

Submit Yourselves to the King

Preached first on 2/2/2020 on www.molibertyradio.us

Well here we are in the middle of winter - where normally it should be just ridiculously cold - and we are having spring-like weather! Awesome! I love it. Seems like every year I get older, I dislike the cold more and more - and these mild winters are such a blessing.

I hope you are getting a break from the cold - or maybe you are just a little crazy - and enjoy the cold.

Sometimes I think to myself, maybe I should do nothing but just stick to Bible texts and preach nothing but Scripture. A preacher should certainly not be able to go wrong doing that. But I realize that it is important - just like in the days of the prophets - where the people were doing certain things - and God raised up a prophet to show the people how they had fallen away from - as the text so often says - serving God - serving Yahweh.

The actions of people - it's nothing that God does - it's never God's fault - it's the actions of the people that separate themselves from God. And as I have shown from Isaiah 58 - many times - they don't even realize that the things they are doing have separated them from the One Who is supposed to be their God.

When I began speaking to you last week about Gina's situation - and how the courts took her to trial - without her being there because the docket clearly shows that the Trial/Hearing was canceled for 1/22/2020 - and how they gave her an attorney - then took it away - then still proceeded to trial - then put her in jail and will quite possibly then put her in prison - I'm not telling you these things because I think it is a terrible thing that they did this to her without an attorney.

Who knows? It may have been worse for her HAD she had an attorney. It's the attorneys who are the ones who have stolen away the key of knowledge - just exactly like they did in Christ' day. These are the very ones - along with their fellow conspirators in evil - the "churchmen" - who have devised these wicked systems that have drawn men away from the Kingdom/Government of God and into the domain of darkness - so warned about throughout the last 23 books of the Bible.

Here's the reality - if the Laws in society today - were simply the Laws of God - a man would not need a quote "lawyer." The Laws of God do not create a web of deceit and loopholes and crafts and volumes and stacks of statutes that a man cannot possibly

know about.

There is a very simple, short, concise list of Laws. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not lie. Thou shalt not commit perjury. There is a flesh and blood victim. There are flesh and blood accusers. A man stands before a Godly - Law advocating judge who hears the two sides of the story - then rules - measures - according to the Laws of God - then renders judgements based upon the Laws of God. Really simple. Really easy.

But in the system that these wicked God-hating lawyers have devised for themselves - it is all but impossible - according to their own words - for a simple, common man - though he be 100% totally innocent - though the prosecutor be corrupt and overzealous - though the judge be biased and eccentric - it is nigh impossible - not just for the common man to free himself from his oppressors - but to even have the slimmest chance of having a fair trial.

So when I am trying to expose what is going on in the courts of America - I'm trying to get people to see that the systems they have voluntarily chosen for themselves - when exposed for the injustice they have produced - those systems have become separation between themselves and the God they claim to serve.

God's Law is not followed in America. And the so-called "preachers" in America have convinced the greatest majority of people in America that God wants it that way. It is the perfect will of God for His Laws to be done away with and man's laws to be the quote "laws of the land." And so not only have the Laws of God been done away with, but because they've been done away with - and man's laws are what's left - man is not even obligated to follow their own laws. We are left with total lawlessness. And anyone who says otherwise is simply a fool or has their head stuck in the sand somewhere.

I saw an article this past week with the following headline:

Let's recap. On this day in 2016, LaVoy Finicum was shot and killed by our government for resisting tyranny, the duty of all patriots

The article then went on and stated what all of us clearly saw with our own eyes as the FBI released the footing of Finicum's shooting. He was murdered. He got out of the truck with his hands raised - and they just murdered him like an animal. Well, Finicum certainly was not the only one that actors for the U.S. government murdered in 2016, 17, 18, 19, 20 or beyond.

But here's the issue. The title of the article says... "Killed by Our government...." And the writer of the article seems to have thought nothing about what he just said. And, it's not surprising to me because I hear people say that phrase over and over and over. And it seems like - and maybe it's just my own perspective - but it seems like they say that almost always when referring to bad things their government does.

"Did you hear what "our government" did last week? Our politicians are just so bad. I can't believe what that judge did. Our judges have just become so corrupted by those democrats. Did you see what our government did to Lavoy Finicum?"

Well friends, if your government did that - then I would suggest a change of governments. This is what I've been trying to tell people who claim Christ for almost 40 years now. This is what Ted Weiland has been trying to tell people who claim Christ for many many years.

Every single thing that the U.S. government does - is done by the people. The government IS the people. The opening statement in the document that created quote "Our government" is done by:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

I just noticed this - does it really spell ensure with an in? Wow that's interesting, but not totally on point so I'll leave it.

The CONstitution was needed to form something more perfect - more perfect than what? They had pretty close to near perfection in the very early stages of life on this land. The reality is - just like it is today - because men refuse to study and understand the Laws, Statutes, Commandments and Judgements of God - and they have no idea what the Perfect Will of God is - they are constantly flailing in the wind - tossing to and fro - trying to improve on their own failures - and they can't do it because all a man's ways are right in his own heart - but his ways end in death.

The evil things that so many U.S. citizens complain about - and there are certainly many - those evil things are ALL done in the name of the people. The people who claim to U.S. citizenship are guilty by association.

And interestingly enough, when the actors for the U.S. are pressed on why they do this or that - they are very quick to say that the CONstitution gives them the authority to do what they do.

This is why when I understood that I had a choice of citizenship - and I chose the commonwealth of Israel - when I understood that the nation of God, the people of God, who were once not a people, but are now the people of God - when I realized that was a reality for me because of my faith in Christ - it was one of the most freeing - liberating - it wasn't one of the most - it was the most freeing, liberating understandings to ever enter my life in which - at that time - was about 27 years.

And, as a man thinketh in his heart - so is he...

From that day til this - I have never said "our government" when speaking concerning the U.S. because it isn't my Government. My Government is the commonwealth of Israel, the Kingdom of God - and its Laws are absolutely flawlessly perfect. Its King has never done a single thing wrong - not once ever. Its Government is totally, perfect and I have never once been ashamed of being a citizen in it. It's fantastic and I just want to testify of its greatness to the point where people will say - yeah - I'm sick and tired of being guilty by association with the politicians, the judges, the persecutors, the CIAs, the FBIs, the crooked cops...

Speaking of crooked cops. Accuse me of piling on here if you want to, that's okay. Because I get weary of people - especially people who call themselves Christians - and they are totally duped by this false Republican/Democrat fairytale - where the republicans are supposedly the good and the godly and the democrats are the evil, demonic ones. When the truth is - there isn't any difference between the two for the most part. And I have to say this - with the exception of Mike Moon. Mike is just a total anomaly for me. But anyway, for the most part, there isn't much difference between the two.

The other day I was speaking with my dad and I said to him that Trump did in about a year what Obama could not do in 8 years. And that was get the quote "red flag gun laws" passed. My dad said, "What are those?"

I was talking about how one president just paves the way for the next.

But anyway, back to my crooked cops story. Several years ago, my wife and I started a Christian homeschool coop for our rural area. We had a lot of families - a lot of children - it was a blessing for a lot of people. In our second year, a new family had moved to the area and wanted to be a part of the coop. They claimed to be a Christian family, they home-schooled their four children - so they were in.

The two boys in the family played basketball so they were on the basketball team. The dad had some basketball skill and knowledge, so he joined as an assistant coach. The dad was a former Pennsylvania highway patrolman. He was well up in the ranks, also.

He had come to Missouri to be a professor of criminology or whatever courses kids take to get into quote "law enforcement." One day, this man and I were traveling together in his truck and he told me that EVERY - these were HIS words - EVERY Pennsylvania highway patrolman - carried in their police car - an unmarked gun - and a bag of drugs in case they needed to plant something on some supposed criminal.

This was not a rogue democrat policeman. This was a man who claimed to be a follower of Christ. He was a republican. He was a highway patrolman. Wow. I just shook my head - not in shock - not in disbelief - I had already heard things like this from gossip or hearsay - I didn't have any problem whatsoever believing what this man said to me.

And, of course, as soon as he said it, I again, was so happy that I had made the decision years before to "Come out from among them and be separate so that I would not be partakers of their sin."

It is, in my opinion, necessary at times, to again point out the wickedness of man's systems and man's governments - in trying to point people - the common man - the man who is serious about a relationship with Christ - and let him know he has a choice. Just like Joshua of old - "Choose you this day whom you will serve." Will you choose the rulers, judges, magistrates that your fathers served? Or will you choose Yahweh? He sent His Only Begotten Son so that you could be free. So that you could have a choice of citizenship in another country - a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

In *Argersinger vs Hamlin*, the history of what the quote supreme court justice was pointing out - which led to the evolution of U.S. standards in the criminal justice system they created for themselves - I found that history intriguing. Which is why I was sharing it with you last week and why I want to continue today. Which, in the end, I am hoping will again bring us to the conclusion that we desperately need to Come Out of this and into the Kingdom of Christ. We left off where the judge was saying the right to counsel should be available for any amount of jail time that a man could receive. Quote:

*Both Powell and Gideon involved felonies. But their rationale has relevance to any criminal trial, where an accused is deprived of his liberty. Powell and Gideon suggest that there are certain fundamental rights applicable to all such criminal prosecutions, even those, such 33*33 as [In re Oliver, supra](#), where the penalty is 60 days' imprisonment:*

"A person's right to reasonable notice of a charge against him, and an opportunity to be heard in his defense—a right to his day in court—are basic in our system of jurisprudence; and these rights include, as a minimum, a right to examine the witnesses

against him, to offer testimony, and to be represented by counsel." [333 U. S., at 273](#) (emphasis supplied).

The requirement of counsel may well be necessary for a fair trial even in a petty-offense prosecution. We are by no means convinced that legal and constitutional questions involved in a case that actually leads to imprisonment even for a brief period are any less complex than when a person can be sent off for six months or more. See, e. g., [Powell v. Texas, 392 U. S. 514](#); [Thompson v. Louisville, 362 U. S. 199](#); [Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 382 U. S. 87](#).

The trial of vagrancy cases is illustrative. While only brief sentences of imprisonment may be imposed, the cases often bristle with thorny constitutional questions. See [Papachristou v. Jacksonville, 405 U. S. 156](#).

Let me interject here. The real issue here in vagrancy is being poor. It is not a crime to be poor in God's Laws. Jesus said, "The poor you will have with you always." Back to the judge.

*[In re Gault, 387 U. S. 1](#), dealt with juvenile delinquency (which today (me speaking), in many instances means failure to make sure a kid is in government school) and an offense which, if committed by an adult, would have carried a fine of \$5 to \$50 or imprisonment in jail for not more than two months (*id.*, at 29), but which when committed by a juvenile might lead to his detention in a state institution until he reached the age of 21. *Id.*, at 36-37. We said (*id.*, at 36) that "[t]he juvenile needs the assistance of counsel to cope with problems of law, to make skilled inquiry into the facts, to insist upon regularity of the proceedings, and to ascertain whether he has a defense and to prepare and submit it. The child `requires the guiding hand of counsel 34*34 at every step in the proceedings against him,' "*

Stop right here for a second. Once again, this is exactly where the local judge has to read the statement - "Did you have effective assistance of counsel at every stage of the process?" Remember, I came across this because I was searching why the local judge asks all these lawyer questions to the accused before he cuts his head off. This is why. This is where it comes from. The local judge gets a "Yes" answer from the accused to satisfy the requirements laid down in this *Argersinger vs Hamlin*.

*citing [Powell v. Alabama, 287 U. S., at 69](#). The premise of *Gault* is that even in prosecutions for offenses less serious than felonies, a fair trial may require the presence of a lawyer.*

Beyond the problem of trials and appeals is that of the guilty plea, a problem which looms large in misdemeanor as well as in felony cases. Counsel is needed so that the

accused may know precisely what he is doing, so that he is fully aware of the prospect of going to jail or prison, and so that he is treated fairly by the prosecution.

Alright. The thought just hit me, treated fairly by the prosecution. Yeah right. I'll guarantee you that's true. You will not be treated fairly by the persecutor without a lawyer. You probably won't be treated fairly with one - but I'll guarantee you you will not be treated fairly without one.

Hopefully you are staying with me following this. For me, this is where this starts to get really interesting. Because you are going to hear - from their own words - the U.S. criminal justice system is not about guilt or innocence, is not about right or wrong - it's about getting guilty decisions. It's about getting as many cases in and out as fast as they possibly can. Its revolving door - sit down, shut up, pay the man. Quote, now listen closely, please.

In addition, the volume of misdemeanor cases,^[4] far greater in number than felony prosecutions, may create an obsession for speedy dispositions, regardless of the fairness of the result. The Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society 128 (1967), states:

*"For example, until legislation last year increased the number of judges, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions had four judges to process the preliminary stages of more than 1,500 felony cases, 7,500 serious misdemeanor cases, and 38,000 petty offenses and an equal number of traffic offenses per year. An inevitable consequence of volume that large is the almost total preoccupation 35*35 in such a court with the movement of cases. The calendar is long, speed often is substituted for care, and casually arranged out-of-court compromise too often is substituted for adjudication. Inadequate attention tends to be given to the individual defendant, whether in protecting his rights, sifting the facts at trial, deciding the social risk he presents, or determining how to deal with him after conviction. The frequent result is futility and failure. As Dean Edward Barrett recently observed:*

" `Wherever the visitor looks at the system, he finds great numbers of defendants being processed by harassed and overworked officials. Police have more cases than they can investigate. Prosecutors walk into courtrooms to try simple cases as they take their initial looks at the files. Defense lawyers appear having had no more than time for hasty conversations with their clients. Judges face long calendars with the certain knowledge that their calendars tomorrow and the next day will be, if anything, longer, and so there is no choice but to dispose of the cases.

" `Suddenly it becomes clear that for most defendants in the criminal process, there is scant regard for them as individuals. They are numbers on dockets, faceless ones to be processed and sent on their way. The gap between the theory and the reality is enormous.

" `Very little such observation of the administration of criminal justice in operation is required to reach the conclusion that it suffers from basic ills.' "

Friends, this was 1972! This is what was said in 1972 about the U.S. criminal injustice system. And I'm telling you from first hand, eye-witness testimony - what was said to be in infancy some almost 50 years ago - has grown into a full-size monstrosity of a beast on steroids and is the norm in the courtrooms all across the U.S.

And the truth is - it's their own fault - not that they are admitting anything wrong with what's taking place - but it is their own fault because their out of control beast system has created so many laws, so many statues, so many regulations - that taking a breath is probably a criminal offense in their system. The system they have produced - which robbed the people of any real wealth when they stole the silver and gold away from the people and replaced it with pieces of paper exchangeable for gold and silver one day - then exchangeable for nothing the next day. Now that beast system duped people into ridding themselves even of their worthless paper and accepting a system of currency based solely on a keystroke of a computer or a cell phone - all of which dangles perilously on the fallacy that electricity will always be abundant and available. The arrogance. The rebellion that men walk in these days is incredible. The judge continues:

*That picture is seen in almost every report. "The misdemeanor trial is characterized by insufficient and frequently irresponsible preparation on the part of the defense, the prosecution, and the court. Everything is rush, rush." Hellerstein, The Importance of the Misdemeanor 36*36 Case on Trial and Appeal, 28 The Legal Aid Brief Case 151, 152 (1970).*

Yes! This is why there is no such thing as a "hearing." Especially for a man who does not have the money or resources for one of their attorneys. Their attorneys are well-trained in their system of rush, rush. They know they have 30 seconds to make their point. If they do not participate in the rush, rush, they'll be sanctioned.

That's why when I spoke with one of their attorneys about my situation, she flat out told me - "You live outside the box - but I have to live and work inside the box. I can't do the things you are asking me to do - I have to work with these people every day."

Continuing.

There is evidence of the prejudice which results to misdemeanor defendants from this "assembly-line justice." One study concluded that "[m]isdemeanants represented by attorneys are five times as likely to emerge from police court with all charges dismissed as are defendants who face similar charges without counsel." American Civil Liberties Union, Legal Counsel for Misdemeanants, Preliminary Report 1 (1970).

*We must conclude, therefore, that the problems associated with misdemeanor and petty^[5] offenses often 37*37 require the presence of counsel to insure the accused a fair trial. MR. JUSTICE POWELL suggests that these problems are raised even in situations where there is no prospect of imprisonment. Post, at 48. We need not consider the requirements of the Sixth Amendment as regards the right to counsel where loss of liberty is not involved, however, for here petitioner was in fact sentenced to jail. And, as we said in Baldwin v. New York, 399 U. S., at 73, "the prospect of imprisonment for however short a time will seldom be viewed by the accused as a trivial or 'petty' matter and may well result in quite serious repercussions affecting his career and his reputation."^[6]*

Really? Do you think being tied up in their system can have serious repercussions affecting a man's career and reputation? That's deep. How about the effects on the children of the man? How about the devastating effects on the man's wife? Yeah, there are debilitating, devastating effects on many people because of their wicked, debauched rush, rush, assembly-line-justice of a system they have created for themselves while masquerading the lie that they are advancing a

more perfect Union, establishing Justice, insuring domestic Tranquility, providing for the common defence, promoting the general Welfare, and securing the Blessings of Liberty to themselves and their Posterity,

Their system has done no such thing. After having said what this judge said so far in Argersinger vs Hamlin, he is going to sum this up with the following statement. This statement should not be subject to legalese. Though I'm quite sure that because the statement says black is black and white is white - just about as clear as anything one could possibly read from their double-minded, double-speak language - this is the sum of what the judge said - listen closely please:

We hold, therefore, that absent a knowing and intelligent waiver, no person may be imprisoned for any offense, whether classified as petty, misdemeanor, or felony, unless he was represented by counsel at his trial.^[7]

That is the view of the Supreme Court of Oregon, with which we agree. It said in Stevenson v. Holzman, 254 Ore. 94, 102, 458 P. 2d 414, 418:

*"We hold that no person may be deprived of his 38*38 liberty who has been denied the assistance of counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment. This holding is applicable to all criminal prosecutions, including prosecutions for violations of municipal ordinances. The denial of the assistance of counsel will preclude the imposition of a jail sentence."*^[8]

Alright. Let's stop here for a second. There are now a couple of legalese loopholes that I think need to be addressed. The first is in the phrase *"that absent a knowing and intelligent waiver,"*

You might say to me, well, Charlie, I know of people who quote "represented themselves" and lost and were put in prison. I do, too. But here's my experience. Most of the people that I know of or know - that quote "represented themselves" are people who have said things to me like "well you just go in there and you tell them they don't have jurisdiction, or you tell them this or you tell them that - and you watch them run and hide." Really? I just read from the words of a quote u.s. supreme court justice where he said - people who are not skilled in the science of law - their law - their procedures - their game playing - though they be totally innocent - will not be able to free themselves from corrupt prosecutors, bias and eccentric judges.

You may walk in there with total confidence of being 100% correct - and you quite possibly are 100% correct - I mean you are ready to provide the truth - and the first thing the judge says is - I have made my ruling. And you stand there thinking, "Huh?" And you could be like me and say, "But you haven't heard my statement?" Then the guy with the gun gives you the look, like - "here is where you shut up and do what the judge says - or else." Or the judge himself basically gives you the - one more word and off to jail you go - which - why? What would you have accomplished? You didn't get to speak your piece at your quote "hearing" and you are now sitting in jail on top of it.

The assembly-line, rush, rush system they have created does not have time for you to speak. You - the mere animal - piece of trash - slave - will do what you are told - submit - and off you go. That's the system I am seeing first hand. So how is it they are able to railroad people who do not have an attorney?

The key is in the quote "waiver of counsel." Some of these homemade legal-gurus that have told me about all these silver bullets (I'm not talking about you, Dave) - are many times the first to stand up and tell a judge they are quote "pro se." And the judge gives them their quote "right" to waive counsel. And when a man quote "waives counsel" then rest assured - they have every quote "right" under their system to do with you however they please.

I have told you before how the judge in my cases has repeatedly told me to get an attorney or waive counsel. "Waive counsel?" I told him only a fool would "waive counsel." The Scriptures say, "There is safety in a multitude of counsellors. Who, in their right mind, would waive counsel?" I will - and I hope you will too, never, waive counsel. That is a foolish thing to do and for a follower of Christ - my people are destroyed for lack of knowledge - and I'm talking about lack of knowledge of the Word of God - specifically that which is found in Proverbs 11:14

Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety.

And, Proverbs 24:6

or by wise counsel thou shalt make thy war: and in multitude of counsellors there is safety.

In Missouri, they have a statue. And of course, it remains to be seen whether they will obey their own statue, or will they again prove themselves to be totally lawless - as has been my witness for more than 4 years now. But there is a statue called 600.051 and it's titled like this:

2016 Missouri Revised Statutes

TITLE XXXVIII CRIMES AND PUNISHMENT; PEACE OFFICERS AND PUBLIC DEFENDERS
(556-600)

Chapter 600 Public Defenders

Section 600.051 Waiver of counsel, when permitted.

To me, even the title is interesting. Waiver of counsel - when permitted.

When permitted says to me that it's not just something freely available. Now, their CONstitution in their 6th Amendment - and remember now - this is for their citizens - I guess they feel they can deny this to someone like me - because I do not claim their citizenship. Which is interesting, because in some ways they have mocked me and said I don't have certain natural rights available to me because of my choice of citizenship - yet they are trying to hold me accountable to the statues of theirs that ONLY apply to their citizens. But their 6th Amendment in their CONstitution says that every one is entitled to assistance of counsel - and their courts have then established that a man can quote "represent himself" if he chooses to be so silly.

But the Missouri statue says that a "waiver of counsel" is permitted - you can have permission to waive counsel - BUT - and this is a HUGE BUT - listen to what this says:

600.051. 1. Any judge of a court of competent jurisdiction may permit a waiver of counsel to be filed in any criminal case wherein a defendant may receive a jail sentence

*or confinement if the court first determines that defendant has made a knowledgeable and intelligent waiver of the right to assistance of counsel and **the waiver is signed before and witnessed by the judge or clerk of the court**, providing further that the waiver contains at least the following information which the defendant has read or which has been read to the defendant before the signing thereof:*

If you look at the docket in Gina's case, as I said last week, she had a speaking on indigency, and the court found her indigent. The court ordered a public defender. The public defender said none was available. Then, a public defender at some point, made an entry of appearance. Then, the docket shows the judge ordered the public defender withdrawn. There is nothing on the docket that shows that Gina signed a waiver of counsel. I asked her if she signed a waiver and she told me, "No." So, we'll see what happens next, I guess, on the 20th of next month.

In my situation, I have not signed a waiver, nor will I ever. I applied for a public defender - at least 3 times - and was denied. Even though, I rarely have more than several hundred of their paper dollars in my possession - in fact - I'd consider myself rich if I had even a couple thousand of their dollars - they held a speaking and determined that I was not indigent in their opinion. Of course, when your Father has cattle on a thousand hills and the wealth of every mine - how could the son possibly be considered "indigent." And, of course, it's perfectly fine for them to declare me whatever they want. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." No, I do not have worldly wealth. But I and my wife and children have never missed a meal - unless we wanted to. And I am truly

rich both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us: and I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you.

As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.

How that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the **riches** of their liberality.

For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was **rich**, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be **rich**.

The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the **riches** of the glory of his inheritance in the saints,

Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable **riches** of Christ;

But my God shall supply all your need according to his **riches** in glory by Christ Jesus.

By faith Charlie, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of the united states of america;

Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;

Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in America: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward.

Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world **rich** in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?

Because thou sayest, I am **rich**, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked:

I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be **rich**; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.

I'll take the riches in Christ over the riches of the world anytime. Oh yes, I'm rich. I may not have the things the world has. I may not travel the world and have nice cars and boats and pleasures - but I am oh so rich in Christ - and I'm satisfied.

So they said - even though I absolutely do not have any possible way of paying for an attorney - that I DO have the means to pay for attorney - so - they think they are now free from the requirements of their statues. This is just another amazing thing in the twilight zone for me. Here I am - 57 years old according to my mother - and I just found out what my name is. Can you imagine that? A grown man. Married 30 years - 5 children - 2 grandchildren - 4 grandmutts (that's what I call my children's pets) - and I have someone who I never met before in my entire life come along and tell me what my name is. That is amazing.

Then, a grown man - I mean - I can feed myself - I can put my own clothes on - I can take a shower - I can even shave without cutting myself - but someone who literally knows nothing whatsoever about me - knows my financial status better than I do. Better than my wife. That is incredible. But of course, I'm just a mere animal, a worthless piece of garbage and these guys in their black robes are gods. Mind readers -

able to look through walls. Pretty amazing. The u.s. supreme court judge continues with Argersinger, and I think I'm just about ready to finish this...

We do not sit as an ombudsman to direct state courts how to manage their affairs but only to make clear the federal constitutional requirement. How crimes should be classified is largely a state matter.^[9] The fact that traffic charges technically fall within the category of "criminal prosecutions" does not necessarily mean that many of them will be brought into the class^[10] where imprisonment actually occurs.

*39*39 The American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice states:*

"As a matter of sound judicial administration it is preferable to disregard the characterization of the offense as felony, misdemeanor or traffic offense. Nor is it adequate to require the provision of defense services for all offenses which carry a sentence to jail or prison. Often, as a practical matter, such sentences are rarely if ever imposed for certain types of offenses, so that for all intents and purposes the punishment they carry is at most a fine. Thus, the standard seeks to distinguish those classes of cases in which there is real likelihood that incarceration may follow conviction from those types in which there is no such likelihood. It should be noted that the standard does not recommend a determination of the need for counsel in terms of the facts of each particular case; it draws a categorical line at those types of offenses for which incarceration as a punishment is a practical possibility." Providing Defense Services 40 (Approved Draft 1968).

*40*40 Under the rule we announce today, every judge will know when the trial of a misdemeanor starts that no imprisonment may be imposed, even though local law permits it, unless the accused is represented by counsel. He will have a measure of the seriousness and gravity of the offense and therefore know when to name a lawyer to represent the accused before the trial starts.*

The run of misdemeanors will not be affected by today's ruling. But in those that end up in the actual deprivation of a person's liberty, the accused will receive the benefit of "the guiding hand of counsel" so necessary when one's liberty is in jeopardy.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER, concurring in the result.

I agree with much of the analysis in the opinion of the Court and with MR. JUSTICE POWELL'S appraisal of the problems. Were I able to confine my focus solely to the burden that the States will have to bear in providing counsel, I would be inclined, at this stage of the development of the constitutional right to counsel, to conclude that there is

much to commend drawing the line at penalties in excess of six months' confinement. Yet several cogent factors suggest the infirmities in any approach that allows confinement for any period without the aid of counsel at trial; any deprivation of liberty is a serious matter. The issues that must be dealt with in a trial for a petty offense or a misdemeanor may often be simpler than those involved in a felony trial and yet be beyond the capability of a layman, especially when he is opposed by a law-trained prosecutor. There is little ground, therefore, to assume that a defendant, unaided by counsel, will be any more able adequately to defend himself against the lesser charges that may involve confinement than more serious charges. Appeal from a conviction after an uncounselled trial is not likely to be of much help to a defendant since the die is usually cast when judgment is entered on an uncounselled trial record.

*42*42 Trial judges sitting in petty and misdemeanor cases— and prosecutors—should recognize exactly what will be required by today's decision. Because no individual can be imprisoned unless he is represented by counsel, the trial judge and the prosecutor will have to engage in a predictive evaluation of each case to determine whether there is a significant likelihood that, if the defendant is convicted, the trial judge will sentence him to a jail term. The judge can preserve the option of a jail sentence only by offering counsel to any defendant unable to retain counsel on his own. This need to predict will place a new load on courts already overburdened and already compelled to deal with far more cases in one day than is reasonable and proper. Yet the prediction is not one beyond the capacity of an experienced judge, aided as he should be by the prosecuting officer. As to jury cases, the latter should be prepared to inform the judge as to any prior record of the accused, the general nature of the case against the accused, including any use of violence, the severity of harm to the victim, the impact on the community, and the other factors relevant to the sentencing process. Since the judge ought to have some degree of such information after judgment of guilt is determined, ways can be found in the more serious misdemeanor cases when jury trial is not waived to make it available to the judge before trial.^[*] This will not mean a full "presentence" report on every defendant in every case before the jury passes on guilt, but a prosecutor should know before trial whether he intends to urge a jail sentence, and if he does he should be prepared to aid the court with the factual and legal basis for his view on that score.*

*43*43 This will mean not only that more defense counsel must be provided, but also additional prosecutors and better facilities for securing information about the accused as it bears on the probability of a decision to confine.*

The step we take today should cause no surprise to the legal profession. More than five years ago the profession, speaking through the American Bar Association in a Report on Standards Relating to Providing Defense Services, determined that society's goal should

be "that the system for providing counsel and facilities for the defense be as good as the system which society provides for the prosecution." American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice, Providing Defense Services 1 (Approved Draft 1968). The ABA was not addressing itself, as we must in this case, to the constitutional requirement but only to the broad policy issue. Elsewhere in the Report the ABA stated that:

"The fundamental premise of these standards is that representation by counsel is desirable in criminal cases both from the viewpoint of the defendant and of society." Id., at 3.

After considering the same general factors involved in the issue we decide today, the ABA Report specifically concluded that:

"Counsel should be provided in all criminal proceedings for offenses punishable by loss of liberty, except those types of offenses for which such punishment is not likely to be imposed, regardless of their denomination as felonies, misdemeanors or otherwise." Id., § 4.1, pp. 37-38. Endquote.

However, this goes on for another 10-15 pages and I suggest reading it. There might be some out there who say well, this is almost 50 years old. Doesn't matter - especially in this instance. There is another interesting reading if one is so inclined and that came out in 2008. It was a case called Rothgery vs Gillespie. It is based on this Argersinger vs Hamlin. It was part of the "evolution of the 6th amendment" that they talked about in Argersinger and the issue was "when does the 'right to counsel attach?' In other words, when does the accused have the quote 'right to counsel?' They decided 8-1 that the quote 'right' begins as soon as a man is arrested. Boy does that throw a monkey wrench into their assembly-line-justice system. Of course, that doesn't seem to have affected anything.

In their system, they are not allowed to bring one of their citizens before a judge - at any stage of the process - without an attorney. Of course, they do it every single day, every single hour in the U.S. today.

It's as simple as, "Oh what a tangled we weave, when we first practice to deceive."

The U.S. criminal injustice system would not be in the crisis it is today - and I say crisis in respect to their own words - though I'm confident the local persecutors, the local clerks, the local cops, the local judges do not see any crisis at all - they are busy - they have job security - they are raking in the dough. Building new injustice centers, new jails, new prisons - their part of the world is rocking and rolling. All is well in their world.

But the real world is that it is in major crisis and it is all man's doing. They're courts are overcrowded, their jails are overcrowded, their prisons are overcrowded - and the biggest reason is because - in their rebellion to the King and His Kingdom - they have taken to themselves to redefine good and evil - and then force men into compliance with their definitions.

They have stolen the wealth from the people with their wicked godless banking system - and in their pursuits of their own greed they have created a society of bloodsuckers and leeches who have learned that they indeed can eat - even if they don't work. In the rich man's desire for more and more - he has found ways to have his products made on the backs of slaves who take even less for their labor than men do here - costing jobs and labor that should be available here - but instead takes place in China, Japan, Viet Nam, Thailand, Mexico etc. Their rebellious ways of turning to their own systems and their own inventions...

Thus they provoked him to anger with their inventions: and the plague brake in upon them.

Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions.

It's turned into a snowball effect that has caused virtually every single area of life to be in opposition to the Perfect Will of God for His Creation.

I had a very sad conversation with my dad this past week. I've told you before that one of my greatest accomplishments - I guess it's ok to say that - but as a preacher - to see my baptist dad turn his back on the rapture teaching and all that baptist futuristic false doctrine - to see him turn from "church" - as a result of my preaching - makes me very happy.

But my dad said to me this past week, "I heard you say in one of your messages lately that if I do not live exactly like you do, then I'm going to hell."

Well, that was a shocker to me coming from my own dad. I told him, first of all, I have never made such a statement. Neither about living exactly like I do - or going to hell. So, what that tells me is that he came to that conclusion while listening to one of my messages. That must have been his own conviction - or maybe - hopefully - the Spirit of God speaking to him.

Here is what I am saying. The Scriptures are clear - and they certainly must have been clear to him - the Kingdom of God is not future. The Gospel is the present day reality of the Kingdom of God. The New Testament preachers are clearly calling men out of the world - "Come out from among them and be ye separate" - I Peter 2 says - as clearly as

anything else can be said - "There is a nation that was established with Christ - and it was with a people who had not obtained mercy, it was a people who were once not the people of God - but now ARE the people of God" and if we are in Christ - that is the nation we are supposed to be.

And I am saying THAT is the Gospel. And I am saying that because 99% of what has been preached in America at least in the last 200+ years has been a Gospel of a future King and a future Kingdom - and that God has ordained man to define good and evil and legislate accordingly - because that has been the Gospel message that nearly universally all who claim to be followers of Christ today have been baptized into - then - yes - if a man has not at the very least - changed his mind from this - to the true Gospel of the Kingdom then that man, woman, boy or girl is lost.

I have never once said that if a man does not live exactly like I do - where he has done everything he can to live as a citizen of the commonwealth of Israel - and not a citizen of man's governments - then he is going to hell.

Salvation begins with a change of mind. That's what repentance is. We went over this last week from Romans 10.

It comes from being presented with the knowledge of what the Bible teaches about what God expects from His Creation. Then, a man makes a choice - accept or reject. I believe it's that simple. But the problem is, because the modern quote unquote preacher has taken the very foundation of what God expects from men - His Law - and has ripped it from the Word and tossed it to the trash - and replaced it with obedience to man's statues - men have never been taught truth - and they have not been exposed to the information - the knowledge - that will give him full disclosure so that he can make a properly informed decision to accept or reject.

The "church" and the "churchman" has twisted the Gospel of Christ into an easy believism - lack of full disclosure - so that no man in his right man would not choose "church" - thereby increasing the amount of funds into the quote offering plate. It has given men a false salvation that is not based on the truth.

Just say this, "Jesus, I know I'm a sinner, please forgive me and come into my heart and save me so that I do not have to burn in fire for all eternity."

Well, who in their right mind would not say those words in order to escape burning in fire for all eternity?

But friends, I'm sorry to be the bearer of the news - but that's not the Gospel. Not in any way, shape or form. And if you or anyone you know thinks it is - then they have missed it - and have missed it by a mile.

I've told you before how the baptist preacher told me what my problem was. And as sincerely as possibly could be, I wanted to know what it was. If I had a problem - I wanted it solved. He told me my problem was that I believed in "Lordship salvation." to which I replied, "Well, isn't that what you believe?" And he answered, "Absolutely not. You believe that a man has to be a theologian in order to come to Christ."

I don't believe that, not at all. I actually believe that a man needs to know WAY MORE than any theologian I've ever known - in order to come to Christ. I don't believe that we should withhold information from a man concerning what God wants for His Creation in order to make it easier for a man to choose Christ. I believe that is deceitful and wicked to not preach:

And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.

Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

I have said that the people in Christ's day - in the first century - knew more about the Law of Moses, they knew more about the prophets, about creation, they knew more about all that than any modern day "churchman" - and they made their decisions to accept Christ or reject Christ. And those who accepted Christ - knew exactly what they were getting into.

They may not have known how to implement that knowledge that brought them to salvation - they may not have known how to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling - they may not have known all the ways to the sanctified life they were called into - but by faith - the true knowledge of Moses in the Law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of Israel - they embraced

them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

They looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

They desired a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:

Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth

Is there really an excuse for us not to know the truth? We have had all 66 books of the Bible given to us in English. I wonder how many people today in America - have actually read all 66 of those books? No, I'm not saying that a man has to have read all 66 books of the Bible in order to come to Christ. For some, I'd say that they may have known very little about the details of Christ before they were so convicted in their heart that they

fell on their knees in yielding to the Kingship of Christ. Their lives bare this out as they learned more about Christ and continually followed in obedience. That's the evidence that a man believed in saving faith.

The Ethiopian was reading Isaiah and didn't understand what he was reading. God sent a preacher to tell him what it meant and that man instantly embraced Christ once he understood Isaiah.

I'm not asking or compelling any man, any where today, to live exactly like I do. I am simply asking men to change their minds about their choice of citizenship. I'm asking men and women, boys and girls to consider Whose Laws they will be Governed by. I'm asking men and women boys and girls to consider the words of the voice from heaven from Revelations 18:4 - does this have application for today? Is this principle as valid for us today as it was for those people living in the first century who were following Christ?

Only you can decide. Only you can make those decisions. I'm not asking you to DO anything today. I'm just asking for a change of mind.