< Back

Two really "hot topics" within The Constitution and The Scriptures: 1. Race 2. Guns

A law study for the objective truth seeker and not for the sensitive politically correct among us

by Kenneth W. Lent 7/12/10 www.solarsabbath.org/lawessayindex.htm

Q: Why do antichrists want to "abort" the
1787 Commonwealth Constitution For the USA?

A: Because the 1787 original Constitution manifests
a Scriptural haven for whites against the tyranny of the
world system of barbaric communalism.

A short summary of important information:

American Constitutionalism of the late 1700's was *nothing* remotely like the present form of (so called) "Constitutionalism" today.

The original Constitution For the United States of America is a branch of Commonwealth Law administration rooted in our Saxon Israel Commonwealth heritage of Ephesians 2:12, 20; Matthew 21:43; Psalm 102:14; Rev.21:2,10,12

The original 1787 Constitution provided for an arrangement whereby the people of the independent American States could meet on common ground for the purpose of unifying in militant safety together against the enemies of liberty, as well as agreeing to mutual economic concerns among the several States for the enhancement of lawful prosperity.

Without the security of a confederation of unified liberty, no family in the land is safe to worship or obey the Living God of the Bible in the peace of their private homes. Without securing "the blessings of liberty" set forth in the *Preamble to the Constitution*, all talk of obeying God's Laws becomes a meaningless exercise in futility. With tyrants on the loose nobody is able to obey God's Laws, short of everybody in the nation becoming martyrs.

Many American constitutional court case decisions and official government declarations up until the mid 1800's still managed to reflect what the Founding Fathers established within the *original* Constitution For the United States of America. Namely, the American patriots had built a safe haven for free Christian whites to live without fear of persecution by the world communal system (promoted by the world's banking monopoly). They had successfully thrown off the bondage endured under the government of the British Colonies.

It's time to study REAL American Constitutionalism

Part One

The controversial "racial issue"

As originally drafted and ratified, the Constitution of 1787 would not fit in with the liberal secular multicultural society of the New Word Order today. In fact from a racial viewpoint, neither do the Scriptures fit in to the New World Order agenda. When in the course of these several law essays on this web site the terms "Israel" or "Israelite" or "Adamic" are used it is to be understood that those terms refer to the White Saxon Christian people of the world.

The worst thing that could happen for all the different races of the world would be for a total international Communist State to succeed in taking power globally. Not only would most freedom loving whites be exterminated, but blacks would be subjected to an infinitely worse form of slavery than at any time in their history. The best policy that would keep the world on the straight and narrow path of civil advancement whereby America could help foreign countries that truly need emergency relief, is for America to retain its traditional makeup of being a dominantly white Christian society. We wish the best for all the races of the world, that they have security, a roof over their heads, food on the table, and peace in their community. This is not going to happen for them with State Communism. The segregation of early America was for the purpose of naturally developing the strength of our nation, which in turn produced (at least for a while) America's lead in stewardship of planet Earth, and it (segregation) was not out of crude hatred for people of color. Does not the Word of God Almighty instruct us in this divinely called out social configuration?

"For thou (Saxon Israel) art an holy people unto Yahweh thy God: Yahweh thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, ***above all people*** *that are upon the face of the earth."* (Deuteronomy 7:6)

"For thou art an holy people unto Yahweh thy God, and Yahweh hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, ***above all the nations*** *that are upon the earth."* (Deuteronomy 14:2)

"And ye shall be holy unto me: for I Yahweh am holy, ***and have severed (separated) you from other people****, that ye should be mine".* (Leviticus 20:26)

*"****A bastard (mamzer- mixed non Israelite) shall not enter into the congregation*** *of Yahweh; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of Yahweh."* (Deuteronomy 23:2 This meant that no non-white could be a citizen. Marxists cannot comprehend why this should be.)

If some find Yahweh's firm statements about peaceful segregation distasteful, all one needs to do is look at where the new world system of forced multiculturalism is headed. There is more increasing war, debt, and worldwide distrust among nations than ever before. Something just isn't right with the socialist utopia trend that is being promised as the "cure all" for society. America must retake the lead in obeying God's laws for an orderly arrangement of nature that was made by an omnipotent Creator.

Original Constitutional provisions:

What most present day Americans do not realize about our nation is that originally only whites were invited into America to become citizens by our first Constitutional Congress, and citizen application had to be through one of the States, not the Federal government. This comes as a shock to most people who simply never learned this in high school civics class.

BELOW TEXT SOURCE: 1 Stat. 103-104. edited version: De Pauw, Linda Grant, et al., eds. *Documentary History of the First Federal Congress of the United States of America, March 4, 1789 – March 3, 1791.* 14 vols. to date. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972-1995. 6:1516-1522.

United States Congress, "An act to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization" (March 26, 1790).

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, **That any Alien being a free white person,** who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for the term of two years, **may be admitted to become a citizen** thereof **on application to any common law Court of record in any one of the States** wherein he shall have resided for the term of one year at least, and making proof to the satisfaction of such Court that he is a person of good character, and taking the oath or affirmation prescribed by law to support the Constitution of the United States, which Oath or Affirmation such Court shall administer, and the Clerk of such Court shall record such Application, and the proceedings thereon; and thereupon such person shall be considered as a Citizen of the United States. And the children of such person so naturalized, dwelling

within the United States, being under the age of twenty one years at the time of such naturalization, shall also be considered as citizens of the United States. And the children of citizens of the United States that may be born beyond Sea, or out of the limits of the United States, shall be considered as natural born Citizens: Provided, that the right of citizenship shall not descend to persons whose fathers have never been resident in the United States: Provided also, that **no person** heretofore proscribed by any States, **shall be admitted a citizen** as aforesaid, **except by an Act of the Legislature of the State** in which such person was proscribed."

[NOTE: The Civil War changed American ideas of citizenship. The spurious Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed citizenship to all people born in the United States regardless of race, class, or gender. Congress then passed the Naturalization Act of 1870, which extended naturalization to people of African descent.]

For those who hear from some misinformed study groups the our first Federal Government was a wicked band of conspirators promoting a multicultural "one world" society, please take note of the following *federal U.S. Supreme Court* case decision that most people have not read. This was a landmark case for its time:

Before the Civil War here is how the **original** Constitutional United States Federal **Supreme Court** viewed citizenship in America:

In the case of SCOTT V. SANDFORD, 60 U. S. 393 (1856-7), United States Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger Taney wrote the opinion of the Court: (underline added)

> "The question is simply this: **Can a negro**, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, **become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States**, and as such become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guarantied by that instrument to the citizen? One of which rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the Constitution?
>
> --- **They (*Africans*)are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word 'citizens' in the Constitution**, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which the instrument provides and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time [1787–1788] considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, **whether emancipated or not**, yet remained subject to their authority, and **had no rights** or privileges but such as

those who held the power and Government might choose to grant them."

Talk about direct. That competely blows the lid off of the theory that the Federal Government of America was clandestinely devised to promote a "Tower of Babel" type of melting pot society promoted by the Iluminati. It most certainly was not. The Dred Scott case did not state anything new. It did not decree a new way of thinking about the race issue in America with regard to the law at the time. Other cases had already explained the same and this view was long held as the "law of the land" with original American Constitutionalism. The original Constitution of 1787 was solidly in line with God's Word. Atheists and ultra liberals may not like either the original Constitution or the Bible, but nevertheless the two writings stand in agreement with each other at law.

Next is a very interesting observation from another Supreme Court decision before the 1900's. Even after the Civil War resulted with the passage of the unconstitutional 14th Amendment granting United States citizenship to all races, the question remained - - was racial **segregation itself** (as we see commanded in Scripture) Constitutional according to the original intent? *"And ye shall be holy unto me: for I Yahweh am holy,* ***and have severed (separated) you from other people****, that ye should be mine".* (Leviticus 20:26)

In another U.S. Supreme Court decision as late as 1896 we see that segregation is indeed a fact of law within the Constitution as drafted by the Founding Fathers.

In Louisiana, the arrest of Homer Plessy on June 7, 1892, was part of a planned court case to challenge the 1890 Louisiana Separate Car Act. The "plan" was set up by the Citizens' Committee to Test the Constitutionality of the Separate Car Law, an activist group of blacks in New Orleans. The black committee intentionally purposed to have someone with mixed blood violate the law, which would allow their attorney to question the law's validity. Homer Plessy was a resident of Louisiana who actually could pass as white, although he had some mixed blood lineage. Plessy agreed to be the test person in this legal challenge. The New Orleans black activist group arranged with the railroad conductor and also a private detective to hold Plessy until he was arrested to stand trial for breaking the segregation law. *When the trial took place over this incident concerning Plessy, in a* ***Louisiana district court****, the court ruled that a state had the constitutional power to regulate railroad companies operating solely within its borders. Therefore the court ruled and* ***concluded that the Louisiana Separate Car Act was constitutional****.* The decision of the District Court was appealed to the state supreme court in 1893 and was appealed again to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1896. Below is the decision of the **U.S. Supreme Court** delivered by Justice Henry Billings Brown. The case makes for an interesting "read".

Plessy v. Ferguson 163 U.S. 537, May 1896 U.S. Supreme Court

Syllabus of the Court (Excerpt) - -

"That petitioner was a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Louisiana, of **mixed descent, in the proportion of seven eighths Caucasian and one eighth African blood**; that the mixture of colored blood was not discernible in him, and that he was entitled to every recognition, right, privilege and immunity secured to the citizens of the United States of the white race by its Constitution and laws; that, on June 7, 1892, he engaged and paid for a first class passage on the East Louisiana Railway from New Orleans to Covington, in the same State, and thereupon entered a passenger train, and took possession of a vacant seat in a coach where passengers of the white race were accommodated; that such railroad company was incorporated by the laws of Louisiana as a common carrier, and was not authorized to distinguish between citizens according to their race. But, notwithstanding this, petitioner was required by the conductor, under penalty of ejection from said train and imprisonment, to vacate said coach and occupy another seat in a coach assigned by said company for persons not of the white race, and for no other reason than that petitioner was of the colored race; that, upon petitioner's refusal to comply with such order, he was, with the aid of a police officer, forcibly ejected from said coach and hurried off to and imprisoned in the parish jail of [163 U.S. 539] New Orleans, and there held to answer a charge made by such officer to the effect that he was guilty of having criminally violated an act of the General Assembly of the State, approved July 10, 1890, in such case made and provided."

(**Decision** by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Brown - - Opinion of the Court, excerpt):

" - - - It is claimed by the plaintiff in error that, in any mixed community, the reputation of belonging to the dominant race, in this instance the white race, is property in the same sense that a right of action or of inheritance is property. Conceding this to be so for the purposes of this case, we are unable to see how this statute deprives him of, or in any way affects his right to, such property. If he be a white man and assigned to a colored coach, he may have his action for damages against the company for being deprived of his so-called property. Upon the other hand, if he be a colored man and be so assigned, he has been deprived of no property, since he is not lawfully entitled to the reputation of being a white man.

- - - We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it.

- - - Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts or to abolish distinctions based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation. If the civil and political rights of both races be equal, one cannot be inferior to the other *civilly* [163 U.S. 552] *or politically*. **If one race be inferior to the other *socially*, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane.**

The judgment of the court below (Louisiana Court) is, therefore, Affirmed." (emphasis above added) --- end

[NOTE: In other words, Federal Justice Brown ruled that even though the 14th Amendment (not part of the original Constitution) gave the negro *civil* equality with whites, the rest of the original Constitution still never declared that whites and blacks are *socially* equal, nor could it ever declare that. Therefore the U.S. Supreme Court of 1896 ruled that **racial segregation was Constitutional.** It wasn't until 1954 (Brown vs. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483) that a "new world" U.S. Supreme Court reversed the 1896 Court ruling.]

We may further realize that since it was exclusively whites who were originally the only lawful citizens of this nation, it would therefore follow that we should be able to find an early law that says it was only whites who were called upon to defend the rights of the citizens of America. True to Scriptural and Constitutional form, the United States Congress DID understand this responsibility of the citizens and defined precisely who it is that was expected to defend the liberty referred to in the Preamble to the Constitution. The Militia Act of 1792, Passed May 8, 1792, provided the federal standards for the organization of the Militia.

Congress May 8, 1792 *"An ACT more effectually to provide for the National Defence, by establishing an Uniform Militia throughout the United States."*

"**Section I. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America***, in Congress assembled, That each and every **free able-bodied white male citizen** of the respective States, resident therein, who is or shall be of age of eighteen years, and under the age of forty-five years (except as is herein after excepted) shall severally and respectively be enrolled in the militia, by the Captain or Commanding Officer of the company, within whose bounds **such citizen shall reside**, - - - -"

"**Section III.** - - - That **the said militia shall be officered by the respective states**, as follows: To each division on Major-General, with two Aids-de-camp, with the rank of major; to each brigade, one brigadier-major, with the rank of a major; to each company, one captain, one lieutenant, one ensign, four serjeants, four corporals, one drummer, and one fifer and bugler. That there shall be a regimental staff, to consist of one adjutant, and one quartermaster, to

rank as lieutenants; one paymaster; one surgeon, and one surgeon's mate; one serjeant-major; one drum- major, and one fife-major."

Likewise it is recorded in the Scriptures that Saxon Israel's army was a militia army:

"Take ye the sum of all the congregation ***of the children of Israel****, after their families, by the house of their fathers, with the number of their names,* ***every male by their polls****; From twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel: thou and Aaron shall number them by their armies."*

"And with you there shall be a man of every tribe; ***every one head of the house*** *of his fathers."*

"These were the renowned of the congregation*, princes of the tribes of their fathers,* ***heads of thousands*** *in Israel."* (Numbers 1:2,3,4, 16)

Multiculturalists view social separation of the races as a "hate act", instead of something which God Himself established as being the best for all races. The emotional "hate attachment" to segregation is primarily because of Hollywood's inaccurate portrayal of black slavery in the American South. Also the reader should be aware that there was much white slavery going on in the American Colonies under the banker controlled British rule, a chapter in history that has been forgotten. White slavery in America promoted by the British Crown was yet another reason for the 1776 Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution.

A comment on slavery

It's amazing to read comments to the effect that "The Federal Constitution *promoted black slavery*". It's easy to criticize the obvious fact that the Constitution tolerated slavery without remembering that slavery had been going on worldwide for millennia. The truth is that most of the Founding Fathers had felt that slavery should be done away with but realized the long standing institution that it was. Major political changes don't happen over night. Slavery was brought into the Colonies while they were under British possession. The Americans didn't invent slavery. Also, most of the slaves that came to America under British rule were at first white, not black people. (see: *They Were White and They Were Slaves*, Michael A.Hoffman II, pub. Wiswell Ruffin House; June 1993) (*White Cargo: The Forgotten History of Britain's White Slaves in America*, Don Kirkland, NYU Press, March 8, 2008)

Nobody wants to be a slave, and I like nearly everyone, have no desire to be a slave master. However the unapologetic truth is that the choice for African blacks during the 1600 – 1800 slave trade period was not a happy situation. Even without freedom, it was sadly better for an African to wind up on an American cotton plantation working for white folks than for them to suffer the utter savage and barbaric 'black on black' slavery that was happening in Africa. The African

continent was a frightening place for its own population in those days. This truth the establishment universities will never teach young people in our educational program. For the doubters of black tribal slave cruelty that greatly surpassed the Negro's lack of freedom in America read *"Slave Trade in the Congo"* E.J. Glave, 1890 –link here) There are other similar documented writings about black slavery in Africa that have, for political purposes, been swept under the rug.

After thousands of years of slavery on the planet practiced *by all races*, it was the American events surrounding the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution that, for the first time, offered a transitional period where economies based on slavery began to be phased out. Oliver Ellsworth, one of the signers of the Constitution wrote, a few months after the Convention adjourned, *"All good men wish the entire abolition of slavery, as soon as it can take place* ***with safety to the public****, and for the lasting good of the present wretched race of slaves."*

Yes, the Constitution tolerated black slavery, but at the same time the Constitution included the beginning of an historic "phase out period" with regard to slavery in Article 1, section 9. clause 1 by leaving room to have the international slave trade banned from the USA: *"The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a Tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person."*

That section gave the option to the States, *if they so wanted*, to assemble in Congress after 1808 and ban the international slave trade from operating in America, which the States by representatives in Congress *in 1808 agreed upon and thus banned*. Slavery that was already ongoing in the States was however not interferred with by the Constitution. A social instution that had been around for thousands of years and which the British had already woven into the Colonial primary economy was not able to be scrapped in one day. The sentiment was that slavery was "on the out" but details would need a reasonable amount of time to rectify the puzzling ramifications.. How could a Southern economy make a transition without econmic chaos, and what could the blacks do to earn a basic living when they knew no skills and most were illiterate? These were serious social issues dumped on America by the former British rule. We are not debating the moral barometer of the Amerian slavery issue in this essay. There are many twists and turns about the international slave trade and America, plus many complications we haven't been told about by the mainstream "educators" with respect to the international bankers and merchants dealings with slavery. Those banker's motives throw an entirely different "monkey wrench" into the slavery subject which we will not examine or comment upon here.

Does anyone ever ask how it is that black slavery was ended *peacefully* in every other Western nation except the USA? In America alone the rising tide of the industrial revolution had already begun in the late 1700's. Soon the following

production of farm machinery that could do the work of hundreds of slaves would have ended slavery peacefully within a few decades of the Civil War – without the war ever being fought. Has the possibility ever been presented to American history buffs that there was an international political force that *wanted* the War between the States to take place in order to have Christian America destroyed?

Dear readers, here's what happened in that needless Civil War partially centered on the black slavery issue. In order to end slavery 620,000 Americans met their death. This is the equivalent of nearly 6 million deaths if compared to our present population. More than twice that number were maimed for life; scores of Southern cities and towns were bombed into dust by Yankee cannons. Tens of thousands of Southern civilians were necessarily eliminated (murdered) by the U.S. Army. The Northern States had found that the Constitution was suspended during that period, and tens of thousands of Northern civilian political dissenters were imprisoned without due process. Many small Northern newspapers that remotely questioned the war were shut down for good. Tens of millions of dollars in Southern private property were looted by Sherman's army, and mansions burned to the ground. Most amazing is the fact the war expenditure accumulated by the North was more money than if the North would have just bought all the slaves from the Southern states and set them free. No – there was a devious international force that wanted America to destroy itself by a civil war.

The true forgotten point of reality is, the American Negro was only "freed" into another form of slavery, that is, to eventually become credit usury slaves pushed into the same banking system that had been responsible for the Civil War in the first place, the same system that has enslaved American whites into an unconstitutional economic hardship. The debt credit economic system had started by then in America and had become worse by 1913 with the passage of the Federal Reserve Act. The international bankers wanted the *entire* population (white and black) to be under the jurisdiction of an unlawful money/debt new "U.S. Citizen" of an unconstitutional 14th Amendment status. The Civil War saw to it that this was accomplished. The blacks were only freed to become consumer slaves, along with the whites, to the bankers.

If America loses all its glory of freedom (and it nearly has) the rest of the world will collapse into a super draconian government nightmare of total misery for all the different races. The worst possible scene for the non white nations of the world would be for America, which supplies them with endless goods and aid, to be destroyed. The liberal non Scriptural theory of a "melting pot society" for *supposed* multicultural "racial equality" is proving to be the death blow to America that it has been to all other past civilizations.

God's Word has declared segregation with respect for natural separation to be the standard that will bless the Earth. The original Constitution was framed precisely upon this Law of Nature, with the early court cases decreeing the matter for any who may question the scope of Constitutional law. This manner of "decreeing" God's Word and explaining its intent of law for modern application is

following the command in Scripture: *"__**Thou (men) shalt also decree**__ a thing, and it shall be established unto thee: and the light shall shine upon thy ways."* (Job 22:28)

Let one major point be made here. Segregation does not mean hate, although there are those among us who stir up racial strife for political motives. God separated the lands for separate inheritances to all races. Each race has its own place for citizenship. Marxists do not like this idea because they hate Godly government, and hate the original U.S.A. Constitution. But God has declared what He wants for the different people of the world and He wants each to have their own land.

*"When the most High **divided to the nations their inheritance**, when He **separated the sons of Adam**, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel."* (Deuteronomy 32:8)

Original American Constitutional law set forth the purpose and decree of God where the racial question was involved. Moreover, travelers of non kindred families into other people's lands certainly is expected in the normal course of international activities. So God's "racial separation policy" does not mean "no contact ever" with other people. It means that within His nation of Saxon Christian Israelites the separation is to be along the lines of the nation's __rights of citizenship__.

There was a day not long ago when the phrase "he is a discriminating fellow" was a compliment paid to someone who was a keen observer with wisdom who could discern differences when needed. Today, to be a person who "discriminates" is viewed as being evil. The prophet Isaiah foresaw these perilous times when he stated, *"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!"* (Isaiah 5:20)

As far as the racial issue goes however, the original Constitutional Federal government, being based precisely upon the previous law of its Christian Colonial history, clearly provided that only whites were __natural citizens__ in America. This position reverts back to the Scriptures reflected in the Preamble, resulting in the Union only being for the then lawful natural citizens (all white Christian heirs) of and for their Preamble's __"Posterity"__ – racial family. At the descretion of our Christian family, after securing America in peace, prosperity, and liberty, under ideal conditions we Saxons would have the option, to give aid and assistance to the other families of people of the world in their appointed lands. We wish the different people of the world happiness and security, but all must be done in accord to the blessings of mutual separation and respect as ordained by "God Above" who has made us all for His great plan for the world.

When we view the world today it is obvious that "man's way" is not working and it hasn't worked for over 6000 years. One would think that people would reflect

upon wisdom and consider that God Almighty may just be right about His plan for world peace. We seem to be slow learners.

Part Two

The Constitutionally Decreed Right To Keep and Bear Arms – Scriptural Or Not?

Why this Second Amendment Constitutional provision is NOT an attempt to add to God's Laws.

The wisdom of God's Word provides for the lawful use of advanced weapons for righteousness.

In discussing the Constitution, from time to time I receive emails from concerned Christians who have read many points of view from a wide variety of sources. One question that I have been asked more than once is whether or not we may make a rule of law that seems appropriately honest but is not literally to be found within the words of the national laws of Yahweh as read in the Scriptures. This verse is cited:

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of Yahweh your God which I command you." (Deuteronomy 4:2)

There are some today that insist that we need only to read from God's Word for our laws and that we must not add one word or *expand* a situation at law to be *in principle* with the Scriptures. Their cry is -- "nothing less than God's Written Laws". Thus we read from any number of Internet blogs or message boards from certain good Christian folks arguing to the effect – *"We won't obey any rules of man, including anything written in any Constitution or Common Law Compact"*.

That position may sound noble at first consideration, but the truth is this dead letter reasoning does not take into account the advancements of a Saxon race blessed with inventive skills by Yahweh God Himself. But still more importantly, the viewpoint is not even a Scriptural position in the first place.

The Scriptures clearly tell us, indeed ***command us,*** to: *"Submit yourselves to every* ***ordinance of man*** *for Yahweh's sake: whether it be to (a) king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him for the*

punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well." (I Peter 2:13,14)

It is beyond doubt that God's Word teaches that there will be certain "ordinances of man" *not mentioned* in the Scriptures which we are to submit ourselves. OK, which ones? --- the one's *"for Yahweh's sake"* or things pertaining to the will and principles of Yahweh God Almighty *"unto them that are sent by Him for the punishment of evildoers."* This commandment certainly is not referring to submitting to ungodly statutes as it is the same apostle (Peter) who tells us in Acts 5:29 *"We ought to obey God rather than men."*

Therefore those who argue that we can't add to God's Word *under any circumstances with regard to law* are left with a dilemma when it comes to firearms. There is no mention of any rules, codes, laws, or regulations in the Bible about shotguns, revolvers, semi-auto pistols, or even musket loaders. We can't have it both ways here. We either stay only with swords and battleaxes as mentioned in the Bible in order to not add to God's Word, or we correctly decree permissable laws of man concerning our use of modern weapons. Christ appropriately told us to purchase *swords* for defense. (Luke 22:36) But He never literally told us to *buy a gun*. Here is where the 2nd Amendment to the Constitution enters in compliance with the "divine principle" of having a righteous command to defend ourselves against evil aggressors. It is an "ordinance of man" not found in God's Laws, yet we are Scripturally commanded to obey it.

"A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the People to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." (2nd Amendment – Bill of Rights)

Since the law of that early American era has defined "arms" to include "firearms" as well as knives, swords, clubs, etc, and yet however the Scriptures DO NOT INCLUDE FIREARMS for any provision of being armed, does this mean that the 2nd Amendment is an added usurpation and even a breach of God's Laws?

No it is not – and neither is any other original Christian intent found within the Constitution signed exclusively by its Christian authors. The principle of the 2nd Amendment is based upon our God given right to be armed in self defense and to decree the matter for the security of our families, towns, states, and nation, even though a discussion of firearms is never to be found in the Scriptures. The Founding Fathers knew full well that the right to keep and bear arms does not originate with the Constitution, rather it is "God given".

"Divine Providence has given to every individual the means of self defense."— George Mason, Co Author of the Bill of Rights

"He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." Jesus Christ – Gospel of Luke 22:36

"And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan." -- Genesis 14:14

"A righteous man falling down before the wicked is as a troubled fountain, and a corrupt spring." -- Proverbs 25:26

Certainly, we would be faltering before the wicked if we choose to be unarmed and unable to resist an assailant who might be threatening our life. In other words, we have no right to hand over our God-given life to the unrighteous.

Is the 2nd Amendment's provision of the Constitution in agreement with our Scripturally based right to "keep and bear arms" on our person and in our house? Is it therefore a proper "ordinance of man" which we must submit to as faithful Christians? The Scriptural and Constitutional answer is to be found in the affirmative.

Here are American court cases and leading precedence on owning guns (arms), which prove a complete union between the will of God that we as individuals bear arms in righteousness, and that of the decree within the 2nd Amendment to do the same. Neither the Bible nor the Constitution nor the background of the Christian Saxon law which led to the Constitution ever state that the right to keep and bear arms is a ***collective*** state right. On the contrary, we ***as sovereign individuals*** possess that right and its root is the liberty we each have in Christ.

Our examination of this topic will not be based on a document from the NRA, any "right wing magazine", or any "conservative religious church announcement". We will refer the reader to none other than a memorandum issued by the **U.S. Dept. of Justice in August of 2004** entitled, "WHETHER THE SECOND AMENDMENT SECURES AN INDIVIDUAL RIGHT".

[Note: One would think that a modern federal government position on the 2nd Amendment would lean toward the "collective rights position" supportive that firearms should be only found in government military agencies. However, in addressing the debate over this issue, the Justice Department legal scholars brought to light ***437 references "AT LAW",*** which compelled the study to focus correctly upon the matter where it should be focused --- namely, upon the historical development of the 2nd Amendment itself at the time of its enactment. –KL]

From the Federal memorandum, August 2004:

"For the foregoing reasons (the 437 law references), we conclude that the Second Amendment secures an ***individual right*** *to keep and to bear arms. Current case law leaves open and unsettled the question of whose right is secured by the Amendment. Although we do not address the scope of the right, our examination of the original meaning of the Amendment provides extensive*

reasons to conclude that ***the Second Amendment secures an individual right, and no*** *persuasive basis for either the* ***collective-right or quasi-collective-right views****. The text of the Amendment's operative clause, setting out a "right of the people to keep and bear Arms," is clear and is reinforced by the Constitution's structure. The Amendment's prefatory clause, properly understood, is fully consistent with this interpretation. The broader history of the Anglo-American right of individuals to have and use arms, from England's Revolution of 1688-1689 to the ratification of the Second Amendment a hundred years later, leads to the same conclusion. Finally, the first hundred years of interpretations of the Amendment, and* ***especially the commentaries and case law in the pre-Civil War period closest to the Amendment's ratification****, confirm what the text and history of the Second Amendment require."--* Steven G. Bradbury,Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General; Howard C. Nielson, Jr.Deputy Assistant Attorney General; C. Kevin Marshall, Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

The American colonial militias were broad-based, composed of all able-bodied white men, who were expected to be armed with the private weapons that all households were required to keep (regardless of eligibility for militia duty), there being a *"general obligation of all adult male inhabitants to possess arms, and, with certain exceptions, to cooperate in the work of defense."* 196 United States v. Miller, 307 U.S. 174, 179-80 (1939) United States Supreme Court

"With slight variations, the different colonies imposed a duty to keep arms and to muster occasionally for drill upon virtually every able-bodied white man between the age of majority and a designated cut-off age. Moreover, the duty to keep arms applied to every household, not just to those containing persons subject to militia service. Thus, the over-aged and seamen, who were exempt from militia service, were required to keep arms for law enforcement and for the defense of their homes from criminals or foreign enemies." Kates, 82 Michigan Law Review. at 215-16

"This is the right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and which is calculated to incite men to a manly and noble defence of themselves, if necessary, and of their country." 1850 Louisianna Supreme Court; 5 La. Ann. 489, 1850 WL 3838

"This may be considered as the true palladium of liberty . . . . The right of self defence is the first law of nature: in most governments it has been the study of rulers to confine this right within the narrowest limits possible. Wherever standing armies are kept up, and the right of the people to keep and bear arms is, under any colour or pretext whatsoever, prohibited, liberty, if not already annihilated, is on the brink of destruction." 1 Tucker's Blackstone, Note D, at 300 (George Tucker was a judge and law professor from Virginia)

"By this clause of the constitution, an express power is given and secured to all the free citizens of the state to keep and bear arms for their defence, without any

qualification whatever as to their kind or nature." Supreme Court of Tennessee 1 Simpson v. State , 3 Tenn. (5 Yer.) 356, 1833 WL 1227

William Rawle of Pennsylvania published his View of the Constitution of the United States of America in 1825, with a second edition appearing in 1829. After having turned down President Washington's offer to be the first attorney general, he had served in the Pennsylvania Assembly when it ratified the Bill of Rights. His commentary gained wide prominence. Rawle wrote this in examining the scope of the 2nd Amendment as applying to the individual citizen and not merely a State army:

"No clause in the Constitution could by any rule of construction be conceived to give to congress a power to disarm the people. Such a flagitious attempt could only be made under some general pretence by a state legislature. But if in any blind pursuit of inordinate power, either should attempt it, this amendment may be appealed to as a restraint on both." "In a people permitted and accustomed to bear arms, we have the rudiments of a militia, which properly consists of armed citizens, divided into military bands, and instructed at least in part in the use of arms for the purposes of war." William Rawle, A View of the Constitution of the United States of America (2d ed. 1829, pg.125, 126 & 153)

So entrenched is our right to keep and bear arms in America that even as late as **2008** the United States Supreme Court upheld that right as belonging to the individual and that it is not a collective right. In the landmark case of *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. (2008) the Supreme Court ruled that the District of Columbia's handgun ban was unconstitutional, as it *"amounts to a prohibition on an entire class of 'arms' that Americans overwhelmingly choose for the lawful purpose of self-defense".*

Jesus says to buy a sword (Luke 22:36), and the 2nd Amendment draws upon those words to include modern "arms" in defense of a free State. This is in no way adding to God's laws. These two precepts of a free Christian nation are overlapping and interwoven in purpose and action. Both are grounded upon the Divine Law. Christ's words are recorded in the Gospels while the 2nd Amendment is based on the Epistle of Peter (I Pet.2:13,14) as a decree of man that is in principle agreement with the Divine Law. In such a case citizens of the Christian Commonwealth are commanded to submit to the decree. *"Submit yourselves to every **ordinance of man** for Yahweh's sake"* This type of "ordinance of man" is known as a decree of justice made to compliment the Divine Law where it may not specifically be written in Scripture. It follows after Godly wisdom to *pattern* modern laws after the guidance of the Scriptures. In fact rulers who are just are said to make wise decrees such as our 2nd Amendment to the Constitution. *"By me (divine wisdom) kings reign, and princes decree justice."* (Proverbs 8:15)

We can correctly conclude by the foregoing Scriptures and corresponding American Law in pursuance of those ends, that the 2nd Amendment to the Constitution For the United States of America was divinely inspired for our

benefit from on High. The Almighty has been kind to us in bestowing a blessing of self defense upon us for our security in a modern world that threatens our Christian Kingdom. Only subverters of the Scriptures and Yahweh's Kingdom dare belittle our 2nd Amendment provision to diminish the importance of our God given Constitutionally guaranteed individual right "to keep and bear arms". To the enemies of liberty we can most assuredly declare "America will never be disarmed".

Summary of parts One and Two

Basically condensed, looking at America from a Scriptural position, it is a place meant for White Christians and the Constitution. Looking at America from an athiest viewpoint it is a place for all people of the world to enter, run by Marxism. The reader is free to choose which system he wants to live by.

Rights come from Yahweh God, and are decreed in *right*eous compacts of honorable men. Dictatorial permissions that must be purchased for a fee come from a secular State. Firearms are the "great equalizer" between the natural born citizens and representative State to insure that the State does not substitute permissions for rights.

-- end

< Back