

# **NO LIBERTY WITHOUT LAW.**

## ***PART SEVEN.***

### **THE LAW, THE FAMILY AND IDENTITY.**

***“Honour thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God hath, commanded thee: that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee”. (Deut.5:16).***

It is an incontestable fact that the present time is one of rampant revolution which convulses the whole creation, leaving none exempt from the insecurity engendered by this modern plague. Because of the publicity given to this subject by the communication media, revolution has come to be accepted as the legitimate means of achieving one's objectives and few are prepared to recognise the situation as it really is. For example, who questions the motives behind the so-called emancipation of women in Women's Lib? How many are interested enough in enquiring into the reason behind the revolution of youth which is euphemistically referred to as the 'generation gap'? Why has the male generation been emasculated of his authority and traditional position as head of the family? From the purely philosophical point of view, the answer to these questions is an evolutionary one which, while not satisfying, has this virtue in indicating an awareness that a situation does exist which is out of the ordinary. However, recognising the existence of a situation and merely defining it as an evolutionary trend is cold comfort to those who suffer the consequences of the erosion of all the principles upon which twentieth century civilisation has been built. It is cold comfort indeed to those families which are shattered by the impact of the revolutionary era and who view the future with a hopelessness born of despair. Diagnosis is not a cure, just as definitions of malady fail to remove them. It is in this context that the following is offered not as a palliative to the prevailing situation, but as a directive toward the regaining of the dignity of identity and re-establishment of structure within the homes of Anglo-Saxondom. In this present revolutionary age, the general emphasis is undoubtedly centred on a break with the past - a rupture of the discipline or structure which, while not being perfect, was infinitely better than the self-centred permissiveness which highlights the behavioural patterns in today's society. From both the political and the religious aspects, one is treated to an over-dose of propaganda which invariably contends that the past is irrelevant, the present transitional and only the future reality or, in other words, it doesn't matter where one comes from so long as one knows where one is going. If ever there was a contradiction in terms, this is it. Who, be he an intellectual or moron, can say with any degree of certainty, precisely where he is going? The future, based on a projection of current trends, is as obscure as the proverbial pool of mud. One of the most vicious aspects in this attempt to break with the past is to be seen in the children who are encouraged to turn on their parents in open animosity and positive rebellion. In this so-called liberty from the past, the children are not told that their action is a self-destructive one in which, in point of fact, they disinherit themselves. The child inherits life from his parents and while they come into the world naked, they do not come into a desolate world. The homes, the fields, the amenities of life, the love and care of father and mother - all these are provided as an inheritance, the continuity of which is jeopardised in the revolution of youth which is prepared to discard all this in favour of some uncertain future.

#### **A Deliberate Campaign**

One wonders if Anglo-Saxondom - for this is the specific arena in which the great drama is being enacted - realises that their present situation is a manipulated one and that from 'Women's Lib' to the revolution of youth, each step is part of a carefully planned conspiracy aimed at self-destruction. To many, this statement will be dismissed as pure fantasy or the product of an over-active imagination - but is it? Examine for a moment the general trend throughout the world - the trend toward statism or state control in all aspects of life. Private enterprise which is synonymous with private property is slowly but surely being phased out of existence with the state - no matter whether in the East or the West - exerting more and more control in those departments of life formerly considered as the prerogative of the individual. Private property or private enterprise is the outgrowth of that time-honoured institution called the 'family' and if all property and enterprise is to pass under state control, the destruction of the family unit becomes the prerequisite to the elimination of private enterprise. Whether one likes it or not, the current Women's Lib movement, the revolution of youth and the emasculation of the male are all part and parcel of the same conspiracy evil which is aimed at this end. Research into the humanistic ideology of Marxism as propounded by Engels and Marx, reveals that in pursuit of the elimination of private property, mothers and wives within the family unit become the first target. High priority is given to the so-called emancipation of women who are 'liberated' from the religion-marriage-property complex through their transformation into an 'industrial worker'. The need for such an emancipation arises out of the propaganda which 'explains' that private property and enterprise is the sole prerogative of the man who tolerates the woman as the means to produce children who become the father's heir to all his property. The women's role in the perpetuity of private property is thus presented as a subservient one in which 'domestic slavery' is covered by the pretentious terminology of 'wife'. This, of course, has become the Communist formula in the acquisition of private property - a formula which has filtered through to the West and is taking its toll in the womanhood of Anglo-Saxondom. Feminism or Women's Lib have become popular slogans in the west and current statistics reveal that broken homes and female aggression is on the increase. This is not liberty nor is it emancipation - it is a deliberate conspiracy which is aimed at the self-destruction of Anglo-Saxondom. The Marxist creed, as this centred on the emancipation of women as the means of state control of private property, emerged during the middle of the nineteenth century - at a time, when, through what may be termed as a 'legal revolution' in America, the status of women had been diminished. Prior to this however, women enjoyed a unique position in the community. As Lundberg and Farnham in "Modern Women, the Lost Sex," put it:... "the all too familiar view of women suddenly emerging in the nineteenth century from a long historical night on to a sunlit plain is completely wrong". In both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, women were often in business, were highly competent managers being involved in the shipping trade, as insurance brokers and in the manufacturing business. In Lundberg and Farnham's above quoted work, it is stated: "Up to the eighteenth century women usually figured in business as partners with their husbands, and not in inferior capacities. They often took charge during prolonged absences of their mates. In some instances, where they were the brighter of the pair, they ran the show". The 'legal revolution' previously referred to which was supported by men, arose out of the Law books initiated by Sir William Blackstone and England's Chief Justice, Edward Coke, which wrote down the role of the woman in marriage. In Walker's Introduction to American Law, it is stated: "The legal theory is, marriage makes the husband and wife one person, and that person is the husband. There is scarcely a legal act of any description that she is competent to perform". When one considers the status of women prior to this new legal code, it is amazing that reaction to it was not immediate and that it took almost a generation for the wheels of resentment to begin turning. During this period, the Church supported the view that women should be charming ornaments gracing the homes of the husband and producing his children - a support which was derived from a one sided and very distorted reading of scripture. Make no mistake here. Women are entitled to attempt the recovery of status lost - they would be lacking in dignity if they did not - but the road to recovery is fraught with pitfalls of disaster. As has been noted previously, Marxism is geared to capitalise on all situations and that prevailing toward the end of the nineteenth century

was tailor-made for Communist exploitation. It will have been noted in the materialistic ideology propounded by Engels that private property was a stumbling block to state control and that the male was considered as the last bastion in the complete take-over by the state. The propaganda therefore, was aimed against the husband and crystallised into an anti-male assault generated by a pro-female crusade for liberty. Without noting the deliberate anti-male conspiracy in the propaganda of contemporary Marxism, the various 'women's rights' movements aligned themselves, some wittingly and others unwittingly, with the principles expressed by Frederick Engles as essential for the total nationalisation of all private property. In one 'Women's Lib' publication, it is stated. "The myth of the contented women, happy in the subordinate role is perpetuated because men want it so and that because of this, society is deprived of women's full contribution as people". Thus, instead of restoring women to their rightful place of authority beside the man (of which more later), women's rights movements have been transformed into a militant 'feminism' - a terminology which implies aggressive competition with men.

### **The Effect of This in Anglo-Saxondom.**

The overall situation arising out of these so-called women's liberation movements has been and still is, disastrous. Apart from the total disruption of family life, identity on the individual plane is brought into jeopardy. The woman, because of her now aggressive role and self-assertion, is no longer recognisable as wife and mother. This identity is projected as totally submissive and reactionary to the new emancipation of women. The husband, formerly the dominant partner in the marriage, and because of the 'rights' issue inherent in all propaganda media, has been forced into a secondary or submissive role and is no longer recognised as 'head of the house' - another loss of identity. The children, reacting to the friction in the home have been transformed from integral parts of the family unit into self-willed islands of isolation doing their own thing. It should be noted again that this has not been a spontaneous development, but a carefully planned exercise which has been cleverly implemented. Basically, the women in Anglo-Saxondom are placid, homeloving and home-building persons with few interests outside those which affect her immediate family. This description however, no longer obtains. Through group pressure, the housewife is accused of being retrogressive in failing to discover her new identity as 'a person' - separate from that identity which formerly defined her as wife and mother. Those who resist this 'voyage of discovery' are further accused of lacking 'creativity' and devoid of courage to 'prove' herself equal to the male. Social pressures are almost inescapable for whenever group activity takes place, someone is sure to introduce the subject of chauvinism in which the wife is suppressed and deprived of the dignity of personal equality with the male. The tremendous psychological assault on the womanhood in Anglo-Saxondom has produced two major results - both of which are disastrous in the extreme. The first of these is the disruption of family life and the imbalance of relationships between husband, wife and children. While this situation could be corrected, the second is far more serious and is increasing in intensity as verified by medical statistic. Hitherto, the subject of mental attitudes in relationship to physical health has remained within the sphere of debate and discussion. However, clinical psychologists have now discovered that mental stresses, such as found in women participating in such movements as 'Women's Lib' are creating physiological problems. Hormonal irregularities have begun to manifest themselves with the biochemical function of the body acting in an unpredictable manner. Other symptoms becoming evident are spastic colon conditions, vaginal infections, bladder infections, headaches and migraine and a host of other features formerly noted as the ordinary run of the mill problems. However, a positive pattern is beginning to emerge which suggests that the physiological effect of the mental stresses created by these new movements of political thought are having an adverse effect on the families in Anglo-Saxondom. The increase in pill-usage to alleviate the situation is yet another instance of this. It has been found that the husband, reacting to the aggression in the wife, has assumed a submissive role which is alien to him and which too has had adverse effects on him and his conduct. While the wife demonstrates an external aggression, the husband develops an internalised aggression which could possibly - this has not been established - account for

the increase in the incidence of cardiac problems. Be that as it may, the continual sniping at one another by husband and wife have in turn an adverse effect on the children who are always interested spectators in any commotion. Because of this home disruption to which the children are now exposed, behavioural problems have developed and the children are now found to be non-compliant - they won't listen - they are aggressive in an acting out behaviour - they throw tantrums - they become highly manipulative, highly attention-seeking and in general, under-achieve in all that they attempt to do. As with the parents, the children fail to relate to one another and retreat into an isolationism seeking security within themselves and shunning environmental factors such as are exemplified by their home situations. In their adolescent years, the children retreat more and more into this isolationism and when they reach adulthood refuse to have meaningful relationship with others and certainly shy away from marriage as an evil to be avoided at all costs. The sperm count in males in this situation has been found to be very low and this, together with a reluctance to establish meaningful relationships with the opposite sex is seen in the declining birth-rate in Anglo-Saxondom. Identity, as a family is lost. The wife is no longer a wife but a competitor with the male for the position as head of the house. The husband retreats within a submissive role always defending himself and accounting for his actions in a vein similar to that of a child. Thus, in the female aggression, the husband is reduced to the status of a child and as a child, his petulant aggression creates the storm in the home which becomes devoid of structure or discipline. As is natural, the child refuses to identify with such an environment and becomes yet another factor in the general break-up of the family unit. That which has been written above is not fiction nor is it fantasy - it is reality - it is really happening throughout all Anglo-Saxondom and is having the effect of (a) reducing the birth-rate (UNO statistics confirm that while that of the coloured races is on the increase, that within the white race generally is on the decline): (b) destroying initiative within private enterprise which is the basic stimulant to the husband for the provision of his family; and (c) providing political reasons for the state control or the nationalisation of all private property. These three effects are basically national in context while at the same time are equally disastrous on the individual plane. There is no longer the time-honoured family institution of frank communication which, in the past, has made for meaningful relationships. With this deterioration of communication, the basic cure for the prevailing situation is held in abeyance for if husband, wife and child cannot relate to one another, how can they relate to God? Here again one is confronted by another facet of life affected by the feminist militarism for while the God of Biblical revelation is always spoken of in the masculine gender, the high-priestesses of the new cult of emancipation blaspheme His Name in their fanaticism. In a profane TV service several years ago conducted by Women's Libber's, the benediction - if one could call it by this name - was pronounced: "In the name of the mother, the daughter, and of the grand-daughter - A-women".

### **The Missing Factor - a God-Directed Home Structure.**

As has been noted, the family has been coerced into a society-centred institution which makes it vulnerable to shaping and conditioning according to the dictates of man. Scripturally, this is the very antithesis of the prescription for family life as provided by God. The society-orientated family today with all its heart-break and catastrophic implications to national continuity is, in company with so much else, yet another casualty in a world 'liberated' from God's Holy Law. As the survival of both family and nation depends on the re-implementation of God's Law - this is assured in Holy Writ - it would once again serve to note the pattern of family structure as this is recorded in the Bible. As one opens the pages of Holy Scripture, the first point which emerges in respect of commitment is that Almighty God provided a mandate to the Adamic family which involved a possessive function. It was told to subdue the earth and exercise dominion over it. From this, it is apparent that while the created earth was 'good' (Gen. 1:12) it was as yet undeveloped in terms of subjugation and possession by God's appointed governor - the Adamic race. This race therefore was committed to a responsibility which it was authorised to discharge solely within the limits of God's charge to them. Neither

responsibility nor authorisation has been changed and the commitment remains valid to the present day. Whatever happened to the Adamic race when it was created 'male and female' in Genesis 1:26-27 is not told for the Bible closes that chapter in the middle of the fourth verse in Genesis 2. It is from this point that the Adam - in the Hebrew text the article pin-points a specific Adam as distinct from the generalisation of Genesis 1:26 - formed out of the dust of the earth, takes the limelight. Here the family, as a unit, takes over in which the balanced structure of the home, in terms of God's mandate, may be seen. "And the Lord God said; It is not good that man (Adam) should be alone; I will make an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18). While the phrase 'help meet' essentially implies 'to surround, protect, aid, help and succour', the fundamental pre-eminence of the male in the family is never challenged. The wife, in providing the above mentioned companionship, enjoys a community in authority in terms of the overall calling of her husband. Many, of course, charge that the Bible relegates the wife to a secondary or inferior position whereas the true role of the wife is a unique one in which neither inferiority nor superiority are tolerated. The authority of the woman as a help meet could, if one were to seek an adequate illustration for this, be seen in the authority of a colonel in the army. His authority grows as that of the general above him grows and likewise that of the wife is enhanced as the husband succeeds in his calling in life. Of course, much of the theological inferiority which is bestowed upon women today derives from the account in Genesis 3 in which, it is suggested, Eve exercised ascendancy over Adam leading him into sin. What is conveniently ignored is the fact the Eve's God-given duty was a counselling role and although in this case hers was ill-conceived counsel, it was nevertheless the exercise of her right in the family. The structure of the family and home, while being headed by the husband and father, nevertheless revolves around the mother of which figure, the scripture states: "Who can find a worthy woman for her value is above price, She has her husband's confidence, for all she does is to his advantage... Secure and aware of her influence, she feels her position is worth more than silver and thus does not falter in times of adversity. Using her influence she sustains all with whom she comes in contact, helping those depressed in mind or through circumstances and those who are destitute... She watches the company her family keeps allowing no slackness and her children accept this, knowing her to be honest, as does her husband who praises her..." (Prov.31:10-31). What a different picture to that obtaining in Anglo-Saxondom today - and yet a picture of the woman to come when her true liberty will be realised when the Law of the Lord becomes the national Constitution of the nation. This woman is indeed the model around which the family will revolve - a figure in which is centred the Fifth Commandment - "Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Ex.20:12).

## **FAMILY PRIORITIES**

The centre of God's Plan for world rehabilitation - if one is prepared to accept what the Lord has to say about this, as distinct from what theology pronounces as God's Purpose - is His Holy Law operating within the nation for which it was codified and given at Sinai. This prodigious national Constitution revolves around the Code of Individual behaviour known as the Ten Commandments at the very heart of which the Lord Commands: "Honour thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee". However, prior to a consideration of this Commandment which militates against state control and the erosion of the family structure, it is necessary to reconsider the matter of priorities as this concerns the family and its structure. The reason for this is that somewhere along the line, someone has reversed the order of things with the result that emphasis is now placed upon the importance of the individual whose whims and fancies take pre-eminence over the family. More, the individual claims - and is given - the 'inalienable right to dispose of one's own person as one pleases' (definition of a lawsuit, Bonner vs. Moran, 1941) irrespective of the impact of this on the family unit. In other words, once an individual has reached the age of adult responsibility as prescribed by the law of the land, he or she can conduct themselves as they see fit with no moral obligations to prevent participation in the new social order of permissiveness. It has not always been like this. Once upon a time the family and not the

individual was regarded as the basic social unit - a unit which comprised blood relatives descended from the same male ancestor as well as others attached to it by marriage or adoption. The traditional head of the family was generally the oldest son in the eldest line from the common ancestor and whose word was law and whose presence, because of his position, commanded respect and obedience. All this has gone as has the custom of displaying 'family tress' which today's socially-orientated generation looks upon as mediaeval pride and reminiscent of a time when 'rights' as this is accepted today, did not exist. Notwithstanding the general attitude toward this subject, it is encouraging to note that among the younger generation i.e., those who have just married and started families of their own, there is a trend toward enquiry into their antecedents and not only this, but also into history of race migrations which resulted in the establishment of civilisation in the untamed wilderness of the world. As yet, the enquiry is on a limited scale but it does indicate that there are still those who resent the permissiveness which is shattering the family structure and which threaten the future unity between mother, father and children.