

The “Rule of Law”:
The biggest scam in history and the most important 4 words to exist!

This is written from a “Canadian” standpoint, but is equally applicable to US citizens and to citizens of virtually every UN Member nation.

“Canada is founded on the principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of Law.” What does this mean? Well, I think it is easy to grasp what the “**supremacy of God**” means, but who is supposed to “recognize” His supremacy? Does “Canada” recognize it? Who is “Canada”? Okay we know Canada, like all countries, is a fiction entity, commonly an artificial or juridical person, or simply put, an imaginary “it”.

Can an imaginary “it” actually recognize anything? Or maybe its Canada’s “principles” that recognize God’s supremacy - that’s actually what the order of the words say? Interestingly, it does not say that “Canadians”, or “people”, or “human beings”, or “men or women”, or anyone for that matter, recognize God’s supremacy - maybe we don’t really know who recognizes God’s supremacy, we just know someone (*or something*) must, or maybe it just sounds better if we pretend someone does without getting specific about it. Or perhaps we should just accept what the words say, and stick with the idea that these “principles” - whatever or whoever they are, can recognize God’s supremacy?

And so what if someone, or everyone recognizes God’s supremacy? What does that mean anyway? I guess if God exists, He must be supreme, so maybe that’s all it means? The statement offers no information about whether or not anyone is “obedient” to God, or if anyone lives by the rule or law of God, but at least we know someone recognizes God is supreme.

Now let’s move on to the meaning of “**the rule of Law**”. To help understand what this part of the statement means, let’s use some comparisons:

We all know what living under the “rule of Napoleon” was alleged to be like. What about the “rule of Hitler”? So I guess in this sense, the word rule, is being used as if it means the same thing as “authority”. For example, living under “Hitler’s authority”, would be similar to living under the “rule of Hitler” - or Napoleon, or maybe even some guy or some thing named “Law”. So essentially, when we live under the “rule” of someone, that “someone”, is our ruler. We notice that United states is very proud of their persistent trotting around the globe promoting “Democracy and the rule of law”, so they also must think the rule of law is significant.

Notice we are not under the rule of our Queen or of our government, nor are we under the rule of our Prime Minister, we are under the rule of “Law”. Now we would never say; “we are under the rule or authority of “the” Hitler”, or of “the” Napoleon, which is also consistent with why we say we are under the rule “of” Law, and why we do not say we are under the rule of “the” Law, because if we said “the” Law, then we would have to define which specific law or set of laws that we are referring to, like God’s Law for example. But because we specifically only say the rule “of” Law, we do not have to be

specific, because we are not referring to any specific set of Laws, rather we are referring to a specific “ruler”.

So it was really nice and quaint that we combined our recognition of the supremacy of God, with our recognition of our new “ruler”, with a name called “Law” in one sentence, but we seem to forget that nothing in that sentence ties the two topics directly together. We are not recognizing the supremacy of God’s Law as being related to the rule of law in the sentence for example, we are simply recognizing the two points in one statement. To grammatically tie the points together, we would have to say something like; “Canada is founded on the principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the supremacy of His Law”, or; “Canada is founded on the principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule (*or authority*) of His Laws”; or “the rules of His Law”, or “the rules of some laws”, etc. I think you get the point.

Maybe we are confused? Let’s compare this to the board game of Monopoly. It has a set of “rules” or pretend “Laws” that we must play by, if we want to “play” the game. So when we refer to the rules, we always say “that’s not what the “rules” say”, for example - it’s always the “rules” in plural, because there are obviously more than one rule. So is there only one “Law” in Canada, or shouldn’t we Canadians recognize the supremacy of many “laws”? Maybe we should recognize the supremacy of the “rules of Law”, like we recognize the importance of playing by the “rules” of Monopoly? Or maybe we should at least get specific about which Law or Laws we are recognizing?

So if it were really the laws that we were recognizing, we would say so - like we would say; “we recognize the supremacy of the rules of Law”, or we “recognize the supremacy of the rules of “the” Law”, but then we would be asking “which law or laws do we recognize? We suspect we mean all laws, but that is not what the statement says.

So here we have a statement that claims we Canadians live under the “rule of Law”, which is like saying we live under the “authority of Law”. So basically our “ruler” is this thing called “Law”; another imaginary “it”. Then shouldn’t we be asking “who” this “Law” is? Well, maybe not, because we seem to only be pretending again, that someone, or something recognizes the supremacy of “the rule of Law”. But let’s also assume this means Canadians recognize the rule of Law - makes sense because the document proclaims to be written “for” Canadians, whatever that means.

So we also know that Canadians, like citizens of all countries are actually fiction entities, commonly artificial or juridical persons, or simply put, a whole bunch of imaginary “its”. Maybe since we decided to make up an imaginary country with an imaginary “personality”, with imaginary “persons” residing in that imaginary country, we figured we needed an imaginary ruler - another imaginary “it” called “Law”?

What if the nation with a name called Canada, had real people living within its borders, and those people recognized the supremacy of God? That would make sense. What if those same people also recognized that the “rule of THE Law”, meaning the rule of God’s Law was a good thing? What if they recognized that the “rule of God’s Law”, or the “rule of THE Law”, or the “rules of the Law” (*“the”*

denotes the meaning of any specified law), were all very, very different statements, than “the rule of Law”?

Interestingly, Americans point out that they “Trust in God”, but nowhere in any of their documents do they imply that God is their “ruler”, only that they Trust in Him, like we Canadians recognize His supremacy. Does that mean they trust Him, or that they trust He exists? Grammatically, it simply means they trust He exists. America is also a UN member nation and the UN proudly proclaims that all of its member nations enjoy the “rule of Law”. Whoever or whatever this “Law” guy or thing is, it is surely a lot more important than what us “people” have been led to believe! The whole world is full of real people operating artificial “persons”; and in fact all pretending to be imaginary “its”, by acting like they really are those “persons”, or as if they could actually be those “persons”, and all of those “persons” are pretending to be ruled by some other person, another imaginary “it” with a name called “Law”. Imagine that.

Well someone did. They were first lawyers. They were some of the first lawyers that formed the BAR Association. They formed the BAR Association because they knew they could create an imaginary fiction entity called a “person”, deliberately designed to trick all human beings into giving away their inheritance as well as giving away all of their productivity.

They intended to create a multitude of these persons; in fact one each for every human being, that the legal parents of each human being would get the privilege of “naming”, plus one supreme person that they themselves would give a name to, called “Law”. The originators of the Bar Association considered human beings to be dimwits, and still do, so there would be little if any risk of real people ever figuring out their trick.

The one person to “rule” all other persons would be the one they called by the name Law. Like the board game of Monopoly, the Bar Association realized they also would need a set of rules to administer their organization by. So they made up what was convenient for them, and essentially kept it secret from all of us people - and still do. The Bar Association is the legal creator of ALL persons, therefore they own every single person and 100% of that person’s property. It’s not likely a coincidence that corporations have been declared by Law to be legal persons, and it’s certainly no coincidence that all governments are legal persons.

According to their rules, this artificial person they created and called by the name of Law, would be omnipotent. Law would be the supreme person, the supreme artificial being. Therefore, whoever created and owns Law, owns everything, because Law controls everything and authorizes everything and licenses everything, even all those things that are otherwise illegal for regular persons. Of course Law also decides what the words legal and illegal mean, and Law fairly well gets to make up whatever rules Law needs from time to time, in order to maintain absolute power over every other regular person, everywhere on the planet.

Maybe it’s just a coincidence that the same families that own and administer the BAR Association also own and administer all of the central banks that are licensed by Law to issue money. Because all

human beings act as if they were persons, they do therefore willingly give 100% of their labour in exchange for one of the many forms of money issued under privilege of these licenses that are so generously granted by Law. Likely it's also just another coincidence that all UN member governments respect the "rule of Law". Law created the UN and Law created the rules that enabled governments to create Civil Persons, so therefore Law owns and controls all of those governments that respect the rule of Law.

We know that whenever the rules are in question, governments always resort to asking Law to provide its determination as to what is legal or illegal. And like all supreme authorities, Law is always respected as knowing what's best for everyone. In fact, Law is often found to make decisions that are "legally", binding and enforceable - and therefore "authoritative", while many of its decisions seem to be contrary to the general will of the people. Well, that's okay, because Law is really only ruling over persons, not people.

Maybe there are good reasons why people are meant to do unto their neighbours as they would have their neighbour do unto themselves? Maybe a few people operating a monopoly called the Bar Association is not what we would want our neighbours to be doing unto us. Imagine if we stopped them - all we have to do, is stop pretending to be their creations.

The "Bar Association" is a "front" to train all of the regular - normal - lawyer - lackeys that do the day to day grunt work for the very few elitists that actually control the Bar Association and that know who created its supreme person, and how to control it; "Law" provides everyone with "his" "rule"; or in other words, how we are ruled by Law, or that our ruler is Law, or we are ruled by a "person" named Law, or whatever makes it easier to grasp that this artificial person named "Law" is really "them" - these few elitists that rule us all thru their manipulative control of Law.

This means that almost all lawyers are also Dimwit persons, they just know how to administer some of Law's rules, they don't know much if anything about the fact that Law actually rules over them and almost everyone everywhere - or that Law is instigating war with those very few countries where someone other than Law rules.

Like the Bar Association, the Institute of Chartered Accountants ("ICA"), is simply another organization of tools, that Law uses to help administer their elitist rule. ("Law" being the very few elitists that control the Bar and probably the ICA. and the Vatican upper hierarchy.) So again, most accountants are just Dimwits like most lawyers, simply following Law's orders.

Legal personality can be assigned to virtually any "name", thus any artificial entity such as a corporation ("*Wal-Mart*") or government ("*Ontario*") is technically a person, thus so is "Law", and it is this person named "Law" that we must come to realize is the person "lording" or ruling over the rest of us "persons".

The US President is democratically elected, and so is our Prime Minister democratically elected, but even they admit that we all recognize the "supremacy" of "the rule of Law". As in the US proclaiming

its right to go around the globe "promoting democracy and the rule of Law", or as in, "Canada is founded on the principals that recognize the supremacy of God and [recognize the supremacy] of the rule of Law". It's sort of like saying we recognize the order of the natural things of nature created by God on earth, and we recognize the order of the fictional things of fiction created by men on earth.

We could also include that we recognize that sugar is sweet, or horses have four legs, but none of it matters, because we are NOT stating that there is any relationship between the various things we recognize, merely that we recognize them for what they are. Ergo, God is supreme in nature, and so likewise, "Law" is supreme as our fictional ruler.

As for the law of the Vatican, it is the very anti-thesis of the one we call the Messiah. All things "Christian" like all things related to the one they call "Christ", are the epitome of evil and completely false. The "Messiah" was spiritually sired and born of a woman as a natural man that walked the living earth, whereas the person of "Christ" was an artificial creation - a legal person created by the Vatican as a fictional persona that lead a fictional life to lead the people astray - after a false - fiction - religion. The same elitist families that control Law, thru the Bar Association, and that use Law to indoctrinate lawyers and accountants also used and continue to use Law to indoctrinate the Catholic hierarchy, because they are also part of the very top of the Catholic hierarchy.

Compare Parker Brother's Monopoly to Law. Monopoly has its own artificial Rules that govern how its "little men" can play. Likewise Law has its own artificial rules that govern how its little persons can play - two fictional games, two sets of fictional rules that must be followed, otherwise the little fictional men, or little fictional persons, will be accused of cheating or breaking the rule of Law.

Now compare the supremacy of the natural Creator God to the artificially created thing called "Law" - God has natural Laws and the created thing which is man, has created laws which are artificial. Each can be recognized as being supreme in their own right, since one has nothing at all to do with the other. No one claims that Law's rules are superior to God's Laws, merely that being "ruled" by Law is supreme - meaning "really good or superior", not necessarily supreme to God, just supreme - like saying this brand of ice cream is supreme, or this brand of ice cream has three price/quality options, good, excellent and supreme.

So the natural God and Creator of the planet created natural men and women and all natural things on the planet. The founders of the BAR Association, were created by God. They are also His creations. These creations, created artificial or fictional things (*or un-natural things*), like persons, "Acts", "Statutes" "Codes" and many other rules and laws, all under the direction and authority of their one supreme fictional person called Law. Law dictates what is legal and what is not.

A man or a woman are naturally capable of being a father and a mother. A "male person" and a "female person" are legally capable of being "legal parents", or "legal guardians" of a "legally defined infant". Along the same lines, we have the natural Creator we will refer to as our God, as opposed to the artificial creators we refer to as our BAR Association. We have natural man and artificial person. We have natural Law and artificial legal rules; we have a natural Messiah, and an artificial "Christ"; we have the naturally inspired Word of God, and we have the Legally copyrighted versions of the "legal" fiction bibles; we have the natural congregation of our Creator and we have the artificial "legal"

members of the equally artificial "legal" churches; we have the natural reverence of our Creator and we have the artificial reverence of the created fiction; we have the natural religion of our Father and we have the artificial religions of men; we have the natural world all around us and we have the artificial - but "legal" world, surrounding us. We are living in the natural world, while we are pretending to be living in and as the artificial one.

Likewise there are many of the "god" kind. There is only one Creator of the universe and He tells us His name is called Yahweh. He is the supreme or omnipotent Creator of all that exists in the entire universe(s). He acknowledges that there are many other lesser "god" kind beings, as well as many false "gods". In fact, He claims that your and my purpose, was to be born into His family as sons and daughters of Him - ergo, we are born to be of the "god" kind thus we have the potential to become His children living with Him, as "gods".

The angels He created are also akin to the "god" kind, inasmuch as they are deemed by Him, to be "sons of the Most High". Now back to "false gods". A false god, could just as easily be a fiction god, or an artificial creation. Lucifer proclaims himself falsely, to be a supreme god, so although he is real, his proclamation is false. Some few men - namely the originators of the BAR Association, proclaim falsely that "Law" is a god. Man-kind everywhere has been manipulated by these men, who have been first manipulated by the great Deceiver, into believing that we are under the "rule of (*their fiction god they named*) Law".

If we recognize and speak openly about the supremacy of "the rule of Law", then we are effectively openly acknowledging that whatever our Creator's law may be, it is inferior to "the rule of Law". We universally proclaim our obedience to "the rule of Law", yet by doing so, we are just as universally proclaiming our disobedience to "the rule of Yahweh". You cannot claim your obedience to the one "rule of Law" as being our supreme duty, and then claim the "supremacy of God", unless you are also claiming that "Law" is indeed "the" God you are proclaiming as supreme. In other words, If John is taller than Bob, then Bob cannot be the tallest - only one can be of the supreme height.

Perhaps we should question more? Wonder why over seven thousand (7,000) instances of the name of our Creator, "Yahweh", have been deliberately removed from all Bible versions? Why would He inspire us to call on His name, and then not tell us what His name was? Do the modern BAR Association creators have anything in common with the ancient Pharisees - the ones our Messiah claimed were hypocrites, a brood of vipers that were the anti-thesis of His faith? Right, they were all lawyers, worshipping false gods. And the Pharisees were among the first to falsely proclaim the "dangers" associated with "speaking or reading" the Creator's name! Since false gods do not exist naturally, then it stands to reason that these same hypocrites, manufactured, or created whatever version of false god they deemed to best suit their needs from time to time.

The Pharisees effectively controlled the people of their day through fear - fear of false notions involving their man-made, artificial rules and regulations, not unlike the modern lawyers, that use fear of false notions to control us now, involving their man-made, equally artificial rules and regulations called acts, statutes, codes, legislation, constitutions, bills of rights, etc. So maybe when we attend to

court and see a copy-righted version of the bible - a “legal” doctrine, as authorized by “Law”, we really are recognizing the supremacy of God - their God - the one they called Law. Obviously we are not, and cannot be recognizing the supremacy of our Father Yahweh’s Law, otherwise we would be obedient to that Law of His, not to “the rule of Law” - that is theirs. But where then would be the fear? Or the ability to control and manipulate?

For now, let us suggest that if you really desire to learn the truth of your spiritual make-up and inheritance, that you start with reading the articles listed in the left hand column of our Library page - from top to bottom in the order they are listed seems to work best. If you have read some of them before, either read them again or at least skim those ones again so you can get through the list in its intended order.

And do not feel distressed about having been deceived in these things - rather feel the joy of being blessed with the knowledge that our Father has promised you, that when you read His truth, you shall know in your heart that you have read the truth, and it is that truth of His, that you will recognize within your very being which shall set you free.

“BAR Association” = “British Accreditation Registry”. Did you know that the word “British”, originates from the two words “**Brit**” and “**Ish**”? Well how about the reality that “Brit” is an English phonetic pronunciation of the ancient Hebrew expression denoting “Covenant”, and the word “Ish”, stems from the ancient Hebrew expression denoting “Man” or “men/Mankind”, so essentially the word, British is the English phonetic sound of combining the two ancient Hebrew words, stemming from the original ancient Hebrew expression for the “Covenant Man”, or “Covenant Men/Mankind”. So I guess the founders of the BAR Association, perceive themselves as the “Covenant Men” - wonder who they think they have a covenant with? Not with our God, that’s for sure - perhaps someone more adversarial?

Definitions of “Of”:

Used before singular or plural nouns and noun phrases that denote particular, specified persons or things. Of is defined as to indicate ownership.

Derived or coming from: resulting from; caused by; through: proceeding as a product from; by: Resulting from an operation or process involving: from the whole, or total number, constituting: distinguished as by excellence from among: distinguished as the best, most important, etc. belonging to: having; possessing: containing: that is; having the designation of; specified as: as a way to characterize: with (something specified) as object, goal, etc.:

Definitions of “The”:

Used before singular or plural nouns and noun phrases that denote particular, specified persons or things. Used before a noun, and generally stressed, to emphasize one of a group or type as the most outstanding or prominent: Used to indicate uniqueness:

Used before a noun specifying a field of endeavour: the law; Used before a proper name. Used before an adjective extending it to signify a class and giving it the function of a noun: used as a function word before the name of a branch of human endeavour or proficiency <the law>