

# NO LIBERTY WITHOUT LAW. *PART EIGHT.*

## THE BIBLICAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FAMILY.

The historical structure of the family unit in Anglo-Saxondom was Biblical in concept - an extension of the Abrahamic structure which was commended by the Lord in His Soliloquy recorded in Genesis 18. In this, a tremendous feature emerges in the fact that God's choice of Abraham as 'head' of the Covenant family was no arbitrary election. The choice was made - not because Abraham was a religious man - but because he 'obeyed my voice, kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws' (Gen.26:5). In pursuit of His objective to 'bless all the nations of the earth', the Lord reflected on the future of the Covenant family - a future which entailed the development of that family into a 'great and mighty nation' with each individual family within the nation being a law-orientated one. God said in Genesis 18:19;

- *“Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgement; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him”*

Apart from the Lord's foreknowledge of Abraham's responsibility toward his position as head of the Covenant family, the person of parental instruction was established in that each parent was duty-bound to teach the young God's 'way of life' as the foundation round which the family revolved. In point of fact, much more emerges as one projects the Soliloquy of the Lord into His Law given at Sinai, for it throws a tremendous responsibility upon parents who need to realise that he or she represents God to their children. To a small and impressionable child, the family is his whole world with the father and mother becoming provider, protector, lover, teacher and law giver. Are these not the attributes of God Who claims to be a 'father' to Israel (Ex. 4:22; Jer. 31:9)? As 'father', the Lord **provides** for His Covenant family (Gen. 22:8-14); **protects** them (Gen. 5:1); **loves** them (Hos. 11:1); **teaches** them (Deut. 4: 10) and **gave them His Law** (Mal. 4:4). The parent, in the Israel Covenant family, represents God to the child, and in this role, is required to be obedient to God's way of life and to ensure that the environment which surrounds the child is conducive to this development into a God-fearing honourable person. This responsibility crystallised into a God-given one when it was written into the national Constitution and given to the nation at Sinai. Moses, in reiterating the Law to the new generation born in the wilderness said:

- *“And what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as this law, which I set before you this day? Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them thy sons, and thy son's son ...”*  
(Deut. 4:8-9).

Thus, in the education of the young, parents are enjoined to (a); emphasise the reality of God as this was demonstrated in the deliverance from Egypt and (b); teach the Law to the heir in the family - not stopping there but instructing his heir as well, thus ensuring continuity of knowledge.

## **Today's Pattern**

In homes that have been shattered by the communistically orientated revolution of women, one finds the husband thrust into the submissive role and in this, by reason of having to explain his every motive or action, he behaves in a manner reminiscent of children. He is accused of placing his wife in a position of 'material dependence' upon him thereby causing her to lose her liberty as an independent person. The neo-feminist today who considers material factors the most important in life has de-liberately ignored the lesson of history which has witnessed the outworking of the principles established in the Law of the Lord. Women's traditional compensation for material dependence is a variety of psychological and sentimental influences which have, from time to time, exerted profound spiritual domination over the male. Herman Keyserling in *Psychoanalyse de L'Amerique* draws attention to this incredible striving for material independence by the neo-feminists and states that the achievement of this independence and consequently material power is an empty goal, for these are only supreme when people believe it to be the decisive element. How far have the Anglo-Saxondom families come from the Law of the Lord which is perfect! Instead of adhering to the pattern for family happiness and prosperity as laid down by the Lord, both husband and wife have allowed themselves to be manipulated by psychological politics which is creating a society of introverts in which thought for self - no matter what the cost - dominates. Instead of teaching the children the 'fear of the Lord' which is surely the beginning of wisdom, one finds the mother, imbued with aggressive feminism, holding the view that beyond the sexual differences involved with procreation, there are no innate physiological or psychological differences separating male and female. It is contended that from the earliest infancy, boys and girls are conditioned by clothes, games and language to play the social role attributed to their sex and that consequently, in an equalitarian society, it would be sufficient to give trucks to little girls and dolls to boys in order to bring about an inversion of their social roles. Unfortunately, the neo-feminist has not left this theory to wander in the hypothetical realm, but have actually introduced it into their families. Professor Gilbert-Dreyfus, an endocrinologist, reacting to the spread of the sex-equalitarian experiment has warned: "Certain functions of the hypothalamus, an agglomeration of fibre's and nervous tissues which are an integral part of the brain, work differently according to sex. The thought processes of men and women are certainly not identical. I declare quite false the assertion that there is no masculine brain or feminine brain, but one unique and common brain, that of the human species... With dresses and dolls one risks making a boy into a neurotic child, but he nevertheless remains a boy. Uneasy in his own skin, badly adapted to the exterior world, he becomes a good candidate for transestitism and homosexuality". Is it purely coincidental that homosexuality in Anglo-Saxondom has increased in proportion to the increase of attempts to 'liberate' women under the ag-gressive feminism of Women's lib?

## **Youth.**

In considering the general attitude of youth today, it is more than a little evident that something has also gone awry - and that 'something' is the discipline to be found in the family structure. Obedience - which is the keynote associated with Biblical Law - no longer exists, indeed is castigated as an oppressive mechanism and destructive of the mind. The truly liberated person - so claims the humanistic propaganda of today - is the woman or youth (note the male is left out of this) who is the product of rebellion, who constantly challenges authority and agitates for reform within the educational system. It is quite common to hear the youth declaring that they 'didn't ask to be born' and because this status of living has been foisted on them, they have an inherent 'right' to dictate 'terms' under which they consent to participate in what they euphemistically call 'the human experience'. This is merely another indication in the non-maturity of youth. Is it not characteristic of the revolution of youth that they demand instant realisation of their ambitions? Is it not characteristic of the younger

generation that when confronted by resistance - in the form of authority - they immediately embark on a campaign of destructive, revolutionary rage? This is precisely how a baby acts, for when hungry, the baby voids its bladder and bowels at will and cries in frustrated rage when gratification is not instantaneous. Without enlarging on some of the debased behaviour actions of those participating in the youth rebellion against authority, it suffices to state that the actions of the baby are indulged in by those attending universities. According to John D. Rockefeller, the above stated situation should not be corrected, for at the age of 62, he said: "Instead of worrying how to suppress the youth revolution, we of the older generation should be worrying about how to sustain it". This, no matter how one approaches the subject, is gross immorality. The student involved in the revolution of youth assumes the 'right' to control and govern other people's properties. Advanced education at universities is not a 'right' but a privilege for the universities are the by-product of the tax-payer's money - in general, the parents of those who attend them. If the student has sufficient funds and is able to enlist the support of like-minded students to build their own educational institution, then, and only then, have they the 'right' to govern and control, but under the prevailing situation, he attends university on the terms of those whose property rights govern the school. This is not coercion as a student - it is the exercise of the rights which belong to those who have earned them. It is of course, a basic premise - supported by the facts of today - that authority is basic to the nature of any and every society and that if this is shattered, the society collapses or continues to be held together in error with chaotic consequences. 'Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee' - here is the Bible authority for a stable society in the land and one which strikes at the very heart of the problem confronting Anglo-Saxondom today. If one considers the account of this Commandment recorded in Deuteronomy 5:16, it will be seen that the authority for demanding 'honour' to parents comes from God Himself for the words 'as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee' are added. Today of course, children in general do not honour their parents and while one may deplore this, are they really to blame - is there not joint responsibility in this?

**The Fifth Commandment.** The Fifth Commandment is not, as many have assumed, directed at minor children alone, for the Hebrew word 'honour' differentiates between the children who have not yet come to age and those who are adult and themselves parents. Children per se are expected to 'obey' - (Heb: shama) - their parents (Deut. 21:18), whereas the Fifth Commandment demands 'honour' which as the Hebrew word implies, is adult behaviour. The Hebrew word Kabad which has been translated as honour is a primitive Hebrew root which has a wide variety of meanings which in the main centre on 'to glorify'; to 'promote to honour'; to 'make glorious'; to 'give great consideration to' and to 'respect'. While it is not denied that obedience will achieve the same end, the specific usage of the Hebrew Kabad appears to have as its main target young parents just setting out on the course of family life. It is a reminder to recall their childhood and the manner in which they were instructed in God's Law and perhaps to recall how punishment was meted out for transgression of that Law. They would, for instance, know all the requirements of the Law, for their parents had ensured that the instruction in Deuteronomy 4:7-10 and 6:6-7 had been adhered to. Then too there was the national reading of the Law every sabbatical year (Deut.31:10-13) at which all, the old and young alike, were compelled to attend. If they were over the age of twenty-one years, they would have attended three such national readings of the Law and during that period, no doubt had witnessed the punitive (punishment) clauses in the Law being put into practice. It would of course be foolishness to suppose that every parent applied the Law to the child when it failed to obey, for in Proverbs one finds warnings against parental tender-heartedness toward them. Then as now, excuses were made for bad behaviour. However, in Proverbs 13:24, it is stated:

- *“He that spareth his rod hateth his son”*

while in 19:18 it is declared:

- *“Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying”.*

Chastening could be a lifesaver to the child for in Proverbs 23:13-14 it is stated:

- *“Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell”.*

Make no mistake here. There was juvenile delinquency in Israel in Biblical times, but this delinquency was dealt with in a manner totally unacceptable to the world today. In today's society, pity has become a word which is synonymous with the word 'Christian' and this is carried to lengths which make the Word of God of none effect. As has been referred to elsewhere, the murderer today has all the pity of the community which does not give a second thought for the dependants of the murdered person. Previous mention has, of course, been made of the reversal of priorities and this is yet another of these. Biblical Law demands pity for the offended and certainly not for the offender. It is seldom that one reads a commentary on the Law concerning juvenile delinquency, and yet this Law was read every seven years in Israel and accepted in its totality by the people. The young parents too accepted this, for their parents had accepted it and had implemented the punitive clauses when these were warranted. This is where 'honour thy father and thy mother' comes into the picture. The Law concerning juvenile delinquency is stated in Deut. 21:18-21 as;

- *“If a man have a stubborn (Heb: carar; backsliding, revolter) and rebellious (Heb: marar: disobedient, provocative) son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them: Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton (Heb: zalal, to be loose morally) and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he shall die: so shall thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear.”*

The natural modern reaction to this would be one of shocked disapproval for what parent would voluntarily deliver their son to execution? It should be recalled that the family was required to align itself wholeheartedly with God's Law rather than with a criminal member. It was the community which became the complainant and the community which became the executioner, for juvenile delinquency was a crime against both family and community. If the parents refused to complain against the delinquent, they were guilty of breaking the Fifth Commandment for they then repudiated the very Law which their parents had held as valid and to which they had been subjected. They then became a party to the offence and as such, a defender of crime in general. Does it 'promote to honour' the grandparents when one's own children violate with impunity the principles which they handed down as an inheritance? Is it 'respect' to the grand-parents to allow the disintegration of the family to which they gave birth through whoredom in the daughters and homosexuality in the sons? Is it giving 'weighty consideration to' parents when one allows the priceless heritage of God's Service to be overshadowed by one's own personal likes and dislikes? Today, the individual family in

Anglo-Saxondom has very little left of its inheritance for its security in land inheritance has been greatly diminished through an increased state control in this. Its efficacy as a witness to God too has diminished until it is fast reaching the point where God has no place in it at all. The family is an arena of conflict with father, mother and children doing their own thing - a 'thing' which is family suicide and national destruction. It is no exaggeration to claim that today in Anglo-Saxondom, identity has all but vanished. The family is fast reaching the stage of being a non-family unit while this is reflected in the nation which has lost its way both spiritually and materially. However, the Word of God assures that the time of recovery is near at hand when father, mother and children will indeed be emancipated from the diabolical conspiracy which seeks not the liberation of man, but the enslavement of all creation.