

## Lawlessness

Dear Friends,

Although I had written this back in 1998 I believe that the relevance of the concern has only become even more pressing upon our contemporary culture today.

In this article I cite an example of the "lie" of a sitting president. **Today we have an American President who willingly and continuously, violates the Constitution and our courts and is supported in these illegal endeavors by his political minions who occupy the Liberal-Left Socialist Statist *law-breakers* currently seated in power!**

Robert

## Lawlessness

By Robert Buckner ~ 1998

Not long ago President Bill Clinton spoke directly to the American people to deny that he had lied under oath regarding allegations of sexual behavior in the Oval Office.

The essence of his stated defense rested on what the meaning of, "is," is.

There could be no better example of how distorted our contemporary judiciary views law today! Their belief that every single word is subject to a new or different meaning, from moment-to-moment, necessarily means that words really mean nothing until they define them for that moment!

Therefore, because laws are written with words, and according to their own account, words can really mean anything, then laws, (made of words), can mean anything, according to the time and place and moment at hand!

I contend that if a law can mean *anything*; it truly means *nothing*!

Law is intended to be the root; the source; the answer; the means whereby we can calibrate the mechanism for the question!

Imagine if two teams playing baseball each brought their own rulebook and were able to change the rules as they played the game!

For many years our judiciary has been moving away from the absolute of law in order that they may make their own law. A law that they say is always evolving and constantly changing; terms they are fond of using when speaking of our Constitution. They claim, it is a "Living Document," and therefore, always evolving and ever-changing. They could not be more wrong!

Our Founding Fathers relied upon English Law in the drafting of our Declaration of Independence and our, Constitution. In order to understand our Founding Father's laws we must consider their source for authority in law: The Holy Bible and Sir William Blackstone.

Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780) a renowned English jurist who played a leading role in forming the basis of law in America. From 1765 to 1770 he published his highly influential work, "Commentaries on the Laws of England," which, by 1775 had sold more copies in America than in England.

His commentaries, which were universally accepted in America, set the foundation for great legal minds such as Chief Justice John Marshall. When scholars examined nearly 15,000 items written by the Founding Fathers from 1760 to 1805 (including books, newspaper articles, monographs, pamphlets, etc.) they found that Sir William Blackstone was quoted more than any other author.

Below, Blackstone expressed the presupposition basis for law:

Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his Creator, for he is entirely a dependent being ...And, consequently, as a man depends absolutely upon his Maker for everything, 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.

These laws laid down by God are the eternal immutable laws of good and evil, ...This law of nature dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over the entire globe,

in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this.

The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the Holy Scriptures, [and] are found upon comparison to be really part of the original law of nature. 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.

Blasphemy against the Almighty is denying his being or providence, or uttering contumelious reproaches on our Savior Christ.

If [the legislature] will positively enact a thing to be done, the judges are not at liberty to reject it, for that was to set the judicial power above that of the legislature, which would be subversive of all government.

The belief of a future state of rewards and punishments, the entertaining just ideas of the main attributes of the Supreme Being, and a firm persuasion that He superintends and will finally compensate every action in human life (all which are revealed in the doctrine of our Savior, Christ), these are the grand foundations of all judicial oaths, which call God to witness the truth of those facts which perhaps may be only known to Him and the party attesting; all moral evidences, therefore, all confidence in human veracity, must be weakened by apostasy, and overthrown by total infidelity.

Wherefore, all affronts to Christianity, or endeavors to depreciate its efficacy, in those who have once professed it, are highly deserving of censure.

One can easily see how Blackstone could be problematic for our contemporary judiciary couldn't he? It would seem that, according to Blackstone there is a point of origin for man's law; God, the creator of man. And, according to Blackstone, there is no wiggle-room leaving a law-of-man to become relevant over God's law.

We can also gain insight as to why our Founding Fathers intentionally made the judiciary the least powerful of the three branches of government.

Also underscored, is the importance of Christianity and the belief of a pending eternal judgment which makes the oath relevant in

determining truth. How can a judiciary, which is openly hostile to God, accept the oath of a man when taken upon God's Bible if in fact they have no regard for God?

So, there is a founding precedence for our law today that dates back to the Founding Fathers, which dates back to English law before them, and the authority for it was rooted in the God of the Bible.

So does this mean that America should really be a theocracy? Absolutely not! Does it mean that the practice of law is now a Spiritual pursuit?

Absolutely not! However, it does establish some very relevant truisms when considering any law today. If God's Law is the foundation for the basis of our, Constitution and laws, then it necessarily makes the exclusion of God from our public-culture-at-large a bit confusing; even contradictory.

That is, if God is indeed the foundation upon which we built all of our laws, how can He be banished from the public forum? (Public prayer, the posting of the Ten Commandments in public places, etc.) Seems sort of ludicrous doesn't it?

Yet, here we are today with a judiciary that is struggling with the constant flux of evolution and getting stuck on what "is" is.

I can understand why the unlawful and the ungodly would like to remove God from our judiciary. It would be pretty difficult to try to condone a woman who decides to murder (the definition of "Murder" is an unjustified taking of life.), her child.

Now you say she isn't murdering her child, she is merely killing her unwanted baby. How did our judiciary arrive at the legal conclusion that a mother could murder her child, while yet in her womb, but not once it is outside her womb?

Well, we are back to the legal wrangling of our contemporary judiciary and the question of what "is" is aren't we? By dismissing the true intent, our modern judiciary purposely misrepresented the 14th Amendment and now women can murder innocent life; legally.

So, could we say that if our law can mean anything we want it to mean, differently from one moment to the next, that we have in fact, become a Lawless culture?

And, could we also say, that until we return to an absolute authority of origin for our precedence, whereby we consistently measure, what is true and what is not, we will never really have an absolute foundation for our law?

We are all wearied by the daily revelation of new dishonesty and corruption and greed in levels of our society that previously seemed to be immune from that sort of behavior.

Could it be that our willingness to wink at the lawlessness in our judiciary has now bled-through into our culture-at-large? Do previously virtuous men in corporate America, and other high and trusted positions now observe the President of the United States of America lie in the face of the people; commit perjury; and go on in their life with no stigma; no accountability; no personal cost, and think; "Okay, why not me too?"

We cannot selectively pretend to apply a measure of law here and there, when we want and to whom we want, and most importantly, how we want!

There must be an absolute, and it must be consistent, as it was...at the founding of our nation!

So what does God and lawlessness have to do with Financial Services? America moans as we consider the absence of lawful behavior on Wall Street! When we are injured by those within our society that we should be able to trust, we cry for their heads! However, while we seem to be willing to allow some corrupt politician continue in office, or worse, re-elect them; can we not see the moral dilemma we create?

We want God when we need Him; but, we do not seem to want Him, or His absolutes, in our courtrooms!



<http://www.freedumbinamericatoday.com/>