

**Eight Questions from  
the Special 4<sup>th</sup> of July  
“State of the Union”  
Discussion of  
Dissolution, Secession & Anarchy**

**1. Can the people vote a dissolved government into lawfulness?**

**“Doug,**

I don't know where new State Constitutions, passed by referendum of the people leave us on this subject(s). For example the current Georgia State Constitution was ratified in 1982. I don't know how many States have ratified a new Constitution but it would seem that if passed on referendum, this represents consent of the governed.

Right or wrong I voted for it in 1982. We need to be careful in our efforts that we don't let our passion over-ride reason. In the case of Georgia, it appears that in 1982 a majority of its voting citizens recognized the Constitution of The United States, Article I, Section 2, Paragraph 5.

At least in the State of Georgia an argument that the government is dissolved or illegitimate would run contrary to the voice of the people in 1982. That would be valid for the State Constitution ratified in 1868 or any of its derivatives, but the 1982 one was a rewrite. There was also a rewrite and ratification by the people in 1877 after the end of "legal" Reconstruction and federal occupation forces in the State in 1876.

This could be changed by Amendment, but that takes a 2/3 majority in both the State House and Senate - then a majority vote in an even numbered year general election.

Thanks,

**Tom Johnson”**

Ron Avery responds:

In regard to passage of referendums to approve constitutions it mainly depends upon who called for the election and did those that called for the election represent a new government being ratified or an old government that had been dissolved. If the election was called for and held by the people seeking the approval of the people of a new constitution that would be lawful. If the election was called for and held by those in the seats of dissolved government the whole election would be unlawful and the outcome null and void. So, if those in government called for and held the referendum, and if you can find a change in the form of government without approval by the people in an amendment then you can prove that the old government was dissolved and the new government was never lawfully consented to.

I suspect that the referendum in Georgia was called for and held by those in a dissolved government without authority. This would make the whole election unlawful and the results null and void. Just because somebody holds an election does not make the results lawfully binding on anyone.

In the case of Georgia recognizing the lawfulness of the United States of America in 1982 we can conclude that to be impossible. It is one thing for the citizens of a state to “recognize” the existence of a paper copy of the federal constitution and it is quite another for them to determine the condition of the union to be in conformity to a federal constitution when it is not so. First, it is not in the power of an election to find something to be true that is false by law or observation. A majority cannot find that daytime is nighttime or that black is white or that the union government is in the form in which it was constituted when it is most obviously not by prima facie evidence. Article 1 Section 2 Paragraph 5 adds nothing to overcome this inability of the people to find lawfulness when the opposite is obviously true. This provision only provides for the filling of vacancies in the US Congress.

It is a temptation for those who have dissolved the once lawful government to hold an election and have the people ratify their crimes and approve a new government that will include their perverted principles and not be so evidently unconstitutional. Tyrants want to do this for fear that the people may take matters in their own hands. Again it matters not what the people vote for if the election was called for and held by those representing a dissolved unlawful government for the election would not be lawfully held.

## **2. Does Marriage and Divorce and Family Law have any real relation to Civil Government?**

### **“Gents:**

Doug, you’re not wrong with your marriage analogy, although there is a bit more to it. Allow me to explain it from a Catholic theological perspective.

Marriage is a Sacrament first and foremost, wherein the proper *matter* is the *parties*, the proper *form* is a *ceremony* witnessed by a Priest and others, and last, but not least, the proper *intention* is a *free and willful* choice by the parties to do what the Church does, i.e. treat their covenant as sacrosanct & indissoluble, help save each other’s souls, and to produce children for God’s glory. If ANY ONE of the three requirements is missing (proper matter, form, and right intention), then the Sacrament was NEVER confected, and morally and theologically speaking, there was NEVER a marriage at all. This is the basis upon which the Catholic Church investigates a marriage and sometimes grants what is known as an annulment (a recognition by the Church that there was never a valid, Sacrament in the first place). If an annulment is granted, the parties are morally free to remarry without pain of sin. This takes care of the moral aspect of the situation.

However, the state still has laws relating to marriage that must be dealt with, e.g. custody of children, division of property, and a recognition that, from a civil perspective, the parties are no longer married. The Church may have granted me an annulment, but if I go and remarry without first obtaining a civil ‘divorce’, I can be prosecuted for bigamy. As a Catholic, I recognize that the moral authority of The Church and Her Laws are above, and supersede, those of the civil government. In an ideal arrangement, the two would be in harmony with one another; however, that is NOT the situation under which we live. The state will exert its power over you if you transgress its statutes. Because those are not in harmony with God’s Divine Law, and are therefore morally invalid, is beside the point to the state. The state may not be operating in a *de jure* sense, but because of their sword, they operate in a *de facto* sense, as you pointed out. And like it or not, most people recognize, and must deal with, the *de facto* situation.

So, you could morally argue that the South was dragged into a ‘union’ with other States against her will. So, there was no free consent on her part (proper intention), and that fact morally invalidates the ‘union’. But the powers that be of the u.s. don’t see it that way. They recognize themselves as legitimate, as does the rest of the world by dealing with their ‘elected representatives’ in Washington City. They certainly don’t see themselves as having been

dissolved by their illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional actions, nor does the rest of the world. The u.s. regime rolls along as before.

The fact that we are morally correct about the invalidity of our ‘union’ with the rest of the u.s., and its lawlessness, does not relieve us of the obligation and necessity of dealing with the *de facto* arrangement of things. In theory, I agree with Ron, but we must deal with the everyday realities of our condition. This means that secession is the course to pursue.

Secession is the civil ‘divorce’ we need to obtain from the ‘union’, despite the fact that our skirts are clear morally. Secession IS a ‘dissolution’, albeit a unilateral one, but then, the decision to join, originally, was also a unilateral one for each State. That’s what FREE government, by CONSENT, is all about.

## Larry”

Ron Avery responds:

Mr. Larry makes a great description of what a good moral marriage would consist of and how the Catholic Church treats it and really how all other churches should treat the subject as well. I have never heard such a good description of it and it appeals to me as a sound, reasonable and righteous way to look at marriage and divorce. The problem, as I see it, has to do with the nature of the contracts that are being made, one civil between many people and the other between only two people and God. We could use Mr. Larry’s own elements in a marriage to show the differences between a marriage of two lovers and a union of many people for a state and several states for a union. So clearly the matter (or parties) are much different, one very limited the other very broad in scope. Certainly the two forms are different; one a ceremony and the other a written instrument that has all sorts of terms that must be honored by both sides (the governed and those that govern). And last the intent at the beginning of the marriage or union.

Regarding form; in a marriage two lovers only contract to love one another until death separates them. There are no specific provisions for what constitutes love or right behavior on the part of each spouse other than general topics like “to keep, hold, love and cherish, in sickness and in health” etc. But in the formation of a state or union there are many specific provisions that constitute what the state or union really is and what must be done to keep the state or union in effect or lawful operation. If those provisions are not maintained the allegiance of the governed is understood to not be required or expected by those that govern. If a state or union alters its form in any way outside the prescribed manner written in the social contract the state or union no longer exists and no officer in it has authority and no person that was under it has any obligation to conform to any provision of it and may morally and legally resist anything it does even with force. There are no such provisions written into a marriage contract. So the form of a marriage and a state or union of states is very different rendering rules regarding marriage inapplicable to civil government.

Now what about intent? Intent is usually presumed in a marriage between two lovers. By saying the wedding vows they are making their intent known. But as we have seen the intent is very general and binding really as long as the two spouses remain alive. A social contract binding a people together and compelling their allegiance and conformity to the law is not a living being. The social contract dies the moment its form is altered without permission by the means prescribed in the constituting document, in our case, constitutional amendments. This is true regardless of what tyrants will tell you while wanting to remain in dissolved offices of a dissolved state or union. Their moral and legal authority are immediately stripped leaving them as ordinary men and women without any authority over any one else. Therefore the intent of a marriage and that of a state or union of states is very different rendering rules of marriage inapplicable to civil government.

Most people I meet like to discuss the manner in which a state or union was born or started and how lawful or legal it was and if it had been ratified properly and such. And they do this to

justify their desire to start by continuing a government that had been abandoned years earlier and claiming it is still in operation or by starting something all new or seceding from the corrupted union. But if the union or state has been altered in form without permission of the people by the manner they specify then the government is dissolved anyway and there is no need to analyze the manner in which the state or union of states were formed in the original or some later event such as a secession and a re-unification. It matters not if one or more states were deceived or coerced or if the union was deceived or coerced. If the form specified in its creating documents has been altered without permission it is dissolved no matter what.

Mr. Larry says above that he might agree with me and the principle of dissolution but then maintains that because the union does not think it is dissolved and other nations deal with them as if they were not dissolved that we have some kind of moral and legal duty to seek a divorce from them implying that somehow this protects those that want to secede from the wrath of those who want to maintain a dissolved union without authority. Let me assure everyone party to this discussion that there is no safety in applying to tyrants for a divorce especially when the divorce must by definition be based upon the admission that the union is lawfully in conformance to its founding documents that gave it authority. All things that are created by contracts are fictions without life of their own and these fictions die as soon as their form is altered without the required means of permission from the people.

Mr. Larry goes further and claims that secession is a civil divorce which I would agree with in the most general terms. But then he asserts that secession is a “unilateral dissolution.” Here I would not agree. One of the great things about the concept and principle of Dissolution is that no one needs to notify the other and no one needs to accomplish some task to obtain it. It is simply an observation of the truth of the condition of the union or state. The condition or existence of the state and or union is based upon its conformity to its founding documents. Its conformity or non-conformity is easily shown with substantial hard evidence and no one can argue or make the observer into any kind of malicious immoral degenerate. Many people think that dissolution must be declared just as secession would need a declaration. This is also false.

There are only two basic ways a state or union can be dissolved from within. The first is the unlikely proposition that those who just created the state or union decided that they did not like the creation and want to dissolve it prior to any event upon which it would be dissolved by a change in form without permission. The other way is by the change in form without permission which we have covered extensively.

A declaration of dissolution would be of great use but not in the sense of an action that any group of people must take or make. Such a declaration would need to make it clear what is being declared. A good title would be: “The Declaration of the Observation of the Dissolution of the so-called United States of America.” In this document it would be made clear that those making the declaration of observation do not, did not, and did not intend to dissolve the union. It would also make clear how dissolution occurred and that it is the people who are the victims of those in government who have dissolved their own authority leaving us no alternative but to create lawful government on our own for the protection of our property from those that have lost all their authority to act for our good or evil.

Mr. Larry tries to make the point that just because a state joined the union by its own unilateral decision that somehow a state declared unilateral application for a divorce from a union is required. But he failed to show us why that would be so. I cannot conceive of why that would be required where the union is dissolved. As I have said before it makes no matter how a state entered a union if it is not in the form required by its constitution and cannot show permission from the people to make that alteration. And there is no lawful court from which to seek justice that would have jurisdiction over the matter as it is dissolved right along with the union.

### **3. Does the U.S. Constitution provide for Secession of any and all states upon their own will at any time?**

“Ron is also completely wrong about there being no provision for secession in the original constitutional arrangement. Granted, the constitution does not EXPRESSLY mention secession; however, the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment casts a wide net concerning all those un-enumerated rights retained by the People.

## **Larry”**

Ron Avery responds:

The 9<sup>th</sup> Amendment says: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” And the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment is just a continuation of the same thought: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” I have said in the first discussion that these two amendments cover a lot of things but not secession as I will show more completely.

The whole intent of the Constitution was to; “form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.” It is no secret that the Articles of Confederation were abandoned because they did not provide for a strong union and in fact it was so weak that it was feared many times that the revolution would not be won as many States were delinquent in their payments to support the war. The founders felt like if they had to defend the land again that they could very easily lose with nothing but the Articles to sustain their efforts.

And just what is a “perfect union?” It certainly is not a “come and go as you will” affair. A perfect union is one that binds the States together under the joint agreement that as long as the union government is in conformity with the written provisions and restrictions of the Constitution, no State had the right to get up and leave of its own will and upon its own “unilateral decision.”

Also note however, that the Constitution is replete with language that implies and presumes that if any of the restrictions and provisions are changed in form or made of none effect without an amendment that the union is no longer in existence and all are released from any obligations to support, defend or conform to the Constitution and the union may be resisted with force if necessary. There is no requirement in the Constitution to bring a law suit to make any branch of government or combination thereof conform to the Constitution if their acts have changed the form of the Constitution. And there is no provision making it necessary for States to seek secession upon dissolution.

Mere violations of the law by officers of government do not constitute a change in form and those breaches must be corrected and reparations obtained by application to the Courts. But there is no provision or requirement to seek restoration of the Constitution when it is dissolved by changes in form as the Supreme Court is stripped of its authority right along with the other two branches of government at the instant the form is altered, without permission by amendment, as required. At that point no State is part of the union as it is dissolved. This is another great advantage of dissolution over secession. Secession leaves states in the union to be harnessed against the leaving States. But dissolution recognizes no lawful union containing any State and any State that decides to stay in a dissolved union is evil and tyrannical to the bone marrow.

### **4. Are Unwritten Terms of Joining the Union a Binding Part of the U.S. Constitution?**

“Add to this that fact that the u.s. constitution is, in fact, a treaty between distinct, independent, and sovereign nations (even though we use the term States). An accepted maxim of international treaty law is that if any party enters with stated conditions, then those conditions apply to all the parties and become a part of the treaty proper. Virginia, New York, and Rhode Island all entered the ‘union’ upon the condition that they could recall their delegated powers, i.e. secede, if they were perverted to their injury or oppression. How could it be plainer?”

Respectfully,

**Larry”**

Ron Avery responds:

The nature of all contracts is that all the terms must be written into the contract itself. There is no special provision for certain States of the union in the US Constitution. Treaties would also hold to these principles that all terms be written into the treaty itself rather than being contained in some other document or trusted in the minds of men. It matters not what Virginia, New York, or Rhode Island thought about the terms of their agreement to the US Constitution at the time of their entering the union. All that matters is what are the terms that are written in the said constitution. And since there is no provision for the coming and going of States at their own will while the terms of the constitution are complied with by the union government, we can soundly conclude that it was the intent of the founders and the States that joined it that all States were to remain in the union unless the union government changed its form without permission by amendment as provided and required. The language of the US Constitution implies clearly that the union is to remain intact unless there is a change in its form without the permission of the people by the means prescribed.

**5. Is Secession any more Practical or More Applicable to the “Real World” than Dissolution?**

“There are a number of meritorious ways to argue our peculiar situation and how it can or should be remedied. I’m only suggesting that we meet the situation as it is, in its practical, real world state and deal with it accordingly.

Respectfully,

**Larry”**

Ron Avery responds:

Mr. Larry preceded his above suggestion of meeting tyranny with secession, rather than dissolution, by claiming that an unlawful defacto government that is treated as lawful by foreign governments demands that we treat the unlawful defacto government as lawful de jure government. The logic of that argument is not persuasive. Why would we allow the perverted intentions of foreign governments force us into a weak, immoral and unsound foundation for our lawful right to form a lawful government where there is none and where our properties are being plundered by those who have no authority of any kind?

Mr. Larry has suggested that just because the condition of dissolution makes more sense and may be more meritorious, we must approach the present situation in recognition of something that does not exist and is detrimental to our own cause. He actually is making a contradictory argument by maintaining that the “practical, real world” demands an impractical unreal response merely because other foreign wicked nations deal with the dissolved federal government.

The fact is that the dissolved federal government in Washington is merely a part of the more global unlawful dissolved governments of Europe and that they are all operating together to deceive the people of their own respective governments. It is time we expose the truth to the people of the whole world that the American people are knowledgeable of this wicked influence and that we will not permit these unlawful foreign interest to destroy the American people and ask that other people of the world do the same in their nations.

But one thing is for sure, we should never let our unlawful conquerors and their foreign friends and allies determine our moral foundation in our pursuit of lawful government. This is also a distinct advantage dissolution has over any other course related to foreign entities. It makes more sense to foreign interests struggling for freedom not to assist unlawful government in America rather than choosing sides such as the “union” or the “secessionists.”

## **6. Should we Concern Ourselves with Alternative Sub-Cultures and Survival Enclaves at this Time?**

**“Larry,**

As a structural engineer, it may do us some good to discuss the foundations we must lay in order to build an "Alternative Society".

ONE concept (and not exclusive), is to create an Order or a Club, a social club along the lines of the Freemasons or the Knights of Columbus, but without the deep, dark (and sometimes pagan) doctrines. There might even be levels of membership. Members would place certain items under the umbrella of some organization. (The first debate is whether or not to set it up as a tax-exempt organization.) It could be a "Brotherhood" or a Social Club. But it would offer members certain protections, including some legal insurance - the club could hire sympathetic attorneys on retainer and for a discount, for example, to defend all of us from encroachment by the County, the State, or the Federales.

In any event, suppose we create a Trust, or better yet, fifty trusts, which could own property, and would lease it back to the first owners. Those with land which has no encumbrance of liens is easily moved under this umbrella. The same could be done with automobiles. When the Trust owns ten or a hundred homes, or a hundred automobiles, I think it might be able to negotiate some killer deals on insurance. And I can lease my vehicle from the Trust for a monthly fee that will include: (a) insurance; (b) taxes; (c) loans, if necessary.

IF we were to deal in silver and gold, instead of paper money, is there any law against that, if we all sign the agreement? Contract law.

We are probably all familiar with brotherhoods which take care of one another instead of normal insurance. If we held this to be a religious tenet (such as the Amish do), that we depend on God and One Another, rather than the government, then this has potential as well.

Indeed, a Religious Order, with some minimum doctrines will appeal to a lot of people. We'll not resolve the split of the Reformation, but we could have more than one religious order, one that appeals to you and another to me, and we can cooperate on things of a financial question. Religion gets a lot of privileges (rights?) under the current system that none of us like. Are we being cowards and hypocrites to avail ourselves of those privileges, or are we being "gentle as doves, wise as serpents"?

There are certain things I sure do want to work toward in this country, and chief among them is the restoration of private property, where ZERO taxes can be levied against private property. This is an area where almost every property owner agrees. Do we work for legislation at the state level to affect such changes, or do we just become vagabonds? (Or do we place our property under the religious and thus tax-exempt control of a religious order?)

**Doug”**

Ron Avery responds:

Doug brings up good ideas regarding trusts, clubs, churches, brotherhoods, corporations, insurance, currency, contracts etc. and how they may be used to protect people and their property. I believe that these ideas should be discussed as a group at a group meeting at some location. I certainly agree with him on property taxes. Personally I think property taxes should be resisted at the state and local level where they are most understood. We already know that the courts are unlawfully closed to these suits that would correct the legislature and stop them from using property taxes to support Texas public education in violation of Article 8 Section 1-e. But that is the very problem with dissolution it changes and protects the new unlawful form of government to the damage of the property of the people. Property tax in Texas is not a legislative matter but one of law and the courts are now closed. Why do we presume the Legislature to be any more

open than the Judiciary? Once again, this proves that all efforts are wasted on dissolved governments to reform them from the inside.

I don't agree with Doug that most people are opposed to them. Most people are too ignorant to know that they should not be paying property taxes. Many people live off the property of others and fear that they will perish without plundering other people's property even if they have to pay these unlawful taxes themselves.

Even though I believe that plans should be made for the protection of groups of people in some kind of group effort while living under abject tyranny as we do presently, I do not believe that this effort should distract us from the ultimate goal of obtaining liberty and the lawful protection of our property by a new lawful government instead of a dissolved unlawful government. Dissolved unlawful government is not by accident and it is driven by plans not yet achieved and no plan we make will be sufficient under the control of the dissolved unlawful government or tyranny. The ability of tyrants to change, alter, repeal or nullify the few laws that still somewhat protects our property threatens everything we have. The unrelenting progression of tyranny we are presently under demands that our ultimate goal become and remain the creation of new lawful government that will, in fact, protect our property from the encroachment of dissolved unlawful government until it is achieved.

## **7. Is a Covenant Established by Fraud Binding Upon All Parties?**

***“Doug,***

You are correct that it was Ron's position.

One reason that I asked the question was referenced in Larry's response. This may not be popular, but the South was not forced into the current Constitution of 1787. In fact the Southern States in some very critical votes swung the direction towards a national government (May 30, June 6, June 19, etc). On both May 30 and June 19 the Southern States could have replaced the working national government model with a report that would have recommended amendments to the Articles of Confederation, retaining a federated form of government. Instead they voted to continue using a national government as the working model.

Yes the framers (they were not our Founding Fathers as some call them) or delegates to the convention practiced deception (by establishing secret proceedings) and publishing misleading information in the Federalist Papers. Probably very few, if any, of the delegates envisioned what we have Washington City today, but they insisted in *“as well as of avoiding too great an agency of the State Governments in the General one. (Madison – June 6).*

However, that raises a question. Is a covenant established by fraud binding? Before answering that it is not, study the covenant that Joshua made with the Gibeonites (Joshua 9:14-15) and what happened when it was violated (2 Samuel 21:1-3).

We are facing perilous times, but need to be careful that we look to God not man to determine the proper course to follow. Many of the things going on today that we find, at best, are simply a national government doing what national governments always do – consolidation.

**Tom Johnson”**

Ron Avery responds:

Now the question before us is not as minor as one might first think. Regardless of how much people think about this issue, most people think that all government, no matter how corrupt and wicked and regardless of how wicked its birth, is put there and maintained by God and anyone that resists the sword of any government, no matter how unlawful, is fighting against God and brings damnation upon themselves. They also will quote Romans 13 as their justification.

I will not labor the interpretation of Romans 13 but will simply say that the modern “fallen away” church is incorrect. Romans 13 has been properly interpreted almost 400 years ago by our



forefathers, Reverend Samuel Rutherford in his book, *Lex Rex* of 1644 for which he was summoned for treason and his books ordered to be burned in London, and Algernon Sidney in his book, *Discourses of Government* of 1684 for which he was beheaded by Charles the II.

The proper interpretation of Romans 13 is that God has ordained lawful government for the good of the people to reward good and punish evil. When the magistrate or government overturns the God ordained purpose of lawful government to punish good and reward evil this ordination of God is lost and its Godly protection lifted and men may morally and rightfully resist it, even with force.

The question that Mr. Crane presents is very similar. And he uses a different set of scriptures to justify what he claims may be of serious concern. He suggests that we look to God rather than man to determine the proper course to follow. I would also submit that this novel approach is no guarantee against peril. Even though God will preserve the correct action forever and preserve one's soul forever, He may not prevent harm to those who follow the correct path.

The summary of the scriptures he sets forth is that Joshua was tricked by the Gibeonites to make a league with them to spare their lives against what God had told the Israelites to do to those in their path to the "promised land," namely kill them all. The trick was that the Gibeonites pretended they were not in their path and in the "promised land" but a great distance from their destiny. Joshua made the all the princes of Israel swear to God that they would spare the Gibeonites. When Joshua learned of the trick and found them living in the "promise land" he made the Gibeonites slaves rather than kill them because of the oath. Many years later King Saul began to kill the Gibeonites to win favor in Israel and Judah. Still later, under King David, there came a severe three year drought and David asked God for the reason and God replied it was because of Saul killing the Gibeonites and David sought to square things with the Gibeonites because of Saul's violation of the oath to spare them. The Gibeonites asked for seven sons of Saul to be killed and David agreed except for the Son of Jonathan because of his own oath. The result was the return of rain and the continuation of the oath to spare the Gibeonites.

How is our present condition anything like that in these scriptures? Did we trick the North in order to save our lives from God ordained death wherein we have been made slaves upon the discovery of our trick with no hope of ever regaining our liberty? When did God tell the Union to kill all the Southerners? Who among us or our forefathers in the North or the South have made an oath with the Lord God Almighty to do anything in regard to civil society? If you could find such a person would their oath be binding upon the rest of us? Is the North, the Union or the South a theocracy where our rulers are selected by God and our orders come directly from God by those God selects for our well being and deliverance from slavery? Are we even waiting for such a thing and do we have a reason to suspect such a thing is coming our way? Are not these scriptures related to a past condition that no longer exists anywhere in the world under a past contract between man and God?

What can be learned from these scriptures? The main lesson for us under a different contract between God and man, namely, equality of all under the kingship of Christ Jesus is that we should always do as we say. If we make an oath or a promise to God or man we should keep it. This brings us right back to our present condition, namely, that of a social contract that has not been kept by those that must keep it in order to remain in authority and under the ordination of God for the reward of good and punishment of evil.

I have met many people who are more comfortable knowing they live in slavery if they can convince themselves that it is due to the will of God rather than their lack of concern, will, knowledge and courage. I think they find slavery tolerable if they feel they will be rewarded and protected by doing God's work and will suffering as "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for their conquerors. It also provides the advantage of being able to dismiss the cries of those who want freedom and are really suffering worse then them from the inability to cope with the rigors of not owning property and gradually losing everything their forefathers have provided for them

under an ever increasing tyranny. The foregoing is not directed at Mr. Crane but at many I have met in churches and elsewhere.

How many of you want to return to the Old Testament? How harsh and difficult those times were! What has happened since then on planet earth? Jesus Christ has come and brought peace and goodwill towards all people. There are no more special chosen people that have a God given command to kill everyone in their path and to kill all others who inhabit their land. We were all sinners and all the sinners have been forgiven and those that accept this forgiveness have been made Kings and Priests of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. The only way Kings and Priests make lawful governments in this age is by agreement or consent among the equal forgiven sinners. The present unlawful government claims that we all made an agreement in 1789. And we should go along with that assertion and then show the incontrovertible evidence that those in their official capacity have changed its form without permission of the Kings and Priests by the required amendments thereby dissolving the agreement leaving us free to seek lawful government for the protection of our properties and the reward of good and punishment of evil.

### **8. Which came First; the State of Nature or Government, and Just How does the “Sin Nature of Man” Apply to Government and Anarchy?**

#### ***“Dear Harry Carter,***

How we all agree, I'm sure, that zero government would be like Paradise, except for one little problem, and that is the sin nature of man. When anarchy looks like paradise, or Utopia, it will be spoiled in short order by some guy who thinks he can take what is yours or mine, without repercussion. And then anarchy grows to look like the Libertine French Revolution. And then we all beg for martial law, or we flee for our very lives.

As much as I hate to admit it, Ron Avery is right. (Even a blind hog finds an acorn now and then.) More to the point, I spent some hours reading the link he provided from John Locke's Second Treatise on Civil Government, and could not find a word with which I could disagree. And Locke could be writing specifically about our situation today as he describes the problems of dealing with tyranny.

**Doug**

***Doug,***

A slight correction: "it will be spoiled in short order by some guy who thinks he can take what is yours or mine, without repercussion" by forming a government!

**Harry Carter”**

Ron Avery responds:

One minute I am likened unto St Paul, (wow) the next minute to a “blind hog.” So much for pride, now the fall into the mire.

This dialog between Doug and Harry Carter is typical among those who want to form a new government for the protection of their properties against a dissolved tyrannical government that is harming our properties consisting of life, liberty and our possessions and those who want no government (anarchists) for the same reason. The problem is that both sides use the “sin nature of man” as a justification for their desire.

But this can be resolved as to who can use the “sin nature of man” more appropriately. We do this merely by asking; “which came first, government, or the state of nature?” We know that government came much later than the state of nature. People left the state of nature to form governments to protect their property from those that could over power them. This overpowering of them was the result of the “sin nature of man.” Now this is not to say that the “sin nature of

man” does not enter men in government and that governments are somehow incorruptible once formed. But we know that lawful governments can only be formed for the purpose of rewarding good and punishing evil. The taking of property rightfully belonging to another is evil. Therefore a lawful government must protect the property rightfully belonging to each and every citizen from their neighbors, foreigners and their own government.

Now since we know that mankind first formed government to protect their property from the sin nature of man they did it to protect themselves from other men and groups of bandits. Now it would be absurd to make the assertion that since men form government to protect their properties from other stronger men and groups of thieves in the state of nature without lawful government that we should return to the state of nature where these stronger men and bandits roam free to harm the properties because the sin nature of man enters those in government to corrupt its lawful purpose.

Therefore if we first formed lawful government for our protection from the sin nature of man in the state of nature it is absurd to argue our return to the state of nature because the sin nature of man corrupts lawful government over time. It should be clear also that government, even imperfect government, can protect the property of the people for a good period of time before it is dissolved by changes in form harming the property of the people to the necessity of forming a new lawful government for the protection of their property of which God cannot be opposed.

If our options be only the creation of lawful government or the institution of and maintenance of anarchy by some unknown means that does not create a government by definition then we cannot use the sin nature of man as the foundation and justification for anarchy as the peaceful state of nature is what anarchists describe as their goal. We left the peaceful state of nature by the introduction of the sin nature of man to create lawful government and we cannot return to the state of nature for the same reason.

Sincerely,

Ronald F. Avery

July 15, 2012