

**A Rebuttal of  
James Redford's treatise entitled  
"Jesus is an Anarchist"  
by  
Ronald F. Avery  
author of  
*Alien Physics – the Physical Operation Performed Upon the Cosmos  
and  
Lawful Government in the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth***

**August 28, 2013**



**A Rebuttal of  
James Redford’s treatise entitled  
“Jesus is an Anarchist”**

**by  
Ronald F. Avery  
author of**

*Alien Physics – the Physical Operation Performed Upon the Cosmos<sup>1</sup>  
and*

*Lawful Government in the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth<sup>2</sup>*

**August 28, 2013**

**Table of Contents:**

Table of Contents:.....	1
Introduction: .....	2
1. Jesus’ Very Life Began in an Act of Defiance to Government – and Would Later End in Defiance to Government.....	4
2. The Golden Rule Unavoidably Results in Anarchism .....	7
3. Jesus does not respect the Person of Men.....	12
4. Jesus on Taxes: Nothing is (Rightly) Caesar’s!.....	12
5. Tax Collection Is a Sin!.....	13
6. On Paul, Romans 13 and Titus 3:1 .....	14
7. On Peter and 1 Peter 2:13-18.....	19
8. The Ruler and God of this World and Age which All Mortal Governments Worship is Satan (a.k.a. Lucifer)....	20
9. Jesus defended the Right to Freely Contract and Private Property Rights.....	22
10. Greatness is in Serving .....	23
11. Slaves Obey Your Masters .....	24
12. Jesus on the Collection of Interest (i.e., Usury).....	24
13. The Cleansing of the Temple: Righteous Libertarian Vigilantism .....	24
14. Jesus on the War on Drugs (and All Forms of Prohibition).....	24
15. Woe to Lawyers! .....	25
16. Jesus on Government Courts: Avoid Them!.....	26
17. Jesus on the Rich.....	28
18. Jesus engaged in Conspicuous Consumption when He could have Provided for the Poor Instead.....	29
19. Jesus has called us to Liberty – Yet Those who Pay Taxes are not free!.....	30
20. Jesus will Overthrow All the Governments of the World and Punish All the Rulers in the Time of His Judgment (i.e., His Second Coming) .....	32
21. God’s People are to be Volunteers and Self-rulers in the Kingdom of Christ .....	35
22. Closing Remarks .....	38
22.1. Christ follows the Libertarian Non-Aggression Principle;.....	38
22.2. All government even the concept of government is evil;.....	39
22.3. To destroy government hastens the return of Christ; .....	40
22.4. Christian Anarchy prevents deception as to the true identity of the real savior; .....	41
22.5. Christian Anarchy prevents bad laws.....	42
Six Reasons Anarchy is not a Christian Doctrine: .....	43

---

<sup>1</sup> A book comparing Christian Cosmology to Scientific Cosmology Available at [www.AlienPhysics.com](http://www.AlienPhysics.com)

<sup>2</sup> *Lawful Government* is a soon to be published book which will be available at [www.LawfulGovernment.com](http://www.LawfulGovernment.com).

## Introduction:

I was asked to comment on a 61 page treatise on the subject of Christ being an anarchist.<sup>3</sup> James Redford made a valiant effort to prove that Christ was an anarchist and we can count his work as a blessing to us all, even if shown to be compelling incorrect. There are two new major movements in America at this time. The more elderly seem attracted to *secession* while the young people are more taken with the so-called “anarchist, libertarian, anarcho-capitalist, Austrian economist, voluntarist” movement prevalent on college campuses. That is not to say that there are not both age groups in both movements.

Both movements of anarchy and secession are suicidal when reduced to their fundamental premise. Secessionist want to pretend that dissolved governments need to be petitioned and left in place but separated and somehow these separated tyrannical entities will then begin to act like lawful governments for some unknown reason and protect the property of each individual that they have been ravaging with impunity.

The anarchists view all government, since the dawn of man to the present day, as an evil, satanic tool of the devil created for the sole purpose of destroying the people and taking or destroying their property. Anarchists want to educate the people about this evil. Anarchists believe if the people are awakened to the moral and theological truth that all government is evil that individuals will be able to resist local, national, international and global organized and mechanized tyranny by themselves without ever agreeing with another human being as to how they are going to successfully achieve the perfect state anarchy. Anarchy to them is the perfect state of nature absent of both evil government, of any kind, and all taxes of every sort. They envision a world where necessities like roads are built, not by taxation and contractors, but by volunteer labor and gifts. One day of working asphaltic concrete would likely expand the vision of most voluntarists. A vision of road erosion and natural reclamation is more realistic in a world under anarchy. Nevertheless, let us determine if Jesus Christ was an anarchist and that somehow he and his Father have commanded all people to become anarchists to please Him and fulfill their will for us.

Because I know that anarchist will demand a strict review of all scripture that Redford used to support his thesis I have chosen to review and address each and every topic or chapter as he presented them and take every passage of scripture he used. A summary of the main points Redford attempted to prove in his treatise showing that Christ was an anarchist and that he calls us all to become anarchists are as follows:

1. Christ is an anarchist;
2. The mission of Christ was to call us to liberty;
3. Liberty consists of no government and no taxes;
4. Government is, always has been, and always will be the greatest evil on earth and a tool of the devil alone;
5. Christians can hasten the return of Christ by becoming anarchists now and instituting anarchy world wide;
6. Christians are in danger of believing the “strong delusion” warned of in 2 Thessalonians 2:11 because they will follow the antichrist who will lead a global government rather than Christ Jesus

---

<sup>3</sup> James Redford, *Jesus is an Anarchist, A Free Market, Libertarian Anarchist, This is – Otherwise what is called an Anarcho-Capitalist* (<http://archive.org/download/JesusIsAnAnarchist/Redford-Jesus-Is-an-Anarchist.pdf> is the pdf version used in this rebuttal) (<http://www.anti-state.com/redford/redford4.html> is the html version at anti-state.com) PDF was first published on anti-state.com on 12/19/2001 and updated on June 1, 2006. Email James: [vonchloride@yahoo.com](mailto:vonchloride@yahoo.com)

The first eleven chapters and chapters 19 through 21 of Redford's treatise focus on the scripture that to him proves Christ was an anarchist. Chapters 12 through 18 focus on issues he thinks prove his other claims that Christ was not only an anarchist but a libertarian, free-market anarchist. Redford provided us with an introduction and 22 chapters and an appendix containing articles that he thought everyone should be familiar with. Two were by Murray Rothbard the famous economist of the "Austrian school," entitled *Anatomy of the State* and *Defense of the Free Market*. The other two articles were by professor Hans-Hermann Hoppe entitled *The Private Production of Defense* and *Fallacies of the Public Goods Theory and the Production of Security*. James Redford also provided us with his own biography.

"Born in Austin, Texas and raised in the Leander, Texas hill country, the nativeborn Augustinian, James Redford, is a born again Christian who was converted from atheism by a direct revelation from Jesus Christ. He is a scientific rationalist who considers that the Omega Point (i.e., the physicists' technical term for God) is an unavoidable result of the known laws of physics."

We feel the intensity of what James Redford believes about Christ being an anarchist and how important he thinks it is that we also see Christ Jesus as an anarchist even more than the Son of God, Creator of Heaven and Earth and the Kingdom of Heaven (or God) on Earth in his introduction:

"The above title may seem like strong words, for surely that can't be correct? Jesus an anarchist? One must be joking, right?"

But you read correctly, and I will demonstrate exactly that. At this point you may be incredulous, but I assure you that I am quite serious. If you are a Christian and find the above title at all hard to believe then you of all people owe it to yourself to find out what the basis of this charge is, for if the above comes as news to you then you still have much to learn about Jesus and about the most vitally important struggle which has plagued mankind since the dawn of history: mankind's continuing struggle between freedom and slavery, between value producers and the violent parasitical elite, between peace and war, between truth and deception."<sup>4</sup>

Redford in the introduction also provides us with the anarchists belief that all governments can be abolished and the perfect state of anarchy brought about by education of at least 10% of the people:

"All governments can only exist because the majority – in one form or another – accept them as at least being inevitable. They believe in the deception that even though government may be evil that it is nevertheless a necessary evil, and therefore cannot conceive of a better alternative. But if such were true then Jesus Christ's whole message is a fallacy. But such is not the truth, there is an alternative: liberty. And I will show that Jesus has called us to liberty, and that liberty and Christ's message are incompatible with government.

"If just one-tenth of the population strongly believed that government was itself the greatest moral evil and that there was a better alternative it would be enough to turn the tide. Since most people are followers and uncritically accept the reigning political opinions, those who do not accept the status quo and who are able to form and articulate a critical alternative will come to be the intellectual leaders by default when the popular regime suffers a crisis and people begin to look for alternatives."<sup>5</sup>

Redford believes that the only reason that anarchy has not come to rule over the last 3000 years is because no one has articulated a viable alternative to government:

"If the history of governments teach us anything it is that such crisis is a regular occurrence, for governments by their nature tend toward instability. If it be asked Why then do we still have

---

<sup>4</sup> Redford, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Redford, p. 2.

government?, it is here answered that it is because no viable alternative to government has been articulated by a critical mass at such a crisis, in that most people throughout history have accepted the deception that government is a necessary evil and could not conceive a better alternative.

Now I will articulate that better alternative, the one that Christ commanded us. I will show that Jesus and His message are necessarily anarchistic.”<sup>6</sup>

The true answer to his question is more simply observed by the common man. Contrary to Redford’s assertion, government by its very nature is very stable. In fact, it remains stable even when it is unlawful, dissolved and without authority or has become abject tyranny. And contrary to Redford’s thesis, anarchy by its very definition, cannot come into existence but by default and cannot be made to endure because that which would be required to sustain it would by definition remove it. Once anarchy would become an agreed upon doctrine or system among a significant number of people, even his 10%, it would become a government thereby replacing anarchy with some agreed to form of government, i.e., the government of anarchy, which is absurd. Redford complies with one of the most pronounced characteristics of all anarchist, namely, they must alter the meanings of all words in order to develop their system of anarchy. Anarchists attempt to institute a contradiction, namely, the establishment of the want of establishment. Now that Redford has set out his purpose and job to articulate this long awaited viable alternative to satanic government he has provided us with 22 chapters to prove that Christ was an anarchist and that Christ provided us with the template to obtain liberty:

## **1. Jesus’ Very Life Began in an Act of Defiance to Government – and Would Later End in Defiance to Government**

Redford points out what all Christians know, namely, that King Herod attempted to kill Christ when he was a new born baby and that Christ was crucified at the order of Pontius Pilot. Redford says that it is government which was the main antithesis or nemesis of Christ Jesus and all the early church leaders knew this and preached this:

“The story of Jesus’s life can in part be summed up as suffering through this unjust Satanic world system for having preached the Truth, with government being chief among the culprits of this Satanic world system. All one has to do is review the life story of Jesus to plainly see that government—far from being instituted by God—is and has been a demonic tool of Satan used to oppress the righteous. And I will demonstrate that Jesus and the early Church leaders—as recorded the Bible—knew this to be the case and preached the same. The instrument which Satan used in an attempt to snuff-out that Truth in an act of deicide was government—from the beginning of Jesus’s life to the very end, it was government which sought to exterminate this most dangerous threat of all to its power.”<sup>7</sup>

It is no doubt that under the form of government in place at the time in Jerusalem as an occupied possession of Rome and under a Roman Procurator, kings like Herod were given power to operate and help control the indigenous people. When King Herod heard of the possibility of a new king being born he saw not only a threat to his power but to the continued existence of the Kingdom of Herod with a challenge to Caesar in Rome leading to the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ Jesus also was not angry at Pontius Pilot nor did he even curse him or the institution that Pilot represented and in fact told Pilot that Pilot had no power over him unless it be given to him from above and that the one who turned Jesus over to Pilot had the greater sin:

---

<sup>6</sup> Redford, p. 2-3.

<sup>7</sup> Redford, p. 5.

“Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.” (John 19:11)

Christ was acknowledging a Holy paradox related to the power of Pilot: first, that Pilot had no eternal power over Jesus; Second that Pilot was in fact given power over Christ to have him crucified and this power was given to him by God above and Christ could not stop it if he was to follow what God had commanded him. The enemy of Christ was not the government in Rome or Jerusalem. The enemy of Christ was Satan in all of us. It was, in fact, Judas and the High Priests of the Sanhedrin that turned Christ over to Pilot. Christ had come to replace Old Testament Judaism with New Testament Christianity and to create the Kingdom of Heaven or God on Earth where all would have access to the Kingdom of Heaven while they yet walked the earth. Those who would come to inhabit the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth would make the new governments on earth in recognition of what Christ had done. Creating lawful governments for the protection of property would be the office of Christians who had been left in charge of the Kingdom while Christ went on a long trip:

“Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country:

And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it.

And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another.

Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise.

But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.

But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance.

And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him.

When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?

They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.” (Matthew 21:33-41)

“For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch.” (Mark 13:34)

And for what reason would Christ give us the “rod of iron” if not to destroy or bring down nations that oppress God’s people and reject the will of God to save all mankind. And for what reason would he make us pillars in the kingdom if there be not a structure to hold up with a column? If we cannot raise-up nations to protect the people of God and do the will of God in what structure are we to become pillars? God raises-up governments and brings governments down and so does his people. Christ did what he saw the Father do. And we do what Christ did:

“And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations:

And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.” (Revelation 2:26-27)

“Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name.” (Revelation 3:12)

“That they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and

seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will.” (Daniel 4:25)

“Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.” (John 5:19)

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.” (John 14:12)

Christ is bringing-down and raising-up nations via his saints on earth. And this was understood by Scottish Presbyterians and English Calvinists:

“The first I conceive is clear, 1st, Because all living creatures have radically in them a power of self-preservation, to defend themselves from violence, — as we see lions have paws, some beasts have horns, some claws, — men being reasonable creatures, united in society, must have power in a more reasonable and honourable way to put this power of warding off violence in the hands of one or more rulers, to defend themselves by magistrates.”<sup>8</sup>

“When he hath proved that God is the immediate author of sovereignty, what then? Shall it follow that the sovereign *in concreto* may not be resisted, and that he is above all law, and that there is no armour against his violence but prayers and tears? Because God is the immediate author of the pastor and of the apostle's office, does it therefore follow that it is unlawful to resist a pastor though he turn robber? If so, then the pastor is above all the king's laws. This is the Jesuit and all made, and there is no armour against the robbing prelate but prayer and tears.

“He saith in his title, that "the king is no creature of the people's making." If he mean the king in the abstract, that is, the royal dignity, whom speaketh he against? Not against us, but against his own father, Bellarmine, who saith, that "sovereignty hath no warrant by any divine law." If he mean that the man who is king is not created and elected king by the people, he contradicteth himself and all the court doctors”<sup>9</sup>

“Sec. 222. The reason why men enter into society, is the preservation of their property; and the end why they chuse and authorize a legislative, is, that there may be laws made, and rules set, as guards and fences to the properties of all the members of the society, to limit the power, and moderate the dominion, of every part and member of the society: for since it can never be supposed to be the will of the society, that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure, by entering into society, and for which the people submitted themselves to legislators of their own making; whenever the legislators endeavour to take away, and destroy the property of the people, or to reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they put themselves into a state of war with the people, who are thereupon absolved from any farther obedience, and are left to the common refuge, which God hath provided for all men, against force and violence. Whensoever therefore the legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society; and either by ambition, fear, folly or corruption, endeavour to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people; by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and, by the establishment of a new legislative, (such as they shall think fit) provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Rev. Samuel Rutherford *Lex Rex* (Crown Rights Book Company, P.O. Box 386 Dahlonega, Georgia 30533, 2004) Question 4, p.6.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. Samuel Rutherford, Question 5, p.10.

<sup>10</sup> John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* ed: Peter Laslett (Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought Cambridge University Press 40 West 20<sup>th</sup> Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA) 412-413, Sec. 222 (<http://www.constitution.org/jl/2ndtr19.htm>)



The Scottish Reverend in the above quotes show that men, as opposed to animals, are gregarious by nature and rational thinkers who do not function as lower animals to defend themselves alone by their own natural physical devices but join into societies to protect their property by government and that this is ordained of God. Rutherford's book *Lex Rex* cost him his life but it also united the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland to resist the Catholic monarchs and give rights and protections to protestant Christians.

Locke coming from the Calvinist tradition showed that governments continually move from lawful to unlawful and then new governments are formed, with new guards and fences to defend against new tricks used by Satan to pervert lawful government in order to harm man and take property from them.

## 2. The Golden Rule Unavoidably Results in Anarchism

Redford says that because we should treat people the way we would like to be treated that all government must be abolished because all governments must of necessity violate the Golden Rule:

“The reason this would necessarily have to be the case is because it is impossible for any actual government to actually abide by the Golden Rule even in theory, let alone in practice. All governments must of necessity violate the Golden Rule, otherwise they would not be governments but would be something else instead.”

Redford is right of course if you accept his premise; that all government is coercive against your property rights. This is not true, but if you accept that then certainly it follows that all governments violate the Golden Rule. Redford tells us what he and all other anarchist think government is and is not:

“To understand why this is unalterably true, one must first have a clear and precise understanding of just what a “government” is and just what it is not, i.e., the distinguishing characteristics of government which differentiates it from all other things that are not governments.

When the word is used in the sense above, government (i.e., a state) is that organization in society which attempts to maintain, and is generally successful at maintaining, a coercive regional monopoly over ultimate control of the law (i.e., on the courts and police, etc.)—this is a feature of all governments; as well, historically speaking it has always been the case that it is the only organization in society that legally obtains its revenue not by voluntary contribution or payment for contracted services rendered but by coercion.”

Nothing could be further from the truth. Government, or a state, is the agreement between those that live in it as to what the law will be and how and by whom it will be enforced upon all that live in its territory or jurisdiction. Government is not an “organization in society,” it is the instrument that creates the society and lays down the rules of the society for all to comply with. Everything else is in the society and under the government that establishes it. A government and formal society is created by a constitution which establishes the law which governs both the citizens and the government. Government, even a monarchy, is created for the people and for their benefit and protection. The law is the delegated authority of people limited to the protection of all their property with force if necessary:

“Sec. 123. IF man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to no body, why will he part with his freedom? why will he give up this empire, and subject himself to the dominion and controul of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others: for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free,

is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates, which I call by the general name, property.

“Sec. 124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting.”<sup>11</sup>

“But simply and absolutely the people is above, and more excellent, than the king, and the **king in dignity inferior to the people**; and that upon these reasons: — “Arg. 1. — **Because he is the mean ordained for the people**, as for the end, that he may save them, (2 Sam. xix 9;) a public shepherd to feed them, (Psal. lxxviii. 70-73;) the captain and leader of the Lord's inheritance to defend them, (1 Sam. x. 1;) **the minister of God for their good**. (Rom. xiii. 4.)”<sup>12</sup>

“The people in power are superior to the king, because every efficient and constituent cause is more excellent than the effect. Every mean is inferior in power to the end; (*So Jun. Brutus, q. 31. Bucher l. 1. c. 16. Author Lib. de offic. Magistr. q. 6. Henænius disp. 2, n. 6. Joan Roffensis Epist. de potest. pap. l. 2, c. 5. Spalato de Repu. Ecclesiast. l. 6, c. 2, n. 3:*) but **the people is the efficient and constituent cause, the king is the effect**; the people is the end; both intended of God to save the people, to be a healer and a physician to them (Isa. iii. 7); and the people appoint and create the king out of their indigence, to preserve themselves from mutual violence.”<sup>13</sup>

“What, then, is law? It is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense. Each of us has a natural right—from God—to defend his person, his liberty, and his property.

These are the three basic requirements of life, and the preservation of any one of them is completely dependent upon the preservation of the other two. For what are our faculties but the extension of our individuality? And what is property but an extension of our faculties?

If every person has the right to defend—even by force—his person, his liberty, and his property, then it follows that a group of men have the right to organize and support a common force to protect these rights constantly. Thus the principle of collective right—its reason for existing, its lawfulness—is based on individual right. And the common force that protects this collective right cannot logically have any other purpose or any other mission than that for which it acts as a substitute. Thus, since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of another individual, then the common force—for the same reason—cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

Such a perversion of force would be, in both cases, contrary to our premise. Force has been given to us to defend our own individual rights. Who will dare to say that force has been given to us to destroy the equal rights of our brothers? Since no individual acting separately can lawfully use force to destroy the rights of others, does it not logically follow that the same principle also applies to the common force that is nothing more than the organized combination of the individual forces?

If this is true, then nothing can be more evident than this: The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitution of a common force for individual forces. And this common force is to do only what the individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect persons, liberties, and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all.”<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* ed: Peter Laslett, p.p. 350-351.

Online: <http://www.constitution.org/jl/2ndtr09.htm>

<sup>12</sup> Rev. Samuel Rutherford *Lex Rex* Question 19, p.78.

<sup>13</sup> Rev. Samuel Rutherford *Lex Rex* Question 19, p.80.

<sup>14</sup> Frederick Bastiat *The Law* (The foundation For Economic Education) p. 2-3

Online: [http://www.constitution.org/cmt/bastiat/the\\_law.html](http://www.constitution.org/cmt/bastiat/the_law.html)

We see then that a lawful government is based upon the law as described by Bastiat above. Without government there is no universal law that can be enforced equally and therefore chaos ensues. The anarchists in their haste to rid themselves of tyranny are at the same time trying to establish a system that abolishes the prevention of tyranny. Which is worse; he that corrupts and perverts lawful government resulting in harm to our property and tyranny or he that prevents the formation of lawful government to stop harm to property and tyranny? The answer to unlawful government and tyranny is lawful government designed to punish harm done to property of the individual.

All anarchists, including Redford, are possessed with the idea that there is no need for a government or society based upon law for the protection of the property of each individual in it. Anarchist believe that there is no need for an all encompassing legislature, judiciary and executive to order society but rather all issues among men can be resolved by commerce or a free market. Anarchist think that because the government has a judiciary that it is a monopoly on force and is coercive and harmful to our property and therefore evil. Any decent society would set up a uniform monopoly on the judicial system in order to ensure that all are treated the same way under the same laws. Redford shows us how anarchists solve the problem of tyrannical governments and their monopoly on their coercive courts rather than create a lawful government with lawful courts:

“All governments set up courts and enforce control over ultimate judicial decision, while outlawing others from engaging in the same practice. Thus, e.g., if a group of people become dissatisfied with the judicial services that the government is providing and decide to set up shop offering their own private arbitration and protection services on the market without seeking the permission of the government to do so then the government will attack these people and put an end to their competitive judicial services, and would thereby enforce its monopoly on ultimate control over the law. If the government failed to enforce its monopoly on ultimate control over the law then it would cease to be a government, but would instead become just another private protection agency offering its services on a competitive market.”<sup>15</sup>

Anyone can see how crazy this would get if all kinds of private courts were open to do business by being paid by those who want a different ruling from a different judge and jury. Hey if I'm not happy with a ruling we could just go get another ruling from another judge. What would the law be if it were open to “private arbitration” and “competitive judicial services” all for direct hire by the parties involved? Because a particular government would naturally put any kind of private court for hire by the parties to a controversy out of business is no evidence of evil but proof of a government sizable enough to establish uniform justice throughout its jurisdiction. That would be the establishment of one of the main purposes of lawful government according Locke:

“Sec. 20. But when the actual force is over, the state of war ceases between those that are in society, and are equally on both sides subjected to the fair determination of the law; because then there lies open the remedy of appeal for the past injury, and to prevent future harm: but where no such appeal is, as in the state of nature, for want of positive laws, and judges with authority to appeal to, the state of war once begun, continues, with a right to the innocent party to destroy the other whenever he can, until the aggressor offers peace, and desires reconciliation on such terms as may repair any wrongs he has already done, and secure the innocent for the future; nay, where an appeal to the law, and constituted judges, lies open, but the remedy is denied by a manifest perverting of justice, and a barefaced wresting of the laws to protect or indemnify the violence or injuries of some men, or party of men, there it is hard to imagine any thing but a state of war: for wherever violence is used, and injury done, though by hands appointed to administer justice, it is still violence and injury, however coloured with the name, pretences, or forms of law, the end whereof being to protect and redress the innocent, by an unbiassed application of it, to all who are under it; wherever that is not bona fide done, war

---

<sup>15</sup> James Redford, *Jesus is an Anarchist* p. 6-7

is made upon the sufferers, who having no appeal on earth to right them, they are left to the only remedy in such cases, an appeal to heaven.

Sec. 21. To avoid this state of war (wherein there is no appeal but to heaven, and wherein every the least difference is apt to end, where there is no authority to decide between the contenders) is one great reason of men's putting themselves into society, and quitting the state of nature: for where there is an authority, a power on earth, from which relief can be had by appeal, there the continuance of the state of war is excluded, and the controversy is decided by that power. Had there been any such court, any superior jurisdiction on earth, to determine the right between Jephtha and the Ammonites, they had never come to a state of war: but we see he was forced to appeal to heaven. The Lord the Judge (says he) be judge this day between the children of Israel and the children of Ammon, Judg. xi. 27. and then prosecuting, and relying on his appeal, he leads out his army to battle: and therefore in such controversies, where the question is put, who shall be judge? It cannot be meant, who shall decide the controversy; every one knows what Jephtha here tells us, that the Lord the Judge shall judge. Where there is no judge on earth, the appeal lies to God in heaven. That question then cannot mean, who shall judge, whether another hath put himself in a state of war with me, and whether I may, as Jephtha did, appeal to heaven in it? of that I myself can only be judge in my own conscience, as I will answer it, at the great day, to the supreme judge of all men."<sup>16</sup>

As is obvious, justice is wanting when the law is for sale by multiple courts of equal jurisdiction. Equal jurisdiction of many private courts is exactly the same as the absence of an authorized single court that all must appeal to. This is anarchy and the state of nature where there is not a single authorized court that cannot be hired by any of the parties to a controversy. Even if these multiple courts for hire were not hired by the parties to a controversy but by a village for a period of time does not provide the confidence required by those in controversy to settle a dispute and avoid the continued state of war.

Anarchy is not merely the absence of any and all government but the absence only of unlawful government. Therefore, anarchy is where one or more governments exist which are unlawful and tyrannical. Only lawful governments can defeat and prevent unlawful tyrannical governments from harming the property of people. Even a state of nature or total absence of all government is quickly replaced by one or more governments by the combination of people by contract which in essence is merely one large government or a multitude of miniature governments. If those governments overlap they are tyrannical. If that one government is unlawful it is tyrannical.

Redford also introduces his view of all taxation of any kind versus voluntary contributions and gifts as violating the Golden Rule:

“The above scenario leaves out something extremely vital though, as it merely assumes that this government in question somehow obtains its revenue by voluntary contribution and not by coercion. Yet all actual governments throughout history have obtained their revenue not by voluntary contribution or payment for contracted services but by coercion. Thus all governments throughout history steal and extort wealth from their subjects which they call “taxes,” yet at the same time governments make it illegal for their subjects to steal from each other or from the government. Thus here again in taxes we see that historically all governments do to their subjects what they outlaw their subjects to do to them.”<sup>17</sup>

A lawful government is based upon the idea that the people agree to the terms of its institution or constitution and that being the case is impossible to imagine how a lawful tax specified in a constitution could become coercion and theft. All anarchists are obsessed with the idea that taxation of any kind is evil, coercive, violent theft. We can all agree that some attacks on property by the state while being improperly termed “taxes” are really rents and thefts and are not lawful and should be prohibited. Yet lawful government which is to do only one thing (protect the property of every individual in its jurisdiction) must be financially supported by some means.

---

<sup>16</sup> John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* ed: Peter Laslett, Sec. 20-21, p.p. 281-282.

<sup>17</sup> James Redford, *Jesus is an Anarchist* p. 7

And this means of support cannot harm property of an individual or the government's demise would be built-in to its means of support. Therefore, property taxes are an unlawful means of support and an income tax on wages is also a property tax which harms property. Therefore, the only tax which does not harm property is a sales or transaction tax paid one time on every sale or transaction. The sales tax is not coercive as no one will prosecute you if you don't buy something. You simply cannot buy an item unless you pay the sales tax. Once paid you own it forever and no entity can tax it again. This is lawful taxation to fund lawful government.

Redford says that anyone who takes the Golden Rule of Christ seriously must advocate the abolition of all earthly governments wherever and whenever they may exist:

“It is for this reason that anyone that takes Jesus’s ultimate ethical commandment seriously must of necessity advocate the abolition of all Earthly governments wherever and whenever they may exist, as governments are necessarily incompatible with Jesus’s ultimate ethical commandment and diametrically opposed to it.”<sup>18</sup>

Now Redford makes a distinction between the “earthly governments of today” and the “coming Kingdom of God or Christ:”

“In passing, it’s important for me to distinguish “Earthly governments” from what is sometimes called the “Kingdom of God” or the “Kingdom of Christ.” In the above discussion I have been analyzing governments as they are operated by men here on Earth—but as I will show, the “Kingdom” which Christ is to establish on Earth will be the functional and operational opposite of any kingdom which has ever existed on Earth before, i.e., it won’t actually be a government in the sense in which I defined above and will in fact be perfectly consistent with the Golden Rule.”<sup>19</sup>

Redford reveals in the above quote that he belongs to a group called the Premillennialist who believe that Christ returns to earth the second time to set up his 1000 year earthly reign over an un-regenerated mortal population in his glorified body with his saints in their glorified bodies. This too is a mistake because Paul said in 2 Thessalonians 2:8 that all evil will be consumed with the mouth of the Lord and destroyed by the brightness of his coming. Therefore, at the second coming of Christ all evil is abolished from the world and there will be no mortals in heaven or earth to rule, as all will be Christian saints.

The reason this is important to us herein is that Premillennialists by believing that the Kingdom of Christ is yet to come at his second coming they deny that Christ set up the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth on his first visit almost 2000 years ago. The only difference between this present Kingdom of God or Christ or Heaven on earth and the same Kingdom upon the return of Christ is the Judgment and destruction and removal of evil. Even though the Kingdom of God is established upon earth presently by the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ it does suffer violence and evil also lives within it. But people can escape death right now by entering this presently established kingdom by going through the doorway opened to heaven by the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ and experience that for themselves and thereby sit down in the heavenly places with Christ (Ephesians 2:6).

Therefore, present earthly governments are also governments presently existing in the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth and Christians have played a role in the formation of them for the last 2000 years and the principles that operate them have grown more advanced over the centuries. The formation, growth and demise of governments is a slow process but they have grown better since the beginning of time. Almost every import theologian you can name from St. Augustine to R.J. Rushdoony have played an important role in the development of the principles of lawful government in the present Kingdom of God on Earth.

---

<sup>18</sup> James Redford, *Jesus is an Anarchist* p. 7

<sup>19</sup> James Redford, *Jesus is an Anarchist* p. 7-8

Now who would argue that the Golden Rule would not be practiced upon the second coming of Christ after the instantaneous destruction of all evil in the cosmos by the brightness of his coming? In this future evil-purged Kingdom there will be no government that would resemble that of present day or be managed and the terms of its management discussed among rulers. That world will be a world of eternal celebration of the Almighty God, not a world of judicial discussions of the proper way to manage the cosmos. It is now that such a discussion as we are having herein is relevant while Christ is away on a long trip and has left us in charge of the Kingdom of God and the doorway to it with the authority to guard and protect the kingdom and discuss and institute the lawful means of ruling and protecting it.

### **3. Jesus does not respect the Person of Men**

Redford repeats his “love thy neighbor as thyself” argument combined with the fact that Christ did not respect the person of men as a proof that all government should be abolished. Redford suggests that because we should not treat men with partiality then we by necessity must abolish government on earth:

“If we as Christians were to take Jesus’s command seriously and apply it to everyone without partiality, then it would necessarily require that we demand the abolition of all governments wherever they may exist, as they can only exist by a continuous violation of the Golden Rule.”<sup>20</sup>

Redford presumes that this admonition to not regard the person of men or to treat people with partiality rather than treating all the same that somehow that applies to those in governmental authority. This is contradicted by Romans chapter 13.

### **4. Jesus on Taxes: Nothing is (Rightly) Caesar’s!**

Redford says here that Jesus purposefully misdirected the Pharisees when they asked him if it was lawful to pay taxes to Caesar. Let’s hear the exchange between Christ and the Pharisees first:

“Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?  
But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?  
Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny.  
And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription?  
They say unto him, Caesar’s. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.  
When they had heard these words, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.” (Matthew 22:17-22)

Redford maintains that Jesus really lied to the people and misdirected them concerning the payment of tribute to Caesar. Redford thinks that Jesus could not answer the question as he really wished because that would have caused his arrest prematurely. Christ did not respect the person of men neither did he fear that which was in man nor what man could do to him at any time. Christ always answered the way God wanted him to answer:

“Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.  
And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him.” (John 8:28-29)

What did Christ say then? “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s” That means pay tribute unto Caesar because the system of government that created and used the coins was the government that Caesar was ahead of and

---

<sup>20</sup> Redford, p. 9

therefore Christ meant to pay tribute to the system that they were under. But Jesus was showing that everything belongs to God's including Caesar and the government he represented. But Christ was not misdirecting anyone from the general idea that they should pay tribute to the system they were under. Christ did not argue the lawfulness of the tax or if the government they were under was lawful. Christ answered the question in a general sense.

Redford says that Jesus would have said that it was good in the sight of God to not pay taxes except he would have been arrested. Such a conclusion is not supported by any scripture. Just because Christ did not tell us to pay taxes to Caesar or any other government does not mean he opposed all taxes and all government and desired all his disciples to resist all taxes and all government.

Redford also misses the entire point of the scripture relating to the payment of tribute when they arrived at Capernaum:

“And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute?  
He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?  
Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.  
Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee.” (Matthew 17:24-27)

The question posed to Peter by those who received tribute money was really about citizenship. They inquired of Peter if his master was a citizen of Capernaum or was he a foreigner or stranger. Therefore, Peter answered them correctly that Jesus was not a citizen of Capernaum and therefore owed the tribute. But then Christ wanted to prove a higher point to Peter by demonstrating that Christ was not a stranger anywhere in the cosmos, world or Kingdom of Heaven. Christ was proving that he was not really a stranger in Capernaum or anywhere else in the world because he created it and he was going to redeem it and was King of it and did not owe tribute to anyone anywhere in the entire cosmos. This whole exchange was about the authority of Christ and true debt and true ownership not about lawful taxation in lawful governments created by Christians in the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth. Notice that Jesus paid the tribute and he did so by a miracle because he that creates redeems and sustains the whole cosmos along with Capernaum can also pay a tax he did not owe with a miracle. It is still lawful for Christian children of the Kingdom to create lawful government for the protection of the property of all and pay lawful taxes to support it.

## 5. Tax Collection Is a Sin!

Redford tries to establish two groups of people that he thinks Christ singled out as exclusive sinners to prove that Christ was against tax collectors and called them sinners for collecting taxes:

“It’s important to point out here that Jesus actually made a stronger case against the unrighteousness of tax collectors than the Pharisees originally had in questioning Jesus’s disciples about it: the Pharisees actually separated the tax collectors from the sinners when they asked “Why does your Teacher eat with tax collectors and sinners?” Yet when Jesus heard this He answered the Pharisees by lumping the two groups together under the category of sinners—thus: “For I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance.”<sup>21</sup>

Redford again misses the whole point of this exchange in the scripture passage he quoted. It was the Pharisees that made all the distinctions between sinners, tax collectors and the good people. Christ did not argue about which group were the greatest of sinners but rather made

---

<sup>21</sup> Redford, p. 12

another general statement about his purpose. Christ knew all men were sinners not just those who were called sinners by the elders and the people but rather all men including the elders and the people. Christ knew there were no righteous people but if there were any he did not come for them. It was another way of saying I have come to save all men not just tax collectors whom all hated. Only those who admit their sinfulness can obtain salvation in Christ. Therefore those who think they are righteous cannot be saved by Christ or God:

“Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.” (John 9:41)

Not only are the tax collectors sinners but all mankind. Christ used the tax collectors which the people hated as examples to show that all men were just like the tax collectors in that they all “loved only those who loved them,” and would “greet breathen only.” Christ compared all people to tax collectors whom all hated. Honest people would be broken hearted and repent when they heard that, but dishonest people would dismiss Christ and his words. Tax collectors were no greater sinners than whores, the common man, doctors, priests and those of the Sanhedrin.

## 6. On Paul, Romans 13 and Titus 3:1

Redford quotes the New King James version corresponding to the Authorized King James version of Romans 13:1-7:

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:

For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.

Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.” (Romans 13:1-7)

Redford immediately says that Paul in these passages did not instruct Christians to follow or submit to any earthly government operated by men:

“But in actual fact Paul never does tell us in the above excerpt from Romans 13 to submit to government!—at least certainly not as they have existed on Earth and are operated by men.”<sup>22</sup>

Redford is obviously incorrect without consulting another source of any merit. St Paul does indeed tell Christians to submit to earthly government operated by men from Roman times to the time of the second coming of Christ. Redford tries to make a point that Paul did not follow his own advice. Redford would be correct if Paul had been in constant trouble with government over where to park his camel, racing his camel through crowded markets, vomiting into the community well, taking a dump in the middle of the street, stealing donkeys and canvas from others, trespassing on the property of others, molesting children, weakening the canvas of other tent makers, lying about the work of his competitors, cheating his customers, sleeping with the wives and servants of others, etc. There were laws about that sort of thing and courts to punish those guilty of the same. This was the kind of law and government that Paul was speaking of and these laws protected the individuals from their neighbors. All governments, even dissolved tyrannical

---

<sup>22</sup> Redford, p. 13



governments, retain some law that protects the individuals from their fellow neighbors. And for this service even by tyrannical government we are commanded to obey such and pay taxes to support it.

No doubt St Paul was in trouble with government but not in a way that made him a liar in Romans 13. Paul was in fact a law abiding Roman citizen. His problem was on a higher level. He could not deny that Christ was the King of kings and Lord of lords over the earth and all therein nor could he stop preaching the same as long as he lived. Peter and the other apostles had the same problem with the Jewish Council that used the Roman government for their own ends and to keep the peace:

“Then went the captain with the officers, and brought them without violence: for they feared the people, lest they should have been stoned.  
And when they had brought them, they set them before the council: and the high priest asked them,  
Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.  
Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men.  
The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.  
Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.  
And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.  
When they heard that, they were cut to the heart, and took counsel to slay them.” (Acts 5:26-33)

The above quote from Acts was written by Paul but was about Peter and the other disciples or apostles. But it was for the same reason that Paul got into trouble with the Sanhedrin or Jewish Council and this was reported to the Roman authorities. They claimed that Paul was a trouble maker who wanted to overthrow civil authority and establish a king other than Caesar. This was what the Jewish Council accused Paul of before Governor Felix in Herod's Hall in Caesarea:

“For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes:” (Acts 24:5)

Paul used the Roman government as well for his protection from the groundless attacks by the Jewish Council or Sanhedrin. Not only was Paul a good citizen and conformed to the laws of the Jews and of Romans he also appealed to Caesar for protection from the Jews. This was the response of Paul to all their accusations:

“And when he was come, the Jews which came down from Jerusalem stood round about, and laid many and grievous complaints against Paul, which they could not prove.  
While he answered for himself, Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Caesar, have I offended any thing at all.  
But Festus, willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me?  
Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest.  
For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar.  
Then Festus, when he had conferred with the council, answered, Hast thou appealed unto Caesar? unto Caesar shalt thou go.” (Acts 25:7-12)

We also know that governments can lose their authority even if they had authority to start with. But the point that Paul was making in Romans 13 is that we should conform to good laws even in dissolved unlawful tyrannical governments. This does not mean we do not have the right to alter or abolish unlawful dissolved governments while we also conform to any good laws being

enforced. We are called not to fight or resist government at every point (those things that are still good for the community) but to alter or abolish the government and replace it with lawful government. This too was pointed out well by Algernon Sidney who in 1683 completed his *Discourses on Government* where he explained the true meaning of Romans 13 better than any modern theologian or otherwise has done to date. He was beheaded for placing all sovereignty in the people rather than in the kings:

“This shews the work of all magistrates to be always and everywhere the same, even the doing of justice, and procuring the welfare of those that create them. This we learn from common sense: Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and the best human authors lay it as an unmoveable foundation, upon which they build their arguments relating to matters of that nature: And the Apostle from better authority declares, *That rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil: Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God unto thee for good: But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.*<sup>23</sup> And the reason he gives for praying for kings, and all that are in authority, is, *that we may live a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty.*<sup>24</sup> But if this be the work of the magistrate, and the glorious name of God's minister be given to him for the performance of it, we may easily see to whom that title belongs. *His children and servants ye are, whose works ye do.* He therefore, and he only, is the servant of God, who does the work of God; who is a terror to those that do evil, and a praise to those that do well; who beareth the sword for the punishment of wickedness and vice, and so governs, that the people may live quietly in all godliness and honesty. The order of his institution is inverted, and the institution vacated, if the power be turned to the praise of those that do evil, and becomes a terror to such as do well; and that none who live honestly and justly can be quiet under it.”<sup>25</sup>

Algernon Sidney was the martyr of the Glorious Revolution in England and Thomas Jefferson said that he and John Locke were the two men responsible for the concepts of human liberty in America. Notice that neither Locke nor Sidney indicated in the slightest that anarchy was the way and that all government was evil and the greatest tool of Satan in the world. Locke, Sidney, Bastiat, Rev Samuel Rutherford and the apostles all say that government and its magistrates in general are a gift from God and ordained of God on earth to protect the property of mankind, and to reward good and punish evil.

Redford is making the same mistake that the Prelate Maxwell was making in defense of the monarchs that Rutherford refuted. Maxwell was saying that the people do not select magistrates or kings and that they cannot resist or remove them for any violation of their oaths because God appointed them not man. Redford says the same of all earthly governments and takes it a step further by then saying that no government on earth was or can be lawful as none of them are appointed by God.

“Instead, what Paul is saying is that the only true and real authorities are only those that God appoints, i.e., one cannot become a real authority or ruler in the eyes of God simply because through force of arms one has managed to subjugate a population and then proclaim oneself the potentate. Thus, by saying this Paul was actually rebuking the supposed authority of the mortal governments as they exist on Earth and are operated by men!”<sup>26</sup>

Rutherford rather said that government in general is ordained of God but that men chose the particular king and magistrate rather than God and if these men violate their oaths they may be replaced or their kingdoms abolished and replaced by a government that will follow the will of

---

<sup>23</sup> Romans 13

<sup>24</sup> 1 Timothy 2

<sup>25</sup> Algernon Sidney *Discourses Concerning Government* ed. Thomas G. West (Liberty Fund, Inc. 8335 Allison Pointe Trail, Suite 300, Indianapolis, Indiana 46250-1687) Chap. 1, Sec. 20, p. 70

<sup>26</sup> Redford, p. 15

God for all government to reward good and punish evil. But Redford has arrived at a conclusion that is opposed to Christ and all the apostles and saints over the last 2000 years and denies to all the ability and right to create lawful governments for our protection. Redford is denying mankind an ordained gift of God for our protection.

Now Redford carries his assertion further by saying that not only did Paul never tell us to submit to earthly governments or magistrates but he never told us to pay tribute, or customs or taxes. Redford says that when Paul says to “owe no one anything except to love one another” that Paul meant pay not taxes of any kind:

“So there we have it in no uncertain terms: Owe no one anything except to love one another! Yet since when have taxes ever had the slightest thing to do with love?”<sup>27</sup>

Redford’s assertion is absurd on its face. The command of Paul to “owe no one anything” does not have anything to do with government taxes. And Paul’s admonition was not to stop paying taxes even if the government had become tyrannical or unlawful. Paul wanted Christians to avoid borrowing and being in debt to other people so that they would not be beholden to them or be dependent upon others for their sustenance. If this scripture applied to taxation at all, it meant the opposite, namely, to pay all taxes so not be in danger of government and the sword of government for owing taxes to government. To win the people we must demonstrate our objection is not government in general or conformance to wholesome worthy laws but the establishment of lawful government that honors God and his Son and protects property rather than damaging property. We are called to be as other men under earthly governments and to obey them as others unless they challenge the most important areas of life at which time we may alter and abolish them and institute new government for our protection as ordained of God.

Redford having attempted to show us that Christ and Paul were “misdirecting” us by saying the very opposite of their intentions regarding taxation and submission to government now adds another passage where he again claims we are misdirected:

“And what of Paul writing in Titus 3:1: “Remind them to be subject to rulers and authorities, to obey, to be ready for every good work”? As was clearly demonstrated above, Paul was referring to the true higher authorities as recognized by God, not to the diabolical, Satanic, mortal governments as they have existed on Earth—as Paul spent his entire ministry in rebellion against the Earthbound, mortal “authorities,” and was at last put to death by them.”<sup>28</sup>

Redford is typical of all anarchists that I have dealt with. They will say the opposite of what is clearly seen by all and declare it as truth. It is very clear in Titus 3:1 that Paul was telling Titus to remind his church to be subject to rulers and authorities and to obey them and be ready to help with good works. If Paul had meant Titus to remind his church to be subject to the rulers in heaven who were authorized by God alone who would know what to do? Who was speaking from heaven with authority that they all knew and heard? What ruler in heaven authorized by God alone would they obey? Surely, they knew Christ but would it not have been more direct to say, “obey Christ in heaven” then to say all that other stuff? To more accurately indicate what Redford desires would be for Paul to have said “obey the scriptures,” for there was no voices from heaven to hear and obey. Why would Paul misdirect anyone there or fear government by that statement. Neither Christ nor Paul feared government to the point that they mislead or lied to anyone. Neither of them had the spirit of fear which ultimately cost them their lives. Had they feared, we would not know them. No! Paul said clearly to Titus to remind his church to be subject to earthly government rulers, and authorities in government and be willing to help all with good works. This would make a good name of all Christians among all people.

Redford brings up the admonition from Paul to the Corinthians to avoid the civil courts if they are in disputes among themselves as implying that Paul saw no use for earthly government and

---

<sup>27</sup> Redford, p. 18

<sup>28</sup> Redford, p. 19

that it was evil and only of Satan contrary to his admonition in Romans 13. First what did Paul say to the Corinthians regarding civil courts?

“Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?

Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?

If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.

I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?

But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.

Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?

Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren.” (1 Corinthians 6:1-8)

This whole issue was an intra church matter between fellow Christians not a Christian and some other non-Christian person. Paul was embarrassed to have Christians taking their personal internal disputes among fellow Christians before a civil court where they could be humiliated. Christians are supposed to be born again into the Kingdom of Heaven on earth and possess eternal life yet they are having disputes among themselves and then going to a civil non-Christian court to resolve their Christian disputes. Then Redford obviously misinterprets 1 Corinthians 6:4:

“Paul said that the government judges “are least esteemed by the church to judge”! It is clear that he considered them to be no authority at all!”<sup>29</sup>

This is clearly false! Paul said that if you have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set the least esteemed in the church to judge the matter. That meant if Christians had disputes among themselves about matters outside the church but between members they should go to the church and select the least esteemed in the church to hear and rule upon the matter because they would be better and more able to render a just ruling than the civil courts. If the members of a church had a matter concerning the faith, such matter was to be decided by the apostles, deacons or elders. None of these verses have anything to do with the authority of the civil courts or how the church viewed their authority. Clearly, Paul did not say civil courts were the least esteemed by the church. He was referring to the least esteemed in the church to decide issues among church members rather than go to the civil courts.

Redford relies on Mark 10:42-45 where Christ compares leaders of the church with leaders of civil government of the time as more proof that Christ was rebuking the supposed authority of earthly rulers. First Mark says:

“But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them.

But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all.

For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” (Mark 10:42-45)

Redford presumes from this that Christ is opposed to all civil governments on earth from the beginning of time to the end of time:

“By saying this Jesus was in fact rebuking the supposed “authority” of the Earthly “rulers”! Just because mortals on Earth may consider someone to be an “authority” and “ruler” does not mean that God considers them to be so!”<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Redford, p. 19

Jesus was not rebuking the authority of earthly governments by telling his disciples how men will become rulers and leaders in the church. Christ simply made a distinction between church government and civil government. And Redford is correct in that just because someone thinks they are an authority or ruler on earth does not mean God considers them to be. But from that we cannot conclude that God does not consider any earthly government to be authorized to do anything on earth, nor can we conclude that God has not ordained the concept of government for the protection of the property of the individual people in society created by government.

Another presumption that Redford has made through out his treatise concerns mortal versus immortals. Clearly, Christians become immortal when they are born again into the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth. They will lose their bodies for a short time and get them back for eternity but they will never lose their life.

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.” (John 6:47)

“And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?” (John 11:26)

He that hath everlasting life and shall never die is immortal by definition. And this being the case, there has been many eternal and immortal people serve in civil government. Therefore, Redford cannot even refer to civil government as being completely mortal since the time of Christ. Civil government has been a mix of mortal and immortal people in them and operating them.

## 7. On Peter and 1 Peter 2:13-18

Once again Redford tries to say the opposite from the clear intended statement of scripture. Let’s hear first the scripture he argues:

“Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the 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.

For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men:

As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.

Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.

Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.

For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.

For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.” (1 Peter 2:13-20)

Peter makes it pretty clear about who he was talking about being in submission to and why. We are to be in submission to the king as supreme or the supreme authority, state or national, and unto governors sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of them that do well. This agrees with Paul’s admonition in Romans 13. We are to do those things to silence the ignorance of foolish men who might say we are anarchists and without law, unruly and rioters not believing in anything but our own wills. One of the ways that governments are made more righteous and just is by the suffering of the righteous under unlawful dissolved governments. When people see people suffer from unlawful government they eventually rise up to alter it or abolish it and make new guards to protect against such injustices.

Redford again uses the passages already discussed when Peter and the other apostles stand up and say that “we ought to obey God rather than men” as showing Peter to be; a liar, a hypocrite, simply misdirecting the people in order to not interfere with the prophesies of God. Redford does

---

<sup>30</sup> Redford, p. 20

not stop there but continues that when Peter said, “submit yourselves to every ordinance of man” he really meant none of them:

“So in other words, when this is combined with what Peter said in Acts 5:29, we can take the entire passage of 1 Peter 2:13–18 to mean that we ought to obey all the ordinances of men: except for all such ordinances that happen to conflict with our God-given liberty and Jesus’s ultimate commandment—which is virtually every single one of them!”<sup>31</sup>

Redford’s assertion is simply ludicrous! He would have us believe; that Peter in saying “submit yourselves to every ordinance of man” that Peter really meant submit to nothing or any law made by man in government as all of them are not of God.

Armed with this same kind of mental agility, Redford shows what he thinks is the meaning of 2 Peter 2:9-10:

“The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished:  
But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, selfwilled, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.” (2 Peter 2:9-10)

Redford is correct to some degree that governments and their societies can become so corrupt and sinful that such governments are said to despise government. Surely a government that harms the property of those that create government, for their own good, despises government. But this correct conclusion cannot dismiss the equally correct conclusion that those who despise government are presumptuous, selfwilled, unafraid to speak evil of dignities and walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness. One thing is for certain about anarchists, they do despise government and they are also presumptuous and selfwilled as they make their individual desires their only government and they presume that the opposite of what is said by Christ, the apostles and saints is true. Anarchists change the meanings of common words and scripture in order to advance their contradictory doctrine that the total absence of government is the only lawful government on earth.

## **8. The Ruler and God of this World and Age which All Mortal Governments Worship is Satan (a.k.a. Lucifer)**

Redford says that when Satan tempted Christ in the beginning of his ministry<sup>32</sup> that the truth was revealed by Satan himself that Satan established and “controls all mortal governments on earth.”

“The Bible is quite explicit as to who it is that really controls all the mortal governments on Earth, and which god is the god that the mortal rulers worship \*\*\*  
This is one of the offers Satan made to Christ during the forty days in which Satan tempted Jesus, an event now sometimes referred to as the Temptation of Christ. Satan wasn’t lying when he made the above offer to Jesus: it was an absolutely real offer that Satan would have delivered on. This is necessarily the case, as Luke even writes in verse 2 of the above chapter that here Jesus was “tempted for forty days by the devil”—thus, this had to be a real offer or else it could hardly qualify as a real temptation, as certainly Jesus would have known whether or not what Satan said here was true: if what Satan was saying here were false then Jesus would have already known that, and hence Satan’s offer could not have been the least bit tempting to Jesus.”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Redford, p. 21

<sup>32</sup> Luke 4:5-8

<sup>33</sup> Redford, p. 22-23

Redford makes the case that most would make as we look at government. Because we see corruption in our own government we conclude that Satan runs it and that would be in fact partially true. But it is not the whole truth. Scripture was quoted earlier herein that shows that God rules in the society and governments of men and he raises them up and brings them down and gives them to whomsoever he chooses. And further, it is still tempting to think that one could rule the whole world or most of it by serving Satan and many people have certainly made that deal. But Redford's quote does not make it conclusive that Satan exclusively controls all earthly governments.

Redford quotes Christ and again makes the wrong interpretation of what he quotes:

“And Jesus later said on three separate occasions that Satan is the ruler of this world. Thus in John 12:31: “Now is the judgment of this world; now the ruler of this world will be cast out.” In John 14:30: “I will no longer talk much with you, for the ruler of this world is coming, and he has nothing in Me.” And in John 16:8–11: “And when He has come, He will convict the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they do not believe in Me; of righteousness, because I go to My Father and you see Me no more; of judgment, because the ruler of this world is judged.””<sup>34</sup>

No doubt these scriptures are a bit confusing because when put altogether they sometimes appear that Christ is the ruler of this world and sometimes that Satan is the ruler of this world. But we know that Christ created the world and by him and for him and by him all things consist. That indeed makes him the King of kings and Lord of lords. However, that does not mean that Satan does not rule much of the world and to some degree in all parts of the world. John 12:31-33 indicates that Christ Jesus is the ruler of this world and is cast out:

“Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die.” (John 12:31-33)

But in John 14:30 Christ says that Satan is the Prince of this world. But a Prince is not yet a ruler but under the ruler or King:

“Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.” (John 14:30)

In John 16:7-11 Christ is talking about the Holy Spirit coming to convict or reprove the world of sin:

“Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not on me; Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.” (John 16:7-11)

Christ says in the above quote that the prince of this world is judged, in this case, referring to himself as prince being judged by the Sanhedrin and the Roman government. When Christ comes the second time he will judge the world and all therein and he will have the authority having been judged by the world on his first visit. These scriptures do not prove that Satan is the sole creator and sole operator of all earthly governments or the sole ruler of this world. This is especially true in light of the Great Commission and Paul's letter to the Colossians:

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” (Matthew 28:18)

“Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

---

<sup>34</sup> Redford, p. 23

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:

And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell;

And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.” (Colossians 1:15-20)

Who then is the creator of government or thrones and principalities? For whom were they created? By whom do these governments consist? Christ made government for himself and he sustains them and he can destroy them if he decides they are not in conformity to his will to defend the property of the people.

Then Redford gives us a short history of all the deaths caused by wars between governments of the world and thereby condemns them as “Satanic machination masquerading as humanity’s salvation:”

“The wars and mass murders which the mortal governments routinely engage in are literal human-sacrifice orgies that the Earthly rulers of those governments offer up to appease their God Satan, a.k.a. Lucifer!

Government, throughout all of recorded history, has been the most methodical and efficient human-meat grinder to ever exist. It is a purely Satanical machination masquerading as humanity’s salvation, but has always been—and forever will be so long as it exists—the scourge of mankind and our decline.”<sup>35</sup>

As powerfully and passionately stated as that was, the evidence of the number of deaths caused by world wars is not evidence that God did not ordain the concept of government in general as a means for mankind to protect their property from those who do not respect the property of others. It is more likely evidence of the end of the Postmillennial 1000 year reign of Christ via the church where Satan is loosed from the pit for a short season to return to deceiving the nations which coincides with the falling away of the church that must happen just prior to the second coming of Christ.

Postmillennialists however, are still concerned with the maintenance of the vineyard and stewardship of the Kingdom of Heaven that exists right now on earth regardless of the closeness of the coming of Christ. Postmillennialist do not attempt to hasten a return of Christ because it is the judgment and our work is to save the lost and maintain the Kingdom and we use all the time we have to do so. And upon the return of Christ we will be found doing his will rather than doing nothing thinking that will hasten the return and the establishment of the 1000 year reign of Christ over an un-regenerated world. And we will try to awaken even a fallen away church on the brink of the return in hopes that the church will again take up the work it was intended to do that they also will be found doing the work they have been given.

## **9. Jesus defended the Right to Freely Contract and Private Property Rights**

Not every chapter or topic that Redford used contributed to his argument supporting his assertion that Jesus Christ was an anarchist. The defense of the right to private property and the right to contract by Christ has no bearing on whether or not Christ was an anarchist. Christ could believe in lawful government and still be a defender of those two rights. In fact the right to contract also covers the right of social contracts and constitutions which fall within the bounds of

---

<sup>35</sup> Redford, p. 24



contract law and the rights to make them. So if Christ defends contracts and the right to enter them he also defends the creation and maintenance of lawful governments. No more need be said of this chapter.

## 10. Greatness is in Serving

Redford here uses a previous quote from scripture where Christ distinguishes between Christian or church leadership and officers in civil government at Mark 10:42-45. Again Redford reveals that he is a Premillennialist who believes that the death, resurrection and ascension had absolutely no impact whatsoever on the world we live in and that the Kingdom of Christ or God on earth is yet to come:

“One of the things which most clearly demonstrates just how different Jesus’s Kingdom is to be from the mortal, Earthly kingdoms and governments—and also why we should be very careful to never confuse the two together—is given in the story of when the apostles James and John came to Jesus asking if they may have the favor granted to them of being able to sit on either side of Jesus’s throne, one to the right and the other to His left, and this is how Jesus answered them.”<sup>36</sup>

The statement of “how different Jesus’ Kingdom is to be from the mortal, Earthly kingdoms and governments” reveals that he does not see that the kingdom of Heaven has been created here on earth already by Christ opening the door that no man can shut in his death, resurrection and ascension where we can sit down in the heavenly places right now:

“But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,  
Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)  
And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:”  
(Ephesians 2:4-6)

Premillennialism was created by Manuel de Lacunza (1731-1801 son of Charles and Josefa Diaz) and then picked up by John Darby and others and then C.I. Scofield made his own translation of the Bible with an emphasis on the Lacunza version of the end time. Prior to this movement the Christian understanding of the world was that Christ had already established the Kingdom of Heaven or God on earth and his second coming was the judgment where rejecters of Christ would be removed from the cosmos. Premillennialism has taken control of the Western world since 1800 and now most churches believe in error that Christ will set up a 1000 year kingdom when he returns the second time. Thus the main difference is that Postmillennialists believe the kingdom of God exists now and Christ rules the earth via his saints and his church while Premillennialists believe the kingdom is yet to come and that the church and Christians have no authority in the world and rule nothing. It is plain to see that great things were produced by Christians prior to 1800 but since then everything has been perverted and the great accomplishments of Christians and the church in terms of human rights and lawful governments have been destroyed right along with the church. In fact it is Premillennialism which has let Satan out of the pit to deceive the nations once again. Premillennialism is the *great delusion* not government.

Finally regarding the two ways that great men are established; one in the church and the second in the civil government, does not mean that Christ saw only the church as having lawful authority in the world and the civil government having none. Christ merely pointed out how harsh government rulers of Rome were and how kind people in the church Christ founded should be. This distinction of Mark 10:42-45 also served as a model for the governments that developed since the time of Christ’s first visit. That is why it was said by the founders of the US

---

<sup>36</sup> Redford, p. 26

Constitution that government was merely an agent of the people for their benefit and that those in office were public servants. This concept has not always been perceived in the world. It is the fruit of Christian doctrine on civil government which continues to grow.

Redford really offers nothing new in this chapter that he has not already said earlier herein.

## **11. Slaves Obey Your Masters**

Redford says that this topic is “not directly related to the issue of the ethical status of government.” He does admit that this issue concerns “social relations in general.” Slavery, however, is related to the issue of what government can and cannot authorize and what people can become as a result of unlawful government or a lawful government becoming dissolved. Even John Locke wrote on the topic of slavery in his *Second Treatise of Government* published in 1689. Slavery is where people become the property of another person or of the state and we know that people are only the property of God not the property of other people or a combination or group of other people like government. A quick definition of a slave is one who owns no property. Locke said the only way to become a lawful slave is to commit a heinous crime for which the penalty of death is issued and those injured by the death decide to let the murderer live on the condition of their servitude.

I will spare the reader however concerning lawful government and the issue of slavery and stick to the issue at hand, namely, was Christ an Anarchist or not. Therefore, I will agree with Redford that this topic of slavery and how the apostles or Christ felt about it does not prove one way or the other if Christ was an anarchist. I can only add that lawful government cannot possess slaves or authorize slavery outside of what Locke considered lawful slavery.

Redford did say that Christ and the apostles did not see slavery as a just or fair institution. But he did not attempt to say that government was slavery and therefore government is unjust and unfair and therefore unauthorized and without God’s ordination.

## **12. Jesus on the Collection of Interest (i.e., Usury)**

How Christ and the apostles feel about the collection of interest as a result of borrowing or lending money does not impact the issue of whether or not Christ was an anarchist. Proving Christ a capitalist or socialist or neither does not prove Christ to be an anarchist.

## **13. The Cleansing of the Temple: Righteous Libertarian Vigilantism**

Proving Christ to be or not to be a righteous libertarian vigilante does not prove Christ was an anarchist. Christ could be those things or not and the Father could still ordain lawful government for the protection of the property of its citizens.

## **14. Jesus on the War on Drugs (and All Forms of Prohibition)**

Much time was spent on this issue which adds nothing to Redford’s proof that Christ was an anarchist. I disagree with Redford where he contends or implies that people have the right to kill themselves. This is a real libertarian error. If people have a right to kill themselves or the property of God then they have the right to delegate their killing to others. They do not have a right to kill themselves or delegate such a thing to government or any other person or body.

## 15. Woe to Lawyers!

Redford complains that throughout history lawyers have been the writers of the law and the legislators in government and that they purposely pass arcane, unintelligible, and numerous laws so that they are insured plenty of lucrative legal work. Even if he could have proved that, he would not have any more evidence that Christ was, or is, an anarchist.

Now contrary to Redford's next interpretation of scripture the lawyers he was referring to were not civil law attorneys or lawyers as he mistakenly assumes. The lawyers Christ referred to were those who were learned in and instructed others of the Rabbinic or oral Jewish law which became the Talmud. These lawyers were not civil lawyers of Roman law. Let us hear the quote Redford uses:

“But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.”  
(Matthew 23:13)

Christ was not angry at the civil lawyers or the practice of civil law but was angry at those who used the laws of Moses and the man made law of the Talmud to deny the work of the Messiah and the fact that he had finally appeared. These same type of lawyers would condemn those that believed that Christ was the Messiah and would pressure them to deny Christ or any of his miracles. And in so doing Christ made the keen observation that they in doing so were refusing to enter the Kingdom of Heaven themselves. Notice too that this was not a Kingdom to come in two or three thousand years but right then. Redford also is thinking this kingdom comes upon the second coming of Christ rather than in the act of being born again as Redford claims to have experienced.

Again Redford quotes other scripture related to lawyers and makes the same mistake:

“And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.” (Luke 11:46)

This scripture as well relates to the lawyers of the Mosaic law and Talmudic law which would require the people to observe all kinds of ceremonies, and doctrines that were not true but man made in order for the priesthood to control the people and profit more handsomely. The next quote he used was of the same nature and related more to the first one and the kingdom of heaven than the last one immediately above:

“Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.” (Luke 11:52)

These three scripture verses have nothing to do with civil law and civil lawyers but religious lawyers and Judaism. Even though Redford is somewhat accurate regarding what civil lawyers have become in America, his assertion has no bearing upon why Christ was talking to lawyers in the scripture quotes given. And they certainly don't prove Christ was an anarchist.

Redford suddenly feels that he should make an exception to his rule that all lawyers are the servants of Satan in the system Satan made, namely government:

“So a “Christian lawyer” is not an absolute contradiction in terms, it's just rather rare—and to the extent that such rare individuals do exist God has undoubtedly blessed them for their work in protecting His children against this Satanic world system. But in the main, how true indeed Jesus was being when He warned lawyers that they were jeopardizing their very souls in practicing the profession that they have chosen! Woe to lawyers indeed!”<sup>37</sup>

So now those who are non-Christian lawyers are the servants of Satan in Satanic government who have lost their souls. But Christian lawyers are not a contradiction in terms but merely a rare

---

<sup>37</sup> Redford, p. 44.

occurrence. But what does the occurrence rate have to do with a satanic profession for a satanic government? The frequency of Christian lawyers in a satanic profession in a satanic system cannot make their office more than Satanic. It is clear that Redford has made a logical error fatal to his argument.

## 16. Jesus on Government Courts: Avoid Them!

It's best to read the scriptures without an axe to grind or a point to prove. We are all tempted to make the scripture back up something we think. Redford takes something that Christ tells all people about their sins and turns it to be something bad about the court system. Redford quotes the following passage as something bad about the courts as opposed to something bad about individual sins being neglected to the point of being drug into court by someone harmed by it:

“Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.” (Matthew 5:25-26)

Now if this is all we read it is possible to conclude that Christ was directing our attention to unjust courts and that alone. But let us expand the context by looking at what Christ said just prior to this:

“But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee;

Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.” (Matthew 5:22-24)

Is it not now clear that what Christ was talking about was the dangers of letting our sin go unchecked? Anger without cause is a sin. If we say our brother is not worth spit or worthless we are in danger of the council of men. If we call a brother a fool we are in danger of hell fire before God. But we should take care of those things by placing a gift on the alter and asking for forgiveness and then go to our brother whom we have said these things about and be reconciled and then offer the gift then we are safe. But if we don't do these things they can turn into more severe problems such as being taken to civil court for the damage we have caused to our brother. Civil courts are not toothless they exact punishments that we don't want to pay. But this does not make them evil or of Satan. Courts can become evil and a tool of Satan, for which God will then remove his ordination, but that is not the reason for existence of courts as Redford would have us believe:

“Needless to say, government judges are also lawyers, so Jesus's advice here fits in with His warning to lawyers. It also completely demolishes the notion that Jesus considers what the government's positive law regards as “authorities” to be true authorities—or otherwise Jesus would have no problem with such government judges resolving disputes among the faithful.”<sup>38</sup>

Jesus was not talking about intra-church resolution of problems but rather how all men should resolve their problems of sin between those in and out of Judaism rather than letting unchecked sin get the best of you resulting in civil penalties that are hard to pay. Jesus also was not saying anything about how much better synagogue councils were than civil courts. Christ was simply saying get right with God and your fellow man and avoid both the church councils and the civil courts.

---

<sup>38</sup> Redford, p. 44.

Then Redford brings up what Paul said about taking disputes between Christians alone to the civil courts rather than having the least esteemed of the church rule on the matter as confirmation that Jesus thought the civil courts were Satanic and designed for evil alone and were all without authority:

“Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?

Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?

If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.

I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?

But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.” (1 Corinthians 6:1-6)

Redford says that the quote above conclusively demonstrates that Paul, and therefore Christ, saw no authority in the civil courts and were not the same authorities that Paul referred to in Romans 13:

“And this also conclusively demonstrates that the “authorities” that Paul spoke of in Romans 13 could not possibly have been the “authorities” as so regarded by the government—as Paul said that the government judges “are least esteemed by the church to judge”! Thus it is clear that he considered them to be no authority at all!”<sup>39</sup>

Paul said nothing of the kind. Paul said the least esteemed in the church should be selected to resolve disputes between church members rather than the civil courts. Paul condemned the church for taking disputes among their congregation to outside civil courts which was a disgrace to the church before non-believers. And this had nothing to do with the authority of civil courts on earth. Likewise, the same condemnation does not indicate that Paul was referring to some other authority in heaven other than the civil authority in Romans 13. Paul did say that the saints would one day judge the world and angels. And since that is true Paul questioned their logic as to why they would take their disputes before the unsaved when they will one day judge those of the court system.

The fact that Christians, being in Christ, will one day judge the entire world and even angels has nothing to do with the fact that God ordains lawful government to punish evil and reward good in society as spoken of in Romans 13.

I am not here indicating that I think the Roman government was lawful or legal. What I am demonstrating is that Christ did not get into the legal, lawful or unlawful nature of the Roman government. Christ was not present on his first visit to create lawful government in Rome or anywhere else. Christ came to create the Kingdom of Heaven on earth in which he succeeded in doing. From that we Christians along with others can determine what constitutes lawful government in the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Redford is saying that Christ has not set up the kingdom of Heaven or God on earth yet which he will do on his second coming and it will be a 1000 year reign of beautiful anarchy. And Redford thinks we are commanded to help Christ set up anarchy and we can hasten his return by doing so. The hope of Redford presents not only a very ugly world but an impossible one.

Finally Redford says the courts are simply an instrument of evil satanic tax collection:

“And so also James writes in James 2:6, “But you have dishonored the poor man. Do not the rich oppress you and drag you into the courts?”

It needs to be pointed out that most of the rich in the days in which the above passage was written were rich due to grants of privilege by the government—particularly that of collecting

---

<sup>39</sup> Redford, p. 45.

taxes. Thus when James writes in the above of the rich oppressing the faithful and dragging them into the courts he is speaking of actual violations of individuals' just property rights, and not of individuals reneging on voluntary contracts in which they had entered into."<sup>40</sup>

The above conclusion of Redford is strictly his own erroneous presumption. No doubt some of the rich men of the day would have been tax collectors with government privileges but by no means were they the only rich people around. There were many merchants in the day and successful needed highly skilled craftsmen of all kinds. Certainly enough has been said about tax collectors and Paul knew their title and could have said that easily had that been the case. And there is no indication whatsoever that every instance of being dragged into court was a matter of the tax collector as an agent of satanic government abusing the just property rights of individual Christians. The preference of the rich to quickly resort to the courts rather than work out something more reasonable and achievable is very likely what was being referred to here. This is still true. Many people even the poor are quick to sue rather than work something out. And these cases brought to court surely would have had voluntary agreements that had been somehow violated. Many of the rich were most likely able to get into an advantageous position related to the poor and did so by voluntary agreements with them.

And again, nothing herein proves the argument that Christ Jesus was an anarchist and would have us abolish all taxation and all government being the main instrument of the Devil on earth.

## 17. Jesus on the Rich

Now let me say at the very beginning that it is not clear how any view of Christ on the wealth of a person will make him an anarchist. But in the interest of a fair hearing, and the suspicion that my work will be dismissed by all those lusting after anarchy, unless I answer in full every last scripture that Redford supplies, let us proceed. Let's be fair here also by saying that Redford is not trying to prove Christ an anarchist alone but a libertarian free market anarchist. But he fails on all points. Christ is the Son of God and is trying to get people into the Kingdom of God that Christ created by his death, resurrection and ascension opening the door that no man can shut.

Redford makes an absurd assertion regarding Christ's statement about a rich man's difficulty in entering the Kingdom of Heaven. He says that Christ was not talking to any rich man but to a rich man that got his wealth from government taxation or extortion and theft by the threat of force of arms and might. Then he supplies us a quote from St. Augustine about what makes a kingdom out of mere robbers being size and power not consent of the governed. But Augustine's quote does Redford no good if what he says about the quote from Jesus is incorrect.

“And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?  
And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God.  
Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother.  
And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up.  
Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.  
And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich.  
And when Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful, he said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!  
For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.  
And they that heard it said, Who then can be saved?  
And he said, The things which are impossible with men are possible with God.  
Then Peter said, Lo, we have left all, and followed thee.

---

<sup>40</sup> Redford, p. 45.

And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, Who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." (Luke 18:18-30)

Notice that Jesus first told the rich man to follow the Ten Commandments. The rich man said he had done that all his life and he may have been a very good man as had he not been he would not have been very interested in what Christ was up to in the first place, certainly not enough to seek him out and ask him a personally question in front of others. But then Christ told the rich man to sell everything he had and distribute to the poor and follow me. Surely the rich man was sorrowful because he knew he could not do that. Then Jesus said "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" But the disciples knew the importance of that statement knowing that all men had some kind of riches that they felt they could not part with even if it only be a story or memory that made them something instead of nothing. The disciples said, "Who then can be saved?" Christ answered, "The things which are impossible with men are possible with God." Christ knew that becoming nothing is what is required to enter the kingdom of God so that one could die on the cross with Christ and be resurrected with him and ascend with him to Heaven. The catch is that one can become nothing with out selling anything to anybody. But to become nothing you have to admit to God that you are not worthy to live on your own without being in Christ and that you deserve to die on the Cross to pay for your sins.

Therefore these scripture passages have nothing to do with liberalism, the free market or anarchy, or government corruption or force of arms or the way in which anyone would acquire anything that they would think valuable.

Redford was correct when he said that no one enters the Kingdom without Christ or alone but that was not the essence of these passages. What was important here was that you can't get into the Kingdom of God even with Christ if you are carrying anything with you. You must dump it all out and become totally worthless. But this can be done without selling anything to anybody and most people in the Kingdom have done so without selling a single thing. But Redford contradicts himself by asserting that the essence of the passage was that the rich man had come into his wealth in a wicked fashion rather than by some wholesome voluntary free market manner.

"Second, when Jesus counseled this particular rich person to sell all that he had and distribute the proceeds to the poor, this was in fact an exceedingly libertarian thing for Jesus to advise this person. For this was not just any kind of rich person—this was a rich person of a particular type: a "ruler," i.e., one who has some variety of command over an Earthly, mortal government. And thus, the riches that this particular rich person was in possession of had been obtained through extortion and theft, i.e., by the threat and force of arms and might—this particular ruler's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding scrutiny."<sup>41</sup>

This is totally ludicrous! Christ was talking to all men that value anything in life of value enough to turn away from Christ Jesus. The manner in which men attach to that value is of no importance at all.

## **18. Jesus engaged in Conspicuous Consumption when He could have Provided for the Poor Instead**

Here Redford offers scripture about the woman who poured valuable oil upon the head of Jesus.<sup>42</sup> The disciples questioned the woman why this waste of precious oil was poured all over the head of Jesus rather than sold and the money distributed to the poor. Christ defended the

---

<sup>41</sup> Redford, p. 46-47.

<sup>42</sup> Matthew 26:6-13.

woman by saying that it was done for his burial and saying that you always have the poor and can help them anytime you can but you do not always have the Son of God with you physically.

Here again Redford comes in with the great anarchist view that this was somehow luxurious consumption of ornamental value alone:

“Yet here in this case of luxurious consumption on the part of Jesus is purely of ornamental value, i.e., of a purely aesthetic value—and a fleeting one at that! When Jesus’s disciples complained about this “waste” Jesus told His disciples to stop bothering the woman about it! At the very least, this demonstrates the notion that Jesus was some sort of austere, principled ascetic to be an untenable one—and thus also, any attempt to make some larger political point out of such a notion is automatically moot.”

Then I wonder why Redford attempted to make the point that Christ was some kind of political entity called an anarchist or an anarcho-capitalist or a libertarian. Such would be “automatically moot.” It is clear that this passage had nothing to do with anything other than the hypocrisy of those who pretend to always be helping the people rather than helping an individual who needs attention at that moment.

Redford concludes that the ultimate responsibility of any individual is not to those around him at all but to feeding himself alone which is just about as bizarre as always contemplating every act as a good work for the whole of the people:

“As well, Paul had this to say as to one’s ultimate responsibility in providing for others: “For even when we were with you, we commanded you this: If anyone will not work, neither shall he eat.”<sup>43,44</sup>

## **19. Jesus has called us to Liberty – Yet Those who Pay Taxes are not free!**

Now we return to Redford’s main thesis that Christ was an anarchist rather than the little rabbit trail we took to see if Christ was a particular kind of anarchist like a libertarian, free market, anarcho-capitalist anarchist. Redford asserts here and elsewhere in his treatise that Jesus has called us to liberty but all those who pay taxes to government of any kind are not free therefore government cannot be lawful because they are all supported by taxation which enslaves all people.

“Another Bible passage that is sometimes cited by statists to supposedly demonstrate that Jesus supported the paying of taxes—but which in actuality demonstrates the exact opposite—is in Matthew 17:24–27:”

This is the same passage that we have discussed completely in section 4. Redford repeats his argument that Jesus paid the tax just to avoid trouble not because it was lawful. I have shown that this applied to Jesus only as he was the King of kings and Lord of lords where as we are many kings and many lords and we make lawful governments by consent and social contract and by assuming the role of protecting the property of all in a particular area or territory which is lawful to do and to expect all to pay a lawful tax for it that does not harm the property of any to collect.

Redford asserts that because the citizens are free of the particular custom he and Peter were charged with that citizens are free. Therefore freedom is not being required to pay taxes:

“Yet the fact that Jesus considers those who are required to pay taxes as being unfree is enough to conclusively demonstrate that Jesus is necessarily against taxes, as one of the main reasons Jesus came was to call us to liberty!”<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> 2 Thessalonians 3:10

<sup>44</sup> Redford, p. 48.

<sup>45</sup> Redford, p. 49.



Jesus never said that it was not lawful for those who were not citizens of a nation or city to pay a custom upon entering that city or nation. What Christ was saying to Peter is that Christ was the creator of all cities and nations and galaxies and therefore was not really subject to any such a tax. Jesus never said that a tax on citizens for the support of some common function was not lawful either. And Jesus never said that a person would be free if they did not pay a tax of any kind. Christ was really saying that the sons of the city were free from paying a particular tax that foreigners had to pay. Christ simply was saying that he was not a stranger anywhere. But that does not mean we are not strangers in nations that we are not citizens of because we did not make them but rather made the nations, states and cities we live in and formed. Being free of a particular tax does not make one free of sin or free of total tyranny of some other kind. It is ludicrous to conclude that Christ's total message was liberty and that meant no taxation. One could easily live under abject tyranny and still have no taxation of any kind just tyrants taking whatever they want whenever they want it.

To make the incredible leap of logic that Christ came to abolish taxes, Redford attaches the proclamation Christ made in the synagogue concerning his appearance as Messiah to his lesson that as the Son of God he owed no tax as he was the creator of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

“And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read.  
And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written,  
The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised,  
To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.  
And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.  
And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.” (Luke 4:16-21)

How does the abolition of taxation deal with sin, blindness, the brokenhearted, the poor, captivity, or even liberty? None of these things are cured by freedom from all taxation. This is not to say that some taxes are really abusive and are opposed to the sole purpose of lawful government and detrimental and destructive to it. But the mere abolition of taxation of all kinds can do very little for all the things that Christ declared that he came to do. And certainly he did not say he came to deliver the captives from government or from taxation. This is all a presumption made by Redford as stated below:

“So here we have it: Jesus Himself said that He came to proclaim liberty to the captives and to set at liberty the oppressed—and yet Jesus also said that those who are required to pay taxes are not free!”<sup>46</sup>

As with most anarchists Redford cannot get taxation out of his mind. He has implied that the abolition of taxation will abolish all sin, all oppression, all illness, all tyranny, all oppression, and all crime.

In fear that somebody might challenge his conclusion that liberty means freedom from taxes he provides us with the Greek translations of the words free, liberty, freeborn, exempt, unrestrained etc., as if we needed to dig that deep to find a problem with his conclusion. Then he added two pages of totally inapplicable scripture passages to make sure we knew that being free of taxes meant we do not have to pay them. Then Redford even quotes some of Rothbard's work concerning law and liberty as if any of that was scriptural evidence that Christ came to deliver mankind from taxation. But in summary, Redford's whole conclusion that Christ came to free us

---

<sup>46</sup> Redford, p. 50.

from taxation is based upon the connection of two scripture passages, namely, Matthew 17:24-27 quoted in section 4 herein and Luke 4:16-21 quoted in this section.

Also, this is not to say that Christians do not have a *right* to abolish certain types of taxes or even all taxes or to abolish a government entirely. But what Redford is attempting to prove is that all mankind, including Christians *do not have a right* to construct government or institute taxes to support it and that to do so would be to serve Satan and become evil. None of Redford's assertions herein are provable in the Holy Scripture or by anything he has written in his treatise entitled "Jesus is an Anarchist."

## **20. Jesus will Overthrow All the Governments of the World and Punish All the Rulers in the Time of His Judgment (i.e., His Second Coming)**

Now it is certainly reasonable that the monarchy of Christ Jesus will replace all governments of the world upon his second coming. But it is not true that he will punish all the rulers of the world at his second coming or at his judgment. As I have shown earlier herein it is not Satan who actually controls the world or the governments thereof but God and he can give them to whomsoever He wants and he can raise governments up and bring them down according to Daniel 4:25 quoted earlier herein under section 1. Satan has the appearance of power to do those things but those things must be approved by God or they do not happen and that is simply because God is more powerful than Satan. Satan depends on people. God commands all things great and small. Satan is a liar and tells people he controls things when in fact he controls nothing without approval. But Redford actually believes that it is Satan who controls the world and the nations thereof:

"In the above it was clearly demonstrated that the Earthly, mortal governments are firmly under the control of Satan—that it is Satan who is the true god and ruler over this perverted governmental world system wherein power-mad psychotics rule over our existence and exempt themselves from every standard of decency which people would otherwise expect from any common stranger. Yet this diabolical, demonically controlled government system is not to last forever."<sup>47</sup>

Then Redford tells us what he thinks the Bible says about the end time:

"Lucifer's false Christ—i.e., the Antichrist—will come to strengthen and empower government during the last days: cementing together for the first time in human history a world government—of which God will allow to continue for a short time.<sup>48</sup> This world government will be the ultimate culmination of the very essence of everything which government represents: in short, it will be the most diabolical government which has ever existed, with mass murder of the righteous on a massive scale.<sup>49</sup> All the rulers of the Earth will whore themselves with this world government and be aligned against Jesus Christ during the final battle of Armageddon.<sup>50,51</sup>

To some degree I agree with the limited scope of what Redford has said concerning the end time in the immediately above quote. However he did not comment on what the 1000 year reign is and when it occurs which may reveal something about his argument. We shall see later.

Redford then reviews some Old Testament scripture about the end time in two passages namely, Psalms 110:5-6 and Isaiah 24:21-22. But neither of these passages actually say that all

---

<sup>47</sup> Redford, p. 53

<sup>48</sup> Revelation 17:9-18.

<sup>49</sup> Revelation 20:4.

<sup>50</sup> Revelation 16:14; 17:2; 18:3,9; 19:19.

<sup>51</sup> Redford, p. 53.

kings and all rulers will be executed. Yes the kings may be a host and many but that does not say all. And further there is no indication that these punishments are reserved just for kings and rulers but for all people who have not lived a righteous life or a life of faith.

Then Redford quotes Ezekiel concerning the shepherds or priests misleading the people of Israel and applies their judgment to all leaders of every nation and state and government, no matter whether they be Christian or otherwise:

“And the word of the LORD came unto me, saying,  
Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, prophesy, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD unto the shepherds; Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! should not the shepherds feed the flocks?  
Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed: but ye feed not the flock.  
The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them.  
And they were scattered, because there is no shepherd: and they became meat to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered.  
My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill: yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them.  
Therefore, ye shepherds, hear the word of the LORD;  
As I live, saith the Lord GOD, surely because my flock became a prey, and my flock became meat to every beast of the field, because there was no shepherd, neither did my shepherds search for my flock, but the shepherds fed themselves, and fed not my flock;  
Therefore, O ye shepherds, hear the word of the LORD;  
Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall the shepherds feed themselves any more; for I will deliver my flock from their mouth, that they may not be meat for them.” (Ezekiel 34:1-10)

As just as that sounds to punish the shepherds, the above passage still applies to the priests of Israel and was addressed to them not to governments in general. It is also obvious that these passages do not even apply to the end time but to the end of Judaism and the introduction of Christianity the pinnacle of Judaism. But Redford stubbornly continues to apply that to all who govern any government:

“Now obviously again, God, speaking here to Zechariah—just as Ezekiel before him—is not talking about literal shepherds and goatherds, but is using these expressions as metaphors for rulers. Indeed, this is how the New Revised Standard Version translates it: “My anger is hot against the shepherds, and I will punish the leaders. . . .”<sup>52</sup>

Now who would argue with Redford that the quotes from Ezekiel and Zechariah were not metaphors about rulers over a mass of people? But that does not mean that it was a general condemnation of all governments and the concept of government in general and all those who operate them. These scriptures still apply only to the priests and the Jewish people prior to the time of Christ:

“For thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day.” (Ezekiel 34:11-12)

---

<sup>52</sup> Redford, p. 55.

Do not the two verses of scripture that follow Redford's quote from Ezekiel predict the day that Christ Jesus walks among the Jews and calls them to repent and follow him? Does not the New Testament confirm that God, even God walked among the people and called them out:

“To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.” (2 Corinthians 5:19)

Redford then says that the Old Testament proves that Christ absolutely abhors and detests all government in general and those who operate them:

“Thus, there is an amazing continuity within the Old Testament prophecies as to what God's End-Times Judgement is, at least in part, to consist of: the punishment of all the Earthly rulers and the abolition of all mortal rulerships! Can there be any doubt left in an honest, true Christian's mind as to just how much Jesus absolutely abhors and detests government?”<sup>53</sup>

Well there remains doubt in my Christian mind and rather think that God the Father and the Son Jesus Christ abhor and detest unlawful tyrannical rulers who violate the law of their own nations and states and cities. It is not the law that God and Christ hate or the governments that should enforce the laws but rather they hate those that violate the laws of nations and governments.

Finally Redford says that if Christians still have doubts as to the hatred Christ has for all government we should hear what St. Paul has to say about it:

“If there should be the slightest shred of doubt left in one's mind, then please, choose to walk in the clear light of liberty and let Paul slay—once and for all—that last misplaced sense of doubt!: But each one in his own order: “Christ the firstfruits, afterward those who are Christ's at His coming. Then comes the end, when He delivers the kingdom to God the Father, when He puts an end to all rule and all authority and power.”<sup>54</sup>

How could it possibly be stated any clearer?! The governments of the Earth are not of God, they are of Satan, and Jesus will come to utterly destroy them all during His Judgement!”

This conclusion is simply not supported by the scripture Redford has quoted. Paul's statement that in the end Christ will “deliver up the kingdom to God the Father when He puts an end to all rule and all authority and power” does not indicate that Christians who operated Christian governments would be punished any more than other sinners who repented and became Christians. This statement by Paul is simply a statement that Christ is the head of the church and head of the world and King of kings and Lord of lords and that all things will be under his authority as the one who created it all and operated upon it all in his death, resurrection and ascension. It does not mean that all those inferior authorities would be damned and punished forever. It certainly means God will punish those who conducted tyranny while they were in office and operated government. Government is no different from any other profession in terms of how it will be judged. Good honest Christian doctors will not be harmed neither will those good Christian government office holders and lawyers, etc. But Redford cannot have anything short of all government and all those involved in it being destroyed and punished forever rather than being replaced or decommissioned. If we continue Redford's logic we would find that in the end time God will also destroy his Son Christ Jesus and punish him forever in the same group of scriptural passages:

“And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” (1 Corinthians 15:28)

Redford keeps on plowing through the scriptures to turn all over on its head for anarchy by saying: “How could it possibly be stated any clearer?! The governments of the Earth are not of

---

<sup>53</sup> Redford, p. 55.

<sup>54</sup> 1 Corinthians 15:23-24.

God, they are of Satan, and Jesus will come to utterly destroy them all during His Judgement! As it is written:"<sup>55</sup> After making that statement he quotes the following scripture from Revelation:

“And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army.  
And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone.  
And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” (Revelation 19:19-21)

No doubt that Satan has been loosed from the pit to deceive the nations once again and the 1000 year reign of Christ through the church on earth has concluded and Satan is once again able to control the actions of many nations by deceit such as the false flag inside job of September 11, 2001. But that does not mean that all government in general and even the concept of it is evil. And yes we see the rulers of the earth come against the Christians in all corners of the earth. But that still does not support the notion that law and the government that maintains it is evil along with all those who fill the offices of same. Revelation does show that those who are tyrants and violate the laws of nations will be harmed by the second death and thrown into the lake of fire. Redford finally ends his section 20 by saying:

“In the above passage from Revelation 19, the “rest” [remnant] referred to being “killed with the sword which proceeded from the mouth” of Jesus in verse 21 are “the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him who sat on the horse and against His army,” which was previously referred to in verse 19.  
And so it is found that from the Old Testament through the New Testament that there is a remarkable continuity and agreement as to what the fate of all the Earthly governments and all their rulers shall be during God’s Judgement. And so also, this all demonstrates unmistakably just how much God is opposed to the ghastly, Satanical machination called government!  
There can be no honest doubt: Jesus is an anarchist!”<sup>56</sup> (Brackets added)

Yes who would argue with Redford again that there will be no earthly governments and rulers when Christ returns to judge the world? Christ will most assuredly abolish, remove, replace, decommission, and in many cases destroy, all earthly governments. There will be no non-Christians in the world to rule by earthly government and therefore there will be no need for government. All will be heavenly people self regulated throughout eternal space.

## **21. God’s People are to be Volunteers and Self-rulers in the Kingdom of Christ**

Now that Redford has proven, to his own satisfaction, that Christ was a free-market libertarian anarchist he sets out to prove that God and Christ want Christians and all people to be anarchists and volunteers and self-rulers in the kingdom of Christ. Redford starts by describing what he thinks the post judgment Kingdom of Christ will be like. But he submits that his whole argument is moot because “God has no need for such material support, as do the mortal governments:”

“Some may object to the designation of Jesus as an anarchist—as some may counter, What about the Kingdom of Christ that is to be established after the Judgement? But as was pointed out in several places above, the “Kingdom of Christ” will in no sense be an actual government as they have existed on Earth and operated by mortals.”<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Redford, p. 56.

<sup>56</sup> Redford, p. 56.

<sup>57</sup> Redford, p. 56.

“Well, to begin with, unlike all mortal governments, which compel people to support them whether they want to or not—in the form of taxes, etc.—\*\*\* The seeking of material possessions means nothing to God as He is what makes their very existence possible. Therefore taxes and their like will have no place in God’s Kingdom, as God has no need for such material support, as do the mortal governments.”<sup>58</sup>

The description of the post judgment world and pre-judgment world and their governments do not prove that Christ and the Father were or are anarchist. What Redford must prove to win his argument is that Christ is an anarchist and that he wants us to be anarchist and live in worldwide anarchy. One of the proofs that Redford said he would show is that Christ came to free us and that this would mean abolition of all taxation and all government. But he cannot prove that by saying that in the post judgment Kingdom of Christ there will be no need of taxes to support His Kingdom. Who would argue with that? But that does not prove Christ is opposed and hates and abhors government and taxation to support it now in the pre-judgment age.

As I have pointed out before, Redford reveals that he thinks all governments are mortal meaning they are ruled by mortal people. That is incorrect as there are Christians in some of these offices resulting in modern government being operated by a mix of mortal and immortal office holders. As I have also shown earlier, Redford thinks that this age is the pre-Kingdom of Christ age. He is also incorrect here as well. This is one of the problems he is having in his assessment of this age. Had he known that this is the age of the Kingdom of Christ wherein Christ rules from above via his church on earth for over 2000 years he might wonder why anarchy had not been more popular and natural among the Christian nations in Europe, North and South America, Russia and Australia.

After Redford submits to us an argument that he agrees is moot, he moves on to show that God and Christ intend for us to be volunteers in this post judgment Kingdom of Christ which again is moot in that such a thing has nothing to do with the present world we live in and what it is supposed to be now and what Christ and God want it to be now. Let us first admit that we cannot make this world into the post judgment world. Only Christ can do that and nothing can be said about that Kingdom that can prove what Christ wants in the present Kingdom of Heaven on Earth prior to his return. No one will argue that government, in any form or fashion, is needed in the post judgment age of the Kingdom of God. But that cannot mean that there is no need for government and its support in the present pre-judgment Kingdom of God.

Regardless of these moot arguments, Redford tries to show that; because we Christians will be “volunteers” in the post judgment Kingdom, we should be volunteers now in the pre-judgment Kingdom of God. Apparently, Redford searched the whole Bible looking for any derivative of that popular root word in anarchy, namely, “VOLUNTARY.” Redford found one in his version of the Bible, the New King James and gives it to us to make his point:

“Your people shall be volunteers In the day of Your power; In the beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning, You have the dew of Your youth.”<sup>59</sup>

I am using the Old King James version and the word *willing* is used instead of volunteers in the same passage:

“Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning; thou hast the dew of thy youth.” (Psalms 110:3)

The word volunteer or any of its derivatives do not show up on the Old King James version at all. Regardless, Redford makes the following conclusion:

“Thus the people of God’s Kingdom shall be volunteers! How different indeed from all the mortal governments which compel people to support them through theft and extortion!”<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Redford, p. 57.

<sup>59</sup> Redford, p. 57.

Now again, Redford does not perceive that the Kingdom of God or Christ already exists on earth at this time. Christians can also admit that there is death and evil in our Kingdom at present and that the Second Coming of Christ will destroy all evil within the Kingdom to the most remote of galaxies. But that does not mean the Kingdom of Christ is not already in place in terms of who sits on the throne over it all and who are the King's instruments upon earth, namely, the saints and the church.

Redford also makes an astonishing observation above that most all anarchists make and that is to conclude that taxation is the same as theft and extortion. But in lawful governments that adhere to their laws taxation collected as per their constitutions cannot be theft or extortion as the people agree to the constitutions of their government either directly or via their representatives. Therefore taxation cannot be theft and extortion if said tax was agreed to in support of the government they agreed to. Who would argue that a government that tries to collect taxes that are not specified in the constitution or are forbidden that this would be extortion, theft and tyranny? But this is a special case of tyranny not a generality applying to all governments and taxation in general.

In the last part of this section 21, Redford makes the assertion that when the four living creatures and the 24 elders sing a new song and declare in same that Christ "has made us kings and priests to our God and we shall reign on the earth," that what is meant by that is that each individual Christian will reign over their own property and not the property of the earth held by all people:

"And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;  
And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth." (Revelation 5:9-10)

If that was the only scripture we had that might be a fair conclusion but that is not all we have. What about the "rod of iron" we are promised and what is that for?

"And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations:  
And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.  
And I will give him the morning star.  
He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." (Revelation 2:26-29)

Make no mistake about it, Christians who keep the works of Christ, namely, the death, resurrection and ascension will receive power over the nations not only their own home and garden and bicycle but over the property of all people in nations. They will also be able to dash into little pieces, like the vessels of a potter, those nations that do not follow the laws of God and principles of Christ and property. These Christians will be able to raise up nations and bring them down and it is all ordained and promised by Christ Jesus. Therefore, the conclusion below of Redford is incorrect as it applies to the present Kingdom of God we are in now:

"Obviously the only who for us to be kings over is our own persons and the only what for us to reign over shall be our own domain. For the first time in history mankind will truly be free from the yoke of bondage—that Satanic world system of servitude in all of its many guises. For the first time ever we will be self-rulers and our homes truly will be our castles! We shall be complete and absolute sovereigns over our own lives!"<sup>61</sup>

Redford makes what he thinks is a grand ending by quoting a passage that proves no part or any of his thesis:

---

<sup>60</sup> Redford, p. 57.

<sup>61</sup> Redford, p. 58.

“Because it very much bears repeating, I will leave this section by citing what Paul had to say on this matter one more time, for he said it as well and as plainly as it could possibly be stated: “But each one in his own order: Christ the firstfruits, afterward those who are Christ’s at His coming. Then comes the end, when He delivers the kingdom to God the Father, when He puts an end to all rule and all authority and power.”<sup>62</sup> Amen.”

How can it be said that when Christ puts an end to all rule and all authority and power under him that he is against all rule, all authority and all power under him? As I have pointed out earlier herein. God also puts an end to all the rule, power and authority of Christ Jesus His Son at the end. Does that mean that God is against His only begotten Son who died, was resurrected and ascended back to God? Totally ludicrous! This too bears repeating:

“But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.  
Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.  
For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.  
The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.  
For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.  
And when all things shall be subdued unto him, **then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.**” (1 Corinthians 15:23-28)

These passages above are not about utter violent destruction of all rule, authority and power on earth but about them all coming under the authority, jurisdiction and power of Christ Jesus. As we see that Christ too is put down under God. But to “put down” is not necessarily utter destruction. It might mean destruction, if, the said authority is resistant to Christ’s rule. Notice too that Christ must rule until he hath put all enemies under his feet. That means Christ is ruling and has been ruling for over 2000 years. Redford claims Satan rules presently. Who would argue that Satan is not powerful? But it shows self deception to argue that Satan rules the world. Notice too that Paul says that Christ has already put all things under his feet and so he has by his death, resurrection and ascension he has conquered the cosmos and created the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth.

## 22. Closing Remarks

Redford tries to make several following points in this section:

### 22.1. ***Christ follows the Libertarian Non-Aggression Principle;***

In Redford’s closing remarks he reveals by his discourse that he was a libertarian anarchist before he was a Christian as he puts primary emphasis on the “libertarian Nonaggression Principle” as if it came first, then Christianity and Christ. It is then not surprising that Redford tries to cram Christ into the libertarian mold which ends in anarchy. It clearly appears that Redford investigated Christ after becoming a so-called libertarian, free-market, anarcho-capitalist:

“In all of my research into Jesus Christ I have discovered that He is nothing if not a perfectly consistent libertarian, at least as it concerns His political ethic. I could come across not one

---

<sup>62</sup> 1 Corinthians 15:23-24.



instance of Him contradicting this position, either in word or in action. I can't say that I was really surprised by this, although I suppose to many it may be surprising to learn this.”<sup>63</sup>

So it may be that Redford did not try to investigate libertarian / anarchist doctrine as to its conformity to the gospel of Christ Jesus but rather to bring the gospel of Christ into conformity to the doctrines of anarchy:

“For one thing, when Jesus gave the Golden Rule as the ultimate social ethic,<sup>64</sup> it's clear that He actually meant it. Yet, as was demonstrated above,<sup>65</sup> this ethic is just a different formulation of the libertarian Nonaggression Principle, at least as a political ethic. As a strictly political ethic it is actually completely congruent with the libertarian Nonaggression Principle, in that as political ethics they actually prohibit the same activity: i.e., aggression against people's just property\*\*\*”<sup>66</sup>

Redford implies that the Golden Rule is just a different formulation of the libertarian Nonaggression Principle. That is rather humorous indeed. Would it not be more appropriate to say the reverse that the so-called libertarian Nonaggression Principle is just another formulation of the Golden Rule, since the Golden Rule is over 2000 years old and the libertarian principles are maybe 100 years old? Obviously, Redford is making the ludicrous comparison of the recently appearing, Christ, congruent with the ancient anarchist doctrines of nonaggression rather than the other way around.

Redford leads us directly from here into a short lesson in how to arrive at an allodial title to land which will be impossible for some people and therefore bring into question the ownership of their property which begs the question of what anarchists propose if you can't prove a nonaggression title to your property. Then he concludes that Christ is a libertarian and calls us to liberty which is incompatible with all Christian and non-Christian governments in general and all taxation:

“What I have shown above is that Jesus has called us to liberty, and that liberty and Christ's message are incompatible with government. Indeed, governments throughout history have been the most demonic force to ever exist on Earth. We need not lament their passing, but instead look forward to it.”

## **22.2. All government even the concept of government is evil;**

Redford says that Christians cannot fulfill their other Christian duties if they do not know who the oppressed are and what is oppressing them:

“To start with, as Christians how can we be attentive to the cries of the oppressed if we don't even recognize the oppressor? How can we comfort and give aid to someone if we don't even recognize them as a victim? We are liable to be obtuse and uncaring to those who have been unjustly wronged by this Satanic world system if we don't even recognize the main instrument of Satan's power on this Earth. So that is first and foremost: by realizing and understanding the truth as to the diabolical nature of government one will thereby have gained back part of one's humanity which this Satanic world system has worked so hard in making people oblivious to. One need only watch some of the old Nazi propaganda films of thousands of German youths

---

<sup>63</sup> Redford, p. 58.

<sup>64</sup> Matthew 7:12; Luke 6:31.

<sup>65</sup> re: Section 2

<sup>66</sup> Redford, p. 59.

goose-stepping in unison to realize just how effective this demonic world system can sometimes be in stripping people of their humanity.”<sup>67</sup>

Redford has certainly a concern for the oppressed and is upset because Christians turn their backs on those that have been hurt by government. But his error is not his concern for those hurt by tyranny but by making the mistake in concluding that people are suffering from government in general instead of government that has been altered unlawfully and dissolved by the crimes of those that have been in the office of government. We should all be concerned and try to help those who have been harmed by unlawful acts of tyranny by unlawful dissolved governments. The church is indeed in error ignoring those oppressed by unlawful government action.

### **22.3. To destroy government hastens the return of Christ;**

Now Redford attempts to show that Christians and others can hasten the return of Christ by instituting the kind of system that Christ desires before he returns:

“Second, according to the Bible, it makes a difference as to when Jesus’s Second Coming will occur depending on our actions in being able to raise the awareness of the world’s population. While although I mentioned Etienne de La Boétie in the introduction and pointed out that if a critical mass of the population could come to understand and accept the truth as to the true nature of governments that it would be enough to topple them, this is ultimately true because it would in this case hasten the coming of Jesus Christ! Thus, Peter wrote about Christians being able to hasten the coming of Christ.”<sup>68</sup>

At this point Redford quotes Peter but his version is not the same as my version of the Bible:

“Therefore, since all these things will be dissolved, what manner of persons ought you to be in holy conduct and godliness, looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God, because of which the heavens will be dissolved, being on fire, and the elements will melt with fervent heat?”

Redford’s New King James version of 2 Peter 3:11-12 does sound more convincing of his argument than the Old King James version:

“Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness,  
Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?” (2 Peter 3:11-12)

But let us consider the scripture itself. Isn’t the real question that is before us the suffering of people under unlawful government action? But it is not evident at all that instituting anarchy would hasten the return of Christ any more than instituting lawful government or altering one with a bad portion. The scripture simply does not say that anarchy will hasten the return of Christ or that anarchy will make Christians able to fulfill their call to help the oppressed any more than the institution of lawful government in the place of dissolved unlawful government.

But in fact let us face the fact that 2 Peter 3:11-12 in the Old King James version does not indicate that any action on the part of Christianity can hasten the return of Christ. And that I believe is to be the case. Many people have attempted to persuade the church to take various actions or non-actions in order to hasten the return of Christ including the Premillennialists who have said that we must stand by Israel and do nothing about our own corrupt government because that will hasten the return of Christ when all nations shall surround the city of the Saints, etc. This too is incorrect on all counts including the entire Premillennial view of the end time.

---

<sup>67</sup> Redford, p. 59.

<sup>68</sup> Redford, p. 59.

If you can't change your stature or the color of one hair on your head, there is nothing to indicate you can alter the time at which Jesus returns and if we don't know when he is going to return how can we know if we are speeding it up one iota?

“Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black.”  
(Matthew 5:36)

“Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?” (Matthew 6:27)

“Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.”  
(Matthew 25:13)

If we cannot alter these little things what makes us think we can alter the arrival of Christ? Rather we should tend to the things we can and should alter like the ruling of the nations with the rod of iron while Christ is away on his long trip so that when he returns he finds us being good stewards and husbandmen of the Kingdom he left us authority to rule as kings and priests. And that means bringing down corrupt tyrannical dissolved governments and raising-up new lawful governments to protect the property of every individual in its jurisdictional area.

#### **22.4. *Christian Anarchy prevents deception as to the true identity of the real savior;***

Redford gives us another reason why all Christians and others should become anarchist. If we don't we will likely fall for the deception as to who the real savior is. Redford says that in the end times that one man, the antichrist, will unite all governments of the world and will be able to offer the world peace because he runs it all. And if one does not know Jesus and what he came to do then we will all fall for the imposter which is the antichrist world government ruler.

“Some Christians mistakenly believe that so long as one accepts a person called “Jesus” as their Lord and Savior then they will have eternal salvation. Yet there will be many people in the End-Times Judgement who will consider themselves to be good Christians worshipping the true Second Coming of Jesus Christ, and yet in doing so they will have condemned themselves to Hell! \*\*\* Thus if one worships a lie in place of the truth then the fact that one will have called this lie by the name of “Jesus” will be of no help! In fact, to do so is blasphemy! In order for one to really worship Jesus one first has to know what the truth of Jesus is about. And that, my friends, is the ultimate purpose of this document: that people may come to know the real Jesus. And what Jesus Christ is about is liberty—at least as politics is concerned.”<sup>69</sup>

Therefore, Redford concludes that if we believe in a Jesus that does not abhor, hate and detest all government on earth even the concept thereof and all taxation as his political position we will be in danger of falling for the antichrist who will present themselves as the savior of mankind via world government. Well no doubt, many people have already placed their trust in a world government and the United Nations and such to their own folly but that is not the strong delusion spoken of in 2 Thessalonians 2:11:

“And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:” (2 Thessalonians 2:11)

Redford thinks he has identified the nature of the antichrist that shall deceive many even some of the elect. His first mistake here is that the antichrist is not just one person but millions of people which have been around since the beginning of the spread of the gospel. They are those who do not believe that Christ is the Son of God or the Savior of the world. And this strong delusion is to believe that those who say they don't believe in Christ are somehow going to be saved at some other time and that they are special people that should be supported no matter what they do.

---

<sup>69</sup> Redford, p. 60.

“Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;  
 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.  
 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?  
 And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.  
 For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.  
 And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:  
 Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,  
 And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.  
 And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:  
 That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”  
 (2 Thessalonians 2:3-12)

We are already in this period of the falling away as the church believes that the Jews are still the chosen people and that they should be supported no matter what evil they inflict upon others and that they are not under the wrath of God for rejecting the Son He sent to save them. This is the strong delusion that the church gave up its love of Christ so that they could have easy credit with fiat currency and destroy the innocent to protect the Jews from being punished for their evil inflicted upon their neighbors such as 9/11/01 resulting in the slaughter of innocent people and the destruction of nations that were innocent of 9/11/01.

The Strong Delusion is not government in the general or taxation and neither does it say such a thing in Scripture. But it does say that the Jews are liars and that they reject Jesus Christ and lie about every thing regarding him. This means there are many in the church that have believed in Premillennialism that the Kingdom of God has not yet been established but will be upon the return of Christ to set up a 1000 year reign over an un-regenerated world that somehow survived the brightness of his coming. These phony Christians care not for the corruption of governments and tyranny and criminal government intrigues because they think that they can do nothing to slow this God ordained destiny towards the return of Christ. The worse it gets the better and closer we are to the glorious return and the 1000 year reign. So none of these Christians have taken up the rod of iron to rule while Christ is away but have hidden under rocks waiting for the return where they think they will be given a scepter to rule along side Christ when he returns. What a surprise awaits them. These beggarly cowards will receive the just rewards who have given up their love of the truth and the savior for easy, risk free, cowardly living where they can claim righteousness at the same time.

## **22.5. *Christian Anarchy prevents bad laws.***

Redford’s last point to make in his closing remarks is that by becoming an anarchist one can avoid bad laws that governments make and that are now in place. Redford is correct in saying that many Christians support bad laws, such as “Prohibition,” the “War on Drugs,” and taxes. Had he said “property taxes” I would have totally agree with him except for the fact that he included “taxes” in his list of bad laws. He believes, erroneously, that all taxes levied by any government are evil and obtained by theft and extortion. But one need not be an anarchist or to think that Christ was an anarchist to come to an understanding that some of these laws are evil and that government does not have authority to make some of them as shown by the principles of property that Redford did not elaborate upon in the slightest.

This completes my review of the work of James Redford and I appreciate the fact that he worked so hard on making his argument.

## **Six Reasons Anarchy is not a Christian Doctrine:**

1. Anarchy denies authority of Christians to rule the world and reign as kings and priests as Christ promised.
2. Ruling and reigning over one's own property is certainly a function of any king but this is nothing that we have not had before on earth. Men have always had the right to rule over their own property and at many times have succeeded in ruling over their own property. This is not what Christ talked about when he promised to those who would keep his works that they would have power over the nations and the use of the rod of iron.
3. It was not until Christ came and established the Kingdom of God or Heaven or Christ on earth by his death, resurrection and ascension that authority was given to his saints to rule the world while Christ was away into a far country or deep space. The saints are to guard the vineyard and watch for the enemy from the tower to protect the property of all in the Kingdom. The world is the vineyard and not just church property and certainly not just each person's property alone but everyone's property. All should be protected in the Kingdom and Christians have a duty to do so.
4. Anarchy says that no group has a right to rule a nation or nations including Christians. Christian Anarchists say Christians will rule the world in a future kingdom and that this rule will be restricted to their personal property and nothing of their neighbors. But this is reflecting the heresy of Premillennialism, which denies the effective work of Christ in his death, resurrection and ascension creating the Kingdom of Heaven on earth and denies that Christ has given those who keep His works the power over the nations with the rod of iron.
5. Anarchy in saying that all government, even the concept of government is evil and should be abolished is like unto saying mankind is evil and should be abolished. If one cannot admit that some government is good and lawful and ordained of God and some other governments are evil and unlawful and without God's ordination we prevent honest men from forming good government to protect their property from evil men who would find it easier to take without a government to prevent it.
6. Anarchists say they believe in private property but they deny the establishment and constitution of a society that recognizes and protects the property of individuals from those who would take it in the absence of government. The superior means of protecting the property of each individual person is the constitution of a government establishing uniform authorized laws, courts and police for the sole purpose of protecting and defending the property of each individual.

Private courts by definition would have no authority to impose a ruling on anyone as the parties could always obtain another court for hire somewhere else. And private protection for hire is also an unauthorized power that will be in competition with any other protection company. None of these approaches can come close to protecting all the property of all the people in a uniform and equal manner.

No doubt governments can dissolve themselves into full blown tyranny, but they are still worth forming as new lawful governments to defend against dissolved unlawful government crimes. We must get better at making governments and get better at preventing their dissolution by miscarriage and get better at removing old dissolved tyrannical governments.

If the only reason Anarchy has not been established upon the earth is because it has not been fully articulated as a superior alternative then we must wait even longer because it has not been sufficiently articulated as a viable alternative herein nor has it been shown that it is a Christian solution to tyranny and harm to property.