

THE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT IS TO FORCE YOU TO DO WHAT I WANT.

Prove me wrong. It sounds like bullying. It also sounds real, when you think about those who oppose your way of life, your worldview, and they attempt to not just stop you, but destroy your way of life, or even destroy your life.

Freedom is the opposite of that. It is doing what you want, when you want, where you want, and with whom you want.

Sometimes my freedom - my desires - might impede or even detain your freedom. This requires negotiation, and that idea of negotiation must have been agreed to, before the situation happened. We must have already agreed on a way to handle clashes of interest, a way that is known to both of us, and accepted by both. This agreement on how to handle conflicts sounds a lot like a law. My liberty ends where yours begins - that boundary is critical. It also should be generalized, so we don't need to revisit the concept for each and every conflict, and only need to work out the details.

This generalized idea of law must be designed to insure as much freedom for the individual as possible, while still maintaining an orderly way of life for each. This law then acts like a third party in the conflict, and sometimes requires an actual third person to help the sides reach an agreement. That actual person needs authority to enforce the decision. Thus, one or both parties are forced to do what the law requires.

That sounds all nice and blue sky, but reality can get a lot dirtier. The REAL problem is that third person, not the law itself, but the person or group who enforce the law. Trustworthy for all participants? Honorable in using authority, and not creating new rules as though laws?

Leviticus 19:15

You are to do no injustice in judgment. You are not to be partial toward the poor nor show favoritism toward the great, but you are to judge your neighbor with fairness.

When the law maker (legislature) or the law enforcer (courts) use their influence to manipulate the voters (subjects) to lose freedoms, that is not fairness.

<https://www.acton.org/pub/religion-liberty/volume-7-number-1/biblical-foundations-limited-government>

"The Bible gives much more guidance on how we should treat people than when we should coerce them, which is the defining characteristic of government. ... Corporate duty differs from personal responsibility. Individuals must respond generously to the needs and rights of their neighbors; government must regulate, coercively yet fairly, relations between both righteous and unrighteous men. In short, the contrast is personal virtue versus public impartiality. ... 'Social justice' demands equality of economic and cultural outcomes. However appealing may be some proposals, advanced under the rubric of 'social justice,' they are not matters of biblical justice, which guarantees a fair civil government

nestled within a larger culture in which the wealthy and powerful recognize their obligation - to God - to help those in need. ...

Exodus 20:3

You shall have no other gods before Me.

Although the "other gods" were usually such supposed deities as Baal, some secular rulers, notably the later Roman emperors, also claimed to be divine. ... Most secular rulers are more discreet in their formal pretensions, but many nevertheless act as quasi-gods. ...

The Bible suggests that an expansive government is bad not only because it might demand to be treated like God, but also because it will reflect the sinfulness of its participants and mistreat its citizens. ...

Little is clearer in Scripture than the duty of believers to care for those in need, particularly widows and orphans. Notably, however, the Bible does not vest this responsibility in the state. Neither does Scripture proscribe a public role, but it implies that believers should fulfill their individual and corporate responsibilities before turning to government, and any state programs should not violate other biblical norms, such as family formation. ...

Freedom is not enough. As Pope John Paul II explained, a market economy will work only 'within a strong juridical framework which places [capitalism] at the service of human freedom in its totality, and which sees it as a particular aspect of that freedom, the core of which is ethical and religious.' "

<https://www.acton.org/pub/religion-liberty/volume-7-number-1/biblical-foundations-limited-government>

What relation does government have with property?

Consider the nature of government, especially representative government, including the extreme version called democracy.

A homeowners association is almost pure democracy - each home has one vote. The impact of decisions is directly felt - and each can go directly to the others to complain or approve. The ratio of representatives to constituents is 1:1

The next level is the local government - a village or town or city. Nothing could be decided if each home (or each person) had to participate directly. Thus we have representatives, chosen by each home (or each person), and hopefully the representative for us will act in agreement with our needs. The ratio of representatives to constituents is about 1:100 to 1:1,000,000 - your vote counts, but not as much, so your interests may not be represented. Pure democracy it is not - you pool your concerns with others to get your representative to vote your way.

The county level is less representative, but you still have a chance of being heard, especially if you are part of a group of like-minded voters.

At the state government level, your vote diminishes by powers of 10.

The final level is federal - your vote is nothing, if you have pure democracy. However, by representative republic government, your wishes at least have a chance, IF the single-minded media would remain neutral.

The point of all this is to show that the more you centralize government, the less representation you have.

Before Israel had a king (Saul), they were a loose confederation of twelve tribes, united by faith and a constitution - Torah. They were decentralized.

<https://www.ncregister.com/blog/a-biblical-warning-on-the-nature-of-government>

"When threats (usually invading armies) beset any or all of the tribes, they would unite under a charismatic leader known as a 'judge,' who would see them through the crisis and then step back once the threat was quelled. It seemed that this was God's central organizing plan for ancient Israel (and for us?): governance under the principle of subsidiarity [government power ought to reside at the lowest feasible level] in which a decentralized confederation of families (nuclear and extended), tribes, and clans supported and cared for one another, and shared an allegiance to God and His revealed law. Although the tribes of Israel did unite under leaders (judges anointed by God) in times of crisis, God was the true King of Israel; He was the lawgiver and the unifier. Or so the ideal went. ...

In modern terms, the consequences of having a king and a centralized authority included high taxes, expansive and aggressive use of power, military draft, conscription of the people into the affairs of the king and the state, intrusive policies that affected families, seizure of land and resources, and a kind of bondage that expanded to take the best resources of the people and entrusted them to cronies and the like. This is a pretty bleak list, and unfortunately it is very familiar to us in this era of expansive, intrusive government with its increasingly complex and burdensome regulations.

In the period of the judges, the system usually worked and the people trusted God to lead them through crises in these ways. The glue that held it all together was tribal, clan, and family loyalty interacting with faith in the LORD. ...

centralized power is costly, tends to grow, and draws people into a kind of servitude in exchange for some sense of security and/or moderation of justice.

G.K. Chesterton once said, 'When you break the big laws, you do not get liberty; you do not even get anarchy. You get the small laws.' Indeed, we get thousands of lesser laws.

How true this is in an age that has cast off God's moral vision (the big laws). We don't get fewer laws; we get more - a lot more. Increasingly in the United States, we ask the federal government to adjudicate every personal matter. And thus, setting aside God's governing vision, we get a modern version of what is described by Samuel. We get an increasingly intrusive and litigious government that inserts itself into every aspect of life: healthcare, childcare, sexual matters, when life begins and ends, what constitutes a marriage, who is more to blame in

a divorce, who can mow your lawn and how much insurance he must have and that you must collect his Social Security number and issue him a W-2 or 1099 and make sure his I-9 papers are in order (but meanwhile are not permitted to profile him).

We have created a central government that can tell you that you must pay for the contraception and abortifacients [substances that induce abortion] of other people, and bake cakes for 'gay weddings,' and accept 'diversity education' in schools, but cannot speak openly of Jesus Christ in those same public schools (which by the way can refer your daughter to an abortionist without your knowledge, but will penalize you or her for sending her to school with an aspirin in her purse to alleviate her headache). Refuse certain demands or disobey certain rules of the government in any way, and expect to receive confiscatory fines followed by even more intrusive policies, forms to fill out, and scrutiny from IRS agents, etc."

<https://www.ncregister.com/blog/a-biblical-warning-on-the-nature-of-government>

The more centralized government becomes, the more power it has over individuals in all aspects of their lives, because it will ignore contracts.

<https://chalcedon.edu/resources/articles/the-biblical-case-for-private-property>

"Freedom is security based upon the unchanging laws of God which all men must obey. It eliminates the uncertainty of arbitrary changes in opinion, pragmatic opportunism, or state control. ...

If private property rights are tolerated only as they contribute to liberty, justice, peace, and prosperity, tell me, who is going to be the official arbitrator of definitions and levels? ... There are times private property creates not peace, but conflict, as people attempt to maximize their assets in a free market. If private property is simply tolerated because it contributes to the 'peace process,' it is open to attack when peace is defined on these terms, especially because there are times when 'peace' and 'freedom' conflict. ...

This universal truth that flows from God's property laws is rooted and grounded in the objective fact that,

Psalms 24:1

The earth is the LORD's, and the fullness thereof: the world and they that dwell therein.

The Biblical idea of property comes up right at the beginning of Genesis where man was created in the image of God and commanded to subdue the earth and to have dominion over it. 'Not only is it man's calling to exercise dominion, but it is also his nature to do so.... Man was created to exercise dominion under God and as God's appointed vicegerent over the earth.'⁵ 'An aspect of this dominion is property.'⁶ The Biblical teaching is that 'the earth is indeed the Lord's, as is all dominion, but God has chosen to give dominion over the earth to man, subject to His law-word, and property is a central aspect of that dominion. The absolute

and transcendental title to property is the LORD's; the present and historical title to property is man's.⁷ ...

To own private property is highlighted by at least two of the Ten Commandments: the Eighth which says, 'You shall not steal,' and the Tenth which strikes at the heart of the entire matter, 'You shall not covet your neighbor's wife; and you shall not desire your neighbor's house, his field, his male servant, his female servant, his ox, his donkey, or anything that is your neighbor's.' ... We can clearly see the principle of private property set forth and confirmed in the Fourth Commandment, where a person and his personal property were required to rest; in the Sixth Commandment which restrained a person from stealing the ultimate personal property, another's life; in the Seventh Commandment which, by outlawing adultery, set personal boundaries which had to be respected; and the Ninth Commandment which prohibited one from robbing a person of his reputation, which is a very important and valuable form of personal property.

The fact is, God created the world and then delegated it, in the form of personal property, to man. The right to own and control private property, therefore, transcends any political, moral, economical, or psychological basis and rests in God's revealed and declared law. ... God's law of securing and maintaining landmarks that define a person's property is stated and reinforced on at least five occasions. That law, stated in, reads like this:

Deuteronomy 19:14

You shall not remove your neighbor's landmark, which the men of old have set, in your inheritance which you will inherit in the land that the Lord your God is giving you to possess.

Notes 5. R.J. Rushdoony, [Institutes of Biblical Law](#), Vol. 1, "The Eighth Commandment."

6. *ibid.*

7. *ibid.*

<https://chalcedon.edu/resources/articles/the-biblical-case-for-private-property>

<https://capmin.org/bible-teach-regards-property-rights/>

"As Karl Marx said in his Communist Manifesto, 'The theory of the Communists may be summed up in a single sentence: the abolition of private property.' ...

Thomas Jefferson said that the United States would be different: 'The true foundation of republican government is the equal right of every citizen in his person and property, and in their management.'

"Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval (July 12, 1816)" *Writings: Auto-biography/Notes on the State of Virginia/Public and Private Papers/Addresses/Letters* ed. Merrill D. Peterson (New York: Library of America, 1984), 1398

<https://capmin.org/bible-teach-regards-property-rights/>

<https://americanvision.org/3756/a-biblical-view-of-private-property/>

"The Jubilee laws of Leviticus 25 insured a family that it would always have land so that dominion could be exercised. Property could not be taxed. Even the father could not dispossess his family from the land because of carelessness, poor stewardship, or debt. ...

When a man is secure in the possession of his property, he has an area of liberty and dominion that is beyond the reach of other men. If no man or no State can

reach in to tax and confiscate property, man can enjoy true liberty and great security, whether he's prosperous or poor. Every attack on private property is, therefore, an attack on man's liberty. Man's freedom and security in the possession of his property is not only basic to man's independence, but it is also basic to his power. A man has power if he can act independently of other men and the state, if he can make his stand in the confidence of liberty. ...

Is it any wonder, therefore, that Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels declared in their 1848 Communist Manifesto, originally titled Manifesto of the Communist Party, that the right to hold individual private property was a crime against the State? Their first 'commandment' called for the 'abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.' Their third 'commandment' abolished 'all right of inheritance.' ((Marx and Engels, Communist Manifesto, 33.)) Both of these edicts sought to overrule the Biblical order where laws against theft operate and inheritance laws are the norm. Marx understood that 'property is power.' The Bible secures private property for many individuals and many families. Communism consolidates power under the umbrella of the one State. From this position of consolidated power the State controls the individual, the family, church, school, and every other institution God ordained for the proper ordering of society. The State therefore becomes both sovereign and owner, displacing God as the absolute sovereign and owner over all creation. The direction of the people comes from the State's central planning committee. This committee determines what is 'best' for the people. Those who wish to deny private property, and thus, the Biblical mandate of stewardship, fail to recognize God's order for society.

<https://americanvision.org/3756/a-biblical-view-of-private-property/>

Not everyone owns or manages property. However, each of us has our own thoughts and ambitions - no one can take those - and that is at least the start of "intellectual" property.

The worst denial of property is denial of self-management: slavery. When others force us to acknowledge their non-Biblical worldview, that is slavery.

Become an abolitionist to forced worldviews.