

The
Huckle
Berrian
Maglette

IS THE BELIEF THAT THAT WHICH IS MOST
PROFOUNDLY CALUMNIZED BY AUTHORITIES IS
IN ALL LIKELIHOOD MOST DIVINE AND
BENEFICIAL TO THE HUMAN SOUL

- *re-introductory note after semi-catatonic state*

- The Paternal State

- The Politics of Human Nature

- *duh Aristotle*

Ishoo no.17

Spring of 2009

re-introductory note after semi-catatonic state

“Is presently on hold till I find time in my life to continue. Till then peruse the 13 existing Ishoos.” That’s how I put it back in the autumn of 2005, when I dropped off these scribblings. With a new dumpling percolating in the Mama Oven, don’t know how much more of this “time in my life” I actually have. For the present I can certainly put forward Ishoo no.17. What spurred the recent spurt of scribblings is spelled out below in **The Paternal State** below. Semi-catatonic? Not really, I have been scribbling here and there the past couple of years, mostly with a proposed book entitled **The Politics of HUMAN NATURE**. I’ve presented the first portion of it in this Ishoo. I really think I should get some kind of award for this, **NOW !!** Clearly I won’t, because I doubt not a single person will even read it. If one dares, I am also quite certain that I will produce and receive nothing but consternation. **Cool !!** I’ve always found some kind of twisted value and delight in consternation. So before proceeding, let me restate the case. Why has this whole Huckleberrian thing moved away from music and gotten so political? It hasn’t, it has been attempting to describe the differences between the “natural” and the “unnatural”, and persuade the artist (back) toward the “natural”. “Natural” is what it is, whether in the context of art or politics. It is always the right way to go. Art has been forcefully sodomized by politics, by “unnatural” ideologies. I am pointing out the beastly shlong embedded up the rectum of the artist, and suggesting the artist can produce his “natural” art with greater facility if he didn’t have a beastly “unnatural” shlong up his rectum. I have written of a clear line of delineation that needs to be taken account of by artists...you can follow the “natural course of you art”, or you can “gad about for success and rewards”. What is “natural course of you art”? I can tell you what it is not...it is not “gadding about for success and rewards.” If you are not doing that, you are following the “natural course of your art.” Let me make my accusation more clear...you achieve success and rewards in this “industry of music” by producing “art” that is in accord with the pervading ideology of those who hand out the success and rewards. What is that pervading ideology? I can tell you what it is not...it is not natural, and so I can tell you what it is now...it is unnatural. What is “natural” then? Well, we are humans, we artists, are we not? Then to answer that question, we must ask “what is human nature, or, what is the true nature of man?” Should we not? That’s what I have done, and that is what I am doing, so get the hell off my back. What? Didn’t you ask, “If this is suppose to be a ‘music maglette’, why have you become so political?” What? You didn’t? You’re not even reading this? I suppose that was me asking then all along. Just like it was me writing songs for me to listen to. I suppose that then is the “natural course of my art” then, because one thing is for certain...I am not gadding about for success and rewards. And here’s the dirty little secret...the same goes for you too. If you’re writing songs for some schmuck in an industrial ivory tower, you’re a loser, you’re quite unnatural, you’re a freak, and not in a good way.

The Paternal State

The "GIVE" Act Calls for Your Kids to be "Owned" by the State

"We should be *owned*, as soldiers are by the army, and our pride would rise accordingly." William James - *The Moral Equivalent of War*

The quote above is taken from an essay that The Corporation for National and Community Service (www.nationalservice.org) takes as one of its founding documents. What is the CNCS you may ask? We'll be getting to that. First let's take a gander at the latest statist scribblings come forth from the horde in Congress, the GIVE Act H.R.1388:

PART III--INNOVATIVE DEMONSTRATION SERVICE-LEARNING PROGRAMS AND RESEARCH

SEC. 120. INNOVATIVE DEMONSTRATION SERVICE-LEARNING PROGRAMS AND RESEARCH.

(2) YOUTH ENGAGEMENT ZONE- The term youth engagement zone means the area in which a youth engagement zone program is carried out.

(3) YOUTH ENGAGEMENT ZONE PROGRAM- *The term youth engagement zone program' means a service learning program in which members of an eligible partnership described in paragraph (4) collaborate to provide coordinated school-based or community-based service learning opportunities, to address a specific community challenge, for an increasing percentage of out-of-school youth and secondary school students served by local educational agencies where--*

(A) not less than 90 percent of the students participate in service-learning activities as part of the program; or

(B) service-learning is a mandatory part of the curriculum in all of the secondary schools served by the local educational agency.

There is much more in statist scribbling, but the first question that should come to the mind of any thinking parent is, "What exactly is *service-learning*, and why should it be *mandatory* in public-statist schools?"

At the National Service Learning Clearinghouse website at www.servicelearning.org, you can read the glossy euphemistic "What is Service Learning?" page for its glorious "Guiding Principles" and its exalted "Vision of the Organization". Or, you can dig deeper. Dig deeper, why don't you? After all, this is about the souls of your children. National Service Learning Clearinghouse is simply one of many operative appendages of The Corporation for National and Community Service. Finding its founding principles would divulge much more than the NSLC's bulleted list of glossy euphemisms.

"The mission of the Corporation for National and Community Service is to improve lives, strengthen communities, and foster civic engagement through service and volunteering." That's pretty, yes? But more importantly, look at the National Service Timeline page to begin to get into the genetics of the matter:

National Service Timeline

Read about the history of national service—from the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933 to the launch of the President's Volunteer Service Award in 2003. This timeline provides a quick glance at key dates and milestones during the past century.

1903

The Cooperative Education Movement is founded at the University of Cincinnati.

Circa 1905

American philosophers William James and John Dewey develop intellectual foundations for service-based learning.

1910

American philosopher William James envisions non-military national service in his essay "The Moral Equivalent War"

"The Moral Equivalent of War" essay is an allegedly monumental ditty, and a founding building block for the concept of "service learning", as it is embodied in today's NCSC and the GIVE Act. As a matter of fact, the NCSC cheerfully lists the GIVE Act as one of their legislative achievements right on their home page. In other places, the essay is claimed to be "based on a speech delivered at Stanford University in 1906, is the origin of the idea of organized national service. The line of descent runs directly from this address to the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps to the Peace Corps, VISTA, and AmeriCorps." AmeriCorps is what the GIVE Act seeks to enlarge and further empower.

So what of William James and his mighty essay? Like all else Mr. James gave birth to with his cumbrous brain, it is quite pointy headed and longwinded. It can be read in full by the interested at www.des.emory.edu/mfp/moral.html. But here's the gist of it for the less than interested; "War is hideous and must come to an end some day. But we can't be wimps about it, because the brutes among us insist it is an essential part of being a true man. War is hideous in all but one respect. It is really good at kicking the childishness out of people. It is really good for organizing and centralizing. I think we need to create pseudo-wars where people don't die, so we can use this positive element of war to help us centralize power in the hands of the unbrutish, like myself, for the good of all mankind." That really is about it. This rather juvenile concept is more fully documented in such books as Johan Goldberg's *Liberal Fascism*.

We are full to the gills with these pseudo-wars in this liberal-socialist American society we presently live in, are we not? As Mr. James says in this article, H.G. Wells puts it best:

"In many ways military organization is the most peaceful of activities. When the contemporary man steps from the street, of clamorous insincere advertisement, push, adulteration, underselling and intermittent employment into the barrack-yard, he steps on to a higher social plane, into an atmosphere of service and cooperation and of infinitely more honorable emulations. Here at least men are not flung out of employment to degenerate because there is no immediate work for them to do. They are fed a drilling and training for better services. Here at least a man is supposed to win promotion by self-forgetfulness and not by self-seeking. And beside the feeble and irregular endowment of research by commercialism, its little shortsighted snatches at profit by innovation and scientific economy, see how remarkable is the steady and rapid development of method and appliances in naval and military affairs! Nothing is more striking than to compare the progress of civil conveniences which has been left almost entirely to the trader, to the progress in military apparatus during the last few decades. The house-appliances of today, for example, are little better than they were fifty years ago. A house of today is still almost as ill-ventilated, badly heated by wasteful fires, clumsily arranged and furnished as the house of 1858. Houses a couple of hundred years old are still satisfactory places of residence, so little have our standards risen. But the rifle or battleship of fifty years ago was beyond all comparison inferior to those we now possess; in power, in speed, in convenience alike. No one has a use now for such superannuated things."

This alone is beneficial from war for the pointy headed cowards. Not that war is ever a self-sacrificial endeavor to save other human beings from servitude or death at the hands of tyranny. True, very often that is not the case, but sometimes it is. The disembodied concept of war though is much more about being "drilled and trained for better services." So all one needs is to be "drilled and trained" without the war, and then one may magically possess "martial virtues".

The militarized person is then groomed to carry out the collective minded "better services" envisioned by the liberal-socialist elite their entire lives. Just that simpleminded. Just that juvenile.

Cutting through the billows of hot air, Mr. James eventually felt the need to make his case clear:

"This is my idea -- there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against *Nature...*"

What is meant by this army "against Nature?" The "Nature" here would be man's seeming innate and undying urge to be a blood thirsty brute, seeking barbaric conquest and loot, or the implementation of his illusory concept of "good" by force. The operative thought here though, that which is foundational to the NCSC and the GIVE Act, is the "conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years." Certainly the concepts of "good" put forth by non-brutish statist would be more worthy of the service of the entire youth, than those of the brutish statist? This idea of "the conscription of the whole youthful population" is nothing new to the world outside our American window. This concept was brought here from Germany by the likes of James and Dewey, who suckled many a year at Germany's academic teat. Look how wonderfully it played out in Germany, remember? This is unnatural to the root of the American tree though.

What else does the exalted and cumbrous brain of Mr. James have to offer in this article?

"All these beliefs of mine put me firmly into the anti-military party. But I do not believe that peace either ought to be or will be permanent on this globe, unless the states, pacifically organized, preserve some of the old elements of army-discipline. A permanently successful peace-economy cannot be a simple pleasure-economy. In the more or less socialistic future toward which mankind seems drifting we must still subject ourselves collectively to those severities which answer to our real position upon this only partly hospitable globe. We must make new energies and hardihoods continue the manliness to which the military mind so faithfully clings. Martial virtues must be the enduring cement; intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built."

The pseudo-wars that need to be created and engaged in, in order to instill the pseudo "martial virtues" in our youth, are an essential part of continuing and expediting "the more or less socialistic future toward which mankind seems drifting." "We must still subject ourselves collectively" he claims, in order to "make new energies and hardihoods continue the manliness ... intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon which states are built." This is what the socialist state of a Mr. James is built on, and this is what the youth need mandatory grooming for, through such means as the "educational" instrument embodied in the likes of a GIVE Act.

Yet more from the statist brain of Mr. James:

"The war-party is assuredly right in affirming and reaffirming that the martial virtues, although originally gained by the race through war, are absolute and permanent human goods. Patriotic pride and ambition in their military form are, after all, only specifications of a more general competitive passion. They are its first form, but that is no reason for supposing them to be its last form. Men are now proud of belonging to a conquering nation, and without a murmur they lay down their persons and their wealth, if by so doing they may fend off subjection. But who can be sure that *other aspects of one's country* may not, with time and education and suggestion enough, come to be regarded with similarly effective feelings of pride and shame?"

These "martial virtues" are effective in brutish war and all, "but that is no reason for supposing them to be its last form," that is, all they are good for. "But who can be sure that other aspects of one's country may not, with time and education and suggestion enough, come to be regarded with similarly effective feelings of pride and shame," as they do in actual brutish military service?

But how does one instill these "martial virtues" otherwise, Mr. James queries himself:

"It is only a question of blowing on the spark until the whole population gets incandescent, and on the ruins of the old morals of military honor, a stable system of morals of civic honor builds itself up. What the whole community comes to believe in grasps the individual as in a vise. The war-function has grasped us so far; but the constructive interests may some day seem no less imperative, and impose on the individual a hardly lighter burden. Let me illustrate my idea more concretely...and this is my idea -- there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against *Nature*, the injustice would tend to be evened out, and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would remain blind as the luxurious classes now are blind, to man's relations to the globe he lives on, and to the permanently sour and hard foundations of his higher life."

If read this essay in full, you would see that the "injustice which would tend to be evened out" by the service-learning programs for which "the conscription of the whole youthful population" is called for, is nothing other than those pesky inequalities between the socialist's concept of classes. The standard class warfare socialist swill. These pseudo-wars that need to be a mandatory part of all public-statist school curriculum is nothing other than the age-old Marxist yelp of "he has more stuff than him. I must rectify this." As stated above, it is essential to "the more or less socialistic future toward which mankind seems drifting," that the teaching of class warfare be mandatory.

The magnanimous pontificator continues:

"To coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fishing fleets in December, to dishwashing, clotheswashing, and windowwashing, to road-building and tunnel-making, to foundries and stoke-holes, and to the frames of skyscrapers, would our gilded youths be drafted off, according to their choice, to get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas. They would have paid their blood-tax, done their own part in the immemorial human warfare against nature; they would tread the earth more proudly, the women would value them more highly, they would be better fathers and teachers of the following generation. Such a conscription, with the state of public opinion that would have required it, and the many moral fruits it would bear, would preserve in the midst of a pacific civilization the manly virtues which the military party is so afraid of seeing disappear in peace. We should get toughness without callousness, authority with as little criminal cruelty as possible, and painful work done cheerily because the duty is temporary, and threatens not, as now, to degrade the whole remainder of one's life."

The "nature" of real brutish warfare is nothing other than the plundering of the have-nots by the haves, as Mr. James and his ilk would have it. The youth must be taught to war against this anti-collectivist and brutish "nature". It is only then that they can be proud of themselves and their society, when they have learned to war against this realest of "injustices", when they have mandatorily volunteered, as the GIVE Act would have it, to serve the oppressed peoples.

Mr. James goes on and on:

"I spoke of the "moral equivalent" of war. So far, war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community, and until and equivalent discipline is organized, I believe that war must have its way. But I have no serious doubt that the ordinary prides and shames of social man, once developed to a certain intensity, are capable of organizing such a moral equivalent as I have

sketched, or some other just as effective for preserving manliness of type. It is but a question of time, of skillful propagandism, and of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities."

The "moral equivalent of war" is nothing other than socialist class warfare. The "equivalent discipline that needs to be organized" is further unveiled in the GIVE Act. This act is not only the fruition of the foundation laid by Mr. James, but also the embodiment of plans announced by both Barrack Obama, and his Chief of Staff Rahm Emmanuel. Plans to have "a civilian national security force." In July 2008 Obama stated (and repeated many times before and since) "We cannot continue to rely on our military in order to achieve the national security objectives we've set. We've got to have a civilian national security force that is just as powerful, just as strong, just as well funded." His Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel, stated his intention to help create "universal civil defense training" in 2006. Despite denials from the Obama administration about specific plans to institute a mandatory program of national service, his original Change.gov website stated that Americans would be "required" to complete "50 hours of community service in middle school and high school and 100 hours of community service in college every year". The text was only later changed to state that Americans would be "encouraged" to undertake such programs. This of course would be an example of the "skillful propagandism of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities." We've heard much about seizing the "historic opportunities" that emerge out of crisis lately, haven't we? According to the statist that crafted the GIVE Act, and all the preceding legislation and agencies that led to its birthing, the "question of time" proposed by Mr. James is now being answered.

A bit more of Mr. James will suffice:

"The martial type of character can be bred without war...Priests and medical men are in a fashion educated to it, and we should all feel some degree of its imperative if we were conscious of our work as an obligatory service to the state. We should be *owned*, as soldiers are by the army, and our pride would rise accordingly...The only thing needed henceforward is to inflame the civic temper as part history has inflamed the military temper ... H.G. Wells adds that he thinks that the conceptions of order and discipline, the tradition of service and devotion, of physical fitness, unstinted exertion, and universal responsibility, which universal military duty is now teaching European nations, will remain a permanent acquisition when the last ammunition has been used in the fireworks that celebrate the final peace. I believe as he does. It would be simply preposterous if the only force that could work ideals of honor and standards of efficiency into English or American natures should be the fear of being killed by the Germans or the Japanese. Great indeed is Fear; but it is not, as our military enthusiasts believe and try to make us believe, the only stimulus known for awakening the higher ranges of men's spiritual energy."

"We should be *owned*, as soldiers are by the army?" "Owned" is pregnant with visions of involuntary servitude, is it not? The further you delve into this brain spewing of Mr. James, the concept of "temporary" seems to evaporate. Nevertheless, being "owned", either temporarily or permanently, is still involuntary servitude. Notice again, the necessity to "inflame the civic temper", to "blowing on the spark until the whole population gets incandescent", through means of "skillful propagandism of opinion-making men." All of this points to the unnatural, the artificial, the fabricated nature of the entirety of what the statist mind puts out as truth. Such are the minds of the Jameses, the Deweys, the Obamas, the Emmanuels. They are unnatural, artificial, fake, deceptive, in a word...lying. That they can state their lies articulately and eloquently does not make them not lies. It does though make them Orwellian *unlies*.

Under section 6104 of the GIVE Act, entitled Duties, in subsection B6, the legislation states that a commission will be set up to investigate whether a workable, fair, and reasonable mandatory service requirement for all able young people could be developed, and how such a requirement could be implemented in a manner that would strengthen the social fabric of the Nation and overcome civic challenges.

One may ask, "What's the big deal about kids doing some good for their community?" There is one very simple answer for this... "What's the big deal with your kids being OWNED by an omnipotent government?" What a wonderful example of its delights the Germans and their drilled and trained wunderkinder left us? Mandatory involuntary service shall set us all free!

The Politics of Human Nature

The number of replies I received to [my previous article, "Does the State Own Your Kids?"](#), took me by surprise. Perhaps I underestimated the reach of LRC, or more horrifyingly, perhaps I have something of some value to offer, which will now be an impetus for me to continue writing. Oh, the horrors! There was one reply from Jim H. that was particularly penetrating, and my answer to him is the present impetus for this article. The matter of not only that article and Jim H's reply, but of all things political, is supremely and conclusively concerned with the grand topic of Human Nature.

Before proceeding further, I must inform the squeamish, that this article must make use of Biblical scripture. Any libertarian vampire is forewarned to turn aside at this point. It is not my intent to wax theological, and, thank God, I have no ability to do so anyway. I am coming at it strictly for purposes of a logical argument. That is, if scripture verse A says this and that, and proponent A says, "I am the representative of scripture", and anti-proponent B says, "I am the anti-representative of scripture A", and both do and say that which is contrary to their proclamations, then logically both are full of crap.

Let's take as my simple supposition that Locke and Rousseau are at disparate ends of the political spectrum. Sure, there's more that could be added to this simplicity, but that will be my starting point. One can go back to the battle between the Gnostics and the Church Father, but there is not need to. It was what it still is now, and was in between in the times of Locke and Rousseau.

I do draw your attention to Igor Shafarevich masterful work, [The Socialist Phenomenon](#), and what Alexander Solzhenitsyn says concerning Gnosticism in his intro;

"Shafarevich points out with great precision both the cause and the genesis of the first socialist doctrines, which he characterizes as *reactions*: Plato as a reaction to Greek culture, and the Gnostics as a reaction to Christianity."

The central matter that would lead to this antagonism between the Locke and Rousseau camps would be their contrary views of human nature. It is my contention that all the opposing political structures that are built upon opposing ideologies, are at their genesis, their germination and sprouting, simple spiritual matters. In the case of Locke and Rousseau, as on all others that abide in either camp, the core spiritual matter concerns *the nature of man*. What is to do or not to do with the nature of man is the overriding question of all things governmental. As James Madison said as well:

"But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on *human nature*? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary."

In the Locke camp you would have the concept of a human nature as that of an essentially and incorrigibly depraved one, a "sinful human nature." It is clear to anyone who reads deeper into Locke, that though he did not believe in an inherent sinful nature with an Adamic source, he had no illusions about a serious "problem", and he did pin this problem on "human nature." As for

Rousseau, he believed in the "nobility of the savage", those who had not had their inherently good human nature ravished by the restrictive moral codes of the unnatural property grubbing mutants. There's wiggle room this way and that, but this simple supposition holds nonetheless.

What to do with these disparate views of human nature? Well, create ideologies about them, and build political structures upon those ideologies, of course! The core focus of the matter remains human nature. One camp calls for governmental restraint on "sinful human nature". The other calls for an unshackling and perfecting back into the image and nature of the "noble savage" (by means of such artificial mechanisms as The GIVE Act).

Here I quote Jim H's response, and his view of William James' essay "*The Moral Equivalent of War*" mentioned in my previous article:

"...it is clear that the *"army against nature ..."* that he (William James, and by extension all like statist) *wants is against the Nature of Man*; that brute that he is not and most others are. Just as plain is the meaning of Conscription; that of the whole population except for those that will be conscripting, of course. Forgotten immediately is the fact that it is this "army" itself, *whose nature is to be changed*, not trained to accomplish that act."

For me, Mr. James' take on the nature of man, and by extension all like statist, as being that of a brute, doesn't matter a whit. It is his opinion, and in my opinion he is wrong, as I will demonstrate below. What does matter, and is correctly pointed out by Jim H, is that he announces a war against human nature in order to change it. He and his fellow statist will fail miserably, as they always do, and will only accomplish making all miserable that they war against, along with themselves.

A final warning for any libertarian vampires, things get dawnish from hereon out. I give you two scripture verses that are pivotal to my argument:

- 1) Romans 2:13-15 For not the listeners to law are just with God, but the doers of law shall be justified. For whenever they of the nations that have no law, by nature may be doing that which the law demands, these, having no law, are a law to themselves, who are displaying the action of the law written in their hearts, their conscience testifying together and their reckonings between one another, accusing or defending them...
- 2) Romans 5:12 Therefore, even as through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death, and thus death passed through into all mankind, on which all sinned...

Purely logical now, not theological...why is this relevant to politics? It is relevant to politics because ideologies and political structures exist, that are either ignorant or errant on these verses concerning human nature. These ideologies and political structures have led to the misery and slaughter of countless millions. That is relevant. Let me take them one at a time:

- 1) Romans 2:13-15; The Locke camp tells us that human nature is somewhat irrevocably depraved, it is a "sinful human nature." Locke does in fact accept the representative mantle of this alleged scriptural truth, even though he denies its inheritance from Adam. Rousseau on the other hand does not take upon himself a scriptural mantle. He instead one-ups it, he usurps the throne of The Divine and all its restrictive moralities, and places in that empyrean chair deified Human Reason. Fair enough, which of our antagonists is in the better, from a logical perspective? What does the scripture verse claim? It says, "of the nations that have no law, by nature are doing that which the law demands." Most importantly it says, "by nature." Being that "the nations" are comprised of humans, it is stating that human nature is in accord with the Divine law. This accord is in the created nature of man, for it is "written in

their hearts", and their "consciences testify to each other" down through the centuries the properness of what is written therein. Further down in the chapter it is stated again that "the nations *by nature*, are discharging the law's demands." It is understood in the study of Natural Law, that all law written by men must be in accord with this biblically mentioned Divine Law "written in their hearts", and testified to by the collective testimony of their consciences, or it is no valid law at all. From the logical perspective, Locke would be more the loser, though not entirely alone. Locke does claim the scriptural mantle, and he in fact pins "sinfulness" directly to human nature, though the scripture he stands on says otherwise.

- 2) Romans 5:12; At first glance, this one seems to have nothing to do with human nature. Upon giving closer scrutiny to the original Greek, it bears some unexpected answers. Strangely enough, the words that need scrutiny are "on which." In the most widely used English translations, the words would read "for that". This translation implies "because", or that which causes. The "on which" translation can more accurately and idiomatically be read as "on account of which", or that which is the result of a cause. This meaning carries conclusive weight when all its usages are viewed throughout the Biblical scriptures. Why is this important to understanding the scriptural concept of human nature? If read, "death passed through into all mankind, for that (because), all sinned...", it says man is mortal because his nature is sinful. If instead it reads, "death passed through into all mankind, on (account of) which all sinned...", then it is mortality which causes man's sinfulness, not his nature. Death and its outcome, sin, are then shown to be "unnatural". This rendering would be in accord with what is said in #1, that it is the nature of man to be in accord with Divine law. Put more succinctly, men sin because men die, not men die because men sin, or are inherently sinful. The nature of man is to be in accord with Divine Law, and this is in turn what Natural Law must accord with.

Who is the logical loser in this second conflict, Locke or Rousseau? Rousseau is, but it is difficult to put into logical terms in the context of this article. It is difficult because the scripture verses are rejected by the Rousseau camp. This can be said though, the Reason which the Rousseau camp enthrones shows itself to be unreason, by its very rejection of the scriptural concept of human nature being in accord with Divine and Natural law. Does it not reject the scripture? Or does it accept the notion and reject the scripture? Either way, it accepts the truth. That is what is known as a checkmate. But more importantly, he loses here because he is dead. His enthroned Reason does not perfect his nature, and I know this is so because he is dead. One would assume a most perfected nature would not suffer death? Does the Rousseau camp deny yet again? At some point you have to say, "So the hell what, you and your asinine denials. Who the hell are you to do nothing but deny, and expect me to respond?" Here's the facts...the ideology of the perfectibility of the nature of man died with its grandpappy long ago. Go now, and overturn the verdict, shovels are cheap enough. Rousseau's opinion is shown not to trump the "opinion" of God.

So what lessons of logic are reaped from all this? Much more can be written, and I hope to complete it all some day in a book entitled *The Politics of Human Nature*. But for now, here are the facts of logic:

- The Locke camp cannot claim to be representative of scriptural truth if it insists on adhering to the false notion that scripture teaches human nature is sinful. It teaches quite the opposite.
- The Rousseau camp cannot adhere to the teaching that human nature is perfectible, because in enthroning Reason, the Divine and Natural Law is simultaneously cast away. This is the very thing which gives the proof that his noble savage's nature is in accord with all that is good.
- Jack is dead, as so his perfecting god of Reason proves to be significantly less immortal than

the words of its philosophical Edenic father that proclaimed, "Surely, you shall not die, but be as God."

- The ideologies and eventual political structures that were built upon these views of human nature, an "inherently sinful human nature" and "the noble savage - perfectibility" model, have both resulted in massive government induced suffering and slaughter. We all lose.

Whether one wants to use the phrases of the Darwinist, and speak of man's evolution to a higher nature; or that of Rousseau, and the returning into the image of the "noble savage"; or that of the perfectibility of human nature; or that of Nietzsche's, the human nature is the will to dominate, and his elevation of the aristocracy of man into the Superman...it's all one and the same at its source for me. It is as Jim H. said to me in his reply, "This is the first time that I have considered propaganda, not as a contrived or intended product, but as a flow, directly from the foundation of belief." It is like the primeval propaganda that flowed forth from its Genesisic voice in Eden that said, "Has God really said you shall not...you shall not die, instead your eyes will be opened to know good and evil, and you will become as God." It seems that Jim H. now hears this voice, for he says, "You have illustrated what I can only refer to as the concepts of Good and Evil, which I have never really accepted." Quite correctly he also pointed out that, "Those that constitute The State, the True Believers that will produce utopia, the salvation of mankind...say to themselves, "We don't need God or Gods, we are Gods.""

Lessons in logic aside, what is it to be at war with human nature, and seek to change it? It is to attack what is in accord with Divine and Natural law, and turn it into discord. This human nature cannot ever be changed, any more than one can change the nature of a peach tree into the nature of a donkey. Nonetheless, the Dukes of Reason will continue to whack at it. That the Reason enthroned by the Age of Rousseau cast off the false religion of the inherent sinfulness of human nature, is a great good. That it in turn cast off all Divine and Natural law, is catastrophic. The proverbial baby with the bath water, but much worse. Reason becomes then immorality, and immorality becomes the liberation of Reason. The deeper the plunge into immorality, the more at liberty the mind of Reason claims to be. When this mind of Rousseauian Reason holds the reigns of power, immorality is then its guiding governmental light. Immoral means will justify immoral ends (even though they delude themselves they are of the highest ethical quality), those which enthroned Reason demand.

It is not by accident that the scripture claims, "Sin is lawlessness." That is, an absence of Divine and Natural Law. To define "sin", it is that which results from the absence of Divine and Natural Law. Do we have enough example of that in the nation, and in the halls of Congress today to make it clear? While I'm at it, let's define death. Scripture again claims, "The day you eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you shall die." A better translation of that is, "to die, you shall be dying." It bespeaks of a process of ebbing, to a conclusive end. I can most assuredly say that the processes of mortality are demonstrated through the ebbing away of Divine and Natural Law, and the filling of the godless vacuum with the mind of enthroned Reason. This is death.

Scripture also pointed out immediately after Adam and his human nature were created, that "It was good." Not, "It looks kinda good for now. I'll leave it to be perfected by Rousseau, James, Carolyn McCarthy D-NY and Barrack Obama C-Kenya, by means of the GIVE Act and martial virtues producing involuntary servitude."

What then is the answer? Do we seek a political answer, or a spiritual one? I say they are one and the same. Without a spiritual answer concerning human nature, we can have no political one. Is the answer then conscience? This I believe is the most libertarian answer. Will that do the proverbial trick? What then of this "good" human nature of which I trumpet so highly? What of healthy sound reason that does not dismiss Divine and Natural Law? It seems men will more often side with the little gods of enthroned Reason, than they will listen to their consciences, which testify of the Divine Law written in their hearts. Why is that? Before giving my concluding

statement, I quote from Jim H's most poignant and concluding question in his reply to my previous article: "...those that constitute The State, the True Believers that will produce utopia, the salvation of mankind, that say, *"We don't need God or Gods, we are Gods"*. William James says, *"It is but a question of time, of skillful propagandism, and of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities."* Will it really, unavoidably, be so...?"

My answer is yes, it will unavoidably be so. I have reasons to believe that, which calls on me to, gasp, wax theological (or, illogical, as some would have it). There is the parable of the wheat and the tares. The wheat is the good of the harvest, and the tares are the noxious counterfeit that grows along side it. The harvester is commanded not to harvest till all comes to fruition. Why must the noxious come to fruition, as well as the good? There are two reasons for this:

- 1) The root systems are so intertwined, that to tear out the tares will do damage to the wheat.
- 2) The two resemble each other so closely in appearance, the harvester may remove the good mistakenly.

Evil will come to its fruition, then there is the winnowing and the fire, where the noxious is separated from the good. To explain further is to wax way too theological for the context of this article and this political theater at LRC. It involves the Divine purpose of evil. There is a beyond the noxious brain of Nietzsche's *Beyond Good and Evil*, and it is in the discussion of the Divine purpose of evil, with much more glorious results than that of the Third Reich.

Let me for the sake of long overdue brevity end with this...God's purpose for man is to gain a knowledge of good and evil, so then to truly and completely be made into the image of his Creator. How could we gain that knowledge if both good and evil do not come to fruition? Human nature was created to be "good", to be in accord with the Divine and Natural Law. It seems men will more often side with the little gods of enthroned Reason, than they will listen to their consciences, which testify of the Divine Law written in their hearts. Why is that? It is mortality that saps human nature's vitality, hampers the conscience from operating fully, and leads it down the path of the false little gods of Reason, who perniciously promises it perfecting of all sorts, and the life of that One that whispers, "Surely, you shall not die. We have universal health care coming."

Shoot at the Trolls!

You've seen the scene in Peter Jackson's movie of Tolkien's *Return of the King*. The one where the siege towers are bearing down on the walls of Minas Tirith, fully laden with murderous orcs. As panicked soldiers aim their wrathful arrows at individual exposed orcs in the tower, Gandalf commands, "Not at the towers, shoot at the trolls!" The cave trolls were the source of the impetus that propelled the danger closer to the walls. Kill the main impetus, and that danger ceases. It is ultimately the philosophical and ideological force behind the thoughts that create the physical outworkings which become the real danger.

The GIVE Act has something greater than Carolyn McCarthy D-NY, or Barrack Obama C-Kenya compelling it forward. There is a higher source dictating the verbiage of the legislating of involuntary servitude for school children. There is a tower higher and more powerful than Isengard, though more hidden in cloud of noxious vapor and haughty declarations. There is a voice more ancient than William James' (as I wrote of in [my previous article](#)) singing the virtues of mandatory voluntary national service.

Being that the purported matter of the GIVE Act is one of "education", you can turn to the highest terrestrial source of global socialist "education", that previously de-legitimized appendage of the UN, United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and read these seemingly innocuous words in [its constitution](#):

That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind

Article I: Purposes and functions

1. The purpose of the Organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations.

2. To realize this purpose the Organization

(b) (To) Give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture.

By suggesting educational methods best suited to prepare the children of the world for the responsibilities of freedom

The voice of William James' *Moral Equivalent of War* essay resounds throughout. The "educational methods best suited to prepare the children of the world for the responsibilities of freedom" embedded in The GIVE Act are referred to as "service-learning." Upon closer scrutiny this is nothing more than involuntary servitude for educationally captive children. Free labor for the state, under the guise of the kids learning something about the evils of being rather uncollective and selfish with their weekend playtime. But does this find its head in UNESCO? Is it actually global in nature, something more than the seemingly "local" sense of it being only a "national" requirement?

Quoting from William Grigg's conclusive book on this question, *Freedom on the Altar*:

"According to the prospectus for the UN's 1995 Social Development Summit in Copenhagen, one proposal dealing with the "mobilization of human resources" in the interest of creating global "solidarity" is a service program for youth: "A Youth Voluntary Service to the community at the world level should be considered to instill in young people a sense of service to the community ... and to create a sense of solidarity at the world level."

A revival of the "international labor camp" program would take on a rather frightening

aspect, should UNESCO and its comrades succeed in defining manual labor as a "responsibility of global citizenship." It should be remembered that the most active supporters of the Clinton Administration's national service program would make "voluntarism" mandatory by law. If present trends continue, it is not inconceivable that in the near future some American students may confront a UNESCO-inspired "global service" graduation requirement."

The global level Youth Voluntary Service was only a proposal in the Social Development Summit in Copenhagen's "Draft Declaration and Draft Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development Preparatory Committee." Though it did not coalesce into an actual global mandate for child involuntary servitude in the final documents of this Social Summit, its proposal shows that it is a goal. The mother-concept of global volunteer service now finds its temporary homes in an enormous list of volunteer-available national governments funded organizations, corporation funded "non-governmental organizations", as well as a plethora of UNESCO-housed youth service affiliates. All national organizations that students would be required to "serve the nation (i.e. state)" through, will be found to have affiliations with one or more of the overarching UNESCO approved list of "volunteer" accepting organizations. The involuntary volunteerism of the GIVE Act will be channeled solely to and through these organizations and affiliates.

As an example, there is Colin Powell's *America's Promise Alliance*, which came out of Summit for America's Future in 1997, which was sponsored by the Points of Light Foundation, the Corporation for National and Community Service and United Way of America. *America's Promise Alliance* is a fully UNESCO-endorsed youth "volunteer" entity, which in turn is fully affiliated by the previously mentioned Corporation for National and Community Service, the Fed.gov master-hub of all things service-learning, involuntary servitude for children. From there you can follow the links to all the "State Service Commissions and State Education Agencies", at one of CNCS's operative appendages, Volunteering In America. Click on your state and find out what (here's the dirty unspoken chain-of-links secret) UNESCO is doing for the global state in your community's school. One giant GLOBAL fascistic pleasuring circle, taxpayers excluded, thank you. If you have the mind and stamina to do so, you will find this the case in all state-approved "volunteer" entities.

Oh, there's much more, but I have slipped into a UNESCO induced coma. For those still conscious, the more onerous aspects of The GIVE Act:

"Congressional Commission on Civic Service Act - Establishes the Congressional Commission on Civic Service to make recommendations to Congress for: (1) improving the ability of individuals to serve others; (2) training leaders in public service organizations to better utilize individuals committed to national service and volunteerism as they manage human and fiscal resources; (3) identifying solutions to the barriers that make it difficult for some individuals to volunteer or perform national service; and (4) building on the foundation of current service and volunteer opportunities. Specifies topics to be addressed by the Commission, including deterrents to service, a mandatory service requirement, and the need for a public service academy."
These were stripped, due no doubt to extensive internet coverage, and by legislative slight of hand place in the brand spanking new HR 1444.

...this here is the first portion of the aforementioned proposed book that I may or may not ever complete...

The Politics of HUMAN NATURE

Let's assume for the purpose of this writing, that all the world is a battle between the philoso-

phies of Locke and Rousseau. There are many skirmishes to be had, but what would be the overarching impetus that brought the full force of these intellectual armies to the battlefield? It is the purpose of this writing to show that this impetus is their diametrically opposing views of "human nature". Further still, beyond Locke and Rousseau, I will seek to show that all the world is broken up into the two warring camps of Natural Law-based Republics (in various diluted forms), and Elitist-lead Gnostic States (in a variety of hideous forms).

On the one side, you have a man created in "God's image". This we are to assume means that man carries in his being some similitude of the Divine Nature. Yet through the introduction of "sin" into the world this human-Divine nature combination became "fallen", "depraved", and "sinful". And so this ill human nature inherently passes on down through the generations, in a somewhat Darwinistic manner. On the other side of the battle line, for the most part the biblical basis for defining human nature is dismissed. Instead we have human nature often of an unnamed celestial origin, and so inherently good, though somehow it had become ensnared into a imprisoned life in a weak body of evil material. This poor flesh-imprisoned spiritman (the "spirit" of the human being the same as the "nature" of the human in this philosophy) was now easily swayed by "environmental" (very loosely defined) and man made institutional forces, to behave against his will in unseemly and criminal manners.

The one side condemns man to an "inherently fallen, sinful, depraved nature", which needs to be restrained from harming others.. The other empathizes with man as an imprisoned celestial spirit, at the mercy of an environmental and institutional deck stacked against him. What to do with these either/or fallen and victimized men? So it is that both sides form governmental structures to accord with their perspective on the nature of human nature. Either a governmental system has to be formed that puts in place restraints to keep the depraved man from inevitably harming others. Or, on the other side, one has to be put in place that seeks "justice" for the grievously victimized spiritman. This is indeed what we have in the philosophies of Locke and Rousseau, and beyond these, what we have in the God-acknowledging Natural Law-based Republics, and the more atheistic self-empowering Elitist Gnostic States. The one seeks to implement reasonable restraints that have been culled and refined through the centuries. The other seeks to implement the plans of an elite that adjusts to the passing whims of the present, with little to no concern for what has passed beforehand. One believes in an inflexible universal moral code this is (re)discovered and compiled throughout history. The other believes only in a code that lasts an historical instant, and will be very different tomorrow.

It must be pointed out that Locke himself did not hold to the "depraved" orthodoxies of the Adamic origin of sin, and it being or becoming inherent in man's nature. But nonetheless he held to the understanding that man was helplessly sinful, regardless of the origins of this state. This perspective is not held by the Rousseau camp in any respect, never mind a debate concerning the "origin of sin". So it is that all who hold to belief of "sinful nature" (regardless of "origin") do find themselves in the camp of Locke, due as well to the vast majority of other common philosophical beliefs .

Sure, this is very basic and non-academic, but I've only written three paragraphs, and I am not an academic. This is fortunate, because it means that it will be written to be comprehended, and not something to be forever ruminated upon with very little conclusion. It will either be comprehended and accepted as of some validity and value, or immediately dismissed as useless trash. I hope for and expect both. I will begin this excursion with a visit to the Natural Law Locke camp first, then the Gnostic Rousseau camp. The former makes more use of the Greek and Hebrew scriptures, so an initial biblical foundation will be laid before visiting Locke. I believe that the biblical foundation that I will lay will be somewhat different from the orthodoxies laid by Natural Law Locke camp of the past. At the conclusion of all this, I think it will be seen that these past orthodoxies have not been wholly accurate, nor has the Gnostic Rousseau camp been wholly wrong. The ultimate argument will still favor the Natural Law Locke camp, though that assumed victory will be reasonably tempered.

A Word on “What is meant by Gnosticism”?

“Philosophical and religious movement prominent in the Greco-Roman world in the 2nd century AD. While Gnosticism drew from and influenced in turn many traditional religions, its effect was most clearly felt on nascent Christianity, in which it led to the formation of the canon, creed, and episcopal organization. The designation Gnosticism, derived from the Greek gnōstikos (one who has gnōsis, or ‘secret knowledge’), is a term of modern scholarship. Evidence for the Gnostic phenomenon, found in the Church Fathers who opposed Gnostic teachings (Irenaeus, c. 185; Hippolytus, c. 230; Epiphanius, c. 375) and in the Gnostic writings themselves, reveals a diversity in theology, ethics, and ritual that defies strict classification. Yet Gnostic sects appear to have shared an emphasis on the redemptive power of esoteric knowledge, acquired not by learning or empirical observation but by divine revelation. The origins of the Gnostic worldview have been sought by scholars in the dualism of Iranian religion, the allegorical Idealism of the Middle Platonic philosophers, and the apocalypticism of certain Jewish mystics. There are analogies also with Egyptian and Mesopotamian thought. It was only with the rise of Christianity, however, that Gnostic syncretism came to full expression. In the Gnostic view, the unconscious self of man is consubstantial with the Godhead, but because of a tragic fall it is thrown into a world that is completely alien to its real being. Through revelation from above, man becomes conscious of his origin, essence, and transcendent destiny. Gnostic revelation is to be distinguished both from philosophical enlightenment, because it cannot be acquired by the forces of reason, and from Christian revelation, because it is not rooted in history and transmitted by Scripture. It is rather the intuition of the mystery of the self. The world, produced from evil matter and possessed by evil demons, cannot be a creation of a good God; it is mostly conceived of as an illusion, or an abortion, dominated by Yahweh, the Jewish demiurge, whose creation and history are depreciated. This world is therefore alien to God, who is for the Gnostics depth and silence, beyond any name or predicate, the absolute, the source of good spirits who together form the plērōma, or realm of light. These conceptions are expressed in various myths, which employ material from many traditional religions but serve to express a basic experience that is new, the discovery of the unconscious self or spirit in man which sleeps in him until awakened by the Saviour. The Gnostic sects of the 2nd century made use of Hebrew and Christian religious writings, employing the allegorical method to extricate Gnostic meanings from them.” Brit. Encyc

What exactly does a 2nd century religious philosophy have to do with Rousseau, or anything else today? Is that a valid question? Things like this don't survive in any kind of influential form, right? What of the fact that *“it was only with the rise of Christianity, however, that Gnostic syncretism came to full expression”*? Has Christianity survived in an influential form from before the 2nd century, to this very day? The question then would be why would NOT Gnosticism also have survived?

So assuming this to be so, what is the meaning of Gnosticism today? It would be everything it was then, but larger, much better defined and formed, more concentrated and powerful. It was a competitor, an imitator, and antagonist of Christianity, and is so today in a larger and more powerful way. It was smugly esoteric, led by self-deifying “evolved” beyond-the-average-fools-and-slaves elitists, and is so today in a larger and more powerful way. It is based on unverifiable “truths”, secretly and mysteriously attained to by the “evolved” and their fellow mystic brethren, come forth from the breath of an unnamed celestial source. It is in opposition to the drudgery of *“learning or empirical observation”* (i.e. true science), and finds its liberty in the claims of the esoteric elite, that receives and blessingly implements “truth” from *“divine revelation”*. This “revelation” is nothing other than the “self discovery of their celestial origins”. It believes that man is *“consubstantial with the God”*, that is, man is made of the same stuff as God is, and so, would be God as well if not for *“a tragic fall that throws them into a world that is completely alien to their real being.”* It believes that this *“tragic fall”* and ensuing imprisonment in *“evil matter that is possessed by evil demons”*, is the doing of and *“dominated by Yahweh, the Jewish demiurge”*. It is then anti-Judaistic, and so in turn also anti-Christian (antichrist as for the Christ presented in the only begotten son of God in the person of Jesus). It believes that *“this world is therefore alien”*

to the gnostic's God, which the imprisoned spiritman is made of the same god-stuff as. This being the case, any destruction of this alien world (Greek *cosmos* – system) is preferable. It is through the destruction of the Yahweh-dominating systems of control and restraint, both internal and external, that the "good spirits" that are of the same stuff as the anti-Yahwehian gnostic God, are released back into the fullness-*plērōma* with their God-daddy in the "realm of light". All of this today is present in a larger and more powerful way.

It cloaks itself in Christianity by "employing the allegorical method to extricate Gnostic meanings from it". It does likewise with true philosophy—love of wisdom, by the same means. It lays itself beside philosophy, so as to make its opinions—*doxa* seem a valid alternative. They are those that Plato and Aristotle referred to as the philodoxers. Yet their opinions they insist are unquestionable because they come from unassailable esoteric celestial sources. This "laying aside" method it also applies in the realm of true science, which is based on exhaustive testing and observation. The gnostic need not bother himself so, he only need to "lay aside" and absorb a semblance of validity, and fall back on his sole claim to celestial esoteric "truth". This all exists today in a larger and more powerful form.

A Scriptural Foundation

What is "nature" exactly? Not "nature", as in the trees and rocks and ferns and deer. But rather as it is used in phrases such as divine "nature", and human "nature". What does the word really mean?

na-ture \ˈnā-chər\ n [ME, fr. MF, fr. L *natura*, fr. *natus*, of *nasci*: to be born]
the inherent character or basic constitution of a person or thing : essence

So what of its biblical meaning, does it match the dictionary definition? Here we will discover much confusion. Not because of any fault of the writers of the Hebrew and Greek scriptures, but due to errors of the translators of the original languages. In almost all English translations there is utter confusion created in the translation of two completely different Greek words by the single English word "nature". The first word would be the Greek ***psuche***, which is more often than not translated by the English word SOUL (and slightly less often as LIFE). The confusion enters in because the adjective form of ***psuche***, which would be ***psuchikon***, is in key verses translated by the English word NATURAL. If it had been more consistently translated as SOULISH, enormous confusion would have been averted.

The second word would be the Greek ***phusis***. This word comes from the root word ***phuo***, which literally means SPROUT, that which comes forth from a seed. ***Phusis*** means SPROUTING. This word fits the dictionary definition of the English word "nature". What SPROUTS forth from seed, will bring to light "the inherent character or basic constitution of a person or thing: the essence" of what is within the seed. Indeed, the word is used in the book of James in tandem with the word "human"..."For every nature, both of wild beasts and flying creatures, both of reptiles and those of the salt sea, is tamed and has been tamed by human nature."

To lay a proper scriptural foundation concerning HUMAN NATURE, the word that needs to be studied is the Greek ***phusis***, and not the words ***psuche*** or its adjective form ***psuchikon***. It will be necessary to look at ***psuche*** and ***psuchikon*** after the meaning of ***phusis*** is fully understood, yet only so we can understand how the mistranslation has tainted the foundational beliefs of human nature in Natural Law Locke philosophy. As for ***phusis***, what would we gain by having a fuller understanding of its use in Greek NT scripture? Does one of the Gnostic Rousseau camp care for anything that is said in Greek NT scripture? He would perhaps, if it confirms something of what he believes? Would it not? Would it not also hold an interest for him if it disproves something of the foundational beliefs concerning human nature of the Natural Law Locke camp? Would those of the Lockean camp gain anything from understanding that in scripture NATURAL does not mean SOULISH, and vice versa, and HUMAN SOUL is not the same thing as HUMAN NATURE, nor is it the same as HUMAN SPIRIT? An entire philosophical foundation for political institutions comes

forth from simple words. An improper translation and understanding of these simple words would lead to an improper foundation, would it not? Does it matter at all for those who simply seek political power, and not proper government that ensures protections for an individuals' unalienable God given rights of life, liberty, and private property?

So what of human nature-*phusis*? Is it "sinful", "fallen", and inherently "depraved"? For whatever it may be worth to the camps, nowhere in scripture is the word *phusis*, or any of its derivatives, used in any relation to "sinful", "fallen", "depraved", or any of the other negatives that may be found in the aforementioned orthodoxies. As you can see for yourself in this listing of all the usages of *phusis* in the Greek NT scriptures:

Ro.1:26 Therefore God gives them over to dishonorable passions. For their females, besides, alter the natural use into that which is beside nature

Ro.2:14 For whenever they of the nations that have no law, by nature may be doing that which the law demands, these, having no law, are a law to themselves,

Ro.2:27 And the Uncircumcision who, by nature, are discharging the law's demands, shall be judging you, who through letter and circumcision, are a transgressor of law.

Ro.11:24 For if you were hewn out of an olive wild by nature, and, beside nature, are grafted into a cultivated olive tree, how much rather shall these, who are in accord with nature, be grafted into their own olive tree!

1Co.11:14 Is not even nature itself teaching you that if a man, indeed, should have tresses, it is a dishonor to him,

Ga.2:15 We, who by nature are Jews, and not sinners of the nations

Ga.4:8 But then, indeed, having no perception of God, you were slaves of those who, by nature, are not gods.

Eph.2:3 (among whom we also all behaved ourselves once in the lusts of our flesh, doing the will of the flesh and of the comprehension, and were, in our nature, children of indignation, even as the rest)

2Pe.1:4 through which have been presented to us the precious and greatest promises, that through these you may become participants of the divine nature, fleeing from the corruption which is in the world by lust.

Here also is a listing of all the occurrences of the adjective form *psuchikon*:

Ro.1:26 Therefore God gives them over to dishonorable passions. For their females, besides, alter the natural use into that which is beside nature

Ro.1:27 Likewise also the males, besides, leaving the natural use of the female, were inflamed in their craving for one another, males with males effecting indecency, and getting back in themselves the retribution of their deception which must be.

Ro.1:27 And according as they do not test God, to have Him in recognition, God gives them over to a disqualified mind, to do that which is not befitting,..unintelligent, perfidious, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful...

Ro.11:21 For if God spares not the natural boughs, neither will He be sparing you

2Ti.3:3 Now this know, that in the last days perilous periods will be present...for men will be selfish...without natural affection, implacable, adversaries, uncontrollable, fierce, averse to the good

Is there anything here that proves that scripture is adamant on the point that human nature is "inherently fallen, sinful. and depraved"? **Ro.1:26** speaks of "dishonorable passions", but these homosexual passions are seen as "altering" the NATURAL, not as being the sinful NATURAL state of humanity. These passions are said to be "beside NATURE", that is, opposed to human nature. **Ro.2:14** speaks of the humans of the nations that are unaware of Yahweh's law given to the nation of Israel, that they are somehow "by NATURE doing that which the law demands". This verse is pivota. Anything that accords with Yahweh's law surely would not be viewed by Him as "inherently fallen, sinful, and depraved". It would be rather the opposite. Here we have the humans of these nations, by means of their HUMAN NATURE, doing something quite sinless and undepraved. It is said that though they had no knowledge of Yahweh's law, by their HUMAN

NATURE were able to be in accord with it. How, if they are inherently sinful and wholly depraved? Where does the ability come from, other than what is stated to be the source, “by **NATURE**”? Likewise in **Ro.2:27**, “the Uncircumcision (those same nations), by **NATURE**” are seen again to be “discharging the law’s demands”. Again in **Ro.1:27** we see again “God giving them over”, but this time it is not as earlier to be enslaved by “dishonorable passions” which are “altered from what is natural” and “beside nature”, but this time given over to a “disqualified mind”. In viewing the matter of the verse as a whole, we understand that to be “given over to a disqualified mind” is to be given over to a mind that is “unnatural”. It is a mind that was bent on “doing that which is not befitting”. In other words an “unnatural mind”, that which is “beside nature”, that which is in disagreement with **HUMAN NATURE**. This what is “not befitting”, what is sinful and depraved. Indeed, there is a list of what is unnatural that follows; “filled with all injustice, wickedness, evil, greed, distended with envy, murder, strife, guile, depravity, whisperers, vilifiers, detesters of God, outragers, proud, ostentatious, inventors of evil things, stubborn to parents, unintelligent, perfidious, without **NATURAL** affection, implacable, unmerciful”. Fairly “sinful and depraved”, that which is **UNNATURAL**? Again in **2Ti.3:3** we find a listing of that which is **UNNATURAL**: “Now this know, that in the last days perilous periods will be present, for men will be selfish, fond of money, ostentatious, proud, calumniators, stubborn to parents, ungrateful, malign, without **NATURAL** affection, implacable, adversaries, uncontrollable, fierce, averse to the good, traitors, rash, conceited, fond of their own gratification rather than fond of God; having a form of devoutness, yet denying its power. These, also, shun. For of these are those who are slipping into homes and are leading into captivity little women, heaped with sins, being led by various lusts and gratifications, always learning and yet not at any time able to come into a realization of the truth. Now, by the method by which Jannes and Jambres withstand Moses, thus these also are withstanding the truth, men of a depraved mind, disqualified as to the faith.” As pointed out here at the end concerning Jannes and Jambres, they were men of “depraved and disqualified minds”. That is to say they exemplify that which is **UNNATURAL**.

Now we come to the iffy verses that follow:

Eph.2:3 (among whom we also all behaved ourselves once in the lusts of our flesh, doing the will of the flesh and of the comprehension, and were, in our **nature**, children of indignation, even as the rest)

Ga.2:15 We, who by **nature** are Jews, and not sinners of the nations

What is to be made of this? Taken at face value out of context, it would appear the writer is saying in **Eph.2:3** that those who he is addressing are “**in their nature** is the inherent bent to be depraved”, just like everyone else of the human race. Is this the case? Whom is he addressing? Does the original language actually say “in our nature”?

First, who is he addressing? Who is the “we also” at the beginning of the verse referring to? The writer, who is Paul, and who else comprises the “we”? Further down in this chapter Paul divides all of humanity into two groups, the circumcision and the uncircumcision. Paul would be in the group termed the circumcision, the seed-race-nation of Israel. The uncircumcision would be all the other seed-race-nations outside of that of Israel. Those who were “*alienated from the citizenship of Israel*”. Paul, in his mission to Ephesus, is primarily there to speak to Greeks, who were “*alienated from the citizenship of Israel*”. So the “we” that is spoken of are those of the seed-race-nation of Israel.

Does the original language actually say “in our nature”? No, not really. There are three other usages of this form of the word **phusis** in the Greek NT. These are in almost all translations given as “by nature”. Doesn’t really change much, other than pointing out that “in our nature” is not consistent. But upon closer examination, the most literal translation would be “**to-nature**”. What is being said here can be more easily understood as read it “according to our nature, according to our sprout, according to our seed, according to the genetic pattern laid out in that nucleus” WE are of the seed-race-nations that has the citizenship of Israel. It is not saying “we are in our nature just as inherently fallen, sinful, and depraved as all other humans”. It is saying “we are of

the seed-race-nation of Israel". This division of seed, this differentiation is also seen in **Ga.2:15** "We, who by **nature** are Jews, and not sinners of the nations", which is also another one of the instances of this "**to-nature**" form of .

So what is proven through this understanding? The verse can be understood read like this: *"among whom we of the seed-race-nation that has the citizenship of Israel also all behaved ourselves once in the lusts of our flesh, doing the will of the flesh and of the comprehension, we were TOward NATURE, in antagonism with NATURE, if we were to go TO THE NATURE we have in the genetic pattern in the nucleus of the seed from which we sprouted and observe and contrast what we are now, we would see what we have become due to our failure in the mission give to the seed-race-nation of Israel. So we too are deserved of indignation for behaving so, even as the other seed-race-nations alienated from the citizenship of Israel".*

How does one "become" a child of indignation? As will be seen further down with the observation of the words **SOULISH-psuchikon** and **SOUL-psuche**, they became SOULISH, dominated by the operations of the soul above that of the spirit. But that will be left till then. What is being said here is that those of the seed-race-nation of Israel were those chosen by God to receive and uphold His law. They were the nature-seed God put on the spot. This is not an indictment on Israelite seed-nature, nor is it one on the seed-nature of humanity as a whole. This is an exhibition of the fact that human nature alone, whether of the seed-sprouting of Israel or any other seed-race-nation, is unable to withstand the corrupting power of becoming SOULISH. The point here, and the point throughout Paul's writings, is that human nature, human spirit, human soul alone is not capable of upholding God's law, and the "exclusiveness" of the seed-race-nation of Israel is no exception.

This is not a matter of believing in a chosen race, or any other biblical premise. It is a matter of grammar. My purpose is a study of human nature from two perspectives (and I firmly believe that when all is boiled down, there only are two), not conversion to a religious belief.

The point does not need to be belabored any further to come to some definitive conclusions. Quite to the contrary of the orthodoxies, that which is "sinful and depraved" is NOT HUMAN NATURE. As a matter of scriptural fact, that which is "sinful and depraved" is shown to be in opposition to HUMAN NATURE, and is found to be UNNATURAL. Not only so, but HUMAN NATURE is shown in the scriptures to be in accord with Divine Law, "discharging the law demands" instinctively, that is, NATURALLY. Clearly something is "sinful and depraved", but that would not be human nature. A culprit though must be found for the Natural Law Locke camp to build its government structure around, to keep the culprit from harming others. Such talk as this may embolden the Gnostic Rousseau camp to hoots of "Victory !!!", would it not? Perhaps, if the Gnostic Rousseau camp's assertion is that the scriptural portrayal of human nature above, is indeed one and the same as the gnostic's spiritman imprisoned in an evil materialist body. But it is not, for there is another Greek word for spirit – **pneuma**, which nowhere in the scriptures with which they may now seek to justify themselves, comes into relation with **NATURE – phusis**. Let's not have further confusion of terms and translations. We already have too much with **NATURE – phusis**, and **SOUL – psuche**, which we will be getting to next.

As I pointed out earlier, the critical confusion from mistranslation does not involve the word **SOUL – psuche**, but rather its adjective form of **psuchikon**, which should properly be translated **SOULISH**, but is quite unfortunately mistranslated as **NATURAL** in several key verses. So there is behavior that should properly seen as **SOULISH**, which is pinned upon the **NATURAL**, and so falsely becomes related to human nature. Here are some of these key errors:

1CO.2:14-15 Now the **SOULISH - psuchikon** man is not receiving those things which are of the spirit of God, for they are stupidity to him, and he is not able to know them, seeing that they are spiritually examined.

The confusion comes in because **SOULISH – psuchikon** in near all English translations is given

as **NATURAL**. So SOULISH and NATURAL become one and the same thing, which they are not. To worsen the effect the NATURAL man is put in opposition to the “spirit of God” and all things “spiritual”. It is said then that the NATURAL man thinks the “things of the spirit of God are stupidity”. Also, that the NATURAL man “cannot know” because they are spiritually examined, something which the NATURAL man does have the power to do. Apparently then, the NATURAL man is without a spirit that can examine spiritual matters?

1CO.15:42-46 Thus also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is roused in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor; it is roused in glory. It is sown in infirmity; it is roused in power. It is sown a **SOULISH** body; it is roused a spiritual body. If there is a **SOULISH** body, there is a spiritual also. Thus it is written also, The first man, Adam, "became a living soul:" the last Adam a vivifying Spirit. But not first the spiritual, but the **SOULISH**, thereupon the spiritual.

Again here, the word **SOULISH – psuchikon** is almost always translated as **NATURAL**. Once more SOULISH and NATURAL become one and the same thing. By extension the Human Soul and Human Nature become entangled in one common mess. To compound the error, **NATURAL** becomes related to “dishonor”, “infirmity”, “corruption”, and is shown to be essentially the opposite of “spiritual”. One must then be left to conclude that in order not to be “dishonorable”, “infirm”, “corrupt”, and in order to be “spiritual” and not think that the “spirit of God” (and all that entails) is “stupidity”, one must become **UNNATURAL**. This is indeed a quandary, because as we have seen in the listings above of UNNATURAL behavior, all of it is actually in opposition to the true scriptural understanding of human nature. What then should we say about the true definition of **SOULISH – psuchikon**? Does it matter to the warring factions, or do we go at it with the mass of confusion as it is?

What is **SOULISH – psuchikon**? What is **SOUL – psuche**?

Let’s look further at the usages of **SOULISH – psuchikon** first, and then take a closer look at **SOUL – psuche** and the claim of the “immortality of the soul”, which is also so integral to the Natural Law Locke camp’s philosophy. Two of the usages of **SOULISH – psuchikon** in the Greek NT scriptures have already been given. Here are the only others:

JA.3:15 This is not the wisdom coming down from above, but terrestrial, **SOULISH – psuchikon**, demoniacal.

JU.1:19 In the last time will be coming scoffers, going according to their own irreverent desires. These are those who isolate themselves, **SOULISH – psuchikon**, not having the spirit.

Aside from what has already been mentioned as being related to **SOULISH – psuchikon**, it being “dishonorable”, “infirm”, “corrupt”, and “thinks the spirit of God stupidity”, we also see it related to being “terrestrial”, “demoniacal”, having “irreverent desires”, and being “spiritless”. Can we say that the soulish man is an unnatural man, a man that is not only opposed to the spirit of God, but also to the nature of humanity? This is what scripture shows. We may safely add the above lists of horrors of that which is UNNATURAL to the account of the SOULISH man. In that case, it is impossible to scripturally prove that the human soul is immortal, for scripture also points out that “the soul that sins will die”, and indeed I believe we have listed a sin or two.

We may conclude that HUMAN NATURE is innocent of all the orthodoxy’s charges. No evidence can be found in scripture to prove its guilt of being inherently “fallen”, “sinful”, and “depraved”. What scripture does bear out is that the culprit is SOULISHness.

We can see also that the Rousseauian claim that human nature is good is in scriptural fact correct. But the Rousseau camp could care less about being “scripturally correct”. So, they assume that ALL that man does, all his sinfulness and criminality, is part and parcel of human nature. They see there is something quite wrong with human behavior, but in order to not dismiss their basis that human nature is good, they seek and find reasons and justifications for it. It is the environment, it is the religious institutions creating a false morality. It is the governmental systems

based on this false morality that forces humanity to behave in such a way, or labels that which is "nature" as depraved, sinful, and criminal. They have no understanding that not all that man does is the outcome of good human nature. That that which is in fact depraved, sinful, criminal, is rather the outcome of what scripture refers to as SOULISHness. Partially right, and utterly wrong.

As for the Lockeans, they deem human nature as inherently bad and in need of serious restraint for its depraved, sinful, and criminal. That there is something direly wrong is correctly observed. But they also do not understand that it is SOULISHness, and not the inherent nature of humanity. That a governmental system is needed to keep in check something vile in humanity is an absolute. As to what it is, they have miscalculated. Utterly right, and partially wrong.

But what is meant by "sin", and what is the "soul", and how does one become "soulish", and how does a soul die? What of the "immortality of the soul"?

So if our nature is "sinful" (which I think I've already proven scripturally this is not the case), what then exactly is sin? Looking at the lists of dastardly deeds defining "soulish", one might come to the conclusion that "soulish" and "sinful" are one and the same thing. That's not a bad conclusion.

Judges20:16 Seven hundred chosen men lefthanded; every one could **sling stones at a hair breadth and not sin**

This may seem strange to some, but the Hebrew word for "sin" here simply means to **MISS** a mark.

1JN.3:4 Everyone who is doing sin is doing lawlessness also, and **sin is lawlessness**.

Taking our initial definition into account, what can we make of "sin is lawlessness"? If "missing the mark" is "lawlessness", then one must correctly reason that hitting the mark is complying with law. Scripture further defines itself when we are told that the "fulfillment of the law is love". As we had seen above concerning human nature and its inclination to comply with God's law instinctively, we may conclude then logically that it is the instinctive inclination of human nature to LOVE. Scripture further defines itself in telling us that "God is love". This is the Nature Divine, what He IS. The inclination of human nature, and the Nature Divine are one and the same thing.

The inclination of human nature is love, and if so, human nature is the "fulfillment of the law, which is love". Everything points away from human nature being inherently "sinful", "fallen", and "depraved". Nowhere in scripture is the human spirit-**pneuma** related to sin. Consistently though we are informed that the soul-**psuche** does sin, and the "soul that sins shall die". So then what is the soul? Also, if the scriptures clearly say "soul that sins shall die", it is impossible that it an also teach the immortality of the soul, without being wholly contradictory and foolish.

So then, what is the scriptural definition of the human soul, and how does it differ from the human spirit and human nature? How does this soul die? What exactly is death, and how does it effect the person into becoming soulish (dominated by the operations of the soul above that of the spirit and the inclination of human nature), and so sinful?

TO BE CONTINUED....



- duh Aristotle

"It is not easy to determine the nature of music and why anyone should have a knowledge of it" *Aristotle*

"There is something uncontrollable and unpredictable about artistic vision. Oppressive forces can control freedom of speech in political, religious, and educational spheres. But they cannot control it in artistic vision. Dangerous to some (the controllers). Uncontrollable and unpredictable. The artist lurks everywhere. You know not who they are, and who they will become." *M.Gallucci* (there Aristotle, I figured it out for you.)

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.