Law

(The legal system of God)

VS.

LEGAL

(The lawful system of man)

His Holy Church

Dedicated to the service of the Lord.

"And they said, An Egyptian delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds, and also drew [water] enough for us, and watered the flock." (Exodus 2:19)

"But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." (John 4:14)

"For this [is] the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:

And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." (Hebrews 8: 10,11)

This booklet was published by
His Church at Summer Lake
Web site: Http://www.hisholychurch.net/

The Ides of July, Two-thousand and Seven

"To investigate is the way to know what things are really lawful."[1]

"Because of what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what only appears to be a law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance."[2]

The Supreme Court talks of "what only appears to be law" "on the surface." What are we so ignorant of that we would mistake something for law that is not law? We have grown up hearing phrases like, "The law is the law," and "Ignorance of the law is no excuse." What is and makes law?

Since "The origin of a thing ought to be inquired into,"[3] then it would follow that we should look into the origin of the word "law" to give us some idea of its meaning today.

Unlike many of the terms used in the legal system of the United States, the word "law" does not come from the Latin, but from the Anglo-Saxon word *lagu* and the Middle English *lawe,* meaning "just, right, and fair". In Latin, "law" would be translated *jus (juris),* from which we take the word "justice". The Romans had another word, *lex (legis)*, from which we get the word "legal", meaning "statute, bill, principle, rule; contract, condition…" What is legal (connected by contract) becomes lawful (just) by consent.

A legal system based upon freedom has no lawful power to "command" until an individual binds himself to it "for lex (law) is derived from ligare (to bind), because it binds one to act."[4]

"All government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery!" Jonathon Swift

If the Romans, from whom we take many of the principles upon which the present legal system relies, saw it fit and necessary to use two separate and distinct words, one *lex* and the other *jus,* then why do we often use them interchangeably? It is in the distinction between these two words that much of our honest confusion lies.

While "The law (jus) is the rule of right; and whatever is contrary to the rule of right is an injury,"[5] we find that "human laws (lex, leges) are born, live, and die."[6] "That which bars those who have contracted will bar their successors also."[7] Therefore, "The contract makes the law."[8]

---

1 Quærere dat sapere quæ sunt legitima verè. Littleton,§443.
2 US vs. Minker. 350 US,179 p187.
3 Origin rei inspici debet. 1Coke,99.
4 Summa Theologica 1st of 2nd Part Q. 90 Essence of Law. Thomas Aquinas.
5 Jus est norma recti; et quicquid est contra normam recti est injuria. 3 Bulstr.313.
6 Leges humanæ nascuntur, vivuntet moriuntur.
7 Quod ipsis, qui cotraxerunt, abstat; et successoribus eorum obstabit. Di.50.17.29.
8 Legem enim contractus dat. 22 Wend. N.Y. 215,223.

"We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The question is, whether world government will be achieved by conquest or consent."[9]

Because of the maxim "Consent makes the law," it is evident that it is *our* authorization makes a man-made rule, such as a statute, into a law. It is not the arbitrary proclamation of a remote group of men, be it parliament or congress, that binds men to obedience and subjection. Could this mean that a person can simply disregard all legislation against which he himself arbitrarily disagrees? No, or else all government would be anarchy.

"A contract is law between the parties having received their consent."[10]

How does government receive consent? When does an act of consent truly become binding? "In every contract, whether nominate or innominate, there is implied an exchange, i.e. a consideration."[11] Nodding the head, raising your right hand, or signing a piece of paper are all evidences that you have given consent, but the taking of "sufficient consideration" is an act that adds force and authority to consent; for either you have consented to an exchange of consideration or you are a thief. A contract is "an agreement, upon sufficient consideration, to do or not to do a particular thing."[12]

Nothing is so contrary to consent as force and fear.[13]

There are countless ways in which the state works its craft of expanding its power and presence in the world. Even though coercion through force and fear are often used, the real binding consent is voluntary.

"What is mine cannot be taken away without consent."[14]

If consent makes the legal system a lawful system, then it is at the point of our consent that we become bound to obey a legal rule. It does not matter that those legal rules are changed regularly, as long as those rules are changed in accordance with the system that was set down at the origin of the legal system and the individual's assent.

"The hand of the diligent shall bear rule: but the slothful shall be under tribute." (Pr 12:24)

"The laws of England are threefold: common law, customs, and decrees of parliament."[15] There was law in England long before a parliament was convened. Then, "new states of facts arising out of changed economic and

9 James Warburg to U.S. Senate, February 17, 1950.
10 Consesus facit legem. Consent makes the law… Branch. Prine. Black's.
11 In omnibus contractivus, sive nominatis sive innominatis sive, permutatio continetur.
12 Blacks 3rd "contract" p421.
13 Nihil consensui tam contrarium est quam vis atque metus. Dig. 50. 17.116.
14 Quod meum est sine me auferri non potest. Jenk. Cent. Cas. 251.
15 Leges Angliæ sunt tripartitæ: Jus commune, consuetudines, ac decreta comitiiorum.

social conditions" brought the desire for a strong central government.

If "Pacta sunt servanda,"[16] then "Non Pacta, non servanda"

"Before the Norman conquest of England in 1066, the people were the fountainhead of justice. The Anglo-Saxon courts of those days were composed of large numbers of freemen, and the law which they administered was that which had been handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation. In competition with these non professional courts, the Norman king William, who insisted that *he* was the fountainhead of justice, set up his own tribunals. The judges who presided over these royal courts were agents or representatives of the king, not of the people; but they were professional lawyers who devoted most of their time and energy to the administration of justice, and the courts over which they presided were so efficient that they gradually all but displaced the popular, nonprofessional courts."[17]

"But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the LORD." (1 Samuel 8:6)

William of Normandy came to England to collect a disputed debt owed to him by Harold. He did not conquer and seize all of England, but only Harold and his properties, duties, and obligations (and those hereditaments of the freemen who had fought along side Harold in his attempt to avoid payment to William).

From this position, William "insisted that he was the fountainhead of justice" and began to consolidate and expand his position and authority by waging war against all who opposed his claim to Harold's limited kingly dominion.[18] Many changes were brought about as a result of William's strong presence. He opened the door to customs and forms of law that had no foothold in the land of the Anglos since the fall of the Roman Empire. He instituted a survey of all the land that fell under his sword by right of trial by conquest. This was done for the purpose of collecting an excise or tribute tax on the land of those defeated landowners, who were then forced to take an oath of fealty, binding their allegiance and lands to William. The people of England called the book that included these subject lands the "Doomsday Book" and it is still called that to this day.

"Wherefore say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Ye eat with the blood, and lift up your eyes toward your idols, and shed blood: and shall ye possess the land?" (Ezekiel 33:25)

---

16 "agreements must be kept.". General Principles of International Commercial Law, Jus Gentium.

17 Clark's Summary of American Law. p 530.

18 See: The History of the Common Law of England by Matthew Hale 1713

With this growing loss of freehold titles in land, the "large numbers of freemen", who were so necessary for the administration of the Common Law of Land, were no longer available.

"Ye stand upon your sword, ye work abomination, and ye defile every one his neighbor's wife: and shall ye possess the land?" (Ezekiel 33:26)

A legal title is not a freehold, lawful, or a fee simple title. Were the remaining freehold titles in land lost by conquest, or by other means?

"Towns and boroughs act as if persons."[19]

Many followed William, establishing the concepts of towns and cities which had been traditionally shunned by the Angles(along with other customs of business) and a loyalty to their homeland that opened a freer avenue for the establishment of commerce. The law of the Anglo-Saxons still remained intact, but not for those who fell subject to William and his successors. The two systems lived side by side.

"...they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top [may reach] unto heaven..." (Ge. 11:4). "And as for the people, he removed them to cities..." (Ge. 47:21)

The "common law" is "distinguished from law created by the enactment of legislatures," and it "comprises the body of those principles and rules of action relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity…" And "as concerns its force and authority in the United States, the phrase designates that portion of the common law of England which had been adopted and was in force here at the time of the Revolution"[20]

Liberi. In Saxon Law - Freeman; the possessors of allodial lands.[21]

The common law is dependent upon "large numbers of freemen" who can decide both fact and law. Citizens of the United States have no allodial land through neglect and ignorance. Today's jurors as U.S. citizens are subject to the *administration of government*. They are almost always sworn to abide by the decrees of the legislature before they take to their seat as jurors, which allows them to judge only the facts of a case, leaving the determination of law in the hands of the legislature and professional judges.

"Liber homo. A free man; a freeman lawfully competent to act as juror."[22] "An allodial proprietor, as distinguished from a vassal or feudatory."[23]

19 Personæ vice fungitur municipium et decuria. Warner v. Beers, 23 Wend. N.Y. 103,144.

20 Black's Law Dict. (3rd ed.)

21 Black's Law Dict. (3rd Ed.) p.1106.

22 Ld. Raym. 417; Kebl. 563.

23 Black's 3rd Ed. page 1105.

The original settlers and founders of this republic called the Americas, had come here fleeing the *king's justice* saying, 'Farewell, Rome. Farewell, Babylon'. Here, the individual had access to a free-dominion by the relinquishment, in charter, of the right of the king to make law without consent. In the case of the American colonies, they were republics, guaranteed by contract with the king that no law could be made "except by the consent of the freeman." The king of England was to give the colonies the benefit of his protection from "foreign invasion" and, in exchange, he could impose only excise *(use)* taxes and tariffs *(taxes on foreign trade),* as well as regulate the equitable practice of business, for which there was no remedies at the common law.

The extent of the legal authority of the king of Britain in the Americas was limited. It was his usurpation *(seizing a use)* of rights that were not his that led to the Declaration of Independence, whereby the colonial governments became totally independent states at the dissolution of the charter. The king broke the contract and violated the terms of the agreement. A limited authority and responsibility was then assumed by the colonial governments, who eventually bound themselves together by Articles of Confederation, and later by a constitution which created a legal society with certain limited obligations and privileges to the republics. All other power and authority was retained by the people who had earned their freedom.

"The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits."[24]

The United States Federal government is a limited jurisdiction. It grew, not by decree, but by government offers and individual acceptance, or it grew by neglect. In other words, the limited authority of government grew by expanding the offer of benefits and obligations to the individual citizens, including membership in the government itself. The more desired, the more offered, and the more that was accepted, all the more was required. An entitlement grants a reciprocating entitlement to the Benefactor.

"The desire of the slothful killeth him; for his hands refuse to labour." (Proverbs 21:25)

Financial benefits were not part of the original obligations of the states or the United States. The average citizen cannot, in justice, accept them without offering at least some seemingly equal consideration.

" My son, if sinners entice thee, consent not." (Proverbs 1, 10)

Each time we accept or apply for new bounties, donations, and benefits, we are consenting by word or deed to the legal authority of that government or body politic. We grant power by application and acceptance.

24 Plutarch.

"Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with [his] hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." (Ephesians 4:28)

To take what is not owed, with no intention of returning equal consideration, is the essence of stealing. To accept without consenting to pay the price is the essence of theft. Ignorance of this fundamental principle is the "ignorance of law". That, the law does not excuse.

"I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding;… [Yet] a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep: So shall thy poverty come [as] one that travelleth; and thy want as an armed man." (Pr. 24:30, 34)

"In respect to the ground of the authority of law, it is divided as natural law, or the law of nature or of God, and positive law." Positive Law is "Law actually ordained or established, under human sanctions, as distinguished from the law of nature or natural law, which comprises those considerations of justice, right, and universal expediency that are announced by the voice of reason or of revelation…"[25]

"Law governs men and reason the law." [26]

The Law of Nature is "The divine will, or the dictate of right reason, showing the moral deformity or moral necessity that there is in any act, according to its suitableness or unsuitableness to a reasonable nature. Sometimes used of the law of human reason, in contradistinction to the revealed law, and sometimes of both, in contradistinction to positive law."[27]

The Natural Law is divine will; not merely the will of men, who, by their own reason, have determined it. If the reason is not *right reason,* then the law or rule is not truly Natural Law. Natural law, as a term, may have several uses and should be clarified whenever it is used.

"They [natural laws] are independent of any artificial connections, and differ from mere presumptions of law in this essential respect, that the latter depend on and are a branch of the peculiar system of jurisprudence to which they belong; but mere natural presumptions are derived wholly by means of the common experience of mankind, without the aid or control of any particular rule of law, but simply from the course of nature and the habits of society. These presumptions fall within the exclusive province of the jury, who are to pass upon the facts."[28]

---

25 Bouvier's.
26 Fuller
27 1.3 Bouvier, Inst. n. 3064; Greanleaf, Ev. É 44.
28 3 Bouvier, Inst. n. 3064;

Jury Nullification "...jury shall be judges of the law and the facts."[29]

The natural law is "divine will" and "right reason"; these are not connected to mere "presumptions of law". Presumptions of law are dependent upon "peculiar systems of jurisprudence".

Jurisprudence "is but the philosophy of law or the science which treats of the principles of positive law and legal relationships".[30] The term *jurisprudence* "is wrongly applied to actual systems of law".[31]

"Nothing against reason is lawful."[32]

The word legal itself is defined in Black's 3rd as:

1. Conforming to law; according to law; required or permitted by law…
2. Proper or sufficient to be recognized by law; cognizable in the courts…
3. Cognizable in courts of law, as distinguished from courts of equity; construed or governed by the rules and principles of law…
4. Posited [assumed] by courts as the inference or imputation of the law, as a matter of construction, rather than established by actual proof.
5. Created by law.

Legal systems may "conform to law", they may be "permitted by law", they may even be created by law, but they are not law in themselves. They may become law by consent and the constructions of law. What is legal is "cognizable in courts of law; as distinguished from courts of equity" which are not "governed by rules of law".

Any legal system is subject to the prior and essential principles of law, law that is basic, fundamental, and well-established over thousands of years of recorded history. It should be apparent that binding oneself to a legal system that is constantly under the process of change is, at the very least, rather dangerous.

"And if the question relate to any point of public liberty, or if it be one of those in which the judges may be suspected of bias, the jury undertake to decide both law and fact."[33]

"He was a mighty provider before the LORD: wherefore it is said, Even as

29 See Art. 1, Sec. 1 of GA's. Art. 1, Sec. 19, of IN's and TN, Con. AL (Art. I, Sec. 12); CO (Art. II, Sec. 10); CT (Art. I, Sec. 6); DE (Art. I, Sec. 5); KE (Bill of Rights, Sec. 9); ME (Art. I, Sec, 4); MA (Art. XXIII); MI (Art. 3, Sec. 13); MO (Art. I, Sec. 8); MT (Art. II, Sec. 7); NJ (Art. I, Sec. 6); NY (Art. I, Sec. 8); ND (Art. I, Sec. 4); OR (Art. I, sec. 16), PA (Art. I, Sec. 7); SC (Art. I, Sec. 16); SD (Art. VI, Sec. 5); TX (Art. 1, Sec. 8); UT (Art. I, Sec. 15); WI (Art. I, Sec. 3); WY (Art. 1, Sec. 20)

30 Blacks Law Dict. 3rd p1039

31 Blacks Law Dict.

32 Nihil quod est contra rationem edt licitum. Coke, litt. 97.

33 Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Va., 1782. Q.XIV

Nimrod the mighty provider before the LORD." (Genesis 10:9)

"The jurisdiction of equity court, gradually developed by the chancellor, was limited only by the chancellor himself. There were two important limitations, both adopted to avoid any clash with the common-law courts. One was that equity would not interfere where there was an adequate remedy at common law; the other was that equity would act merely against the person of the common law plaintiff or defendant and therefore affect the legal right only in that indirect fashion."[34] Equity was dealing with the legal rights of a person, not lawful rights of an individual freeman. Equity courts administered the king's justice in the king's dominion.

"A person is a man considered in reference to a certain status."[35]

The courts of equity were used to fulfill a need for remedies which the common law, by tradition and custom, did not provide.

"Law, as distinguished from equity, denotes the doctrine and the procedure of the common law of England and America, from which equity is a departure." [36]

Equity is a "body of rules existing by the side of the original civil law, founded on distinct principles, and claiming incidentally to supersede the civil law in virtue of a superior sanctity inherent in those principles."[37]

First, "equity" is not law in itself, but it only exists "by the side of" the civil law. The "'Civil Law,' 'Roman Law' and 'Roman Civil Law' are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence."[38] Second, it should be noted that it only *claims* to supersede the civil law.

"As old rules become too narrow, or are felt to be out of harmony with advancing civilization, a machinery is needed for their gradual enlargement and adaptation to new views of society. One mode of accomplishing this object on a large scale, without appearing to disregard existing law, is the introduction, by the prerogative of some high functionary, of a more perfect body of rules, discoverable in his judicial conscience, which is to stand side by side with the law of the land, overriding it in case of conflict, as on some title of inherent superiority, but not purporting to repeal it. Such a body of rules has been called **Equity**."[39]

America was settled by men who came to this new land to escape the arbitrary bonds of civil and equitable systems, which were often no more

34 Clark's Summary of American Law. Equity, p 233.
35 Persona est homo cum statu quandom cosideratus. Heinecc.Elem. 1.1, tit.3, §75.
36 Bouvier's.
37 Maine, Anc. Law, 27.
38 Black's 3rd p 332.
39 Holl. Jur. 59.

than the will of men over men, and sought to be ruled by Divine Will.

"The jury has the Right to judge both the law and the facts."[40]

The United States Government, in establishing its own legal system, was forced by custom and reason "that suits in equity shall not be sustained in either of the courts of the United States, in any case where plain, adequate, and complete remedy may be had at law."[41]

Equity is not law, either, in the sense of the common law or the civil legal system. Equity is designed and used to enlarge the system of laws without appearing to disregard the laws themselves; overriding them, but not repealing them. It is that "part of the law which, having power to enforce discovery, (1) administers trusts, mortgages, and other fiduciary obligations; (2) administers and adjusts common-law rights where the courts of common law have no machinery; (3) supplies a specific and preventive remedy for common law wrongs where courts of common law only give subsequent damages."[42]

Equity is important, because in a civil society such as the one created by the Constitution, it is the instrument used to remedy conflicts that arise from certain relations where plain, adequate, and complete remedy may not be had at law. Equity is used to administer trusts and uses.

Blue-sealed certificates, red-sealed United States notes, or green-sealed Federal Reserve notes all state that they are "legal tender for all debts public and private." For decades, these notes also stated that they were "redeemable in lawful money." If they were *redeemable* in lawful money, then it should be clear that they are not lawful money. Gold and silver are lawful money, which is used as "payment of debt."[43] Legal tender is a *legal or binding offer* in place of payment of debt and does not lawfully pay a debt. "There is a distinction between a debt discharged and one paid. When discharged the debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist…" [44]

Where does this debt continue?

It goes on to say, "…which may be transferred, even though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident to the discharge. The fact that it carries something which may be a consideration for a new promise to

40 1804, Samuel Chase, Supreme Court Justice and signer of the Declaration of Independence

41 Judiciary Act of 1789 "an architectonic act still in force."

42 Chutes, Eq. 4.

43 Black's 3rd p 1079.

44 Stanek v. White. 172 Minn. 390, 215 N. W. 784.

pay, so as to make an otherwise worthless promise a legal obligation, makes it the subject of transfer by assignment."[45]

"The first farmer was the first man, and all historic nobility rests on possession and use of land." Emerson.

A "legal title" is "one cognizable… in a court of law."[46] "Judicial cognizance" being "judicial notice, or knowledge upon which a judge is bound to act without having it proved in evidence."[47] Even more importantly, a legal title is "one which is complete and perfect so far as regards the apparent right of ownership and possession, but which carries no beneficial interest in the property, another person being equitably entitled thereto; in either case, the antithesis of 'equitable title.'[48]

"And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you:" (II Pe. 2, 2-3.)

First, we see that a legal title, although it may appear to be a "right of ownership", "carries no beneficial interest." If a legal title does not include a right to the beneficial interest, then it does not include a right to the "profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract," nor does it include "the ownership of an estate." After all, a beneficial interest is "distinct from the legal ownership."[49] In the simplest of terms, a legal title only appears to be a right to ownership, but it is not the "ownership of an estate."

"Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee..." (Exodus 34, 12.)

By definition, a legal title is the opposite---or at least the antithesis---of an "equitable title." An equitable title, as opposed to a legal title, "is a right in the party", rather than only appearing to be a right. It is "the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another."[50]

Even though you may discharge a debt and obtain legal titles, you still do not have clear and good titles, which "are synonymous; 'clear title' meaning that the land is free from incumbrances, 'good title' being one free from litigation, palpable defects, and grave doubts, comprising both legal and equitable titles and fairly deducible of record."[51]

---

45 Stanek v. White, 172 Minn. 390, 215 N. W. 784.
46 Black's 3rd p 1734.
47 Black's 3rd "cognizance" p 346.
48 Black's 3rd "legal title" p 1734.
49 Black's 3rd "beneficial Interest" p 206.
50 Black's 3rd "Equitable Title" p 1734.
51 Black's 3rd "clear title" p 1733.

"Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own pit: but the upright shall have good [things] in possession." (Proverbs 28:10)

This division of true title into a legal title on one hand, versus an equitable title on the other, is called "equitable conversion." Equitable conversion is a "Constructive conversion."

CONVERSION is an "alteration, interchange, metamorphosis, passage, reconstruction...."[52]

BENEFICIAL INTEREST is the "Profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract, or the ownership of an estate as distinct from the legal ownership or control."[53]

BENEFICIAL USE is "the right to use and enjoy property according to one's own liking or so as to derive a profit or benefit from it…[54]

Is it any wonder that you are required to get a permit to build on what you think is <u>your</u> land? You have to get permission, i.e., a license, to operate what you believe is <u>your</u> car. If you do not pay the use, tribute, or excise tax on your land, auto, or labor, you will lose them all. Haven't you lost them already if you do not own them, or, at the very least, own the use of them? If you lack the right to the benefit or profit of a thing can you say you own it at all? Does anyone have a lawful title? And who has the true title and for what purpose do they have it?

You have a "legal" right to work, only if you have applied for and obtained an employee identification number---and then are you allowed to labor for an employer who has an employer identification number.

The word "legal" originates in the idea of being *connected* to a legal system by contract, application, oath or merely participation. Society may include such systems as Equity, as well as general constructions of law. In Equity, the extent of contractual participation may vary.

It is by an indulging consent that these mere constructions of law divide a clear and good title into the legal title and the equitable title.

A legal title may *appear* to be a right of ownership, but it is not. Legal title provides no beneficial interest, and, therefore, no right to the profit, benefit, or advantage in the property. If you do not pay the legally prescribed use tax, they, the administers of the trust holding the equitable title, may summarily take the property away from you. Somewhere, someone or something holding the equitable title is the actual owner, in the eyes of the Natural law, of your land, your home, your car, your cattle, your

52 LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition
53 Black's 3rd p 206
54 Black's 3rd p 206

legal right to work, and much, much more. You have no rights since your conversion, alteration, or rebirth. You have no right to the profit, benefit, or advantage of such things, but only an apparent legal ownership.

If things have been equitably converted, can they be equitably reconverted? Can things be turned around from what they have become? Can you make a legal title a lawful, good, and complete title again?[55]

Can you now apply this idea that someone else may hold the true and lawful title to everything that you now only appear to own, but do not? Has it been kept a secret, a mystery, how everything that the LORD God has given you is owned by another, who the law considers the *true owner*?

"Standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: The merchandise of gold, and silver… and slaves, and souls of men." (Revelation 18:10, 13)

Have you been seduced with vain offers and a covetous heart or is it through ignorance and lack of knowledge that you have been sold into slavery, yoked with unbelievers and entangled by contractual relationships?

"For when they speak great swelling [words] of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, [through much] wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollution's of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known [it], to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog [is] turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." (2 Peter 2:18, 22)

If we have followed the ways of men can we return to the ways of the LORD? Who has deceived us? Who has devised this plan of confusion?

"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)

"Who shall we seek to know the truth? Who shall we cry out to, man or the LORD God? " (Malachi 2:6, 10)

ABBA! FATHER!

55 conversion vs. reconversion. Money vs. Mammon Trust vs. Faith.

Publications Available:

The Covenant of the gods

A blend of Law, the Bible, and History. Offering an explanation of how the contractual nature of governments began. The method by which gods are created: obtaining our consent through application, construction, and acquiescence. How we choose bondage through apathy and avarice, covetousness and greed, and, of course, lack of knowledge and ignorance. The rise of despots and rulers with a reciprocal decline in liberty.

Thy Kingdom Comes

The history of the Kingdom of God, it's peculiar nature and character, and how it can change our lives, today and tomorrow. A look at the sophistry and trickery that has hidden the truth that the kingdom of God is at hand for those who will seek it and its righteousness.

The Free Church Report

The nature, structure, and method of the Free Church; how it worked and can work in the past and present. Guidelines, polities and accords for forming a free Church in accordance with the precepts of God and His Son, the Anointed King of His Kingdom.

Other audios and DVDs are available at:

Web site: Http://www.hisholychurch.net/
For more information concerning the Church
and other publications, services and projects please contact:
His Church
Via Box 10
Summer Lake, Oregon 97640

His Church

P.O. Box 10

10 Anna Lane

Summer Lake, Oregon 97640