
- Murder is only A crime against nature. Child rape is only A crime against nature. Consensual homosexual sodomy is THE crime against nature. It is traditionally punished more harshly than lesser crimes against nature.
- "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature **vested in every individual**"²
- The Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle the United States to exist.³ We are one nation under God. The received law of the land continues until cancelled by the legislature with "express words of nullity"⁴ but no congressman can cancel the authority for the government to exist.⁵
- When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.⁶
- We must then "bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent **natural power of individuals** must be referred that right...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."⁷
- Contracts that are made against good morals have no force.⁸ And agreements founded upon an immoral consideration are not to be observed.⁹

Contra negantem principia non est disputandum. There can be no debate with one who denies principles.

1. Maxim of law: *Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat.*
2. Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7. The U.S. Supreme Court confirms that Blackstone's law encyclopedia was part of the received law of the land.
3. According to the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence
4. U.S. Supreme Court, as for example, in the marriage case *Meister v. Moore*
5. Their oath of office to uphold the Constitution that created their office
6. Maxim of law: *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturae utendum est.*
7. Blackstone's introduction to Book 4. The U.S. Supreme Court confirms that Blackstone's law encyclopedia was part of the received law of the land.
8. Maxim of law *Pacta quae contra bonos mores fiunt nullam vim habere*
9. Maxim of law *Pacta quae turpem causam continent non sunt observanda*

* ~ ~ ~ *

PREFACE

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

As was explained in my previous book, traditional marriage is a lifetime union, until death they do part. Mankind cannot put marriage asunder, at least according to the Christ in Matthew 19:6. Today, many people have been deceived into thinking that divorce courts can cancel a traditional marriage. But this has never been true. Many deceived people have repeated the lie. But repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

Now that anti-Christian courts are firmly established, pervert politicians have declared war against the very laws that created government.¹ While self-called Christians remained silent.²

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

Even though the Supreme Court has never legalized homosex (Lawrence v. Texas only responded to privacy concerns and Obergefell v. Hodges invented the idea that the authors of the 14th Amendment somehow intended to legalize homosex even though sodomy was a felony in every state), activist judges now expect to overthrow the very foundation of our society by advocating homosex "marriage". In pornography cases the Supreme Court said that the community decides their own standards of decency, yet now we have the sodomites shoved upon us with no chance to determine our own standard of decency. We are expected to tolerate those who refuse to tolerate us. Ungodly lawyers actually believe they changed the definition of marriage expecting that Christians will not interfere³.

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

Traditional marriage is the foundation of society. Society will crumble without a solid foundation. Collectivists have destroyed the American family to implement their fascism.

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

America needs a modern day Phinehas to rise up as a national hero to deter perverts from their final overthrow of your nation.

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

Or forever hold your peace.

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government paragraph 222:

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

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

2. Silence has consequences:

- Silence implies consent.
- *Veritatem qui non libere pronunciat proditor est veritatis*. He who does not freely speak the truth is a betrayer of truth.
- "To sin by silence, when we should protest, makes cowards of men." Ella Wheeler Wilcox, (1914).
- *Veritas, quæ minime defeusatur opprimitur; et qui non improbat, approbat*. Truth which is not sufficiently defended is overpowered; and he who does not disapprove, approves.
- "Silence is equated with fraud if there is a moral duty to speak." United States v. Prudden, 424 F.2d 1021
- *Veritas nihil veretur nisi abscondi*. Truth fears nothing but to be hid.

3. Inaction has consequences:

- By doing nothing, you acquiesce to the change. The US Supreme Court ruled in a 1913 case, *German Alliance Insurance Co. v. Kansas*, 233 U.S. 389 at page 432 that, by your inaction, criminals can interpret your laws for you: These laws "...permitting what theretofore had been regarded both as an ecclesiastical and civil offense. ... therefore fall within the rule that contemporary practice, if subsequently continued and universally acquiesced in, amounts to an interpretation of the Constitution."
- tacit procurement according to Black's Law Dictionary "takes place when an individual sees another managing his affairs and does not interfere to prevent it."
- *Ab assuetis non fit injuria* according to Black's Law Dictionary "From things ... in which there has been long acquiescence, no legal injury or wrong arises. If a persons neglects to insist on his right, he is deemed to have abandoned it."

* ~ ~ ~ *

Introduction

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

Courts once venerated as “the pure fountain of justice” are now polluted by the perversion, filth and shame of homosex advocacy. The very same judicial authority to execute murderers comes from the same Laws of Nature that entitle government to exist. Yet today’s courts protect THE crime against nature. A crime that has always been more detestable than murder or child rape.

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

Holy Matrimony is not state licensed so-called “marriage”¹. They are totally different things.

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

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

One hundred years of judicial activism has blinded your once-great nation into drifting away from our Godly purpose. As with any counterfeit, a civil licensed “marriage”¹ is a close imitation of the actual. But worthless and without authority.

There are only two Doctrines of demons mentioned in the Bible². One is to prohibit marriage. This is what your government did when they created licensed marriage to make marriage a government granted privilege. Demons have every right, under God, to possess unrepentant perverts and then seduce others. Then demand divorce rights or gay rights. Rights that have never existed.

In the last days, people will abandon the faith and be seduced by the doctrines of demons (First Timothy 4:1).

Footnote 1. “Marriage” is within quotation marks for a reason.

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

According to Black’s Law Dictionary a Marriage License is only for those “persons who intend to intermarry”

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

According to Black's Law Dictionary, Licensed Marriage is "a reciprocal engagement by which each of the parties "marries" the other." The lawyers put the word "Marriage" in quotes because licensed "marriage" is not a marriage.

Footnote 2. A brief word about the doctrines of demons. Driving out demons is commanded by Christ. There is no middle ground in this issue. Compromise is not an excuse: when Christ spoke of driving out demons, Christ said that "**he who is not with me is against me**". Matthew 12:28-30 and Luke 11:20-23. Believers have a primary duty to drive out demons (Mark 16:17). But we have been subdued to the point where we refuse to perform one of our primary duties. It is our own fault that demons have gained political power over us. Demons will work to deceive, if possible, the very elect. Do not be deceived.

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

SECTION 1: MARRIAGE LAW.

Recognize real marriage so you can spot a counterfeit.

[Summary of Undivorceable Marriage](#)

My preceding book [Defense of Marriage, Part 1: The History of Undivorceable Marriage](#), provides proof that:

- The U.S. Supreme Court says marriage is a relation for life.
- Marriage has always been man and woman united until death. Marriage was defined prior to the first human government.
- When the Constitution was written there was no divorce that could cancel a marriage.

- The U.S. Supreme Court says that States do not confer the right to marry.
- Real marriage is undivorceable. Courts enforce real marriage. Courts in America would stop a divorce case once they see proof of a regular marriage. The first wife could divorce her husband's second marriage.
- No Supreme Court has ever upheld divorce of a traditional marriage.
- State Licensed marriage is so phony that divorce courts cannot uphold it.
- Divorce does not cancel a marriage, it declares the marriage void from the beginning. It was not until 1979 that Law Dictionaries changed the definition of marriage to suggest that divorce cancels a marriage. But no Supreme Court has ever said such a thing.
- All children of divorce are bastards. Bastards cannot have rights.
- Holy Matrimony as it has always existed was not defined by humans, and cannot be redefined by humans.
- Holy Matrimony excludes gay "marriage".
- Legal Maxim: "The union of a man and a woman is of the law of nature." *Conjunctio mariti et femina est de jure naturæ*. This is the same Law of Nature that entitles the United States to exist.
- In the Bible, divorce never cancels a marriage. Remarriage is always the crime of adultery: Luke 16:18, Romans 7:3. Adulterers cannot inherit the Kingdom of heaven First Corinthians 6:9.
- Marriage is the foundation of society. Men create governments to help them defend their families.
- Adultery is a felony, and is the greatest of civil injuries.
- Christ said divorce was not lawful since the beginning of mankind. Don't let a divorce lawyer or ungodly judge tell you that Christ was wrong. By denying the existence of undivorceable marriage, they deny the legitimacy of government.
- The U.S. Supreme Court says that States can prohibit sex outside of marriage.

* ~ ~ ~ *

REAL MARRIAGE IS NOT THE GOVERNMENT'S DEFINITION

The vast majority of people use a radical re-definition of the term *marriage* that has never existed. The term *Marriage* was defined prior to any English dictionary. Marriage was defined prior to any human government. Governments cannot change the pre-existing definition of marriage anymore than they can redefine gravity. There is no such thing as a divorceable marriage (except for infertility), or gay marriage, or a disposable spouse.

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

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

The Supreme Courts (U.S. and every state) still use the original definition. NO Supreme Court has ever said that marriage can be cancelled by divorce.

The lawyers changed the law dictionary definition in 1979 to a definition that has never existed. The new definition ignores the traditional definition that existed prior to any human government.

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

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government:

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

From family status to government contract

Marriage was the foundation of society. Then along came lawyers to invent the legal fiction that there is a presumed contract with the state that removes the status of a family bond. Gradually, the family was no longer greater than the state.

The U.S. Supreme Court case *Maynard v. Hill* in 1888 was the first case to recognize government divorce. But they specifically legalized the divorce of intermarriage, not marriage. In this court decision they used the word *status* three times. In every occurrence the word *status* was in italics.

Bouvier's Dictionary of the Law; 1856 under the term "STATUS" we find:

"The action of assumpsit must be reckoned a technical instrument which gave no small help to the forces which were making for the transition from status to contract; . . ." 3 Holdsw. Hist. E. L. 349."

"Ancient Law" by Sir Henry Sumner Maine (John Murray Publisher, Albemarle Street, London. 1861):

Page 170: ". . . we may say that the movement of the progressive societies has hitherto been a movement from Status to Contract."

Page 26: "But I now employ the expression "Legal Fiction"* to signify any assumption which conceals, or affects to conceal, the fact that a rule of law has undergone alteration, its letter remaining unchanged, its operation being modified."

"The fact is in both cases that the law has been wholly changed; the fiction is that it remains what it always was."

"They [i.e., "legal fictions"] satisfy the desire for improvement [read: "innovation in the law"], which is not quite wanting, at the same time that they do not offend the superstitious disrelish for change which is always present. At a particular stage of social progress they are invaluable expedients for overcoming the rigidity of law . . ."

Page 27: "Now legal fictions are the greatest of obstacles to symmetrical classification.

"The rule of law remains sticking in the system, but it is a mere shell. It has been long ago undermined, and a new rule hides itself under its cover."

Page 30: ". . . the wide diffusion of legal fictions, and the efficiency with which they perform their two-fold office of transforming a system of laws and of concealing the transformation."

Page 31: ". . . we habitually employ a double language and entertain, as it would appear, a double and inconsistent set of ideas."

"Yet the moment the judgment has been rendered and reported [after a court has issued its decision], we slide unconsciously or unavowedly into a new language and a new train of thought."

Page 32: The fact that the old rule has been repealed, and that a new one has replaced it, eludes us . . ."

* Bouvier's Dictionary of the Law; 1856: "FICTIONS OF LAW".

"The assumption that a certain thing is true, and which gives to a person or thing, a quality which is not natural to it . . ."

3. Fictions were invented by the Roman praetors, who, not possessing the power to abrogate the law, were nevertheless willing to derogate from it, under the pretence of doing equity. Fiction is the resource of weakness, which, in order to obtain its object, assumes as a fact, what is known to be contrary to truth: when the legislator desires to accomplish his object, he need not feign, he commands. Fictions of law owe their origin to the legislative usurpations of the bench. 4 Benth. Ev. 300.

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

Redefining marriage is blasphemy. You have converted a right into government granted licentiousness.

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

This right knowledge of terminology will become apparent as we study how the lawyers deceived us, and then changed the definition of marriage.

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

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

Licentiousness

A license is permission to do something that is otherwise illegal. A marriage license is permission to do something that is otherwise illegal. A marriage license is only for intermarriage. It is licentiousness.

Licentiousness is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary as

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

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

Civil unions are not real marriage. ■

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

Substitute marriage is a government privilege. It can be licensed, controlled and cancelled by government. This perverted civil union "marriage" can of course, be redefined to include some perversions. Whereas real marriage, defined prior to any human government by the Almighty, can never be redefined.

The reason civil union "marriage" cannot include homosex perversions. is, as we shall see, because government cannot remove punishment for homosex. The moment homosex becomes unpunishable is the moment the purpose of government ceases to exist. Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law, Book 1, Part 1, starts out with an explanation of why statutory law exists. He eloquently explains that the law of nature is from the divine revealed law of the Bible. "If man were to live in a state of nature, unconnected with other individuals, there would be no occasion for any other laws, than the law of nature, and the law of God. **Neither could any other law possibly exist;** for a law always supposes some superior who is to make it; and in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being."

The law of nature authorizes government to exist. The moment homosex becomes unpunishable is the moment graven manmade law replaces the law of nature which created government. If congress were to make homosex unpunishable, then they will have denied the legitimacy of their office, overthrown government in the most inhumane way possible, and misused their office of government contrary to the trust that created government. Government must "bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt." [full quote in the Chapter [Punishment that fits the crime](#)]. The moment homosex becomes unpunishable is the moment the sword of Justice reverts back to those who delegated the task: "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual" [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7] which we delegated to our civil servants when we created government.

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

SECTION 2: LAW OF NATURE

[What does the Bible say about homosex?](#)

Prior to the existence of any Jewish law, the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for tolerating homosexuals. Even Lot was affected by this tolerance of perversion. This was in 1896 BC, long before the first Jew existed. Don't blame Jewish laws for the universal precept requiring capital punishment for homosex.

Leviticus 20:13 "*They must be put to death....*" These words are in the NIV Bible translation. "*They shall surely be put to death*" is the KJV translation.

Leviticus 20:13 says they must be put to death. Leviticus 20 is not the law of Moses, it is the law of the LORD according to verses 7,8. In Genesis 18 the Lord Himself came down to earth to supervise the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. To burn to death the homosexuals and those who tolerated them.

And in the Christian times (Romans 1:26,27,32) we learn that homosexuals "*are worthy of death*" (direct quote from King James Bible) as are those who approve of them.

Both Jude and Peter called them beasts. Peter called them beasts to be destroyed. Jude said they will burn in hell. In Romans 1:26, 27, 28 God Himself gives them over to a reprobate mind so that they will be condemned. Verse 32 says they are worthy of death, as are those who approve of them.

King Asa was one of the most righteous kings in the Bible. First Kings 15:11-12 (KJV)
"And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the LORD, as did David his father. And he took away the sodomites out of the land,"

As did Asa's son Jehoshaphat in First Kings 22:46.

As did King Josiah in Second Kings 23:7. *"And he brake down the houses of the sodomites."*

The righteous drive out evil. Driving out evil is not hate, it is love. The righteous will enjoy the fruit of their deeds. Disaster is upon the wicked. The wicked will suffer the consequence of what they have done. Isaiah 3:8-11:

"Jerusalem staggers, Judah is falling; their words and deeds are against the LORD, defying his glorious presence. The look on their faces testifies against them; they parade their sin like Sodom; they do not hide it. Woe to them! They have brought disaster upon themselves. Tell the righteous it will be well with them, for they will enjoy the fruit of their deeds. Woe to the wicked! Disaster is upon them! They will be paid back for what their hands have done.

Disaster is upon the wicked.

The Christian Bible gives these warnings. Confirm them for yourself.

Homosexuals know the due punishment for their perversion (Romans 1:27). They know that they will suffer the punishment of eternal fire according to Jude verse 7. They know that they cannot go to heaven according to First Corinthians 6:9.

Romans 1:26,27,32 lesbians and sodomites "are worthy of death". But Romans 1:32 continues. It imputes this death punishment to those who merely tolerate – the NIV and the New King James Version both use the phrase "approve of those who practice" – these crimes. This leads up to a promise of reconciliation for the repentant four verses later, and warnings of wrath for those who reject the truth.

First Corinthians 6:9-10 (NKJV):

... Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God.

The King James translation put it this way: "nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind. . ." ¹

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

Homosexuals will burn in eternal fire according to Jude 7:

"Sodom and Gomorrah ... serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire"

Peter and Jude both refer to homosexuals as unthinking² beasts. Peter called them unthinking² beasts to be caught and destroyed. Second Peter 2:12. And Jude called them unthinking² beasts in Jude verse 10, referring to verse 7 homosexuals who will burn in eternal fire.

It is your duty to speak out against evil.

The Jewish law is more explicit than these Christian precepts. Leviticus 18:22 and Leviticus 20:13 are explicit punishments for consensual homosex, not rape. In Leviticus 20 the LORD gave his laws for his people. Homosexuals in verse 13, were to be driven out of society by the death penalty. These are instructions from the unchanging God of the Bible. Leviticus 20:8 (KJV) "And ye shall keep my statutes, and do them: I am the LORD which sanctify you."

TOLERATION OF HOMOSEXUALS

The Bible warned us about those "who suppress the truth in unrighteousness... whose hearts were darkened... to dishonor their bodies... who, knowing the righteous judgment of God, that those who practice such things are deserving of death, ... [as are they who] approve of those who practice them." Romans 1:18-32 .

The margin note to Romans 1:32 in Tyndale's 1534 Bible says "To have pleasure in another man's sin is greater wickedness than to sin thyself." These greater-wicked who are entertained by today's television misfits have become your accusers and jurors. But it is much worse; they now control Congress. Political power so great that congressmen fear loosing misfit votes. This is contrary to a republic form of government guaranteed by your Constitution Article IV section 4. You have lost the nation in the most inhumane way possible.

Within the very same book of Romans where those who merely tolerate homosexuals (Romans 1:26,27) "are worthy of death" (verse 32), the apostle Paul also tells us to love our fellow man (Romans 13:8, 12:10, etc). Love of your neighbor is sincere when you abhor that which is evil (Romans 12:9) . You love your neighbor by driving out evil. Driving out evil is love. Don't let Satan's legalists call it hate. Deny ungodliness and lusts, rebuke with all authority, let no man despise thee. (Titus 2:12-15).

Those who love their community will drive out evil. Driving out evil from your community (even as in Deuteronomy 17:7) is an act of love. It is not hate. The community will receive God's blessing and avoid God's punishment (Leviticus 20:13, 22-24).

The God of the Bible is an unchanging God. (Malachi 3:6, Hebrews 13:8, Hebrews 6:17-18, Numbers 23:19, First Samuel 15:29, Titus1:2). His law lasts forever, Psalm 119:152. The everlasting covenant mentioned in the New Testament is the same everlasting covenant of the Old. Christ said not one jot nor tittle shall fall from the law, Matthew 5:18. The Bereans (Acts 17:11) studied the Old Testament daily to prove that the New Testament was true. Did they come to the conclusion that God's law was abolished?

The unchanging God of the Bible is not going to change just because your church said it was okay to invent a more permissive god of your own choosing. The same unchanging God that said homosex is an abomination in Leviticus 18:22 is the same one who instructs you in verse 4.

"You shall observe My judgments and keep My ordinances, to walk in them: I am the LORD your God. 5 You shall therefore keep My statutes,..."

These are hardly just policies invented by Moses, as many perverts insist. The anti-homosex warning from the LORD himself became the law of the land in America.

WARNINGS

In Leviticus 18:22,24-30 the unchanging LORD of the Bible promised to destroyed any nation that tolerated homosexuals. And again in Deuteronomy 28. Toleration of homosexuals defiles the land. Repent to avoid God's wrath.

Christ Himself warned the cities that did not repent. He said in Matthew 11:24 (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11): "**But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.**"

Because we were warned, but they were not. Heed the warning.

1. See Strong's Concordance Lexicon reference 733 for a definition of "them that defile themselves with mankind" ἄρσενικοίτης a sodomite.
2. ἀλογα -- unthinking, irrational, without reason, unreasonable, absurd

* ~ ~ ~ *

MESSAGES TO CHRISTIANS

Here are your jury instructions. In your deliberations, you must consider:

- Ignorance of the law, which everyone is bound to know, excuses no man.
- "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder **and the like**, is in a state of mere nature **vested in every individual**"
- Magistrates normally "bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. ...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."
- Consensual homosexual sodomy is THE crime against nature, whereas murder is only A crime against nature.
- You must determine if the laws of the state failed. John Locke's Second Treatise Of Government states that a government that would not execute the laws would be "politics inconceivable to human capacity, and inconsistent with human society."
- But when laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature. It then becomes the "precedent **natural power of individuals**" to punish crimes against nature. The natural power of individuals to punish these criminals "in case they have offended, ... against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."
- "This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other - It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to

this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.” ... “Nay, if any human law should allow [violation of natural law], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”

- The unchanging Lord of the Bible is not going to change just because someone told you to tolerate homosexuals. We are still one nation under God.
- Cursed is he who keeps his sword from bloodshed. Jeremiah 48:10.
- Cowards shall have their place in the lake of fire. Revelation 21:8.

Contra negantem principia non est disputandum. There can be no debate with one who denies principles.

Some Christians are pacifists who would not execute criminals. Embrace this diversity. Murder is only A crime against nature. We do not execute murderers because we hate. We execute murderers because we love our neighbors.

What is your verdict?

* ~ ~ ~ *

The Law of Nature

Summary so far:

- As Blackstone so eloquently explained the law of nature: "*Neither could any other law possibly exist.*"
- Marriage "*is a contract of natural law antecedent to its becoming a civil contract in civil society*" according to Shelford's Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29.
- The law of nature authorizes government to exist. The Laws of Nature are mentioned in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence. They are the foundation of our right to create a government.
- Georgia Supreme Court in Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga 173: "marriage is founded in the law of nature, and is anterior to all human law"
- Maxims of Law from Bouvier's 1856 Law Dictionary: "The union of a man and a woman is of the law of nature." *Conjunctio mariti et femina est de jure naturæ.*
- Marriage "*is a contract of natural law antecedent to its becoming a civil contract in civil society*" according to Shelford's 1841 Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29.
- Federal law does not recognize homosex marriage. [Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7](#).
- Murder is A crime against nature, and child rape is A crime against nature, but consensual homosexual sodomy is THE crime against nature. Traditional

punishment of murder or child rape was death by hanging, but consensual homosex has traditionally deserved a harsher punishment.

- The US Supreme Court in 1986 upheld a Georgia law that punishes by 20 years in prison a single act of consensual sodomy committed in the privacy of a house.
- Satan's legalists who plan to destroy America must demean Christians in order to take away the restraining force of moral values. (the mystery of iniquity doth already work)
- The way of God is proven by Biblical history. When Godly people turn their back on God, He uses pagans to bring his disobedient nations into captivity.
- History shows that those people "who have known freedom and then lost it, have never regain it." Full quote, later.
- The English common law, which was the received law of the land in all 13 original States, allowed the death penalty for consensual homosexual sodomy.
-

The received law-of-the-land that existed at the time when the original 13 States wrote their Constitutions is explained in Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law. This was a four-volume law encyclopedia that existed in Colonial times. The first edition was published until 1769.

Human Government exists because the Laws of Nature exist. Legislatures cannot deny their own legitimacy by canceling their original authority. Blackstone's Commentaries, Book1, Part 1 explains why laws exist by explaining that the Laws of Nature exist:

“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other - It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”

“Nay, if any human law should allow [violation of natural law], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”

Blackstone, Book 4, page 7: “the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual”

Government's right to execute murderers "and the like" does not come from congress. It comes from God, through us, when we delegated Natural Law to our civil servants by creating their government.

The execution of murderers "and the like" is not done out of hatred. It is done out of love. You love your neighbors by driving out evil. You love your God by obeying Him. Are we now somehow expected to tolerate murderers?

The Christians who created -- ordained was the religious term they used in the Constitution -- a government were very cautious about violating the 6th Commandment.

They created a government that would provide extra protections to ensure that executions done on their behalf were just.

Continuing Blackstone's introduction to Book 4:

Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, which some have argued to belong to every state, (though, in fact, never exercised by any) of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.

That's right! We entrusted our civil servants to perpetuate the Laws of Nature that created their office.

We are now confronted with a government that denies their duty. They confuse the "created equal" phrase in the Declaration of Independence, which was originally a conclusion that there can be no other law than the law of nature, with a new concept in American jurisprudence. They now boldly proclaim that murderers and the like have a "created equal" right to liberty.

Yes, we are all created equal. "... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being." In one nation under God, we are all created equal. Because "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual: For it must be vested in somebody; otherwise the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution"

As you can see, the homosexual protestors claiming to be created equal are perverting the law.

Blackstone's Commentary did not include punishing crimes against nature as a "natural liberty which is not required by the laws of society to be sacrificed to public convenience" (quote from Book 1 introduction) because apparently, we must rely upon government to perform their duty to bear the sword of justice. Which some claim is the reason we created government.

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government at paragraph 135:

"the obligations of the law of Nature cease not in society, .. human laws... enforce their observation. Thus the law of Nature stands as an eternal rule to all men, legislators as well as others. The rules that they make for other men's actions must [conform] to the law of Nature, and the fundamental law of Nature being the preservation of mankind, no human sanction can be good or valid against it."

According to The United States Supreme Court in a Georgia case, Bowers, at the top of page 197 there is an infamous crime against nature that is not fit to be named:

"the infamous crime against nature" as an offense of "deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature," and "a

crime not fit to be named." 4 W. Blackstone, Commentaries 215. The common law of England, including its prohibition of sodomy, became the received law of Georgia and the other Colonies.

As we shall see, the law of nature is not just a Christian notion. According to Blackstone: "It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal".

Notice here again we see that the law of nature authorizes government to exist.

LAW OF NATURE. A rule of conduct arising out of the natural relations of human beings, established by the Creator, and existing prior to any positive precept. Webster. The foundation of this law is placed by the best writers in the will of God, discovered by right reason, and aided by divine revelation; and its principles, when applicable, apply with equal obligation to individuals and to nations. 1 Kent, Comm. 2, note; Id. 4, note. See JUS NATURALE.

We understand all laws to be either human or divine, according as they have man or God for their author; and divine laws are of two kinds, that is to say: (1) Natural laws; (2) positive or revealed laws. A natural law is defined by Burlamaqui to be "a rule which so necessarily agrees with the nature and state of man that, without observing its maxims, the peace and happiness of society can never be preserved." And he says that these are called "natural laws" because a knowledge of them may be attained merely by the light of reason, from the fact of their essential agreeableness with the constitution of human nature; while, on the contrary, positive or revealed laws are not founded upon the general constitution of human nature, but only upon the will of God; though in other respects such law is established upon very good reason, and procures the advantage of those to whom it is sent. The ceremonial or political laws of the Jews are of this latter class. 11 Ark. 527.

This is Black Law Dictionary, first edition, 1891, entry for Law of Nature.

Notice that "without observing its maxim, the peace and happiness of society can never be preserved."

Unfortunately, this law dictionary entry did not appear in subsequent editions. It disappeared completely. No recent law dictionary mentions the law that entitles the

United States to exist, even though it "applies with equal obligation to individuals and to nations".

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

The unchanging Law of Nature did not change when ungodly lawyers removed it from their dictionary.

Unfortunately, today's lawyers are only told by their dictionaries to "See Natural Law". But the Natural Law entry now mentions only "*the philosophical speculations of the Roman jurists of the Antonine age, and was intended to denote a system of rules and principles for the guidance of human conduct which... might be discovered by the rational intelligence of man... to grow out of and conform to his nature.*" That's right. Today's lawyers are only taught that the rational intelligence of ancient Romans is the only basis that authorizes government to exist. They are taught that laws conform to man's will to dominate others.

Not only have ungodly lawyers obliterated any mention of God's rules of conduct that apply "with equal obligation to individuals and to nations"; they have reverted back to the same brutal pagan Roman law that executed Christ and forced gladiators to fight to the death, and entertained the public by executing Christians. Are you forced to fight in their arena?

Today's lawyers are never exposed to the legitimacy of government, or "a rule of conduct... established by the Creator" or the restraining force of moral values that has been taken out of the way. The lusts of their father they will do, for there is no truth in them.

Also related to the Law of Nature in Black's first edition, we find:

—Absolute law. The true and proper law of nature, immutable in the abstract or in principle, in theory, but not in application; for very often the object, the reason, situation, and other circumstances, may vary its exercise and obligation. 1 Steph. Comm. 21

Leges naturæ perfectissimæ sunt et immutabilēs; humani vero juris conditio semper in infinitum decurrit, et nihil est in eo quod perpetuo stare possit. Leges humanæ nascuntur, vivunt, moriuntur. The laws of nature are most perfect and immutable; but the condition of human law is an unending succession, and there is nothing in it which can continue perpetually. Human laws are born, live, and die. 7 Coke, 25.

Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, Part 1, starts out with an explanation of why law exists. Laws are immutable rules of action applied indiscriminately. Such as, for example: the law of gravity or the law of nature. (emphasis added)

LAW, in it's most general and comprehensive sense, signifies a rule of action; and is applied indiscriminately to all kinds of action, whether animate or inanimate,

rational or irrational. Thus we say, the laws of motion, of gravitation, of optics, or mechanics, as well as the laws of nature and of nations. And it is that rule of action, which is prescribed by some superior, and which the inferior is bound to obey.”

...This then is the general signification of law, a rule of action dictated by some superior being: and, in those creatures that have neither the power to think, nor to will, such laws must be invariably obeyed, so long as the creature itself subsists, for its existence depends on that obedience. But laws, in their more confined sense, and in which it is our present business to consider them, denote the rules, not of action in general, but of human action or conduct: that is, the precepts by which man, the noblest of all sublunary beings, a creature endowed with both reason and freewill, is commanded to make use of those faculties in the general regulation of his behaviour.

Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his creator, for he is entirely a dependent being. A being, independent of any other, has no rule to pursue, but such as he prescribes to himself; but a state of dependence will inevitably oblige the inferior to take the will of him, on whom he depends, as the rule of his conduct: not indeed in every particular, but in all those points wherein his dependence consists. This principle therefore has more or less extent and effect, in proportion as the superiority of the one and the dependence of the other is greater or less, absolute or limited. And consequently, as man depends absolutely upon his maker for every thing, it is necessary that he should in all points conform to his maker's will.

This will of his maker is called the law of nature. For as God, when he created matter, and endued it with a principle of mobility, established certain rules for the perpetual direction of that motion; so, when he created man, and endued him with freewill to conduct himself in all parts of life, he laid down certain immutable laws of human nature, whereby that freewill is in some degree regulated and restrained, and gave him also the faculty of reason to discover the purport of those laws.

Considering the creator only as a being of infinite power, he was able unquestionably to have prescribed whatever laws he pleased to his creature, man, however unjust or severe. But as he is also a being of infinite wisdom, he has laid down only such laws as were founded in those relations of justice, that existed in the nature of things antecedent to any positive precept. These are the eternal, immutable laws of good and evil, to which the creator himself in all his dispensations conforms; and which he has enabled human reason to discover, so far as they are necessary for the conduct of human actions. Such among others are these principles: that we should live honestly, should hurt nobody, and should render to every one his due; to which three general precepts Justinian[1] has reduced the whole doctrine of law.

But if the discovery of these first principles of the law of nature depended only upon the due exertion of right reason, and could not otherwise be obtained than by a chain of metaphysical disquisitions, mankind would have wanted some

inducement to have quickened their inquiries, and the greater part of the world would have rested content in mental indolence, and ignorance its inseparable companion. As therefore the creator is a being, not only of infinite power, and wisdom, but also of infinite goodness, he has been pleased so to contrive the constitution and frame of humanity, that we should want no other prompter to inquire after and pursue the rule of right, but only our own self-love, that universal principle of action. For he has so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former; and, if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot but induce the latter. In consequence of which mutual connection of justice and human felicity, he has not perplexed the law of nature with a multitude of abstracted rules and precepts, referring merely to the fitness or unfitness of things, as some have vainly surmised; but has graciously reduced the rule of obedience to this one paternal precept, "that man should pursue his own true and substantial happiness." This is the foundation of what we call ethics, or natural law. For the several articles into which it is branched in our systems, amount to no more than demonstrating, that this or that action tends to man's real happiness, and therefore very justly concluding that the performance of it is a part of the law of nature; or, on the other hand, that this or that action is destructive of man's real happiness, and therefore that the law of nature forbids it.

This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other-It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.

But in order to apply this to the particular exigencies of each individual, it is still necessary to have recourse to reason; whose office it is to discover, as was before observed, what the law of nature directs in every circumstance of life: by considering, what method will tend the most effectually to our own substantial happiness. And if our reason were always, as in our first ancestor before his transgression, clear and perfect, unruffled by passions, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by disease or intemperance, the task would be pleasant and easy; we should need no other guide but this. But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error.

This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine providence; which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures. These precepts, when revealed, are found upon comparison to be really a part of the original law of nature, as they tend in all their consequences to man's felicity. But we are not from thence to conclude that the knowledge of these truths was attainable by reason, in its present corrupted state; since we find that, until they were revealed, they were hid from the wisdom of

ages. As then the moral precepts of this law are indeed of the same original with those of the law of nature, so their Intrinsic obligation is of equal strength and perpetuity. Yet undoubtedly the revealed law is of infinitely more authenticity than that moral system, which is framed by ethical writers, and denominated the natural law. Because one is the law of nature, expressly declared so to be by God himself; the other is only what, by the assistance of human reason, we imagine to be that law. If we could be as certain of the latter as we are of the former, both would have an equal authority; but, till then, they can never be put in any competition together.

Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true a great number of indifferent points, in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty; but which are found necessary for the benefit of society to be restrained within certain limits. And herein it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy; for, with regard to such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to, the former. To instance in the case of murder; this is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. Those human laws that annex a punishment to it, do not at all increase its moral guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation in foro conscientiae to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine. But with regard to matters that are in themselves indifferent, and are not commanded or forbidden by those superior laws; such, for instance, as exporting of wool into foreign countries; here the inferior legislature has scope and opportunity to interpose, and to make that action unlawful which before was not so.

If man were to live in a state of nature, unconnected with other individuals, there would be no occasion for any other laws, than the law of nature, and the law of God. **Neither could any other law possibly exist;** for a law always supposes some superior who is to make it; and in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being. But man was formed for society; and, as is demonstrated by the writers on this subject,[2] is neither capable of living alone, nor indeed has the courage to do it. However, as it is impossible for the whole race of mankind to be united in one great society, they must necessarily divide into many; and form separate states, commonwealths and nations, entirely independent of each other, and yet liable to a mutual intercourse. Hence arises a third kind of law, to regulate this mutual intercourse, called "the law of nations:" which, as none of these states will acknowledge a superiority in the other, cannot be dictated by any; but depends entirely upon the rules of natural law, or upon mutual compacts, treaties, leagues, and agreements between these several communities: in the construction also of which compacts we have no other rule to resort to, but the law of nature; being the only one to which all the communities are equally subject: and therefore the civil law[3] very justly observes, that *quod naturalis ratio inter omnes homines constituit, vocatur jus gentium.*

Thus much I thought it necessary to premise concerning the law of nature, the revealed law, and the law of nations, before I proceeded to treat more fully of the principal subject of this section, municipal or civil law; that is, the rule by which particular districts, communities, or nations are governed; being thus defined by Justinian,[4] "jus civile est quod quisque sibi populus constituit." I call it municipal law, in compliance with common speech for, though strictly that expression denotes the particular customs of one single municipium or free town, yet it may with sufficient propriety be applied to any one state or nation, which is governed by the same laws and customs.

Blackstone continues. He then proceeds carefully to differentiate the difference between punishment for sin and punishment for violating the law of nature, so that punishment for sin is left only to ecclesiastical courts. This is still true today. As was explained earlier, government courts in the United States have never possessed jurisdiction in any matrimonial cases whatsoever, other than the authority to annul incestuous marriages.

Ancient Law of Nature also had a similar view. A very brief summary of the Law of Nature is at the introduction to Justinian's Institutes:

The law of nature is that law which nature teaches to all animals. For this law does not belong exclusively to the human race, but belongs to all animals, whether of the earth, the air, or the water. Hence comes the union of the male and female, which we term matrimony; hence the procreation and bringing up of children. We see, indeed, that all the other animals besides men are considered as having knowledge of this law.

Notice in Justinian that animals are subject to the law of nature. In The Bible both Peter and Jude repeatedly use the word "beasts" to refer to homosexuals.

The Ancient Law of Nature was also considered universal. Justinian continues:

"The law which a people makes for its own government belongs exclusively to that state and is called the civil law, as being the law of the particular state. But the law which natural reason appoints for all mankind obtains equally among all nations, because all nations make use of it. The people of Rome, then, are governed partly by their own laws, and partly by the laws which are common to all mankind.

Before I continue, I want you to understand the purpose of Government, so that you will understand that governments still have "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like" Here is the accepted purpose of government, according to the Declaration of Independence:

"all men are created equal, they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights... That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed."

In other words: government exists to secure rights, and if you join society, you consented to be governed, although Thomas Jefferson never believed it. As Blackstone put it: you agreed that

Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who bears the sword of

justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, ... of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.

You have consented to be governed. This is a difficult concept for some people to understand. So I will introduce some basic principles from John Locke. The US Supreme Court still occasionally quotes John Locke.

The Declaration of Independence evolved from long debates over the course of the prior centuries. One of the most influential publications, other than the Magna Carta itself, to define the purpose of government was John Locke's Second Treatise of Government wherein he explained that political power is created when men contract together to create a society "for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates".

This thought continued into the new world, and when the writers of the Declaration of Independence created a new society they did so "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

Here is a quote from John Locke's Second Treatise on Government to help explain why people created a government in order to preserve society. Government derived their just powers, and only their just powers, from the consent of the governed:

171 political power is that power which every man... has given up into the hands of the society, and therein to the governors ... with this express trust, that it shall be employed for their good and the preservation of their [lives, liberties and estates]. This political power... [to preserve] himself and the rest of mankind; so that the end and measure of this power, being the preservation of all of his society- that is, all mankind in general- it can have no other end or measure, when in the hands of the magistrate, but to preserve the members of that society in their lives, liberties, and possessions, ... a power to preserve the whole, by cutting off only those parts which are so corrupt that they threaten the sound ... And this power is by mutual consent of those who make up the community.

The laws of nature as quoted earlier, require that as "long as the creature itself subsists, ...it's existence depends on that obedience" to the laws of nature. The apostle Peter made a brief statement about those who violate the laws of nature.

Second Peter 2:7-12 KJV

"... just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds;)... But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, ... beasts made to be taken and destroyed.

Psalms 11:3 If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?

* ~ ~ ~ *

What does the law say about homosexuals?

Acceptance of homosexuals is part of the planned destruction of America. Many people are fooled into thinking that sodomy is legal, but they don't bother to find out if this is true. THE crime against nature is still more detestable than lesser crimes against nature, such as murder or child rape.

Deception. Deception. Deception. Christ said, "take heed that ye be not deceived."

The received-law-of-the-land specifically allows government to execute anyone, even foreign ambassadors, for violating the laws of nature. But Thomas Jefferson never believed that we surrendered any of our natural rights to the government.

Federal law still does not recognize homosex marriage. [Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7.](#)

Black's Law Dictionary, first edition:

Peccata contra naturam sunt gravissima. 3 Inst. 20. Crimes against nature are the most heinous.

In 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 US 186:

"To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."

The Goths would bury them alive. The Brits would burn them at the stake. Romans would crucify them (both Justinian Code 9.9.31 and Theodosianus Code 9.7.6). And homosex was punished by death in England up to 1861 and in Canada (enforcing our shared English common law) until 1869.

It is your duty to speak out against evil. You will suffer the consequence of what your neighbors have tolerated. Just as General Douglas MacArthur prophesied in his speech December 12, 1951:

"History fails to record a single precedent in which nations subject to moral decay have not passed into political and economic decline. There has been either a spiritual awakening to overcome the moral lapse, or a progressive deterioration leading to ultimate national disaster."

The unchanging God of the Bible -- who is both the Author of you and also the Author quoted in Leviticus 20:8&13 -- is not going to change just because ungodly lawyers taught you to tolerate the intolerable. Do not think that toleration of homosexuals is Christian. Get your values from the Bible. Lean not unto thine own understanding (Proverbs 3:5). There is a way that seems right to man, but its end is the way of death (Proverbs 14:12, & Proverbs 16:25). Lawyers take away the key of knowledge (Luke 11:52). Those who believe the lies of religious leaders are twofold damned (Matthew 23:15). Second Timothy 3:13 evil men and imposters will wax worse and worse,

deceiving and being deceived. Walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly. Love God enough to obey Him.

Do you have the same unchanging LORD as Moses, King Asa, King David, Jehoshaphat, Josiah, Paul, Peter, and Jude?

You love your neighbors by driving out evil. Driving out evil is not hate. It is love.

Do you love your LORD enough to do what is right? Sheep follow their master's voice. John 10:4 & 16. Cowards have their place in the lake of fire. Revelation 21:8.

Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat Ignorance of a law, which every one is bound to know, excuses no man.

What happens if homosexuals go unpunished? "*Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another. . . Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. . . he gave them over to a depraved mind,. . . They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed, and depravity.*" (Romans 1:24, 26, 28, 29). Because you tolerated them, their elected political force made hate crime laws to punish people for what they believe, not for anything they do.

Instead of obeying God, you tolerated them. You, by your toleration, embraced perversion, depravity, greed, filth, disease and shame. God gave you a free will. He will not save you from the evil you tolerate. First Samuel 8:18 "*And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen; and the LORD will not hear you in that day*".

Martin Luther: "And if thou not be of the Kingdom of Christ, it is certain that thou belong to the kingdom of Satan, which is this evil world."

Recommended book: A Queer Thing Happened to America by Dr. Michael L Brown (2011) ISBN 978-0615406091

* ~ ~ ~ *

Crimes against Nature

Blackstone's Introduction to his Commentaries on the Law: the law of nature applies "with equal obligation to individuals and to nations"

SUPREME LAW

The law of nature authorizes government to exist. The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence declares their only authority to create a government: "... *the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitles them*" to create a government.

The law of nature requires all creatures to obey their creator.

The received law of the land, as elaborated by William Blackstone, quoted below, says there can be no law other than the law of nature, for we are all created equal.

As Blackstone so eloquently explained in the introduction to his four volume law textbooks all valid legislated laws must conform to the laws of nature:

“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other-It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”

"...Nay, if any human law should allow [violation of natural law], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine."

Blackstone, Book 4, page 7: "*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual*".

That's right. We are all created equal, with an equal right to punish crimes against nature. Government's right to execute murderers "*and the like*" does not come from congress. It comes from God, through us, when we delegated Natural Law to our civil servants by creating their government.

The execution of murderers "*and the like*" is not done out of hatred. It is done out of love. You love your neighbors by driving out evil. You love your God by obeying Him. Are we now somehow expected to tolerate murderers and the like?

The Christians who created -- ordained was the religious term they used in the Constitution -- a government were very cautious about violating the 6th Commandment. They created a government that would provide extra protections to ensure that executions done on their behalf were just. Continuing Blackstone's introduction to Book 4:

“Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, which some have argued to belong to every state, (though, in fact, never exercised by any) of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.”

That's right! The received-law-of-the-land in America enforces “the divine laws of nature”. We entrusted our civil servants to perpetuate the Laws of Nature that created their office. But there is a big problem with Blackstone’s presumption that “Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone” -- Thomas Jefferson never believed such a thing, because it was never true in America. See the Social Compact Theory of government below.

We are now confronted with a government that denies their duty. They confuse the "created equal" phrase in the Declaration of Independence, which was originally a

conclusion that there can be no other law than the law of nature, with a new concept in American jurisprudence. They now boldly proclaim that murderers "and the like" have a "created equal" right to liberty.

Yes, we are all created equal. *"... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being."* In one nation under God, we are all created equal. Because *"the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual: For it must be vested in somebody; otherwise the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution"* As you can see, the homosexual protestors claiming to be created equal are perverting the law. Blackstone's Commentary did not include punishing crimes against nature as a *"natural liberty which is not required by the laws of society to be sacrificed to public convenience"* (quote from Book 1 introduction) because apparently, we must rely upon government to perform their duty to bear the sword of justice. Which is, after all, the reason we created government.

Any Law Dictionary will tell you: *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturae utendum est.* When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.

SOCIAL COMPACT THEORY OF GOVERNMENT

As both Blackstone and Locke so eloquently explained, we are all created equal with no other superior than our creator. But in joining society, we consent to be governed. We give up the right to

“punish the offences of all those of that society... where every one of the members hath quitted this natural power, resigned it up into the hands of the community”

“though every man quitted his power to punish offences against the law of Nature in prosecution of his own private judgment, yet with the judgment of offences which he has given up to the legislative, ... he has given a right to the commonwealth to employ his force for the execution of the judgments of the commonwealth whenever he shall be called to it, which, indeed, are his own judgments, they being made by ... his representative. And herein we have the original [source] of the legislative and executive power of civil society...

Wherever, therefore, any number of men so unite into one society as to quit every one his executive power of the law of Nature, and to resign it to the public, there and there only is a political or civil society...”

[quotes from Locke's Second Treatise, paragraphs 87, 88, 89.] Note that in America Thomas Jefferson never agreed that we gave up any rights by joining society.

In other words, those who created government trusted their new government to uphold and perpetuate the law of nature that created it. Blackstone believed you gave up the right to judge and punish crimes against nature, as murder and the like. If a group doesn't have the right to execute murderers and the like, then it is not a government. It is merely an association. It remains a government duty to uphold the law of nature.

Otherwise they don't represent the society that created government. Governments bear the sword of justice because we delegated this authority.

It is from this same delegated authority that society can issue, and you are subject to, arrest warrants, subpoenas, summons and restraining orders. Only the community itself, through its – your – authorized judges, appeal courts and executioners, can be the umpire. You, yourself, authorized this. You pledged allegiance to the arbiter.

“Neither could any other law possibly exist; for ... in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”

“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind ... is of course superior in obligation to any other... no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this:...Nay, if any human law should allow [violation of natural law], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”

Is the very purpose that created your government now invalid?

If courts left you in the law of nature for your remedy, then you have been reinstated to the authority that you surrendered when you joined society.

"When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature". *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturm utendum est.*

According to https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_compact:

"Social contract arguments typically posit that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority), in exchange for protection of their remaining rights."

Have your neighbors infused into government an authority that “We The People”, who created government, did not ourselves have? Have they given life to our graven image that it should both speak and demand reverence and to kill? Have they given the graven image a right to demand reverence/worship (such as salute, courtroom oaths, perjury oaths)? Have they given the graven image a right to issue credentials so that all might receive a mark?

Thomas Jefferson was there and he never had such a thought:

- Thomas Jefferson: “These are our grievances, which we have thus laid before his Majesty, with that freedom of language and sentiment which becomes a free people, claiming their rights as derived from the laws of nature, and not as the gift of their chief magistrate.” Jefferson, Rights of British America, 1774, page 141
- Thomas Jefferson: “the idea is quite unfounded that on entering into society we give up any natural rights.” – letter to F. W. Gilmer 1816.

Notice Jefferson’s word *entering*. You voluntarily enter society. Lawyers hinder your entering, just like Luke 11:52.

LYNCHING

Summary so far:

- The law of nature authorizes government to exist.
- "*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual*". That's right! We are all created equal, with an equal right to punish crimes against nature.
- Maxim of law: "When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature".
- Maxim of law: *agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur* Acting and consenting parties are liable to the same punishment.
- During Christ's time, Roman martial law prohibited the Jews from executing anyone (John 18:31) under martial law.

Although contrary to the social compact theory of government¹, It is perfectly constitutional for the masters² of the civil servants to resort to extra-judicial punishments, but they risk trial for murder if they do not have solid objective evidence of the crime they are punishing.³

More than a century ago, wanted posters once offered a reward bounty for criminals dead or alive. But only for crimes against nature. Back then, everyone knew the laws of nature. *Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat* Ignorance of a law, which every one is bound to know, excuses no man.

The term Lynching comes from a Judge Charles Lynch, a Virginia Quaker⁴ who preferred extra-judicial punishments for crimes against nature. The judge recognized where his authority came from, and had no problem with an expedient way to administer justice. Judge Lynch was never accused of racial bias, and had acquitted blacks accused of murder on three occasions.

Then liberals' invented stories to defame his expediency to mean something abhorrent.



1. Thomas Jefferson never believed that we surrendered any right when we delegated some our authority to the limited government offices we created.
2. The "We The People" The *jura summi imperii*.
3. Murder is only A crime against nature. Executions of Homosexuals (Romans 1:32 "Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death") for THE crime against nature were rare. Blackstone's Commentary on The Law Book IV, Chapter 15, explained that sodomy was "A crime, which ought to be strictly

and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature, so easily charged, and the negative so difficult to be proved, that the accusation should be clearly made out: for, if false, it deserves a punishment inferior only to that of the crime itself.” (Note that there were three forms of execution. Burning at the stake was eliminated by Henry VIII in the Buggery Act of 1533 act, 25 Henry 8 chapter 6, so that these felons would be punished by hanging and beheading. A “punishment inferior only to that of the crime itself” was still death.)

4. Quakers ran the illegal underground railroad to aid escaped slaves. It is doubtful that any Quaker would hold racial bias.

* ~ ~ ~ *

Gay “Marriage”

The gay "rights" movement is not about granting rights to a minority, it is about destroying religious liberty of Christians.

I should not even be discussing this topic. All you need to know is that the Supreme Court case in *Lawrence v. Texas* only considered two privacy issues. Sodomy remains a felony. Some politicians want it to go unpunished.

Even though the Supreme Court has never legalized sodomy (although *Lawrence v. Texas* talked about sodomy, they didn't rule on the criminal issues, they would only consider two privacy questions under the 14th Amendment due process clause), activist judges now expect to overthrow the very foundation of our society by advocating homosexual "marriage". The Supreme Court ignored their own decision in *Zablocki v. Redhail*, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978) that States can indeed restrict legal sexual activity to the marriage relationship. They also ignored their prior decision in *Arizona v. Bateman*, 429 U.S. 864. They allowed Arizona to "prohibit consensual sexual acts between married adults..." And they have never ruled otherwise. In fact, the US Supreme Court in *Arizona v. Bateman* quoted the Arizona Supreme Court's decision regarding this married heterosexual couple's anal sex: "*the legislature has acted to properly regulate the moral welfare of its people, and has specifically prohibited sodomy...*" -- Which, of course, it must do to perpetuate the received law of the land.

And the Supreme Court never apologized to Mormons for prohibiting Utah from statehood until bigamy was criminalized -- even though bigamy is allowed for everyone except bishops in First Timothy 3:2. (And Solomon was considered a wise man.)

The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence declares that the laws of nature entitle the United States to exist. If this natural law authority is legislated away (which it cannot), then Congressmen will have erased the legitimacy of the government that created their office. Which they did not do.

Maxim of Law: *Peccata contr naturam sunt gravissima*. Crimes against nature are the most heinous.

Marriage existed prior to any human government. This kind of traditional marriage is no longer available to Christians. If your marriage is equal to gay marriage equality, then you do not have a traditional marriage. The “marriage” union is fornication. In the Christian Bible First Corinthians 6:9 says that fornicators cannot go to heaven.

Marriage is the foundation of society as was explained in the article on [Family](#).

FEDERAL PROTECTION OF FEDERAL PERSONS WITHIN STATES

The privilege and immunity clause of the 14th Amendment “protects all citizens against abridgment by states of rights of national citizenship as distinct from the fundamental or natural rights inherent in state citizenship.” -- quote from *Madden v. Kentucky*, [309 US 83](#), at the bottom of page 90 (1940).

MARRIAGE EQUALITY

According to the Christian Bible in Jude verse 7 Homosexuals will suffer the punishment of eternal fire. In hell everyone will be equal. Is this what gays mean by the term “marriage equality”? Consider the following:

Romans 1:26-27 God gives the homosexuals over to their lusts ... so that they will receive the due penalty for their perversions. Verse 28 God gives the homosexuals over to their reprobate minds. Verse 32 they that know the judgment of God but continue to sin “*are worthy of death*” (those words are in your Bible). Verse 32 continues. Not only they worthy of death, but also those who approve of (tolerate) them. Do not be deceived by their equal sign.

Ignorance of the law of nature is not an excuse¹.

Homosexuals know the due punishment for their perversion (Romans 1:27). They know that they will suffer the punishment of eternal fire according to Jude verse 7. They know that they cannot go to heaven according to First Corinthians 6:9.

They know that in hell everyone will be equal. Your ignorance of the law of nature is not an excuse¹.

But it gets worse. Without traditional marriage, All children are bastards. Deuteronomy 23:2 bastards cannot enter into the congregation of the Lord unto his 10th generation. Satan knows his time is short. How can we judge angels (First Corinthians 6:3) if we are disqualified for 10 generations?

THE RIGHT TO MARRY ALREADY EXISTS

Homosexuals want to exterminate millennia of moral code and prohibit religious liberty. But many people are fooled into thinking that gays only want the equal right to marry that everyone else has. As it says in the Bible, God Himself has given them over to a reprobate mind.

THE GAY AGENDA WANTS MUCH MORE THAN JUST WANTING EQUAL RIGHTS.

Are Gay "rights" dangerous to religious liberty? The movement to abolish millennia of moral code has already produced Hate Crime Laws. For the first time in history you can now be arrested and convicted for what you think, not for anything you do.

The traditional definition of marriage has remained unchanged ever since it was defined in the Garden of Eden. But pervert lawyers like to change definitions frequently. Example: In 1979 they changed the Law Dictionary definition of marriage to a definition that has never existed. They decided that divorce would cancel a marriage, but this has never been true. Marriage is still until death they depart. Divorce does not cancel a traditional marriage. It never has.

More information is in the article on [Divorce Industry](#).

DESTRUCTION

The unchanging God of the Bible promised to destroy any nation that tolerates homosexuals. Leviticus 18:22,24-30, and again in Deuteronomy 28 starting with verse 15. What better way to destroy America than to turn God against us?

But Christians have another problem with homosexuals, because the Christian Bible is more specific. In Romans 1:26,27,32 we learn that those who merely tolerate² homosexuals are "worthy of death". And the same unchanging Christ who will someday judge Christians warned in [Matthew 11:24](#) (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11): "**But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.**"

LEGALIZED?

Many people are fooled into thinking that the U.S. Supreme Court legalized homosex in [Lawrence v. Texas](#). But did it?

Although the Supreme Court decision overturned a prior case [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) 478 U.S. 186 on a technicality, the Supreme Court documented some history about gay wrongs

“...As the Court notes, ante, at 192, the proscriptions against sodomy have very "ancient roots." Decisions of individuals relating to homosexual conduct have been subject to state intervention throughout the history of Western civilization. Condemnation of those practices is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards. Homosexual sodomy was a capital crime under Roman law. See Code Theod. 9.7.6; Code Just. 9.9.31. See also D. Bailey, Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition 70-81 (1975). During the English Reformation when powers of the ecclesiastical courts were transferred to the King's Courts, the first English statute criminalizing sodomy was passed. 25 Hen. VIII, ch. 6. Blackstone described "the infamous crime against nature" as an offense of "deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human

nature," and "a crime not fit to be named." 4 W. Blackstone, Commentaries 215. The common law of England, including its prohibition of sodomy, became the received law of Georgia and the other Colonies. In 1816 the Georgia Legislature passed the statute at issue here, and that statute has been continuously in force in one form or another since that time. To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."

Notice that Blackstone's Commentaries "became the received law" of the land.

Notice the Supreme Court partially quoted Blackstone's reference of "deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature". The Supreme Court was too polite to give a full quote. Blackstone, when establishing what became the received law of the land here in America, said that Homosex -- throughout the history of mankind -- has always been more detestable than child rape.

The Supreme Court left off a part of Blackstone's quote that was after a conclusion of his commentary on child rape laws in his Book 4, Chapter 15. Here is the full quote with the Supreme Court partial quotes highlighted:

"... the crime is the more detestable... of a still deeper malignity; the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast. A crime, which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature..."

"I will not act so disagreeable part, to my readers as well as myself, as to dwell any longer upon a subject, the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature. It will be more eligible to imitate in this respect the delicacy of our English law, which treats it, in it's very indictments, as a crime not fit to be named."

Child rape is a crime against nature. Murder is a crime against nature. But consensual homosex is THE crime against nature, requiring a traditional penalty harsher than child rape or murder. The English would burn them at the stake, The Goths would bury them alive.

If the Supreme Court had not been so polite by omitting Blackstone's emphasis, perhaps the Bowers decision would have stood as a shining beacon of morals, enlightening the world.

Everyone should know that the Supreme Court's Bowers decision relied upon the law of the land that confirms millennia of moral teaching. Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape.

Again, Black's Law Dictionary quotes a maxim of law:

Peccata contra naturam sunt gravissima. 3 Inst. 20. Crimes against nature are the most heinous.

YES. CHRISTIANS HAVE A PROBLEM WITH TOLERATION

The Christian Bible in Romans 1:32 concludes that homosexuals (of Romans 1:26-27) "are worthy of death". But verse 32 continues from there. Not only are homosexuals

worthy of death, but so are those who tolerate them. A Christian cannot tolerate homosexuals and still claim to be a Christian.

The margin note to Romans 1:32 in Tyndale's 1534 Bible says "To have pleasure in another man's sin is greater wickedness than to sin thyself." These greater-wicked who are entertained by today's television misfits have become your accusers and jurors. But it is much worse; they now control Congress. Political power so great that congressmen fear losing misfit votes. This is contrary to a republic form of government guaranteed by your Constitution Article IV section 4. You have lost the nation.

The Bible continues 4 verses later with a message of repentance and forgiveness to avoid the righteous judgment of God.

Jude verse 7 says that homosexuals will burn in eternal fire. This is not hate. Clear warning is not hate. It is love. And again in Revelation 21:8

First Corinthians 6:9 homosexuals cannot go to heaven. And again in Galatians 5:19. Clear warning is not hate. It is love. You love your neighbor by warning him.

[Leviticus 20:13](#) is an explicit punishment for consensual homosex, not rape. In Leviticus 20 the LORD gave his laws for his people. Homosexuals in verse 13, were to be driven out of society by the death penalty.

But these are NOT laws invented by Moses. They are instructions from the unchanging God of the Bible. Leviticus 20:8 (KJV) *"And ye shall keep my statutes, and do them: I am the LORD which sanctify you."*

Americans proudly engraved Leviticus 25:10 on their liberty bell. But you cannot pretend Leviticus 25 is legitimate while denying Leviticus 20.

Within the very same book of Romans where those who merely tolerate homosexuals (Romans 1:26,27) "are worthy of death" (verse 32), the apostle Paul also tells us to love our fellow man (Romans 13:8, 12:10, etc). Love of your neighbor is sincere when you abhor that which is evil (Romans 12:9). You love your neighbor by driving out evil. Driving out evil is love. Don't let Satan's legalists call it hate.

Driving out evil from your community (even as in [Deuteronomy 17:7](#)) is an act of love. The community will receive God's blessing and avoid God's punishment ([Leviticus 20:13, 22-24](#)).

The unchanging God of the Bible is not going to change just because your church said it was okay to invent a more permissive god of your own choosing. The same unchanging God that said homosex is an abomination in Leviticus 18:22 is the same one who instructs you in verses 4 and 5. "You shall observe My judgments and keep My ordinances, to walk in them: I am the LORD your God. 5 You shall therefore keep My statutes,..."

These are NOT ancient Jewish laws invented by Moses. After all, Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed long before the first Jew ever existed. Destroyed by the unchanging God of the Bible.

Jude and Peter both called homosexuals *beasts*. Peter said that homosexuals are beasts to be destroyed. (second Peter 2:12). Jude also says homosexuals are beasts, woe unto them (verses 10,11).

Intolerance of homosexuals is a true Christian virtue. How can any Christian have a problem with this?

GAY WRONGS:

- Deny that marriage is the foundation of society, upon which dozens of Supreme Court cases rely, including all inheritance laws.
- Deny that we are all created equal. (The divine Laws of Nature are superior to us ...“*neither could any other law possibly exist for we are all created equal with no other superior than the author of our being*”)
- Force us (with threats of imprisonment for Hate Crime Laws -- for what we think, not for what we do) to tolerate the lie that perversion, disease, filth and shame are equal to the foundation of society.
- think they have prohibited our right to enforce the laws of nature. The same laws of nature that entitle the United States to exist.
- Deny that government authority itself is derived from family authority. From which is delegated the *imperium* (both the *merum* and *mixtum*). Or as Shelford said in his 1841 Law textbook on Marriage: marriage is "*the source of all natural relations of mankind... the source of all industry and economy.... The origin of all subordination and government, and consequently of all peace and safety in the world, and, finally the foundation of all religion,*"
- Deny that States can restrict sexual activity to marriage, contrary to Supreme Court decisions (such as the one quoted below). Tolerating perversion will eventually result in prostitution, child rape, child pornography, bestiality, indecent exposure and whatever other perversions THEY decide we must tolerate. If we allow them to spit on our moral beliefs then we will have no principled basis to enforce millennia of moral values.

The US Supreme Court in 1986, reaffirmed that the traditional death penalty for homosexuals is indeed in the foundation of our laws by quoting the British law that existed in the colonies when they became states. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186 at page 214-215:

See, e. g., 1 W. Hawkins, *Pleas of the Crown* 9 (6th ed. 1787) ("All unnatural carnal copulations, whether with man or beast, seem to come under the notion of sodomy, which was felony by the ancient common law, and punished, according to some authors, with burning; according to others, with burying alive"); 4 W. Blackstone, *Commentaries* (discussing "the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished").

According to Blackstone's definition of Law as the strict and impartial punishment of immutable rules applied indiscriminately. Consider:

- The "right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual" which we then delegate to our civil servants.
- "When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature. *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege natureae utendum est.*"
- Justice delayed is justice denied.
- Ecclesiastes 8:11 "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil."
- The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. We do not execute criminals out of hate. The punishment of murderers is not an act of hate. How can punishing a more detestable crime be hateful?
- The law of nature "applies with equal obligation to individuals and to nations".

Refusal to uphold the law-of-the-land **is the most inhuman way to overthrow government** according to John Locke's last chapter in his Second Treatise of Government.

How can you claim that there is no planned destruction of America?

More information is in the article on [Laws of Nature](#).

IF SODOMY BECOMES LEGAL, THEN CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY REVERTS BACK TO US.

Maxim of law:

"When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature. *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege natureae utendum est.*"

The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence says that the Laws of Nature entitle the United States to exist. The Supreme Court says that Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law are part of, and explain, the received law of the land. Blackstone writes about the Laws of Nature. He states that all legislated laws "derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal"

Blackstone's Commentaries (Book 4 PUBLIC WRONGS, introduction, starting at the bottom of page 7). This was the received law-of-the-land when the original 13 American States wrote their Constitutions:

"As to the power of human punishment, or the right of the temporal legislator to inflict discretionary penalties for crimes and misdemeanors. It is clear, that **the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual:** ... otherwise the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution; ... it must also be vested in all mankind; since all are by nature equal. Whereof the first murderer, Cain, was so sensible, that we find him expressing his apprehensions, that whoever should find him would slay him. In a state of society this right is transferred from individuals to the sovereign power; whereby men are prevented from being judges in their own causes, which is one of the evils that

civil government was intended to remedy. Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent **natural power of individuals** must be referred that right, which some have argued to belong to every state, (though, in fact, never exercised by any) of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."

Did we really surrender our right to punish crimes against nature³ when we entered society? It is the magistrate's duty to bear the sword of justice. When you see that judges refuse to punish crimes against nature (such as murder and child rape and consensual sodomy), then government authority reverts back to us.

¹. *Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat*. Ignorance of a law, which every one is bound to know, excuses no man.

² silence implies consent. Acting and consenting adults are liable to the same punishment. It is a crime to not report crimes. Supporting gay agenda is pimping, a criminal act. THE crime against nature has always been more detestable than child rape.

³ See Thomas Jefferson's comments on social contract theory of government

Supporting gays is more detestable than pimping children to their rapists, which would only be A crime against nature. Again: Acting and consenting adults are liable to the same punishment.

* ~ ~ ~ *

States Cannot define marriage

Homosexual advocates try to tell us that States can define *marriage*. This is a lie.

Marriage "is a contract of natural law *antecedent to its becoming a civil contract* in civil society" according to Shelford's 1841 Treatise of the Law of Marriage, page 29.

COURTS AGREE THAT MARRIAGE CANNOT BE RE-DEFINED

Marriage was defined prior to any human government. Governments cannot redefine prior definitions anymore than they can redefine gravity. Gays and their pervert politicians want to change the definition of marriage. But the pre-existing definition that was ordained and established in Genesis cannot be changed by government, by legislatures, or by a vote.

After all, any lawyer can tell you:

NY law in *Rubin v. Irving Trust Co.*, 305 N.Y. 288, 1953. Page 305: "The right to contract marriage is a natural right, **not a legislatively conferred privilege.** "

Georgia law Askew v. Dupree, 30 Ga 173: “marriage is founded in the law of nature, and is **anterior to all human law**”
NY law in Ramon v. Ramon 34 N.Y.S.2d 100, 1942, at page 104: "Marriage is a natural right. **It was not created by law. It existed before all law.** "
Washington Supreme Court McLaughlin's Estate, 30 Pac. 651 at 654, 4 Wash. 570: "marriage is a natural right, which always existed **prior to the organization of any form of government**,...[page 590 marriage has] **its origin in divine law**"

Don't confuse licensed marriage (licentiousness) with the right to unlicensed marriage. Everyone already has a right to marry, WITHOUT state permission. After all, any lawyer can tell you:

States do not confer the right to marry according to the U.S. Supreme Court in [Meister v. Moore](#) 96 U.S. 76 at the bottom of page 78.
"The liberty of **marriage is a natural right inherent in mankind**, confirmed and enforced by the Holy Scriptures..." Virginia Law Register Nov 1900, Vol VI, No.7, article Essentials of a Valid Marriage.
California law Norman v. Norman 121 Cal. 620,. 1898: "It has been properly held that as **marriage is a natural right, of which no government will allow its subjects, wherever abiding, to be deprived**"
McLaughlin's Estate 4 Wash. 570, 30 Pac. 651 at 654, 1892: "**marriage is a natural right, which existed independent of statutes**, and that ordinarily the statutory provisions regulating the contract of marriage should be held to be directory [rather than mandatory]"
Beverlin v. Beverlin, 29 W.Va. 732. 1887: “**marriage is a natural right, and one that existed independent of statutes,**”

COURTS AGREE THAT STATUTES MUST BE INTERPRETED TO PRESERVE CUSTOMARY LAWS, DUTIES AND RIGHTS.

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

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

I find it interesting that one of the natural rights that “is to prevail” is the right of every individual to execute homosexuals:

- The received-law-of-the-land states “the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual”

As for the rules of statute construction:

- *Verba debent intelligi cum effectu ut res magis valeat quam pereat* Words ought to be understood with effect, that a thing may rather be preserved than destroyed. This is especially true if there are no legislated "express words of nullity" to prove that a law changed the original intent.
- Marriage law cannot be changed by legislature without “express words of

nullity.” We know from the Supreme Court's *Meister v. Moore*, 96 U.S. 76, at page 79: "No doubt, a statute may take away a common law right; but there is always a presumption that the Legislature has no such intention, ... unless they contain express words of nullity."

- The U.S. Supreme Court, Headliner note to *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264 "The Supreme Court will construe provisions of Constitution which appear to be repugnant, so as to preserve the true intent and meaning of the Constitution... "
- *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturae utendum est.* When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.

Canada shared our same English Law heritage. England's law changed when Queen Victoria (24 Victoria 100, section 61) made homosex punishable by a minimum of ten years in prison and a maximum of life in prison at hard labor. And soliciting homosex was punishable to ten years at hard labor but not less than three years. Are these "express words of nullity" or does execution by hanging remain an option for these reprobates?

* ~ ~ ~ *

SECTION 3: THE CURSE UPON AMERICA

Sodomy has not been legalized

Consensual homosex has always been more detestable than child rape. Both perversions are now tolerated by manmade laws that are contrary to the very reason that government exists.

The Supreme Courts definition of *homosexual* excludes sodomy. Homosexual marriage is impossible. Homosex is a crime historically punishable by death. The very purpose of government requires homosex be punished. Homosex has never been legalized. As we shall see, The Supreme Court's *Lawrence v. Texas* was a Fourteenth Amendment privacy case. And *Obergefell v. Hodges* invented the idea that the authors of the 14th Amendment somehow intended to legalize homosex even though sodomy was a felony in every state. The Supreme Court did not suddenly "find" a right to homosex. Just as certainly as murder committed in the privacy of a closet is still a felony, so also is homosex still a felony. As we shall see, the court cases leading up to the *Lawrence* decision ignored evidence of terrorism and genocide. The Supreme Court had actual knowledge of terrorism and genocide, yet remained silent.

As for the Supreme Court's *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision:

- At the end of its opinion, the court decision reassured those who oppose same-sex marriage that their rights of conscience will be protected.
- The *Obergefell* decision was an inheritance case. The same sex couple had to travel to a state that recognizes such "marriage" to get "married" in order to qualify for inheritance rights in their own state.

- The Supreme Court ruled on a marriage case in 1888 -- a full 23 years after the 14th Amendment -- that divorce bastardizes children so they CANNOT inherit either parent's property. And now they say the 14th Amendment recognizes traditional crimes as equivalent to "marriage" so as to allow inheritance.
- The Obergefell decision mentions sodomy, but they did not rule on the legality.
- The Defense of Marriage Act was not ruled invalid by the Obergefell decision. Federal law still defines Marriage as a man and woman. [Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7](#)

As for homosexuals, God Himself gives them over to a depraved mind to "become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed, and depravity". Romans 1:24, 26-27, 28, 29.

You cannot have it both ways: either the unchanging God of the Bible will punish America, or He will apologize to Sodom and Gomorrah. As Christ said, "**But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.**"

Toleration of homosexuals is part of the planned destruction of America.

The Supreme Court, until recently, repeatedly insisted that the law-of-the-land requires punishment of the infamous crime against nature.

Homosex is traditionally punishable by a death sentence. Queen Elizabeth The First modified the law so that the death penalty could not be avoided. This became the received-law-of-the-land in the original 13 states.

The laws of nature authorize the United States to exist. The very same laws of nature that authorize the United States to exist, also allow States to execute homosexuals.

Perverted demands that their crime be converted into a right are much more than a political debate. The real issue is whether or not the foundation of all law is now void.

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

Child rape is A crime against nature. Murder is A crime against nature. But consensual homosex is THE crime against nature, requiring a traditional penalty harsher than child rape or murder.

Consensual Homosex is punishable for the same exact reason that murder is still punishable. You cannot have it both ways. It is the same law. Punishing consensual sodomy is one of the main reasons government exists. Just as punishing Murder is one of the main reasons that we created a government. The risk to society of allowing these threats against morality to go unpunished is contrary to the reason government was created.

No Supreme Court decision has legalized the crime of sodomy. The US Supreme Court has only upheld a 14th amendment right to privacy, which limits government snooping into their closets. The Supreme Court did not change any penalty nor did they legalize

THE crime against nature. And Murder committed in the privacy of a closet is still a crime. The Supreme Court did not “find” a right to commit murder or sodomy in the privacy of a closet.

Execution is the ultimate divinely delegated power. The right of everyone to execute certain criminals is delegated to you by the unchanging God of the Bible. In America the received law-of-the-land acknowledged that “*the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual*” which we then delegated to our civil servants. Your civil servants, by the law-of-the-land must now “*bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*”[full quote in my Chapter [Punishment that fits the crime](#), below]. To suggest otherwise is to deny the legitimacy of the American judicial system that the Constitution ordained and established. If judges are not bearing the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community, then your government has been overthrown in the most inhuman way possible.

Murder is a capital felony for the same reason that consensual sodomy is a capital felony. It is the very same law: The law of nature.

A law that punishes, with 20 years in prison, a single act of consensual sodomy committed in private was upheld by the Supreme Court’s Bowers case in 1986. The U.S. Supreme Court in Bowers called the crime of consensual sodomy “a heinous act”

Today, many people are convinced that crimes against nature are unpunishable. But this has never been true. The law of the land still requires punishment of crimes against nature.

Satan is a legalist. People have been deceived into substituting their own counterfeit knowledge of good and evil. Until people want to control their urges, we cannot have a moral nation. Would they understand Deterrence if the law of the land was again enforced by all courts?

Declaration of Independence, first sentence:

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

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

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

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

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

The very foundation of our nation’s laws established that “*It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this [law of nature]”. Nay, if any human law should allow ... us to commit it [crimes against nature], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we offend both the natural and the divine.*” [full quote in my Chapter [Punishment that fits the crime](#), below]

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

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

I will now quote what the United States Supreme Court said in 1986 *Bowers v. Hardwick* (bottom of page 196, top of 197) about homosex. They would later overturn this decision on a technicality. I want you to notice two things:

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

2. consensual homosex, according to the Supreme Court, is contrary to the law of nature.

“Decisions of individuals relating to homosexual conduct have been subject to state intervention throughout the history of Western civilization. Condemnation of those practices is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards. . . . To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Douglas MacArthur speech December 12, 1951:

"History fails to record a single precedent in which nations subject to moral decay have not passed into political and economic decline. There has been either a spiritual awakening to overcome the moral lapse, or a progressive deterioration leading to ultimate national disaster."

* ~ ~ ~ *

[The Planned Destruction of America](#)

Consider the following fundamentals:

#1: The Supreme Court cites Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law as proof of the received-law-of-the-land. This was a law textbook used in the American Colonies. Its first edition was printed 1765 to 1769. According to Blackstone's Book 4 (Criminal Law) introduction: Government must "bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."

#2: Leviticus 20:13 is not a law created by Moses. See verses 1 and 8. And in the Christian times (Romans 1:26,27,32) we learn that homosexuals "are worthy of death" (direct quote from King James Bible) as are those who approve of them.

#3: Why do judges insist on denying the legitimacy of their government? The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence states that the laws of nature entitle the United States to exist.

#4: *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturae utendum est.* When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.

#5: The Goths would bury homosexuals alive. The Brits would burn them at the stake. Romans would crucify them (both Justinian Code 9.9. 31 and Theodosianus Code 9.7.6). And homosex was punished by death in England up to 1861 and in Canada until 1869.

It is impossible for homosex to be legalized.

Proofs:

#1: The Laws of Nature require homosexuals to be executed. Sodomy has always been a crime more detestable than other crimes against nature, such as child rape or murder.

#2: The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence states that the Laws of Nature entitle the United States to exist. No congressman, much less a majority of congressmen, can deny the legitimacy of their government.

#3: The common law remains as the rule of decision in all courts. The received-law-of-the-land cannot change without congress passing a law canceling the received law with "express words of nullity". But that would be impossible. No congressman can cancel the foundation of society that created their government, prevent judges from enforcing the law of nature -- which is the only source of all law, tear up government by the roots, cast aside millennia of moral teaching, corrupt the society that created their government, nor prevent us from reverting to the law of nature to correct the problems they cause.

#4 Marriage was defined in the Garden of Eden. The pre-existing definition cannot be changed by passing a pervert law, any more than they could redefine gravity, or legalize child rape.

#5 No congressman can use the influence of a public office to corrupt anyone.

#6 No officer of government can ignore felonies.

And no, *Lawrence v. Texas* did not legalize sodomy. It is impossible to legalize sodomy. This Supreme Court decision restricted government snooping into "certain homosexual acts" which can receive 14th Amendment due process privacy protections. It seems obvious that genital contact was not legalized.

The US Supreme Court in *Meister v. Moore*, 96 U.S. 76, at the bottom of page 78, ruled that the common law regarding marriage remains unchanged unless the statute contains express words of nullity. "And such...has been the rule generally adopted in construing statutes regulating marriage. Whatever directions they may give respecting its formation or solemnization, courts have usually held a marriage good at common law to be good notwithstanding the statutes, unless they contain express words of nullity. "

But since marriage is the foundation of society that created government, no legislator can nullify the legitimacy of the government they swore to uphold. *

Lawrence v. Texas went so far astray as to state "Early American sodomy laws were not directed at homosexuals as such but instead sought to prohibit nonprocreative sexual activity more generally, whether between men and women or men and men."

This is in direct contradiction to the American sodomy laws that perpetuate the laws of nature. The same laws that have been enforced for millennia.

Some people now say that gay rights are human rights.

Human rights? In 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 US 186, said: "To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."

Human rights? It is a human right to execute murderers and homosexuals. The same law of nature that entitles the United States to exist also allows the execution of homosexuals. The received law of the land acknowledges that "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual". Murder is only A crime against nature. Child rape is only A crime against nature. But there is a much more detestable crime that has always, throughout the history of mankind, deserved a harsher punishment than murder or child rape. THE crime against nature. Romans would crucify them (both Justinian Code 9.9. 31 and Theodosianus Code 9.7.6). Goths would bury them alive. English would burn them at the stake.

Both Jude and Peter called them beasts. Peter called them beasts to be destroyed. Jude said they will burn in hell. In Romans 1:26, 27, 28 God Himself gives them over to a reprobate mind so that they will be condemned. Verse 31 says they are worthy of death, as are those who approve of them. Leviticus 20:13 says they must be put to death. Leviticus 20 is not the law of Moses, it is the law of the LORD according to verses 7,8. In Genesis 18 the Lord Himself came down to earth to supervise the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The U.S. Supreme Court cites Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law as proof of the received law of the land. This was a law textbook used in the American Colonies. Its first edition was printed 1765 to 1769. According to Blackstone's Book 4 (Criminal Law) introduction: Government must "bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."

Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law introduction to law in Book 1 of this 4 volume law textbook starts out with an explanation of why statutory law exists. It eloquently explains that the law of nature is from the divine revealed law of the Bible.

"This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other - It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... Neither could any other law possibly exist; for a law always supposes some superior who is to make it; and in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being."

That's right. Both human rights and equal rights include our equal right to punish crimes against nature such as murder and the like. We also delegated that right to our subordinates when we created a government.

The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence says that the Laws of Nature entitle the United States to exist.

Human rights? *Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturae utendum est.* When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.

Not reporting a crime is a crime. It is misprision of felony. Persuading others to not report a crime is also a crime. It is tampering with a witness. Approving of those who commit crimes is a crime. Like those of Romans 1:32 they are just as "worthy of death" (direct quote from KJV) as those who commit the crimes.

Americans who remain quiet, just like those of Romans 1:28, do not retain God in their knowledge. God himself will give them over to a reprobate mind to be destroyed. Their only hope for eternal salvation is for you to convince them otherwise (Second Timothy 2:25)

Second Thessalonians 2:12 "that they might be damned which believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Because they had pleasure in unrighteousness. Fags will burn in hell, Jude 7. Fags cannot go to heaven, First Corinthians 5:19 and Galatians 5:19.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Even if you don’t believe God will send wrath upon the United States, your refusal to conform to the will of the unchanging God will have still have disastrous consequences for the future of society, and for your family.

Whether you believe in God’s wrath or not, your silence will have the same consequence.

Tolerance (silence) compromises the word of God. To sin by silence, when you should protest, will destroy America more than any terrorist.

By doing nothing, you are participating in the destruction of society's foundation.

Freedom of speech exists to permit discussion of controversial topics. There are some criminals who misuse their freedom. They want the filth, perversion, disease and shame of unspeakable crimes against nature to be equated with the legitimate law of nature, the foundation of society. Free speech ends where treason begins.

By the way, First John 3:13 tells us that Christians will be hated by the world. If you are not hated, then perhaps you are not acting Christian enough.

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

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

Conclusions:

We are now confronted with a judiciary that refuses to punish "crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like..." In a flagrant breach of duty "inconceivable to human capacity, and inconsistent with human society."

U.S. Supreme Court, *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 469-471:

"In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

When government officers corrupt society, the result is "to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security..." John Locke's Second Treatise of Government paragraph 222.

* what better way to destroy America than to convince everyone that solemn vows to God are meaningless religious chants that can be ignored by black robed priests at any courthouse. With the added advantage to Satan's disciples that perversion becomes acceptable, Christ is mocked, and the crime of adultery, that just 100 years ago was the

greatest of civil injuries, now becomes frivolous. Marriage ceases to be Holy and becomes a piece of paper to be conferred or revoked by the subjective determination of civil servants, who eventually claimed to act as “guardians of their morals”. After society accepts unholy as Holy, then the road is paved for perverts to demand equal rights to commit their heinous crimes against the Laws of Nature, then demand that traditional marriage be denied to Christians.

And indeed, the Supreme Court’s Obergefell decision to legalize homosexual “marriage” (which is not real marriage, and did not legalize sodomy) contains warnings in a dissenting opinion by Justice Alito:

- "will be used to vilify Americans unwilling to assent to the new orthodoxy."
- "the majority facilitates the marginalization of the many Americans who have traditional ideas."
- “I assume that those who cling to old beliefs will be able to whisper their thoughts in the recesses of their homes, but if they repeat those views in public, they will risk being labeled as bigots and treated as such by governments, employers, and schools.”

I find it curious that this same Justice Alito had the only dissenting opinion in the Westboro Baptist church protest case *Snyder v. Phelps*. In the 37 page decision, his dissenting opinion, two sentences long, apologized to the Snyder family for contributing to their grief. (the same court defines *frivolous* as *without basis in law*)

By the way, Obergefell did not repeal the Defense of Marriage Act. Federal law still does not recognize homosex marriage. [Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7](#).

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

What does the Bible say about false doctrine?

There are many examples in the Bible showing that debauchery destroys righteousness.

Many people now want the Bible to be permissive. But it is idolatry to invent a god of your own choosing.

This kind of thinking changes the grace of God into a license for immorality, and actually denies our Lord, according to Jude verse 4. They secretly introduce damnable heresies to follow their shameful ways, in order to bring the way of truth into disrepute. Second Peter 2.

If your church tolerates damnable heresies (sensuality, civil licentious "marriage", remarriage, or tolerance of homosexuals) then find another Church. Christ Himself, in Matthew 23:15, said that those who believe the lies of religious leaders are twice-fold damned. Judgment must begin at the house of God, First Peter 4:17.

Christians have a duty to spread moral values. Look around you. If moral values are not spreading, then you haven’t done your job. We are at war against the world. In the last

days, people will abandon the faith and turn to doctrines of demons (First Timothy 4:1). If the gates of hell are prevailing against your church, then perhaps you are not effectively advancing the cause of righteousness.

Here are two suggestions to more effectively get your point across:

(1) Don't send the wrong message. "Speaking the truth in love" (Ephesians 4:15) is the wrong message. Ephesians 4:15 is about revealing doctrines of scripture to your deceived fellow believers, it is not about confronting false teachers. Your love duty is to warn your opponents. We love the sinner by warning them. Christ warned his opponents about being slammed into hell, (as for example the more-tolerable-for-Sodom warning). This is love. You cannot advance the cause of righteousness by tolerating destruction of your society. Don't use mealy-mouthed* weasel words to get your point across.

(2) Christ and Paul spoke bluntly. They risked stoning when they confronted those who twist morality. They did not "speak the truth in love" to their opponents. They spoke such things as: Woe unto you, You hypocrites! (spoken directly to them 7 times in Matthew 23) Ye shall receive the greater damnation. You vipers, how can you escape the damnation of hell? (Matthew 23:33) Woe unto you lawyers, for you have taken away the key of knowledge (Luke 11:52) Ye are of your father the Devil (John 8:44) homosexuals cannot go to heaven (First Corinthians 6:9). Agitators should be castrated (Galatians 5:12) and fornicators turned over to Satan (First Corinthians 5:5) . They spoke plain truth. You are to love society by driving out evil.

Speaking plain truths means that you understand your Bible. First Timothy 5:20 "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear."

You have a duty to warn sinners, Ezekiel 3:18-21. Tell them like it is. Homosexuals will burn in hell (Jude 7). This is not hate. Clear warning is not hate. It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, than for those who tolerate homosexuals. Homosexuals are "worthy of death" as are those who tolerate them (Romans 1:26,27,32). Peter said they are beasts to be destroyed. (Second Peter 2:12). Jude also says homosexuals are beasts, woe unto them (verses 10,11). Intolerance of homosexuals is a true Christian virtue. How can any Christian have a problem with this?

A brief WORD about hate. Hate comes from God Himself, Genesis 3:15. Satan cannot create hate, he only redirects it to the wrong people. Christians are to hate wickedness Hebrews 1:9. And yes, Hate is a family value. Luke 14:26. Matthew 10:35. Don't let them accuse you of hate.

A brief WORD about judgment. God is love (First John 4:8). Christians are to "judge righteous judgment" John 7:24. You cannot separate love from judgment -- Christ's weightier matters are justice, mercy and faith; Matthew 23:23. You cannot tolerate evil men. Don't be brainwashed by multiculturalism nonsense that all viewpoints are valid. If you don't stand for something, you'll fall for anything. Take a stand.

Titus 1:13 "... rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;"

Titus 2:15 "... exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."

Second Corinthians 10:5 "We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ. "

Ezekiel 3:18-21 (NIV)

"When I say to a wicked man, 'You will surely die,' and you do not warn him or speak out to dissuade him from his evil ways in order to save his life, that wicked man will die for his sin, and I will hold you accountable for his blood.

But if you do warn the wicked man and he does not turn from his wickedness or from his evil ways, he will die for his sin; but you will have saved yourself.

Again, when a righteous man turns from his righteousness and does evil, and I put a stumbling block before him, he will die. Since you did not warn him, he will die for his sin. The righteous things he did will not be remembered, and **I will hold you accountable for his blood.**

But if you do warn the righteous man not to sin and he does not sin, he will surely live because he took warning, and you will have saved yourself."

You have a duty to engage liberals on some level. You may be their only inspiration to accept eternal salvation according to Second Timothy 2:25.

* The great reformer Martin Luther coined the term "mealy-mouthed" to describe those who are not direct in speech. <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/mealy-mouthed>

* ~ ~ ~ *

[What does history say about homosex Privacy?](#)

According to Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law, Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape. The Supreme Court considers Blackstone's Commentaries to be part of the received-law-of-the-land.

Blackstone, quoted at length later, laid down the foundation that became the received law-of-the-land in the original American States. As he concluded his remarks on child rape, he introduced the laws relating to trials of the accused sodomite:

"... the crime is the more detestable... of a still deeper malignity; the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast. A crime, which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature..."

U.S. law is based on English law as it existed in the American colonies when the States wrote their Constitutions. The Supreme Court refers to this pre-existing law as "well settled law" or as the "received law of the land."

The pre-existing law from Queen Elizabeth I (statute 5 Eliz c 17) requires that those convicted of the crime of homosex, either consensual or rape, could not avoid the death sentence by appealing their case to an ecclesiastical court.

A discussion of privacy rights will explain why they usually get away with it.

In the United States, homosex crimes are protected by the fourteenth amendment due-process concern against unwarranted government intrusion. And now, post-Lawrence, a Fourteenth Amendment due-process liberty. Government cannot snoop to learn about these crimes until there is probable cause to do so. The crime has to be reported to government before an arrest can be made, just as the crime of murder that is committed in a closet must first be reported before an arrest can be made. [Lawrence v. Texas](#) recognized the fourteenth amendment due-process protections against government intrusion. Yet, many people mistakenly call this a “right to privacy”.

In my opinion, the crime of sodomy is not a right to privacy any more so than a child rape -- or any other crime against nature -- committed in secret could be a “right to privacy”. Crimes committed in secret are not private acts, they are public wrongs.

Crimes cannot be converted into rights. Homosex has never had a fourth amendment privacy protection. The Supreme Court in [Bowers v. Hardwick](#) has recognized that sodomy laws are enforceable because “The right to privacy does not extend to acts of consensual sodomy between homosexual adults”. This ruling showed that once the crime becomes known, it was lawful to intrude into their closets in order to enforce punishment. (now protected by Lawrence)

It has always been so. More than 3,200 years ago Phinehas in [Numbers 25:8](#), without respecting privacy, enforced punishment against the sexually immoral of his day, so that his community was spared God’s plagues. Phinehas will be honored for his righteousness forevermore. God counted him as righteousness for executing perverts. [Psalm 106:31](#) It took national heroes like Phinehas to enforce God’s punishment against perverts and avoid national plagues. (Abraham is the only other person who God counted as righteousness. Genesis 15:6 and Romans 4:3).

Smayda v. U.S., 352 F.2d 251, determined that police can have a camera peephole in a public restroom to catch homosexuals committing their secret consensual crime against nature. Now, the crime has to be reported to government before an arrest can be made. Secret crimes are still public wrongs, they have not become privacy rights.

Beard v. Stahr, 200 F.Supp 766, determined that undercover police can solicit consensual homosex in order to catch those so inclined. The mere intent to commit such an unspeakable crime can be punished, with no actual crime committed. Again: public wrongs are not privacy rights. Since there is NO expectation of privacy in a public setting, such police tactics should still be lawful.

Pervert lovers want you to believe that it is now wrong to do what is right in the eyes of the Lord (First Kings 15:11) to drive the sodomites from the land. Or to break down the houses of the sodomites, as in Second Kings 23:7.

The original law of the land prohibits consensual sodomy. Sodomy is not love. It is a crime. You love your neighbor by driving out crime. The fourth amendment right to privacy does not extend to any crime. As long as due process rights are observed, the felony shall be punished. Government has a duty to punish crimes. It is a crime to not report a felony.

The US Supreme Court often quotes from [Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England](#) in order to establish what the common law was when the former colonies wrote their State Constitutions. The received law of the land is the common law that applies to everyone. As we shall see, Blackstone's precepts remain valid in America as a solid foundation of American jurisprudence. American revisions to Blackstone's work were published in America up to 1884. The Supreme Court still quotes from it.

There has always been a deep concern for the due process rights of those falsely accused of crimes committed in secret. Blackstone's Commentaries Book IV, discusses the history of English law concerning Public Wrongs. Among these public wrongs against nature are the crime of child rape and the crime of consensual sodomy. Child rape is not discussed in Book IV as a crime against the child, but as a public wrong. In Book IV, Chapter 15, upon concluding the discussion of child rape, on page 215, Blackstone continues with a discussion of a crime more detestable, of a deeper malignity, of an offense so dark, yet so difficult for an innocent defendant to disprove, that a death sentence (beheading was the most lenient of the three methods of execution) may be appropriate for those who make a false accusation of witnessing a sodomy.

Now we find perverts line up to register their criminal confessions with the marriage-license authorities. They are praying to receive the "due penalty for their perversion" promised by [Romans 1:27](#). They waived their due-process privacy right by confessing to a felony.

After all, the crime has to be reported to government before an arrest can be made.

Concern for due process rights is the only reason that sodomy laws can be unpunished by the courts, primarily *Lawrence v. Texas* which treats privacy as a Fourteenth amendment due process right and NOT a fourth amendment privacy right. And indeed, we see that it is NOT a privacy concern as was confirmed by the Supreme Court in *Bowers v. Hardwick*: "The right to privacy does not extend to acts of consensual sodomy between homosexual adults". Now that homosexuals are openly confessing their felonies, due process cannot be raised as a defense to avoid "the due penalty for their perversion".

So that you might understand the impact of the 14th Amendment, Here are some notes on OTHER 14th Amendment privacy cases:

- Abortion in [Roe v. Wade](#) was also a Fourteenth Amendment due process case, not a fourth amendment privacy right. *Roe v. Wade* did not legalize abortion – in the *Roe v. Wade* decision, the abortion doctor, Dr. James Hubert Hallford was remanded back to Texas for his punishment. Those who have overthrown one nation, under God, want you to believe that abortion was legalized, so that sex will have no consequences. God invented sex with life and death consequences. We abort 3,000 babies a day and no one seems to care. Your representatives authorized this with your consent. Innocent blood is on your hands.
- In *Lawrence v. Texas* the Supreme Court relied upon a brief by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to show that some nations tolerate homosexuals. Has the Supreme Court determined that your laws must accommodate foreigners who want to destroy your nation? God has always

used pagan nations to punish his people. Pagan Conquerors are instruments of His discipline.

- In *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, the Supreme Court allowed married couples to get away with the crime of using condoms. But this was a 14th Amendment due process concern about government intrusion to detect the crime. And ONLY a due-process concern. It is not a Fourth Amendment right to privacy. It decriminalized, but did not legalize, condom use by married couples in private. This case would later be cited by the Supreme Court in *Lawrence v. Texas* as somehow proving that crimes committed in a closet have a right to privacy.

The US Supreme Court has never found a right to sodomy. Has the crime of consensual sodomy somehow become a civil right?

Sodomy was traditionally a capital felony. The fourth amendment right to privacy does not extend to any felony. As long as due process rights are observed, a felony can be punished.

What perversion of logic leads them to believe that confessing to a felony gives them civil rights as a protected minority?

Here is the exact text of Blackstone's (First Edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1769) Book IV, so that you can read for yourself exactly what our Christian society has historically required for mankind to preserve itself. I start the quote from Page 214 discussion of child rape, to show you that due process of the accused has always been a primary concern in cases of child rape and other crimes against nature that are committed in secret. But once guilt is known, punishment is swift and just. This was the received law of the land in all 13 original States,

MOREOVER, if the rape be charged to be committed on an infant under twelve years of age, she may still be a competent witness, if she hath sense and understanding to know the nature and obligations of an oath; and, even if she hath not, it is thought by sir Matthew Haleⁱ that she ought to be heard without oath, to give the court information; though that alone will not be sufficient to convict the offender. And he is of this opinion, first, because the nature of the offence being secret, there may be no other possible proof of the actual fact; though afterwards there may be concurrent circumstances to corroborate it, proved by other witnesses: and, secondly, because the law allows what the child told her mother, or other relations, to be given in evidence, since the nature of the case admits frequently of no better proof; and there is much more reason for the court to hear the narration of the child herself, than to receive it at second hand from those who swear they heard her say so. And indeed it is now settled, that infants of any age are to be heard; and, if they have any idea of an oath, to be also sworn: it being found by experience that infants of very tender years often give the clearest and truest testimony. But in any of these cases, whether the child be sworn or not, it is to be wished, in order to render her evidence credible, that there should be some concurrent testimony, of tome, place and circumstances, in order to make out the fact; and that the conviction should not be grounded singly on the unsupported accusation of an infant under years of discretion. There may be therefore, in many

cases of this nature, witnesses who are competent, that is, who may be admitted to be heard; and yet, after being heard, may prove not to be credible, or such as the jury is bound to believe. For one excel-

i 1 Hal. P. C. 634.

.P 215

PUBLIC WRONGS.

BOOK IV.

Ch. 15.

lence of the trial by jury is, that the jury are triors of the credit of the witnesses, as well as of the truth of the fact.

“IT is true, says this learned judge^k, that rape is a most “detestable crime, and therefore ought severely and impartially “to be punished with death; but it must be remembered, that “it is an accusation easy to be made, hard to be proved, but “harder to be defended by the party accused, though innocent.” He then relates two very extraordinary cases of malicious prosecutions for this crime, that had happened within his own observation; and concludes thus: “I mention these instances, that “we may be the more cautious upon trials of offences of this “nature, wherein the court and jury may with so much ease be “imposed upon, without great care and vigilance; the heinousness of the offence many times transporting the judge and jury “with so much indignation, that they are overhastily carried to “the conviction of the person accused thereof, by the confident “testimony of sometimes false and malicious witnesses.”

IV. WHAT has been here observed, especially with regard to the manner of proof, which ought to be the more clear in proportion as the crime is the more detestable, may be applied to another offence, of a still deeper malignity; the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast. A crime, which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature, so easily charged, and the negative so difficult to be proved, that the accusation should be clearly made out: for, if false, it deserves a punishment inferior only to that of the crime itself.

I WILL not act so disagreeable part, to my readers as well as myself, as to dwell any longer upon a subject, the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature. It will be more eligible to imitate in this respect the delicacy of our English law, which

k 1 Hal. P. C. 635.

.P 216

PUBLIC WRONGS.

BOOK IV.

Ch. 15.

treats it, in it's very indictments, as a crime not fit to be named; “peccatum illud horrible, inter christianos non nominandum.” A taciturnity observed likewise by the edict of Constantius and Constans^l: “ubi scelus est id, quod non proficit scire, jubemus insurgere leges, armari jura gladio ultore, ut exquisitis poenis subdantur

infames, qui sunt, vel qui futuri sunt, rei.” Which leads me to add a word concerning it's punishment.

THIS the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God^m, determine to be capital. Of which we have a signal instance, long before the Jewish dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven: so that this is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept. And our ancient law in some degree imitated this punishment, by commanding such miscreants to be burnt to deathⁿ; though Fleta^o says they should be buried alive: either of which punishments was indifferently used for this crime among the ancient Goths^p. But now the general punishment of all felonies is the same, namely, by hanging: and this offence ... was made single felony by the statute 25 Hen. VIII. c. 6. and felony without benefit of clergy by statute 5 Eliz. c. 17. And the rule of law herein is, that, if both are arrived at years of discretion, agentes et consentientes pari poena plectanturq .

The terminology “without benefit of clergy”¹ means the case cannot be removed to ecclesiastical court and thereby avoid the death penalty. Even sodomite priests could be put to death.

The terminology “if both are arrived at years of discretion, agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur” is speaking about consensual sodomy, not homosexual rape. The Latin is for: “Acting and consenting parties are liable to the same punishment.” This is proof that death penalty for consensual homosex was the common law here in America. Legislators cannot change the common law without express words of nullity. But since the law of nature authorized the United States to exist, it is doubtful that any legislator would deny the legitimacy of their office.

Agentes et consentientes pari poena plectentur /əjén-tiyz et kənsənsiyéntiyz péray piynə plekténtər/. Acting and consenting parties are liable to the same punishment.

Both are to be put to death. This Latin phrase from Blackstone's commentary was in American Law Dictionaries.

And when we compare this British first edition with an 1803 Virginia version that had been revised with commentary to conform to the U.S. Constitution, we see that these consensual sodomy laws remain unchanged in the United States. (Tucker's 1803 Blackstone is can be downloaded from the Constitution Society's on-line library www.constitution.org) And Blackstone's remained as a renowned reference book for American jurists until the late 1800's.

The Common Law is the well-established law that applies to everyone, even if not legislated.

Ever since we brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty, the common law that applies to everyone required the immediate execution of homosexuals. As quoted earlier, Blackstone's also warned that “licentiousness and debauchery” would destroy both society and government. It is very unlikely that government officers can commit treason by legalizing destruction of both society and government. It is also unlikely that government officers can disturb your worship. Worship is defined in the

Law Dictionary as “Any form of religious service showing reverence for Divine Being, or exhortation to obedience to or following of the mandates of such Being....”

Locke’s Second Treatise paragraph 222:

“.... it can never be supposed to be the will of the society that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure by entering into society,”

The Clean Hands doctrine prohibits government from rewarding a crime.

Throughout the history of Western civilization, sodomy – whether with man or beast – has traditionally been a capital felony. Driving out evil from your community is not hate, it is love.

Because we failed to enforce family rights for 100 years, the wicked now expect a “civil right” to destroy us.

Christ spoke of the value of family hate in Luke 14:26 -- and in Matthew chapter 10, starting with Matthew 10:34-35 (NKJV) "**Do not think that I came to bring peace on earth. I did not come to bring peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother...**" this was right after his warning us not to tolerate homosexuals in verse 15. A solid doctrine of true family values from the words of Christ himself. The unchanging God of the Bible understands family values; He drives out sin by demanding that we punish sinful family. As in Exodus 32:27, for example.

Second Peter 2:6 "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly;"

1. Without benefit of clergy. Prior to Queen Elizabeth (the first) the defendant could appeal his case to ecclesiastical courts to avoid the death penalty. And priests could be executed.

* ~ ~ ~ *

[What about Lawrence v. Texas?](#)

Summary so far:

- The Law of Nature authorizes governments to exist. All human laws "derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”
- The unchanging Law of Nature did not change when ungodly lawyers removed the definition from their law dictionary. The Law of Nature still "applies with equal obligation to individuals and to nations"

- The Law of Nature authorizes governments to execute homosexuals, murderers and child rapists. Government must “*bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*”
- The Received-Law-of-the-land in America is the law that existed in the British Colonies when the states wrote their Constitutions. The Common Law is the law that applies to everyone. A common law continues in full force until the legislature cancels it with "express words of nullity" (according to the Supreme Court in a marriage case, *Meister v. Moore*). *Verba debent intelligi cum effectu ut res magis valeat quam pereat* Words ought to be understood with effect, that a thing may rather be preserved than destroyed. (We will use this rule for construing sentences of Supreme Court rulings).
- No congressman would question the legitimacy of his own government (that he swore an oath to uphold) by canceling with "express words of nullity" the law that authorizes his government to exist, which is also the same law that requires government to "bear the sword of justice... [to execute those who offend] against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."

Did the Supreme Court finally discover a right to homosex and thereby nullify the Laws of Nature that entitle the United States to exist? Or is something else going on here?

I highly suspect that the Supreme Court's definition of *homosexual* excludes sodomy, even though they mention sodomy. Another fact to notice is that ONLY 14th Amendment homosexuals (citizens of the federal government who are receiving federal welfare funds) are protected by the Supreme Court's decision.

The Lawrence case is confounding in many ways. The United States Supreme Court decision in *Lawrence v. Texas* overruled their prior decision in *Bowers v. Hardwick* on a technicality but did not overturn other related cases or existing laws against homosexual perversion.

Are sodomites now free to commit unpunishable crimes against nature?

The Lawrence decision stated right up front that it was a due process case,

“Resolution of this case depends on whether petitioners were free as adults to engage in private conduct in the exercise of their liberty under the Due Process Clause.”

yet it flippantly overturned their prior *Bowers* decision without much discussion other than to conclude that 14th Amendment due-process equal protection, rather than privacy, somehow trumps the State's right to punish crimes. As if to say that equal protection OF the law, somehow means equal protection FROM the law.

The Lawrence decision stated, "**there is a pattern of nonenforcement with respect to consenting adults acting in private.**" Are they trying to say that equal protection now means that since some get away with crimes that therefore we must allow all to get away with crimes? If so, then we have entered into an era where prosecutors must prosecute all

crimes committed in private, without mercy, or by our nonenforcement the crimes automatically convert into protected rights.

Condom use committed in private by married heterosexual couples is still a crime. And is still punishable by unmarried couples. Lawrence was based on their Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 decision that decriminalizes, but does not legalize, condom use in private by married couples. But Griswold was a due process privacy case not an equal protection case.

It ignored that the Laws of Nature are the foundation of government. The terminology "Laws of Nature" is capitalized in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence. It is the authority that entitles the United States to exist.

It ignored their own decision in Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978) that States can indeed restrict legal sexual activity to the marriage relationship.

The Lawrence decision said that they ONLY considered three questions:

"We granted certiorari, 537 U. S. 1044 (2002), to consider three questions:

"1. Whether Petitioners' criminal convictions under the Texas "Homosexual Conduct" law -- which criminalizes sexual intimacy by same-sex couples, but not identical behavior by different-sex couples--violate the Fourteenth Amendment guarantee of equal protection of laws?"

"2. Whether Petitioners' criminal convictions for adult consensual sexual intimacy in the home violate their vital interests in liberty and privacy protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?"

"3. Whether Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U. S. 186 (1986), should be overruled?"

Let's briefly examine their stated reasons for even considering the case:

Notice how they blamed a Texas "law which criminalizes sexual intimacy by same-sex couples, but not identical behavior by different-sex couples" -- which is not true even in Texas statute law, and never in common law. This is simply not the case. The Supreme Court has never legalized anal sex, even for married heterosexual couples, although the Lawrence decision implied that they had. Married heterosexual couples have never had a right to commit anal sex, not even in the privacy of their homes.

Anal sex among heterosexual married couples (the crime of buggery) remains punishable. The US Supreme Court, in a prior case, had refused to interfere with Arizona's sentence of 4 years in prison for a married couples anal sex in Arizona v. Bateman, 429 U.S. 864. They refused to rule whether or not Arizona "may prohibit consensual sexual acts between married adults..." They left the question unanswered. And they have never ruled otherwise. In fact, the US Supreme Court in Arizona v. Bateman quoted the Arizona Supreme Court's decision regarding this married heterosexual couple's anal sex: "the legislature has acted to properly regulate the moral welfare of its people, and has specifically prohibited sodomy..." Which, of course, it must do to perpetuate the received law of the land.

Notice that the Lawrence case only considered a Fourteenth Amendment Due Process "vital interests in liberty and privacy". But they never explained how committing crimes is a vital interest.

Notice that the Lawrence case found some technicality with the Texas statute law, yet crimes against nature are common law questions, not statute law questions. The common law remains as the rule of decision in all Texas courts¹.

Basic human rights had nothing to do with the case. Inalienable rights had nothing to do with the case. Sixth Amendment due-process of accused criminals had nothing to do with the case. Nor Fifth Amendment due-process rights. Fourth Amendment privacy has nothing to do with the case. Only the Fourteenth Amendment liberty granted to freed slaves after the Civil War is being considered here.

Texas' death row has a very busy execution schedule. They would never argue that their right to execute murderers comes from the US Supreme Court. Yet the right to punish crimes against nature -- what Blackstone called "murder and the like" -- comes from the same received-law-of-the-land that authorizes consensual homosexual sodomy to be punished by death.

Perhaps they were only saying that Texas had bad prosecutors. The Lawrence decision states: "**The Texas court considered Bowers v. Hardwick, 478 U.S. 186, controlling on that point.**" [the point of constitutionality under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment]. PERHAPS if Texas had merely stated that their authority to punish crimes against nature came from the law-of-the-land, or the Texas Constitution, or "millennia of moral values" or their common law, or even the law of nature itself (which, after all, is the law that authorizes government to exist) then perhaps the Bowers decision would have stood.

Texas had bad prosecutors who insisted that prior U.S. Supreme Court case was controlling their law, when in fact

- "Nobody objects to a state enforcing its own penal laws." -- Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. at 374

Here are some Bowers Supreme Court quotes, within quote marks, each of which is followed by unanswered questions and comments:

"Held: The Texas statute making it a crime for two persons of the same sex to engage in certain intimate sexual conduct violates the Due Process Clause."

"(a) Resolution of this case depends on whether petitioners were free as adults to engage in private conduct in the exercise of their liberty under the Due Process Clause."

-- notice the illogic of how they immediately assumed, without proof² or explanation, that a crime was somehow a liberty. (A crime that has always been more detestable than -- and more harshly punished than -- child rape).

Laws... **"seek to control a personal relationship that, whether or not entitled to formal recognition in the law, is within the liberty of persons to choose without being punished as criminals."**

-- How did the received-law-of-the-land's "right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like" somehow evolve to allow serious crimes to become "the liberty of persons to choose without being punished as criminals."? This is not logical. There should be at least an explanation to differentiate this crime from other laws against private consensual relationships like prostitution, or extortion, or usury, or buggery, or conspiracy, or even treason. And why does a government that has "'the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like" not even deserve the consideration of any explanation at all? IF there is equal protection of criminal conspiracy against nature, THEN The Supreme Court has converted murder and child rape into a liberty. If not, then the Supreme Court DID NOT legalize homosex.

-- Where did this fourteenth amendment right to personal relationships come from? It did not exist in 1943 when Haupt had to spend 20 years in prison because he opened his front door to welcome his son, U.S. v. Haupt, 136 F.2d 661. It did not exist when Cramer "engaged long and earnestly in conversation" with no proof² of what was said 325 U.S. 1, 37. Does a right to personal relationships now exist for other personal relationships like prostitution, or treason, or aiding a felon, or conspiracy, or for child porn rings?

"It should be noted, however, that there is no longstanding history in this country of laws directed at homosexual conduct as a distinct matter. "

-- Where do they get this nonsense? They did not support this absurd statement. The Bowers decision quoted the Colonial era capital punishment laws that became our received-law-of-the-land. See the "ancient roots" commentary, below. The only way this statement could be true is if their words "homosexual conduct" excludes genital contact.

"Early American sodomy laws were not directed at homosexuals as such but instead sought to prohibit nonprocreative sexual activity more generally, whether between men and women or men and men. "

-- but this has never been true. Blackstone's Commentaries made it very clear that the death penalty was for consensual homosex, not just rape. Blackstone's even used the Latin phrase "*agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur*". The legal community used Latin because it is a dead language whose meanings do not change. When the States were created, the law was clear that acting and consenting partners were liable to the same punishment.

-- Notice that they did not quote the early American sodomy law "All unnatural carnal copulations, whether with man or beast" which is nonprocreative, even though they quoted it in their earlier Bowers case.

-- Where do they get this concept "**nonprocreative sexual activity... whether between men and women or men and men**"? It was not from the received-law-of-the-land's "more detestable [than child rape]... committed either with man or beast... to be ... strictly and impartially punished... [acting and consenting partners are liable to the same punishment]"?

-- AND, since when did infertility become a crime? Sodomy was always a crime. A crime more detestable than child rape.

"Instead, sodomy prosecutions often involved predatory acts against those who could not or did not consent: "

-- This might be true, as well as consensual. Queen Elizabeth the First changed the law (statute 5 Eliz c 17) so that the death penalty for consensual homosex could not be avoided by appealing the case to an ecclesiastical court. This became the received-law-of-the-land in America. Consensual homosex was always punishable, as noted in their Bowers decision, by millennia of moral tradition.

"The longstanding criminal prohibition of homosexual sodomy upon which Bowers placed such reliance is as consistent with a general condemnation of nonprocreative sex as it is with an established tradition of prosecuting acts because of their homosexual character."

-- Nonprocreative sex certainly was never "as consistent with" traditional crimes against nature "as murder and the like" [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, page 7].

-- There is no proof² of this. There was never a crime against nonprocreative sex, except for child rape and sodomy (which includes bestiality). In fact, it is the opposite. Nonprocreative sex was given special exception in the laws that is not available to fertile couples. Marriage is until death they depart, that mankind could not put asunder, marriage is always enforced by courts with one exception. Infertility was, according to Blackstone's Commentary, Book 1, "indeed the only cause, why a man may put away his wife and marry another ."

-- Noticed how the Supreme Court confessed that "The longstanding criminal prohibition of homosexual sodomy... is with an established tradition of prosecuting acts because of their homosexual character." AND then they pretend that it was never true.

"Far from possessing "ancient roots," *ibid.*, American laws targeting same-sex couples did not develop until the last third of the 20th century"

-- How can the Lawrence Supreme Court ignore obvious history to the contrary, including the history cited in their Bowers case?

-- The Bowers Supreme Court correctly stated: "In fact, until 1961, all 50 States outlawed sodomy".

-- As for ancient roots, The Bowers decision referenced specific Roman laws (both Justinian and Theodosianus), and quoted English common law that became our law-of-the-land, and mentioned Judeo-Christian moral standards to support the universal death penalty for homosex. And they quoted Georgia Law from 1816 to support Georgia's 20 year imprisonment for consensual homosexual offenders.

-- Bowers at the bottom of page 192 correctly stated: "Sodomy was a criminal offense at common law and was forbidden by the laws of the original 13 States when they ratified the Bill of Rights" How then, did the Lawrence decision conclude that the laws against homosexuals didn't exist until the last third of the 20th century?

-- Was 1300BC not ancient enough? In Leviticus 20, the unchanging God of the Bible (not Moses) requires the death penalty for consensual homosex. The moral values of the Bible were brought by Pilgrims on the Mayflower to America, from which we derived today's laws -- and this was before British Colonies existed in America with their own laws against homosex. Notice how the Pilgrim separatists, as well as those they

separated from, both had laws from ancient roots targeting same-sex couples. Both brought their laws to America. Embrace this diversity.

-- Was Justinian Law not ancient enough? The Bowers decision gave plenty of references to support their statement that the proscriptions against sodomy have very "ancient roots." But the Lawrence decision left no clue as to why they would suddenly claim that laws targeting same-sex couples were recent laws.

-- Where do they come up with this? Laws targeting same-sex relations were clearly mentioned in Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law, the First Edition was published from 1765 to 1769, prior to the existence of any State Constitution. Later in Tucker's Blackstone, which was an 1803 American law encyclopedia that updated Blackstone's work with legal commentary about Virginia law, the homosexual punishment (death) remained the same in Virginia. And homosexual was punished by death in England up to 1861 and in Canada (enforcing our shared English common law) until 1869. Blackstone's Commentaries remained a renowned reference for jurists even after Cooley's Blackstone last edition was published in Chicago in 1884.

-- Is 1896BC not ancient enough? This was before the first Jew ever existed. Blackstone's Commentaries states in Book 4, Chapter 15 why the death penalty for homosexual has always been universal: "THIS the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God determine to be capital. Of which we have a signal instance, long before the Jewish dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven: so that this is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept."

"Even now, only nine States have singled out same-sex relations for criminal prosecution. Thus, the historical grounds relied upon in Bowers are more complex than the majority opinion and the concurring opinion by Chief Justice Burger there indicated. "

-- Imagine that! Only nine States were able to withstand the pervert politicians. Even though [Blackstone's Book 4, Public Wrongs, introduction page 7] "the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual..." [which we then delegated to our civil servants when we created a government to] bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreigners could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt."

-- Did the Supreme Court just un-delegate the government duty to punish these crimes? If they abandoned their duty, then the duty reverts back to the source. [Blackstone's introduction to Book 1, Part 1, explaining why laws exist] "Neither could any other law possibly exist; for ... in a state of nature we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being... This law of nature, being coeval with mankind ... is of course superior in obligation to any other... no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this:... Nay, if any human law should allow [crimes against nature], we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine."

Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturæ utendum est. When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature. 2 Rolle, 298.

From Black's Law Dictionary, second edition.

- “the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual...”
- the law of nature applies "with equal obligation to individuals and to nations"

"The 25 States with laws prohibiting the conduct referenced in Bowers are reduced now to 13, of which 4 enforce their laws only against homosexual conduct. "

-- Wrong again. The common law, without being written by Congress, still applies in every courtroom in every State. To suggest otherwise is to deny the legitimacy of government -- The *jura summi imperii* upon which government was created. And also denies the received law of the land.

[emphasis added] **"The Bowers Court was, of course, making the broader point that for centuries there have been powerful voices to condemn homosexual conduct as immoral, but this Court's obligation is to define the liberty of all, not to mandate its own moral code,"**

-- How can you conclude that "murder and the like" is now a liberty or that the Supreme Court does not mandate a moral code? They said they would not mandate it's own moral code, but then did. And did the Fourteenth Amendment liberty -- which was originally for slaves freed after the Civil War -- somehow obliterate moral code or authorize "murder and the like"?

The decision ignored logic. If the law of the land acknowledges “the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, ... is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual” AND if all political power -- the *jura summi imperii* -- is vested in "We the People" who created government, then how did these detestable crimes become unpunishable in the societies that created government? How could another law possibly exist other than the law of nature, upon which legislated law hangs its authority?

It ignored an obvious truth stated in their prior decision: To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching. And then proceeded to cast aside millennia of moral standards. Thereby promoting exactly what Blackstone had warned us about: law detrimental "to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ..."

It ignored that homosex is a crime more detestable than child rape. (which the Bowers decision acknowledged by partially quoting Blackstone's "deeper malignity" than child rape sentence even though they did not continue to quote the "more detestable" than child rape part of Blackstone's same sentence).

Just because Texas had incompetent prosecutors who argued the wrong point by stating that the Bowers decision was their controlling authority, instead of stating that the

common law or the law of nature was their authority, does NOT mean homosex is now a right.

Lawrence v. Texas overturned Bowers v. Hardwick on a technicality, but did not require that Hardwick be compensated for his imprisonment, or his fine returned. It didn't even exonerate Lawrence and his buddy; it just remanded them back to Texas courts.

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT overturn the Texas Constitution nor did it overturn the common law as the rule of decision in Texas criminal cases.

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT repeal the Defense of Marriage Act.

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT overturn Zablocki v. Redhail, 434 U.S. 374 (in 1978). Therefore States can indeed still restrict legal sexual activity to the marriage relationship.

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT overturn Arizona v. Bateman, 429 U.S. 864 that punished anal sex of a heterosexual married couple.

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT overturn Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. at 374 "Nobody objects to a state enforcing its own penal laws."

They did not overturn Smayda v. U.S., 352 F.2d 251 that allows camera peepholes in public restrooms to catch crimes against nature.

They did not overturn Beard v. Stahr, 200 F.Supp 766 that allows police stings to catch those so inclined.

Neither the hate crime law nor Lawrence v. Texas had any effect on their later 2011 decision in Snyder v. Phelps³ which allows the Westboro Baptist Church to protest at military funerals to remind us that America is under a curse brought upon us because we tolerated homosexuals. They are famous for their GOD HATES FAGS message at www.Godhatesfags.com.



Lawrence v. Texas overturned Bowers v. Hardwick on a technicality, but did NOT overturn the Georgia Law that convicted Hardwick (Bowers was the Georgia Attorney General, the Hardwick pseudonym was the sodomite). In fact, Georgia did not, and can not, overturn their received-law-of-the-land. As you can see below, state powers still come from the people who created their government.

Georgia Law

TITLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

O.C.G.A. § 1-1-10

§ 1-1-10. ... provisions saved from repeal

(c) The following specific laws and parts of laws are not repealed by the adoption of this Code and shall remain of full force and effect, pursuant to their terms, until otherwise repealed, amended, superseded, or declared invalid or unconstitutional:

(1) An Act for reviving and enforcing certain laws therein mentioned and adopting the common laws of England as they existed on May 14, 1776, approved February 25, 1784. (For the adopting Act of 1784, see Prince's 1822 Digest, p. 570; Cobb's 1851 Digest, p. 721; and Code of 1863, Section 1, paragraph 6.)

As you can see, our common law has not changed. The Lawrence case, by overturning the Bowers Georgia case, did NOT overturn the received-law-of-the-land that authorizes Georgia to execute homosexuals.

The received-law-of-the-land still requires:

- [Government to] bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community...[even foreign diplomats and pedophile priests could be executed] in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.”
- “... the crime is the more detestable [than child rape]... the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast. A crime, which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature...”
- "*agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur*" acting and consenting partners are liable to the same punishment.

Queen Elizabeth The First modified the law so that the death penalty for sodomy could not be avoided. This is still the received-law-of-the-land.

Punishing crimes against nature, such as murder and the like, is one of the main reasons government exists. It remains true that all human laws "derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.... neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal, without any other superior but him who is the author of our being.”

The laws of nature entitle the United States to exist.

As you can see, the received law-of-the-land that existed in 1776 remains in full force. No congressman can deny the legitimacy of his government by repealing the foundation of government. The common law in 1776 allowed for death by hanging for crimes against nature. Congress cannot legislate "express words of nullity" that cancel their sworn oath of office. Government has a duty to "bear the sword of justice".

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT change the rules of evidence. A defendant's history of Sexual misconduct can still be considered by juries in order to convict perverts. How jury instructions can still allow consideration of past history of sexual misconduct and also instruct that it is now "within the liberty of persons to choose without being punished as criminals." was left unexplained by the Supreme Court.

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT overturn Arizona v. Bateman, 429 U.S. 864 which upheld "the legislature has acted to properly regulate the moral welfare of its people, and has specifically prohibited sodomy..."

Lawrence v. Texas did NOT alter the federal definition of marriage, or the federal definition of spouse, in Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7.

Perhaps all the High Court is waiting for is another chance to uphold the common law by a State that will argue the right point.

The Lawrence v. Texas decision was influenced by a brief filed by the American Psychological Association which promoted as truth a seriously flawed research article that the APA relied upon in 1973 to transform homosex from a mental illness into acceptable behavior. (see various research articles at www.familyresearchinst.org/category/articles)

Satan is deceptive, if possible, to deceive the very elect.

Satan has jurisdiction over the Kings of the Earth. (Psalm 2:2, Isaiah 24:21, Acts 4:26, Revelation 16:14, Revelation 17:2&18, Revelation 19:19).

Imagine a government casting aside millennia of moral values.

Throughout the span of history, consensual Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape (according to Blackstone's commentaries Book 4, page 214 in the first edition, in the same sentence that the US Supreme Court was to quote in the Bowers case). Once homosex becomes unpunished, we will have no basis or rational logic for rejecting child rape, prostitution, polygamy, bestiality, pedophilia, indecent exposure - or any form of sexual involvement. (And indeed, we had what was commonly called "The Pedophile Protection Act" H.R. 1913 in the House and S. 909 in the Senate). And certainly these perverts will demand equal protection of the law, equal to Lawrence and his buddy. Men defend their families, which is why we created government -- to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity. The very reason government was created will become invalid. The Laws of Nature mentioned in the first sentence of the Declaration of Independence will become meaningless. The Supreme Court has denied the legitimacy of their office.

Now that government has ceased to govern, is the final collapse of society imminent?

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

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government paragraph 222.

When marriage laws become detrimental "... to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery among the single of both sexes; and thereby destroying one end of society and government, ..." [Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 426]

Abraham Lincoln:

"Our safety, our liberty, depends upon preserving the Constitution of the United States as our fathers made it inviolate. The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution."

1. Texas Law Title 1 (Criminal Procedure) Article 1.27 entitled Common Law Governs and Title 2 (Trial), subtitle A (General Provisions), chapter 5: “The rule of decision in this state consists of those provisions of the common law of England...”.

As you can see, our common law has not changed. The Lawrence case did not overturn the received-law-of-the-land that allows any state to execute homosexuals.

2. What appears not, is not. *Quod non apparet non est; et non apparet judicialiter ante judicium*. That which appears not is not; and nothing appears judicially before judgment.

3. U.S. Supreme Court, Snyder v. Phelps:

“For the past 20 years, the congregation of the Westboro Baptist Church has picketed military funerals to communicate its belief that God hates the United States for its tolerance of homosexuality, particularly in America’s military.

“The picketers peacefully displayed their signs —stating, e.g., “Thank God for Dead Soldiers,” “Fags Doom Nations,” “America is Doomed,” ...and “You ’re Going to Hell ”

* ~ ~ ~ *

[FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS](#) of Fourteenth Amendment federal persons.

There is still separation of powers between State and Federal powers. We are still one nation under God. The feds must fund the programs they create and regulate. The states are exempt from the costs of enforcing federal programs. Until they accept the funds.

In the last chapter, I speculated that the Supreme Court decision tolerating homosexuals was equating equal protection OF the law, with equal protection FROM the law.

The law the feds SEEM to be protecting their criminals from is the State laws. And the communities own standards of decency. After all, the U.S. Supreme Court once ruled "Nobody objects to a state enforcing its own penal laws." -- Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. at 374

Those who accept federal benefits are 14th Amendment citizens of the federal government. They have to voluntarily apply for federal protections. Otherwise they are not “subject to the jurisdiction thereof” according to the Supreme Courts Elk v. Wilkins case (a native American voting case where he was not allowed to vote because he was not a 14th Amendment citizen).

Another 14th Amendment protection case, involving murders of 14th Amendment citizens (who were NOT protected by the federal government) was the Supreme Court in U.S. v Cruikshank case, [92 U.S. 542](#) at 551:

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

Now that the federal government wants to extend protections of their criminals into the states, they will have to pay for it.

If they don't grant funds to local counties for processing "marriage" licenses then the counties should not have to fund the federal program. Here are the authorities:

Congressman Ron Paul said this in a one minute closing remark in a presidential debate:

"One issue that I think we have to revisit, because the founders understood it, but we have forgotten about it . and that is the principle of nullification. If the federal government won't respond, [then] . I would respond in the favorable way of reinstating the principle of nullification. The states have to be able to nullify [bad law and bad court decisions]. This would reverse the trend, and this would stop the usurpation of the powers and privileges from the states to the federal government. "

According to article Six, The Constitution is the supreme law of the land and judges in every state shall be bound thereby. BUT Amendment 14 is NOT self-enforcing as part of the Supreme Law of the Land which would bind judges in every State (as required by Article 6). The anti-commandeering laws acknowledge States authority to refuse to enforce federal laws.

The Supreme Court has long held that states do not have to be active participants in the enforcement or effectuation of federal acts or regulatory programs.

The basis for what is known as the doctrine of "anti-commandeering" was first apparent in James Madison's Federalist #46. He said that there are four tactics for individuals and states to effectively refuse federal overreach, including a "refusal to cooperate with officers of the Union."

In *Prigg v. Pennsylvania* (1842), The Supreme Court held that the federal government could not force states to implement or carry out the Fugitive Slave Act of 1793. The Supreme Court says that federal laws had to be enforced by federal government.

The fundamental principle applicable to all anti-commandeering cases is that where the federal purpose is required by Congress, the means and appropriation are provided by Congress. Where the duty is specified, the ability to perform it is assumed to exist on the part of the officials in whom it is given. The duty is not in that of any state. It does not point out any state officials, or any state action to carry its provisions into effect. The states cannot be compelled to enforce them; and it is an unconstitutional exercise of the power of interpretation, to insist that the states are bound to provide means to carry into effect the duties of the national government which are nowhere delegated or entrusted to them by the Constitution.

In *New York v. United States* (1992) the Court held that the regulations in the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendment Act of 1985 were coercive and violated the sovereignty of New York, holding that "because the Act's take title provision offers the States a 'choice' between the two unconstitutionally coercive alternatives—either accepting ownership of waste or regulating according to Congress' instructions—the provision lies outside Congress' enumerated powers and is inconsistent with the Tenth Amendment."

Congress may not simply "commandeer[r] the legislative processes of the States by directly compelling them to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program." While Congress has substantial powers to govern the Nation directly, including in areas of

intimate concern to the States, the Constitution has never been understood to confer upon Congress the ability to require the States to govern according to Congress' instructions.

Printz v. United States (1997) demonstrates the anti-commandeering doctrine. The case was about the Brady Gun Bill that required county law enforcement officers to administer part of the background check program. Sheriffs Jay Printz and Richard Mack sued, arguing these provisions unconstitutionally forced them to administer a federal program. The Supreme Court said "it is apparent that the Brady Act purports to direct state law enforcement officers to participate, albeit only temporarily, in the administration of a federally enacted regulatory scheme."

Citing the New York case, the court majority declared this provision of the Brady Gun Bill unconstitutional.

"We held in New York that Congress cannot compel the States to enact or enforce a federal regulatory program. Today we hold that Congress cannot circumvent that prohibition by conscripting the States' officers directly. The Federal Government may neither issue directives requiring the States to address particular problems, nor command the States' officers, or those of their political subdivisions, to administer or enforce a federal regulatory program. It matters not whether policymaking is involved, and no case-by-case weighing of the burdens or benefits is necessary; such commands are fundamentally incompatible with our constitutional system of dual sovereignty."

In *Independent Business v. Sebelius* (2012), the Court held that the federal government can not compel states to expand Medicaid by threatening to withhold funding for Medicaid programs already in place. The Supreme Court said that allowing Congress to punish states that refused to go along violates constitutional separation of powers.

"...Congress's exercise of the spending power "thus rests on whether the State voluntarily and knowingly accepts the terms of the 'contract.' " *Pennhurst, supra*, at 17. Respecting this limitation is critical to ensuring that Spending Clause legislation does not undermine the status of the States as independent sovereigns in our federal system. That system "rests on what might at first seem a counterintuitive insight, that 'freedom is enhanced by the creation of two governments, not one.' " *Bond*, 564 U. S., quoting *Alden v. Maine*, 527 U. S. 706, 758 (1999). For this reason, "the Constitution has never been understood to confer upon Congress the ability to require the States to govern according to Congress' instructions." *New York, supra*, at 162. Otherwise the two-government system established by the Framers would give way to a system that vests power in one central government, and individual liberty would suffer.

The anti-commandeering cases establish a legal doctrine holding that the federal government has no authority to force states to participate in implementing or enforcing its acts.

Madison's advice in *Federalist #46*, supported by the anti-commandeering doctrine, provides a precedence that states can use against federal acts and regulatory programs.

I don't know if we are being forced to tolerate homosexuals yet. After all, the Defense of Marriage Act is still valid. And marriage is still defined in [Title 1, U.S. Code, section 7](#).

* ~ ~ ~ *

Punishment that fits the crime

The laws of nature entitled us to create a government. When we created a government, we delegated to it the essential function of punishing crimes against nature, such as murder and the like.

Throughout the history of mankind, ever since Genesis 4:14, criminals who violate the laws of nature could be executed by anyone, not just government.

There has always been a moral duty to drive out sodomites with the death penalty. It existed before the first Jew ever existed, through ancient Roman Law, then into the Christian era, then English law, and into the new world as the common law. Peter wrote that they are beasts to be destroyed. The British would burn them at the stake. The Goths would bury them alive. Homosex was punished by death in England up to 1861 and in Canada up until 1869. The U.S. Supreme Court mentioned this "millennia of moral teaching" in their 1986 Bowers decision. And Islamic countries continue the moral responsibility.

In England, from which we get our common law:

- in 1806 there were more hangings in England for sodomy than for murder.
- the last execution for sodomy in the U.K was 1835.
- in England sodomy was punished by minimum 10 years in prison until 1967.

According to the book *Capitol Punishment in America*, by Raymond Paternoster 1991 published by Lexington Books, there were five death sentences for homosex sodomy in America during the 1600s.

According to *Executions in the U.S. 1608-1987*, there were 10 executions for sodomy or buggery between 1625 and 1674. Between 1757 and 1801 there were five executions for sodomy or buggery.

Peccata contra naturam sunt gravissima. § Inst. 20. Crimes against nature are the most heinous.

Sodomy, whether with man or beast, whether or not consensual, has always been punished by death. "*agentes et consentientes pari poena plectantur*, Acting and consenting parties are liable to the same punishment".

And this death penalty was always considered universal. Even after the Roman Empire no longer ruled the entire known world, Justinian wrote of "*the laws which are common to all mankind*". And while the American Colonies were writing their Constitutions, the received-law-of-the-land confirmed that even foreign diplomats could be executed "*in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.*"

In Christian nations, the lesbians of Romans 1:26 and the males who lust for one another in Romans 1:27 "are worthy of death" as are those who tolerate them, according to verse 32. Life sentence in India, Singapore, Bangladesh, Nepal and others. It is irrelevant that the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights says that homosexuals were tolerated in some countries.

Driving out "*murder and the like*" is a moral duty. It is not hate.



The law of nature is "binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this". Yet Satan's disciples have gained such a political force that only a few countries still punish homosexuals. By what authority did the Supreme Court allow homosex just because a UN report that said some countries tolerate homosexuals?

Some Christians are pacifists. Some are not. The question each Christian must ponder is this: can I forgive a murderer while I execute him? Ever since before Cain was expelled in Genesis 4:14 mankind had a duty: everyone who findeth a fugitive murderer shall slay him. Noah's descendents (including you) were commanded by an unchanging God to take the life of a murderer, even though murder is only A crime against nature. Genesis 9:6. We then delegated this authority to government when we created a government to help us protect our rights. Governments punish crimes against nature with the death penalty. As Blackstone put it: "To bear the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community".

Since consensual homosex is more detestable than child rape we would expect the punishment to be harsher. And indeed, child rape is punishable by hanging but

consensual sodomy was traditionally punishable in the English common law by both felons being burned at the stake.

The law of nature authorizes governments to exist. If homosex perversion is punishable by death, how much more so are those who try to depict holy matrimony -- ordained by God at the Garden of Eden -- as equivalent to crimes against the very law that authorizes government to exist?

Woe to those who call evil good and good evil. Isaiah 5:20

Questions:

- Why is it the law of the land?
- Has the authority to execute homosexuals been done away with?

Answers:

We are all created equal. The duty to execute murderers and homosexuals is delegated from the LORD, our superior. As explained by the Supreme Court, quoted below, the received law of the land punishes THE crime against nature. The authority to execute murderers is the same authority to execute homosexuals. Government has the duty to enforce the law of nature, because each and every man who voted to create a government had this duty, which they then delegated to their civil servants to bear the sword of justice. And indeed one of the very reason governments are created, is to punish "crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like...". To suggest that this duty has been abolished is to suggest that the law of nature did not also give us the right to write a constitution to create a government.

The US Supreme Court in 1986, reaffirmed that the traditional death penalty for homosexuals is indeed in the foundation of our laws by quoting the British law that existed in the colonies when they became states. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186 at page 214-215:

See, e. g., 1 W. Hawkins, *Pleas of the Crown* 9 (6th ed. 1787) ("**All** unnatural carnal copulations, whether with **man or beast**, seem to come under the notion of sodomy, which was felony by the ancient common law, and punished, according to some authors, with burning; according to others, with burying alive"); 4 W. Blackstone, *Commentaries* (discussing "the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished").

Allow me to translate into the vernacular language that even unthinking¹ beasts might understand:





The reprobate community wants you to believe that "All unnatural carnal copulations" perpetuated by millennia of moral values only punishes forcible sodomy, such as that depicted above in the painting by Edouard Henri Avril.

Just because the Supreme Court's Bowers decision failed to fully quote the received law-of-the-land that requires acting and consenting adults to suffer the same penalty, does not mean it disappeared.

The reprobate community also wants you to believe that millennia of moral values evaporated when the Supreme Court overturned their Bowers case on a technicality involving privacy rights of 14th Amendment citizens.

Our received law of the land was received from the original British Colonies. *Verba debent intelligi cum effectu ut res magis valeat quam pereat* Words ought to be understood with effect, that a thing may rather be preserved than destroyed. But the reprobate community also wants you to believe that our received law of the land allowed consensual sodomy when England removed the death penalty in 1861.

They want you to ignore Arthur Gilbert's article "Buggery in the British Navy, 1700-1861" in the Journal of Social History, 1976:

- in 1762 two sailors received 1,000 lashes each for **consensual** sex
- average lash counts were often double those for mutiny and desertion
- Officers were held to a higher standard than their mates: Capt. Henry Allen of the sloop Rattler was executed for sodomy in 1797. Lieutenant William Berry was hanged in 1807 for sodomy
- the last British navy execution for sodomy was in 1829

While you ponder the strict and impartial punishment of immutable rules applied indiscriminately, and "*binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this*", I want you to consider that

- The “right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual” which we then delegate to our civil servants. Even foreign ambassadors could be executed for violating the divine laws of nature.
- "When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.
Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege natureae utendum est."
- Justice delayed is justice denied.
- Ecclesiastes 8:11 "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil."
- It is not hate. The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. We do not execute people out of hate. The punishment of murderers is not an act of hate. How can punishing a more detestable crime be hateful?
- The law of nature "applies with equal obligation to individuals and to nations".

Here, is a quote from Blackstone’s Commentaries (Book 4 PUBLIC WRONGS, introduction, starting at the bottom of page 7). This was the received law-of-the-land when the original 13 American States wrote their Constitutions (emphasis added):

“As to the power of human punishment, or the right of the temporal legislator to inflict discretionary penalties for crimes and misdemeanors. It is clear, that the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual: ... it must also be vested in all mankind; since all are by nature equal. Whereof the first murderer, Cain, was so sensible, that we find him expressing his apprehensions, that whoever should find him would slay him. In a state of society this right is transferred from individuals to the sovereign power; whereby men are prevented from being judges in their own causes, which is one of the evils that civil government was intended to remedy. Whatever power therefore individuals had of punishing offences against the law of nature, that is now vested in the magistrate alone; who bears the sword of justice by the consent of the whole community. And to this precedent natural power of individuals must be referred that right, which some have argued to belong to every state, (though, in fact, never exercised by any) of punishing not only their own subjects, but also foreign ambassadors, even with death itself; in case they have offended, not indeed against the municipal laws of the country, but against the divine laws of nature, and become liable thereby to forfeit their lives for their guilt.

“As to offences merely against the laws of society, which are only mala prohibita, and not mala in se; the temporal magistrate is also empowered to inflict coercive penalties for such transgressions: and this by the consent of individuals; who in forming societies, did either tacitly or expressly invest the sovereign power with a right of making laws, and of enforcing obedience to them when made, by exercising, upon their non-observance, severities adequate to the evil. The lawfulness therefore of punishing such criminals is founded upon this principle, that the law by which they suffer was made by their own consent; it is a part of the original contract into which they entered, when first they engaged in society; it was calculated for, and has long contributed to, their own security.

“This right, therefore, being thus conferred by universal consent, gives to the state exactly the same power, and no more over all it's members, as each individual member had naturally over himself or others. Which has occasioned some to doubt, how far a human legislature ought to inflict capital punishments for positive offences; offences against the municipal law only, and not against the law of nature; since no individual has, naturally, a power of inflicting death upon himself or others for actions in themselves indifferent. With regard to offences mala in se, capital punishments are in some instances inflicted by the immediate command of God himself to all mankind; as, in the case of murder, by the precept delivered to Noah, their common ancestor and representative, "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." In other instances they are inflicted after the example of the Creator, ...; as in the case of the crime against nature.

The execution of murderers is not done out of hatred. It is done out of love. You love your neighbors by driving out evil. You love your God by obeying Him. Are we now somehow expected to tolerate murderers for fear of being called hateful?

Is murder committed in the privacy of a closet now a “right to murder”?

Inaction has its consequences, as I explained in the preface. Romans 1:32 is clear that we are not to tolerate "those who commit such things". Are we now expected to tolerate genocide just because some have tolerated homosex? The Genocide Treaty was ratified by the Senate on February 19, 1948. 78 UNTS 277, defines genocide in its Article II as “any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such: ... (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”

Now that public schools use your money and your consent (at least through your representative) to openly promote, ratify and condone homosex, while welcoming gay recruiters to commit genocide of your children, how long will you remain silent while they implicate you in their crime of genocide? The crime of genocide is punishable by death. Just as specified in Romans 1:32, those who tolerate homosexuals "are worthy of death". Consenting parties are liable to the same punishment. Even failing to report a felony is still a crime. The obeying-the-law excuse did not work at Nuremberg and it won't work here. Accessory to "murder and the like" is still punishable. What will be your punishment? The cowardly shall have their place in the lake of fire, Revelation 21:8.

The unchanging God of the Bible -- who is both the Author of you and also the Author quoted in Leviticus 20:8 -- is not going to change just because ungodly lawyers taught you to tolerate the intolerable. Do not think that toleration of homosexuals is Christian. Get your values from the Bible. Lean not unto thine own understanding (Proverbs 3:5). There is a way that seems right to man, but its end is the way of death (Proverbs 14:12, & Proverbs 16:25). Lawyers take away the key of knowledge (Luke 11:52). Those who believe the lies of religious leaders are twofold damned (Matthew 23:15). Second Timothy 3:13 evil men and imposters will wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. Walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly. Love God enough to obey Him.

Do you have the same unchanging LORD as King David? (by the way, King David called Christ his Lord. Psalm 110, Matthew 22:44, Mark 12:36)

First Kings 15:11-12 (KJV) "And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the LORD, as did David his father. And he took away the sodomites out of the land,"

As did Asa's son Jehoshaphat in First Kings 22:46. As did King Josiah in Second Kings 23:7.

Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat Ignorance of a law, which every one is bound to know, excuses no man.

"Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another... Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. ... he gave them over to a depraved mind, .. They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed, and depravity." Romans 1:24, 26, 28, 29

Do you love your LORD enough to follow him? Sheep follow their master's voice. John 10:4 & 16. Cowards have their place in the lake of fire. Revelation 21:8.

What happens if homosexuals to go unpunished?

Because you tolerated them, their elected political force now represents you. Instead of obeying God, you embraced perversion, depravity, greed, filth, disease and shame. God gave you a free will, He will not save you from the evil you tolerate.

First Samuel 8:18

And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen; and the LORD will not hear you in that day.

Offences against the Person.

Child, whether such Child died before, at, or after its Birth, endeavour to conceal the Birth thereof, shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof shall be liable, at the Discretion of the Court, to be imprisoned for any Term not exceeding Two Years, with or without Hard Labour: Provided that if any Person tried for the Murder of any Child shall be acquitted thereof, it shall be lawful for the Jury by whose Verdict such Person shall be acquitted to find, in case it shall so appear in Evidence, that the Child had recently been born, and that such Person did, by some secret Disposition of the dead Body of such Child, endeavour to conceal the Birth thereof, and thereupon the Court may pass such Sentence as if such Person had been convicted upon an Indictment for the Concealment of the Birth.

Unnatural Offences.

61. Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable Crime of Buggery, committed either with Mankind or with any Animal, shall be liable, at the Discretion of the Court, to be kept in Penal Servitude for Life or for any Term not less than Ten Years.

Sodomy and Bestiality.

62. Whosoever shall attempt to commit the said abominable Crime, or shall be guilty of any Assault with Intent to commit the same, or of any indecent Assault upon any Male Person, shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof shall be liable, at the Discretion of the Court, to be kept in Penal Servitude for any Term not exceeding Ten Years and not less than Three Years, or to be imprisoned for any Term not exceeding Two Years, with or without Hard Labour.

Attempt to commit an infamous Crime.

63. Whenever, upon the Trial for any Offence punishable under this Act, it may be necessary to prove carnal Knowledge, it shall not be necessary to prove the actual Emission of Seed in order to constitute a carnal Knowledge, but the carnal Knowledge shall be deemed complete upon Proof of Penetration only.

Carnal Knowledge defined.

Making Gunpowder to commit Offences, and searching for the same.

64. Whosoever shall knowingly have in his Possession, or make or manufacture, any Gunpowder, explosive Substance, or any dangerous or noxious Thing, or any Machine, Engine, Instrument, or Thing, with Intent by means thereof to commit, or for the Purpose of enabling any other Person to commit, any of the Felonies in this Act mentioned, shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof shall be liable, at the Discretion of the Court, to be imprisoned for any Term not exceeding Two Years, with or without

Making or having Gunpowder, &c., with Intent to commit any Felony against this Act.

British Law changed in 1861 to make homosex punishable by up to life of penal servitude, minimum of ten years. This reduced sentence was never part of our received law of the land.

Martin Luther: "And if thou not be of the Kingdom of Christ, it is certain that thou belong to the kingdom of Satan, which is this evil world."

1. ἀλόγα -- unthinking, irrational, without reason, unreasonable, absurd

* ~ ~ ~ *

Arguing against the foundation of all law

Here is the real issue in the defense-of-marriage debate:

Is the foundation of all law, and of government itself, still legitimate?

The first sentence of the Declaration of Independence states the Laws of Nature entitle the United States to exist.

The US Supreme Court in 1986 Bowers case refers to crimes against nature as being enforceable as the received law of the land, which allows a 20 year prison sentence for a single act of consensual sodomy in the privacy of a home. The Supreme Court's Bowers decision at the top of page 197, quotes Blackstone:

"the infamous crime against nature" as an offense of "deeper malignity" than rape, a heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature,"

As Locke put it, no society has the right to deliver up its preservation to a wicked legislature who would destroy it. "by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people [to] provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society...."

As Blackstone put it, all laws are subject to the natural law and we are bound to transgress any human law that offends the natural law.

Blackstone book 4 page 7 explains that statute laws exist because the law of nature exists. We are all vested with the right to punish crimes against nature whenever government fails to do so. For it must be vested in somebody.

"the right of punishing crimes against the law of nature, as murder and the like, is in a state of mere nature vested in every individual . . . the laws of nature would be vain and fruitless, if none were empowered to put them in execution"

International law recognizes that in the absence of governmental order, when chaos reigns, the rule of necessity allows anyone to step in and perform necessary governmental functions.

Legibus sumptis desinentibus, lege naturae utendum est. When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.

“Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil” Isaiah 5:20.

* ~ ~ ~ *

What could Lot do?

Intolerance of homosexuals made to be destroyed, as defined in Second Peter 2:12, is a true Christian virtue. Jude also referred to homosexuals as beasts. They will suffer eternal fire, Jude verses 7 – 10.

Lot “vexed his righteous soul”. He tolerated them. However, he was so affected by the “filthy conduct” of his neighbors that he even offered his own daughters to the perverts. You cannot tolerate them and expect to remain uncontaminated. What should Lot have done? First Corinthians 15:33, evil company corrupts good character. Even those who merely tolerate the homosexuals of Romans 1:26,27 are “worthy of death” according to Romans 1:32.

God sent warnings in the form of destruction from heaven “as an example to those who afterward would live ungodly” according to Second Peter 2:6.

In other words, we were warned by their destruction. Christ Himself also warned the cities that did not repent. He said in Matthew 11:24 (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11): **"But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."**

Second Peter Chapter 2:

2:4-5 (NKJV): "For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment; ..."

2:6 "and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them to destruction, making them an example to those who afterward would live ungodly;" ¹

2:7 "and delivered righteous Lot, who was oppressed by the filthy conduct of the wicked"

2:8 "(for that righteous man, dwelling among them, tormented his righteous soul from day to day by seeing and hearing their lawless deeds);"

2:9 "then the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptations and to reserve the unjust under punishment for the day of judgment,"

2:10 "and especially those who walk according to the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise authority. They are presumptuous, self-willed. They are not afraid to speak evil of dignitaries,"

2:12 "But these, like natural brute² beasts made to be caught and destroyed, speak evil of the things they do not understand, and will utterly perish in their own corruption,"

2:13 "and will receive the wages of unrighteousness, as those who count it pleasure to carouse in the daytime. They are spots and blemishes, carousing in their own deceptions while they feast with you,"

2:14 "having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin, enticing unstable souls. They have a heart trained in covetous practices, and are accursed children."

2:15 "They have forsaken the right way and gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Beor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness;"

2:16 "but he was rebuked for his iniquity: ... "

2:17 "These are wells without water, clouds carried by a tempest, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

2:18 "For when they speak great swelling words of emptiness, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through lewdness, the ones who have actually escaped from those who live in error."

2:19 "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are slaves of corruption; for by whom a person is overcome, by him also he is brought into bondage."

2:20 "For if, after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overcome, the latter end is worse for them than the beginning."

2:21 "For it would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than having known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered to them."

1. Is America now learning the harsh lesson for violating this warning?
2. *άλογα* -- unthinking, irrational, without reason, unreasonable, absurd. It does not refer to brutal forced sodomy as the perverts want you to believe.

* ~ ~ ~ *

[Is homosex activism an act of terrorism? How about judicial activism?](#)

Here is the Federal Criminal Law (Title 18, section 2331) that defines "domestic terrorism":

- 5) the term "domestic terrorism" means activities that -
 - (A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State;
 - (B) appear to be intended -

- (B)(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;
 - (B)(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or
 - (B)(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and
- (C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

Crimes of terrorism “involve acts dangerous to human life”. This involvement need not be direct involvement.

Dangerous need not be deadly.

And, as for the element of “acts” (as, for example, in Supreme Court decisions determining the crime of treason), “Acts” need not be overt criminal acts.

Is it terrorism – dangerous to human life – to promote all the suicide, murder, filth, and disease that reduces the life expectancy of these perverts? Is it dangerous to human life to promote a lifestyle that has well documented psychological problems like domestic violence, incest and pedophilia (see [Family Research Institute](#) research studies, and [www.afa.net](#)) Does spreading HIV, like Dr. Acer did, qualify? How about any other HIV spreading that intimidates a civilian population?

Is 20 years reduced life expectancy considered to be dangerous to human life? Even with government paid health care -- these reprobate perverts still reduce their life expectancy by 20 years, according to a Canadian study. After disease decimates their finances, a perverted Congress forces US to pay for their hospital care.

Another element of the crime is that the crime “appear to be intended” to influence a policy of government or that it “appear to be intended” to intimidate a civilian population.

“appear to be intended” is the only burden of proof mentioned in this law. The jury determines what appears or does not appear to be intended. Does a gay protest appear to be intended to “(B)(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation”? Is it criminal to influence a politician to deny the laws of nature that entitle government to exist?

It is obvious that these terrorists “appear to be intended” to destroy both society and government. After all, it has always been known that licentiousness would destroy society. The law of the land, as explained in Blackstone’s Commentaries about questionable marriage laws said:

“encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ...”

John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government concludes in his last chapter, that for government officers to refuse to uphold the law is the most inhuman way to destroy a government. Does it influence government policy by political coercion for voters to show a government officer an = sticker, or a looped red ribbon (looped into the shape of an HIV infected anus)? In my chapter on [treason](#), you will read that “If the object of an assembly of persons... to resist the exercise of any one or more of its general laws,... is treason against the state”

How long should it take a jury to deliberate about a gay-pride parade, or a gay protest? Isn't it obvious that such acts "intimidate or coerce a civilian population", or "influence the policy of government"?

How about a gay pride parade that involves any crime (jaywalking, indecency, disorderly conduct, trespassing, disturbing the peace, or any number of other crimes) and appears to be intended to induce someone to accept a lifestyle that will spread HIV or a lifestyle with a high domestic violence rate (dangerous to human life)? We would never tolerate a pedophile pride parade. Yet they routinely influence public policies with pride in felonies that were traditionally considered more detestable than child rape.

In the book *Sex Appealed*, a Texas judge explains the case that led up to the Supreme Court's *Lawrence v. Texas*. The arrest was staged by a false call to 911 about an armed trespasser, so that four policemen with guns drawn would burst into a house and find sodomy. Was this criminal act dangerous to human life that appears to influence a policy of government?

And now that the Supreme Court ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, pervert politicians are demanding that politicians change the laws to remove the words husband, wife, father, mother, bride, groom, boy and girl. [now reread the genocide treaty quoted in the Chapter [Punishment that fits the crime](#)]

Is sodomy "a violation of the criminal laws of any State"? After all, the US Supreme Court has never overturned their prior decision in *Arizona v. Bateman* in which they upheld the Arizona Supreme Court's decision: "the legislature has acted to properly regulate the moral welfare of its people, and has specifically prohibited sodomy..."

And the gay rights community wants us to believe that *Lawrence v. Texas* allows sodomy, but the Supreme Court never overturned the common law of Texas. Texas law still requires in all criminal cases, that the common law shall be the rule of decision. And for Texas civil law Title 2 (Trial), Subtitle A (General provisions), Chapter 5 (Rule of Decision): "The rule of decision in this state consists of those provisions of the common law of England..."

* ~ ~ ~ *

SECTION 4: GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION

"What a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive." -- Sir Walter Scott, *Marmion*, Canto VI

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

While evils are still sufferable

Do reprobate perverts still agree that the United States exists? If so, then they should suffer the consequences of their crimes against the laws of nature and nature's God. The same laws of nature that entitle the real government to exist.

We are still one nation under God. But liberal wackos want to play god. They believe they have unshackled government from the original divine chain of command, and hooked¹ us to a god they fabricated. The laws of nature did not create, and do not recognize their graven (manmade) counterfeit lord- protector- provider.

As an indication of just how far we have strayed, consider the law-of-the-land in the original 13 states as it was received from the English colonies:

- Blackstone's Commentaries Book 4, page 58: "the temporal courts resent the public affront to religion and morality, on [page 59] which all government must depend for support, ...Christianity is part of the laws of England."
- President John Adams: "Our Constitution was made only for a religious and moral people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other."
- President Andrew Jackson: "The Bible is the rock on which our Republic rests."

Some people claim that Romans 13:1 requires us to obey government, no matter how abhorrent. Yet the divine right of Kings to rule was completely debunked when we came out of the dark ages. Go read Locke and Rutherford. Romans 13 requires us to obey legitimate powers. Verse 3 excludes tyrants. Tyndale's translation says "Rulers are not to be feared for good works, but for evil." The same apostle who told us in Romans 13 to obey legitimate powers, tells us in First Corinthians 6:12 that he would not be brought under the power of any. He did not change his mind.

The Declaration of Independence correctly stated that we are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to correct our government.

When will evils become less sufferable? The American male has been neutered to the point that he will no longer raise the feeblest whimper when his family is torn from him by black robed priests, his children bastardized and sacrificed on their alter of perversion and half of his family wealth is taken from him and given as a reward for the felony crime of adultery. And his right to marry declared void from the beginning, his vows to God ridiculed, and his Holy Matrimony determined to be "a meretricious, and not a matrimonial, union." And the foundation of his once-great nation sodomized by perverts.

Men defend their families, which is why we go to war. Yet the American male now immediately surrenders whenever a disciple of Satan touches him with a piece of paper to extort ransom, with no hope of his children being returned. Why are such evils still sufferable? (read John Locke's Second Treatise paragraph 233).

America's submissive wimps have not won a war since 1945. Out of respect for what only appears to be law, we have now been dominated and ruled² by black robed priests of Satan. Cowards shall have their place in the lake of fire. Revelation 21:8.

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

Agreeing to settle this issue by a vote is evil. By registering to vote, you agree to abide by the outcome, no matter how abhorrent. They held a vote to determine whether or not they wanted a moral compass. You agreed. You consented to be governed. The god they fabricated became your god.

Obey your lawgiver and suffer the consequences. The lesson to be learned is to avoid deception. It is our own fault for being deceived.

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

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

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

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

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

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

WHILE EVILS ARE SUFFERABLE

The Declaration of Independence states "*that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But...[if abuses and usurpations intended] to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government...*"

When will evils become insufferable? Will you draw another line in the sand? When will we stand fast in liberty that Christ has made us free (Galatians 5)?

Is it too late to stand fast in this liberty, or have we lost it? According to John Locke's Second Treatise on Government paragraph 57:

"in all the states of created beings capable of laws, where there is no law, there is no freedom"

California Governor Ronald Reagan, first inaugural address:

"Freedom is a fragile thing and never more than one generation away from extinction... It is not ours by inheritance. It must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people. Those who have known freedom and then lost it, have never regained it."

That's right. Those who have lost their liberty never get it back. What can decent people do to defend society against the vicious perverts who seek to destroy us all? God-fearing people throughout history have offered their suggestions. Here are some references to study, so that you can decide for yourself whether or not you want to work now to secure the blessings of liberty to your posterity. Or whether you want to face the consequences later in a battle for more than just your family. You have already lost the law of the land. Lost it by the most inhumane way possible. Few options remain.

The Declaration of Independence says that governments derive "their just power from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive

of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government... “

Christians in the American British Colonies had to defend themselves to bring forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty. Many of these principles were previously articulated in a 1644 publication *Lex Rex* by Samuel Rutherford. He explains that sovereignty comes from the people who create a government, and that men create a civil society when one family can no longer contain them. Rutherford, Locke and Blackstone all agree that Society is the extension of the family. Rutherford and Locke agree that people are sovereign and may retake control of their society to preserve themselves. Supreme power *jura summi imperii* resides in the people.

Your Right to defend yourself is a “natural liberty which is not required by the laws of society to be sacrificed to public convenience”. (According to Blackstone's *Commentary on the Law Book 1*, introduction.) Yet you cannot get a trial in divorce cases. You are denied the right to defend your family, which is why we created government.

This principle was still valid when Abraham Lincoln made his First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861:

“This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.”

Unstated: because the law of nature requires us to supervise our civil servants, and if they fail to enforce the law of nature, we are restored to the nature that we were in prior to creating government, for we are all equal. See Locke's *Second Treatise* paragraphs 135, 149, 171, 209. And Blackstone's *Commentaries Book 4 Introduction*.

Abraham Lincoln:

“Our safety, our liberty, depends upon preserving the Constitution of the United States as our fathers made it inviolate. The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.”

John Philpot Curran, July 10, 1790: “The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he breaks, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime. ”

Thomas Jefferson's inscription on his ring: Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.

You can pray that heathen not rule over you, but it is too late. If you want your government back, you must fight for it. Daniel Webster, in a speech to the Senate June 3, 1834: “God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it.”

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

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

1. snare is the Biblical word
2. “captured, vanquished and subdued” was the terminology they used when they first promised to dominate us. For more information read my book [The Citizen Cannot Complain](#).

* ~ ~ ~ *

Corruption

Merely tolerating their perversion makes one “worthy of death” according to Romans 1:32. But our moral anguish is much worse than merely watching as the world tolerates perversion. God punishes bastards unto the tenth generation. Without legitimacy of marriage, the church is destroyed. When legitimacy is destroyed, the entire future of the universe is disrupted. Without legitimacy there can be no blessings of liberty for your posterity.

Corruption destroys society on many levels. Woe unto judges, lawyers and legislators who insist that Holy matrimony is a civil union.

Deny the pernicious ways of those who brought the way of truth into disrepute. Second Peter 2:2. "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." Ephesians 5:11. Stand fast in liberty and not let yourselves be entangled by the yoke of bondage Galatians 5:1.

We failed at these simple duties out of fear that we would be labeled as hateful or intolerant. (Contrary to Titus 2:15 let no man despise thee.) We are now facing the consequence.

“No polluted hand shall touch the pure fountain of justice” was once a maxim in American courts

Unclean hands shall never pollute the pure fountain of justice according to 1841 Supreme Court decision *Groves v. Slaughter*, 40 US 449

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

On February 29, 1892 the US Supreme Court in a 9 to 0 decision (143 U.S. 266) ruled that this is a Christian Nation. If you want your nation back, you must fight for it.

Have divorce lawyers and sodomites convinced you that the purpose of government has been abolished?

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

Prosecutors are now targeting Christians who believe their Bible. Yet the law of the land prohibits this. *Nemo ex proprio dolo consequitur actionem*. (No one maintains an action arising out of his own wrong.)

Those who seek to destroy one nation under God have demanded that you surrender your families. They want your families, your fortunes, and your sacred honor. Now they want to assimilate you into their den.

If we don't win a moral battle, consider what options remain.

"A simple democracy is the devil's own government." -- This quote is attributed to several American patriots. Most often to Benjamin Rush, or Jedidiah Morse. And a book published in 1871 attributes the quote to Thomas Jefferson.

* ~ ~ ~ *

Treason

Here are some authorities on treason:

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

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

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

Barbarism

I find it interesting that today’s lawyers themselves now insist on their right to reverse what the Supreme Court said was the graceful path from barbarism to civilization.

The US Supreme Court confirmed that the ancient law profession was corrupted by a bar association.

The US Supreme Court in their 1793 case *Chisholm v. Georgia*, [2 US 419](#) at the top of page 449, while comparing different justice systems, said that in ancient Greek tribunals, law and liberty were "*in strict and graceful union*" before the justice system was corrupted. The high court explained: "*The rude and degrading league between the bar and feudal barbarism was not yet formed.*"

Their comment, not mine.

Walk not in the counsel of the ungodly.

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

* ~ ~ ~ *

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

Summary so far:

There are two sides to the perversion coin. Neither homosexuals nor adulterers can enter the Kingdom of Heaven First Corinthians 6:9.

Both perversions are prohibited by the law-of-the-land. When the original States wrote their constitutions, the law-of-the-land in America confirmed that perversions are detrimental “to religion and morality, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery ... thereby destroying one end of society and government, ...” [Blackstone’s law

commentaries Book 1, page 426, in his only mention of the word government in any of his commentary about marriage]

It is doubtful that any legislator or judge would knowingly commit treason to destroy one end of society and government, by encouraging licentiousness and debauchery.

Because your civil servants no longer enforce the law-of-the-land, perverts have destroyed the morals of your country.

Government has a duty to enforce marriage. If your courts are not enforcing marriage, then your government has been overthrown.

Government has a duty to punish crimes against nature such as murder, child rape and sodomy, consensual or otherwise. If your courts are not punishing crimes against nature, then your government has been overthrown.

MARRIAGE ISSUES

Enforceable (undivorcable) marriage is the foundation of every society. Legitimate societies then create their governments to preserve themselves. History and courts all agree that marriage is the parent of society. Only legitimate marriage can create legitimate society. Marriage is the pre-existing foundation of society. Society then creates government to defend their families. NOT to destroy families.

If mankind does not have the authority to cancel his neighbors' vows to God and to bastardize his children, then we do not have the right to delegate such authority, that we don't have, to our civil servants. Not by writing a constitution, not by electing corrupt judges, not by demanding divorce laws.

Activist judges promote adultery by using the full force of the state to enforce the idea that sex need not have consequences. The crime of adultery that once was

“... criminal conversion of a man's wife, though it is, as a public crime, ... considered as a civil injury (and surely there can be none greater) the law gives satisfaction to the husband,... wherein the damages recovered are usually very large and exemplary.”

is now unpunished and even condoned by the state, and rewarded by forcing the victim to pay ransom to support the State's children, with no hope of the kidnapped children ever being returned.

Divorce always bastardizes children, which God punishes unto the tenth generation. Bastards are the children of nobody. Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 1, page 446, chapter 16: “bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes”.

Civil marriage is not a marriage, and cannot create anything legitimate. Their children are bastards. Bastards cannot inherit property; they cannot even inherit a surname. [This is still true today. You cannot get a government ID card with your Christian name; all you can get is an all capitalized non-proper noun. Although government may allow you to hold custody of – inherit – a percentage of what you think is the family wealth, this grant of custody is taxed as a government privilege. Hardly a right that existed prior to any earthly government.]

Black robed priests at your local courthouse (who promote inequity, debauchery and allegiance to the forces of Satan) will pretend to cancel any Holy Matrimony for any reason. But no Supreme Court has ever allowed this. *Maynard v. Hill* only upheld a legislative divorce by a territorial legislature, of an intermarriage, while stating that traditional marriage remained “a relation for life” . This was so radical at the time, that David Maynard’s children thought they would try to inherit their mother’s property. They did not even try to inherit their father’s property. They got neither. Bastards have no civil rights.

Marx’ The Communist Manifesto third plank prohibits inheritance. A right cannot be taxed. If death has become a government taxable privilege, then how can you pretend that you own your estate? Political power of your state was originally ordained to preserve your estate, and now they take your estate. You cannot claim that society is preserved.

Courts agree that legitimate Marriage existed prior to any human government. Marriage is not created by society (not even by a marriage license). Courts agree that marriage is the parent of society.

When legitimate marriage becomes impossible, legitimate society cannot exist past the next generation.

Even the word “nation” refers, not to a government, but to an extended family. “a people ... possessing historic continuity, and distinguished from other like groups...”

The patriarchal form of government (family government) worked just fine for the first ten Books of the Bible until Saul was elected as King. This election was evil in the eyes of the Lord, First Samuel 12:17.

Children are surrendered by perjury on a divorce form verifying that there is a broken civil union – allowing the full armed police power of the State to brutally enforce the surrender of the state’s children.

America started out with a solid moral doctrine. Yet there is now an alleged “civil right” pretending unpunishable adultery.

Real men defend their families, which is why we created government. Each successive office holder had to swear an oath to uphold and perpetuate the constitution, yet we now find ourselves with a government that rewards the greatest of civil injury. This is contrary to the Clean Hands doctrine. Someone has overthrown the lawful authority of government and declared war against the foundation of society.

Real men defend their families, which is why they go to war. But the American male has been neutered by Civil Unions disguised as marriage. He will no longer defend the sanctity of his family. He is utterly submissive to lawyers who denounce the very legitimacy of government. He will sacrifice his family, fortune and sacred honor to Satan’s legalists. This only encourages them. It is our own fault for tolerating this abuse. Misuse of the courts was punishable by Deuteronomy 19. Show no pity, verse 19 in order to “put the evil away from among you”.

Those who would destroy one nation, under God, are now so sure of their overthrow that they expect to grant licentiousness (license) to commit crimes such as adultery or

homosex. Licentiousness is now spoken of as a civil right. Licentiousness has destroyed the foundation of society.

HOMOSEX ISSUES

The Declaration of Independence states, in the first sentence, that the laws of nature authorize your government to exist.

History and courts agree that consensual sodomy is THE unspeakable crime against the laws of nature. Historically, throughout the history of mankind, even before Jewish or Roman law ever existed, consensual homosex has always been punishable by death.

Homosex has always been more detestable than child rape.

Black robed priests at your local courthouse refuse to punish the crime of homosex. Even though NO Supreme Court has ever allowed such crime to go unpunished when lawfully prosecuted. In 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Bowers v. Hardwick* "To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching."

The duty of government is to punish evil. The very foundation of our nations laws presumes that "no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this" law of nature. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Bowers v. Hardwick* has recognized that sodomy laws can be enforced because "The right to privacy does not extend to acts of consensual sodomy between homosexual adults". The U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona v. Bateman* 429 US 864 acknowledged that "sodomy laws are valid as a general proposition." And *Lawrence v. Texas* only recognizes a fourteenth amendment prohibition against illegal search to discover evidence of the crime. *Lawrence* did not address what happens if the crime becomes known. Well-settled law has not changed.

Anyone who knows of a felony is required by law to report it. Failing to report a felony is a crime. 18 US Code, section 4. Homosex is a felony "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature," (according to the Supreme Court's quoting Blackstone in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, bottom of page 196)

The received law of the land in all thirteen original states requires prosecution of "the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished".

Either the reason State governments were created still exists or it doesn't. The future of the nation hangs in the balance.

Be ye not deceived. First Corinthians 6:9 homosexuals cannot go to heaven

* ~ ~ ~ *

Can we still secure the blessings of liberty?

Or, asked another way: When are we going to defend marriage?

LIBERTY

Marriage is a liberty:

The United States Supreme Court at 262 U.S. 390, at page 399, defines the term Liberty:

“Liberty... denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint, but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience... “

At what point will we once again defend the sanctity of the family by upholding the existing law-of-the-land? At what point will we honor those who ordained the Constitution to secure the blessings of liberty to their posterity? Against all enemies foreign or domestic.

Pilgrims brought forth on this continent a nation conceived in liberty. They took their families and risked death at sea to flee from oppressive government so that they could seek religious liberty.

Just twenty-one years after Patrick Henry announced his decision “give me liberty or give me death” Thomas Jefferson was warning about complacency to the new government. Thomas Jefferson, April 24, 1796: “Timid men prefer the calm of despotism to the boisterous sea of liberty.” Have we, too, become complacent to the calm of despotism?

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICA

Political forces want you to believe they have obliterated the law of the land that entitles the United States to exist.

As it was with many great patriots of the past, we are again engaged in a great war between good and evil. But the risk is more than just the sanctity of families. The very legitimacy of a nation is now on the political chopping block.

Men in America have already surrendered their families, their fortunes and their sacred honor. Surrendered without the feeblest whimper. Divorce bastardizes the children so that there are no inheritance rights to “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.” The law of nature still authorizes government to exist. In the overthrow of America, only one final question remains to be decided. Is marriage, which is the pre-established legitimacy of society, to be forevermore equated to the perversion, disease, shame and filth of unspeakable crimes against the very authority of government to exist? Crimes that have always been more detestable than child rape.

Edmund Burke on April 23, 1770 wrote: “All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing”

DEFEND MARRIAGE NOW, OR DEFEND REMAINING LIBERTY LATER

It will be more difficult to shake off your yoke of bondage after it is padlocked around your neck. You need to decide now: Are family rights worth fighting for? How can decent citizens preserve society's crumbling foundation against perverts who have overthrown your government?

Do you want your nation back from the pervert lawyers who have nullified the law of the land?

Do you want your children back from the civil servants who vehemently insist that the state's children are to be processed (sacrificed) by the state gods?

Do you want to live in a nation where people would once again have a right to "marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of his/her own conscience..." as stated by the Supreme Court?

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE

Defense -- the act of defending against attack, danger or injury. Christ commanded you to "let not man put asunder" A very simple command. How can any Christian have a problem with this call to defend?

Men defend their families, which is why we created government. And why we go to war. To secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity, we occasionally go to war. In the history of your once-great nation, two million men have marched off to secure the blessings of liberty to your posterity, never to return home. We are now asked to spit on their graves. You are asked to join the traitors and secure the domination of those who overthrew government in the most inhumane way possible, so that they can continue to encourage crimes against nature, aid and abet the criminal conversion of wives by adultery ("and surely there can be none greater" as Blackstone so eloquently stated), and brutally enforce the surrender of children they bastardize.



Russia has a straight pride flag.
Is this now hateful?

DEFEND OF THE LAW-OF-THE-LAND

In 1986 the US Supreme Court acknowledged the authority of the law of the land by quoting Blackstone in *Bowers v. Hardwick* 478 U.S. 186:

“...sodomy, which was felony by the ancient common law, and punished, according to some authors, with burning; according to others, with burying alive”... “the infamous crime against nature, committed either with man or beast; a crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished”.

“... authorizes a court to imprison a person for up to 20 years for a single private, consensual act of sodomy. ... even in the private setting of a home,”

“...there is no such thing as a fundamental right to commit homosexual sodomy”.

“To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.”

Matthew 11:24 (and Matthew 10:15 and Mark 6:11) warned the cities that did not repent:
"But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."

Redefining marriage as equivalent to a crime will destroy families, and it will invalidate the purpose of government. The law of nature that authorized the United States to exist will become unenforceable. The very foundation of society will become a crime in your once-great nation where the law-of-the-land still requires that *“no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original...[law of nature] neither could any other law possibly exist... for we are all equal”*.

LAST CHANCE

Time is running out. If you do nothing, then we accept the pervert view that daddy government can sodomize anybody he wants. But the situation is much worse than societal degradation. Satan has a deadline on this scheduled destruction of society.

Satan knows that he is running out of time (Revelation 12:12). The remnant of the Christian church will soon judge angels (First Corinthians 6:2-3). Satan’s legalists are in a final battle to disqualify all future judges.

- Satan knows that government licensed “marriage” is not a marriage. It is a civil union, not holy matrimony. Satan knows that spouses of government licensed marriage are fornicators. Satan knows that remarriage is adultery (Matthew 5:32). Neither adulterers nor fornicators can inherit the kingdom of heaven (First Corinthians 6:9). Fornicators risk their salvation (First Thessalonians 4:3).

- Satan knows that bastards and their descendants cannot join the congregation of the Lord for ten generations (Deuteronomy 23:2). And history within Christian nations proves that “A bastard was also, in strictness, incapable of holy orders; ... utterly disqualified from holding any dignity in the church: ...” Licensed marriage (civil unions) are not marriage. Christ himself opposed bastards having authority (John 8:40-44).

The dragon makes war with the [legitimate] remnant who keep the Commandments of God and have the testimony of Christ (Revelation 12:17). Only the remnant shall be saved (Romans 9:27). These days shall be shortened for the elect’s sake, or no flesh shall be saved. (Matthew 24:22).

Without legitimate marriage there will be no legitimate remnant to judge angels.

The law of the land, Blackstone and Justinian all agree that children bastardized by divorce are “spurious”.

What chance do you have of judging angels if your family values are based on a license to commit licentiousness rather than a God-given right to marry? Judgment must begin at the house of God, First Peter 4:17. Civil licensed marriage is not a marriage at all – it is fornication. What chance do Fornicators have of judging angels? Fornicators cannot inherit the Kingdom of God 1st Corinthians 6:9, and fornicators risk their salvation First Thessalonians 4:3.

Satan’s legalists redefined the term *marriage* in 1979 to exclude traditional marriage¹. Now they are trying to redefine marriage as a crime that they can regulate -- a crime that denies the legitimacy of government. Satan is running out of time to disqualify all potential future judges. You are running out of time to enforce the law of the land.

The future of mankind hangs² in the balance. The final curtain of human history hangs by a remnant. Except these days be shortened, no flesh shall be saved to judge angels.

Defend marriage. Or forever hold your peace.

1 Traditional marriage existed prior to any earthly government. The right to marry did not come from graven (manmade) government. Yet the 1979 law dictionary redefinition ignores the existence of traditional marriage. Their counterfeit “marriage” vows are to the state, not to God. *Statewide Organization of Stepparents v. Smith*, 536 P.2d 1202: “Purpose of statute declaring marriage to be a civil contract was to make it clear that marriage was governed by civil law rather than by ecclesiastical law” An oath is always a religious ritual. Their 1979 redefinition of marriage is an oath of allegiance to their black robed courthouse priests, contrary to Matthew 5:33-34, James 5:12, Hebrews 6:16 and the first and second commandments.

2. Now go look up testicles and testament and testify in a good encyclopedia and find out what the prefix means.

THE END

* ~ ~ ~ *

Books by Steven D. Miller:

- [The Citizen Cannot Complain](#)
- [Oaths: Mandatory or Voluntary?](#)
- [Census: Mandatory or Voluntary?](#)
- Social Security: Mark of the Beast
- [Defense of Marriage, Part 1: The History of Undivorceable Marriage](#)
- [Defense of Marriage, Part 2: Crimes Against Nature](#) (for those qualified)
- Defense of Marriage, Part 3: Family Rights
- End Time Deceptions
- [The Citizen Cannot Complain](#)
- [The Sign of Jonah: Christ's only divine credential](#)

###

Traditional Marriage was once a lifetime commitment that cannot be put asunder, in a nation where divorce courts did not exist.

If you are considering the traditional marriage contract – to work out your problems just the way God intended, in a marriage that cannot be divorced – find out how.

If your church solemnizes marriages that can be divorced, then for God's sake, find out what marriage is.

This book should be in the hands of

- ✓ every innocent spouse who has just been served divorce papers
- ✓ engaged couples **before** they apply for a marriage license
- ✓ Christian counselors
- ✓ everyone who conducts wedding ceremonies
- ✓ paralegals who need to refute divorce lawyers or activist judges
- ✓ activists opposed to gay marriage
- ✓ legislators and lawyers who do not yet realize what marriage is
- ✓ anyone who questions how court ordered kidnappings could be legal

The moral codes discussed in this book apply only to Christians who were, or will be, married in a church ceremony. It is not suitable for others. References are to U.S. laws.

- This book presents traditional family values. If you believe that centuries-old moral teachings are not relevant in today's society, then this book is not for you.
- If you want society to remove punishment for criminal perversions, then this book is not for you.
- The unchanging God of the Bible is not going to change just because your church told you to get a civil marriage license.

Men defend their families, which is why they created government. The purpose of government is to protect families – To secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity. Not to destroy them.

There is no gay "marriage". Sodomy has never been legalized. Crimes against the immutable Law of Nature cannot be converted into rights, not even in a democracy. The law-of-the-land still equates licentiousness and debauchery with the destruction of government. The Supreme Court has never found a right to homosex. The Supreme Court said that States do not confer the right to marry.