

Marxism Unmasked

by B. Scott MacPherson, Esq.

A “worldview” is an internally consistent and complete treatment of at least ten subject areas:

- theology
- philosophy
- ethics
- biology
- psychology
- sociology
- law
- politics
- economics
- history

The point of a worldview is that all 10 subject areas fit together like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. There is internal consistency from one subject to the next, and there are connections from one subject to the next because we're talking about people's lives. How can one separate law from politics? How do you divorce ethics from religion? You can't. You don't. Of course there *must* be overlap – and that's the point. Within a worldview, all of the subjects fit together and support each other like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle.

The whole point is that there is, and there must be, overlap in what you believe about “this” and “that,” so all subjects must be addressed *holistically* in the light of all other subjects. You cannot address one subject in isolation of all the rest, if you honestly want to hold consistent beliefs.

The following explanation addresses only five of the ten subjects: theology, ethics, biology, psychology, and law. That's 50% of the worldview.

The subject of economics is mentioned in passing but not addressed, but the answer would be that socialism is incompatible with a Christian worldview but required by Marxism. Without doing the deep dive, I also strongly suspect that the mask and separation orders have violated the Christian view of sociology, as well.

So that means at least six out of ten subject areas, if not more, of a Christian worldview are actually violated by the ubiquitous mask and separation orders across the United States right now. But, as I said, only five of them are discussed below.

I. A little bit of context

Imagine a pastor being arrested and/or fined for preaching on a Sunday morning inside his church building.

We're not talking about China, or North Korea, or the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War. We're talking the year 2020, in the United States of America.

August 5, 2020, pastor John MacArthur of Grace Community Church in Sun Valley, California received a letter from the City of Los Angeles threatening him with fines or arrest if he does not comply with a state order to stop holding indoor church services due, allegedly, to the virus outbreak. The California governor ordered the closure of churches in 30 of the state's 58 counties effective July 13.

In March 2020, Pastor Rodney Howard-Browne of The River at Tampa Bay church in Tampa, Florida was arrested for leading public church services in violation of stay-home orders issued at the state and county level.

Also in March, Pastor Tony Spell of Life Tabernacle Church in Central, Louisiana, was "arrested on misdemeanor charges for holding Sunday services."

(I'm sure there are other examples. These are just the cases I know of and remember right now.)

Imagine a pastor being arrested and/or fined for distributing the Sacrament of Holy Communion to members of his congregation at their homes. Again, this isn't China, or North Korea, or the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War. This is the year 2020, in the United States of America. This is what our law suit in Idaho is about. A witness on our side of the case, who is a Christian pastor, declared in an affidavit that the local law enforcement advised him that it was okay to get pizza delivered to a house, but illegal for a pastor to deliver communion bread to the same house.

The difference is that pizza is not religious, but communion bread is religious. So religion is illegal.

II. Mask and separation orders

Cities and counties across the USA have enacted mask and spacing orders, but for illustration purposes I picked the three jurisdictions closest to where I live:

1) Maricopa County, Arizona order

The Maricopa County, Arizona mask and separation order applies to two things: places of public accommodation, and public transportation.

The order defines “place of public accommodation” as a facility, et cetera, “offered to or for use by the general public in Maricopa County.” No school, whether public or private, is “offered to or for use by the general public.” That is undeniable. Therefore, no school is a “place of public accommodation.”

Arguably, no church is “offered to or for use by the general public,” either. It would not be wrong to say that churches are open only for those who are already members, or who are thinking about becoming members. Consider: it would certainly be wrong for someone to use the pews inside a church as park picnic benches for lunch and a game of frisbee, right? And the office buildings are not open for people to just leisurely pass through on their morning walks, right? And certainly it would be wrong for a group of friends to sit in the pews on Sunday morning and have their own boisterous conversation while Mass is being administered, right? The point is, even though the church ministers and administrators want people to come there on Sunday morning, that is only in the context of participating in scheduled events that have been designated as open to the public. Weddings and funerals, for example, are generally not open to the public, but rather are for invitees only.

The county order defines “public transportation” to mean “transportation services open to the general public.” No school provides transportation services to the general public. Therefore, no school offers public transportation. Likewise, no church provides transportation services to the general public, either.

By the express terms of the county order, the requirement of actually wearing masks applies only to “public transportation” and “places of public accommodation.” There are eight enumerated exceptions, one of them being for medical health reasons. Therefore, the county order has no effect on schools or churches.

So any school mailer that cites the county order as the reason for the school policies, is a lie. (And yes, I’ve seen such mailers.)

2) Glendale, Arizona order

The City of Glendale order also applies only to places of public accommodation. It has ten exceptions, one of them being for health.

3) Phoenix, Arizona order

The City of Phoenix order applies to everyone inside the city, but Section 2 of the order provides seven bulleted exceptions, one of them being “for people whose religious beliefs prevent them from wearing a face covering.” Another exception is for medical health reasons.

Conclusion:

The mask and spacing orders do not apply to any Christian school in Glendale or in Phoenix (both of which are within Maricopa County) because they are not “public accommodations” nor do they offer “public transportation,” and, second, as to Phoenix, there is a religious exemption which I detail next.

But why, then, are Christian schools everywhere in the Phoenix area requiring masks and spacing?

Answer: As explained below, they have abandoned a coherent and internally-consistent Christian worldview.

III. Legal background

III-A. Christian law

Our legal system and our laws were founded upon English Common Law, which was the law of the Pilgrims and the 13 colonies, and thus was the original law of the United States. The Common Law (that’s the actual name – “Common Law”) can be traced back 900 years to the Normans in the 11th century, and formally has been the law of England since 1189.

In 1892, the US Supreme Court walked through the history of the United States and specifically held that the United States was formed as a Christian nation, and at that present time, 1892, it was a Christian nation. That’s part of the actual holding of the U.S. Supreme Court. See *Rector, Etc of Holy Trinity Church v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457, 12 S.Ct. 511, 36 L.Ed. 226 (1892). The legal issue in the case was whether or not a church violated federal law by hiring a pastor from overseas. Congress had passed an immigration bill that made it illegal to pay for the voyage of an immigrant to the USA for a job in the USA. Yes, it was an anti-immigration jobs protection act. The border was restricted. A Christian church in New York hired a pastor from England anyway, and paid for his voyage across the ocean. The Supreme Court held that the church did not violate the federal immigration law

because there was no possible way that Congress could validly pass a law that restricted the hiring of a pastor:

The construction invoked [by the government] cannot be accepted as correct. It is a case where there was presented a definite evil [high unemployment in America], in view of which the legislature used general terms with the purpose of reaching all phases of that evil; and thereafter, unexpectedly, it is developed that the general language thus employed is broad enough to reach cases and acts which the whole history and life of the country affirm could not have been intentionally legislated against.

Holy Trinity, 143 U.S. at 472 (emphasis added).

Notice that the Common Law was the law that developed in and was used by Christian England and then the Christian United States. The Common Law is inherently, by design, a legal system consistent with Christianity, and it was on the basis of that Christian Common Law that the Supreme Court very specifically said that it was impossible for Congress to interfere with the operation of a Christian church. Contrast that with the modern lawsuits mentioned above.

The Common Law is judge-made, as contrasted against bills passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor or the President. The judges form their decisions by application of principles and adherence to the past. It works because of the assumption that universal inalienable principles actually exist. That's the point: timeless laws actually exist.

Think of the Ten Commandments – they were written by the finger of God, not by the imaginative rumination of any person. And they will never change unless and until God pokes his finger back into a new slab of rock. Until that happens, the Ten Commandments are immutable. (But that will not happen, because God does not change. Malachi 3:6, Hebrews 13:8.)

The Declaration of Independence expressly states a belief in a God who created people and set forth universal laws: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights” and then seven unalienable rights are listed. That is basis for the Common Law.

III-B. Marxist law

Marxism is atheistic – there is no God whatsoever.

When there is no God, there are no supernatural commands that we must follow. God did not carve anything into stone.

So we need something other than “God said so” or God wrote on rock with his finger as the foundation for law, both because man is constantly changing (more on that below) so his needs change, and also because there is no outside lawgiver to decree any unchanging rule.

When there is no God, we are left only with the natural material processes of evolution. We evolved upward from fish in the ocean through salamanders and monkeys up to cavemen, to what we are today, and we are still evolving into something new and different.

As people evolve, so does the society of a nation, obviously, because the nation is just collections of people. And as society changes, the law must change to match the society to which it applies. Said another way, human rights evolve as people evolve.

So from the Marxist perspective, it’s okay if we radically change our laws every now and then. We actually have to, to keep up with human evolution. That’s “natural” and expected. The past is never binding – and that is the big difference from the Common Law.

Our foundational legal system conflicts with Marxism on a fundamental level, that of stability.

But obviously to live side-by-side with other people we have to agree on some basis for laws. Having decided that there is no God, we ask, what can we base our laws on?

The only thing that does exist is life on this planet.

And we humans are the highest life form on this planet, so law must come from us, from mankind.

Again, that is the opposite of Common Law, which by definition and design seeks to always give the same answer it always gave in the past. Breaking with the past is discouraged under our English Common Law heritage that presupposed an

unchanging God who created us and created inalienable universal rules, but it is required under a Marxist (atheist) framework. We have a conflict.

III-C. Science cannot be the basis of law

We all have seen countless news articles and Facebook videos and Youtube videos about this and that scientist or doctor or nurse talking about the need for masks. And we are all aware that for every person saying “X,” there is a person with the same credentials saying “not X.”

In our Idaho law suit, the Assistant Attorney General outright literally said to us in our discussions, that the Idaho Governor has been and continues to base his decisions on the advice of medical doctors and research scientists.

But let us not getting stuck in the weeds of “my credentialed speaker is more right than your credentialed speaker,” because they’re both wrong. Because science is not and cannot ever be a source of law.

First, there is no law that says we should write our laws based on what scientists say. The assertion that we should base our rules on what scientists have said is not itself a statement that comes from any law. It’s not found in the US constitution or in any of the 50 state constitutions. It’s not found in the statute books for the federal law or for the law of any of the 50 states. No part of the English Common Law came from science.

The idea was made up out of thin air in the year 2020.

Science cannot be the source of laws because science cannot and does not answer the question of what a person should do. Laws prescribe or proscribe behavior – you ought, or must, do ABC and not do XYZ. Law is should/ought behavior with a penalty for doing wrong.

There is no scientific experiment that can ever be constructed to test what a person should do. Science can tell us that a Nazi regime ruled Germany over a certain time period and it did certain things, but science cannot tell us whether the Nazi rulers should have done any of those things. The “should” question comes from ethics, which comes from religion, not from science.

Science can tell us what will break apart and move at what speed when a 3,000 pound car hits a brick wall, but science cannot tell us how fast the speed limit should be. Should be the speed limit be 10 mph based on the scientifically-

predictable collision damage? or 15? 20? 30? 75? Maybe no one should drive, because the potential damage is too great?

Science can tell us what is going on in the cells of our body when we get drunk, but science cannot tell us what the blood alcohol content threshold should be for drunk driving. Should it be 0.07? Or 0.08? Or 0.09? Maybe it should be zero based on the scientific evidence of the damage of beer on the human body?

Should/ought moral answers come from ethics, which derive from religion. Should/ought civic behavior answers come from politics, which is intimately wed to law, which derives from religion. For governments to be advertising the basis of mask laws on quote-unquote “scientific advice and data” is either grossly ignorant, or an outright lie.

IV. Biology

That difference in law (discussed above) overlaps with a difference in biology, at the point of atheism.

IV-A. Christian biology

Christianity, as well as other theistic religions such as Islam, begins with the belief that intelligence is only created by intelligence. Or, more generally, life comes from life. Humankind, and everything else on this planet, was created by God.

But the opening chapters of Genesis teach that humans were created in the image and likeness of God. There is something about the way God is, that is like the way we are. We have some of God’s qualities. We are different than all other living creatures. God became one of us, but God never incarnated as a rabbit, as far as we know.

And to quote Genesis, “It is not good that man should be alone.” We were made to be social creatures – made to have relationships with our own kind, and made to have a relationship with God, both, simultaneously. As Pastor John said one Sunday in August, “it is not good that man should be alone.” Our whole purpose for existing is to be in relationships. That purpose was put forth by the voice of God right at the beginning, in the Garden of Eden.

That is how we fulfill the Golden Rule: “love one another.” The mask and separation laws violate this hardwired desire to make relationships by pushing people away, stopping or at least impeding relationships. As an illustration, the Cowtown skateboard shop in Phoenix permits only two people to be in the store at

one time. Everyone else must wait outside. The owner of that store is outright forbidding personal relationships to develop between anyone at all in his store. In contrast, just a few years ago when we lived in Redondo Beach, California, my son and I would visit Soul Performance skate and surf store almost weekly. We would hang out there and talk with everyone. We developed actual friendships with the owners and relationships with other customers because we were inside the store, standing very close to other people, and talking with them.

That contrast between the two skate stores is the whole point.

Christianity posits that humans have a physical body and a non-physical soul. We are “dualistic” creatures – two parts. That means humans have dual natures, physical and non-physical. That means that there does exist something non-material in our universe. This dualistic view of people is fundamental to the religion, and it directly conflicts with the Marxist view of people, discussed next.

IV-B. Marxist biology

Repeating, when there is no God, then mankind is an animal evolving on his own. Obviously.

As he evolves, his needs will change. Obviously. That’s where we connect with law. Human rights, or natural rights, can not be unchanging when the collection of people is changing.

But also, when there is no God, the only thing that exists is the natural world – “materialism.” There is nothing supernatural, and there is nothing that is not material. There is only what we can study with the tools that we make, such as telescopes and x-ray machines.

It is here that we connect to the area of psychology, because now we have to account for our intellect and our emotions and our will through naturalistic physics and chemistry instead of through a non-material soul that God put in us for the express purpose of communication and relationships.

V. Psychology

V-A. Christian psychology

The human soul accounts for individual identity, and memory, and free will, and conscience, and individual sin.

As in biology, we believe that God is a person, and our personhood is somehow related to his. There is something about the way God is, that is like the way we are. We have some of God's qualities when it comes to creativity in our minds, and in our drive to create beautiful things. Why do we even recognize beauty at all? Why do we like pretty things and why do all humans in all places recognize that certain things are beautiful, e.g., sunsets, beaches, and roses? Why are we driven to create and build things? These are questions that Christianity answers by looking at the non-material soul portion of a person, which is in the intellectual mind distinct from the jello brain that zombies eat.

V-B. Marxist psychology

Marxists have to deny a non-material mind and have to say there is only the jello brain that zombies eat, and that poses a problem: Which came first, thoughts or body?

In Marxist belief, physical existence (the material body) came first, and then came the thinking mind, because we evolved up the animal chain. And there is no "spirit" or "soul" because there is nothing that is not material.

No one denies that humans differ from all other living beings by virtue of their mind, and more specifically their language. Because the mind, and hence the mental process, evolved out of the purely physical process of the purely physical body, there must be a scientifically-provable explanation for our minds.

In Marxism, that explanation is a combination of behavioralism (think of Pavlov's dog) and a dialectical interplay between thought and speech (meaning that they form each other). By controlling rewards and punishment, one can train people to behave according to Marxist principles. And as speech is internalized into thoughts, those thoughts become cravings for more input which creates more speech which feeds the cycle.

Think of the new vocabulary of 2020: "social distancing." That term did not exist in 2019. We now have "virtual marathons" for joggers even. We've had the idea of "virtual learning" for several years but it has exploded in 2020.

On Facebook and on Yahoo!, I see more and more advertisements for masks in all sorts of creative designs. All of this is consistent with the Marxist psychological idea of programming behavior through speech and images that are internalized into thoughts that become cravings for more of the same.

This interplay between behaviorism and the thought/speech cycle is a form of the “dialectical process,” which is the single most basic, most core, idea behind Marxism. It is even more basic than atheism because dialectics explains the origin of the universe and the process of Darwinian evolution. The dialectical process explains absolutely everything in the Marxist worldview. It is a very deep topic. Entire books are written on it, so I won’t try to explain it any further, but it is perhaps most visibly seen in these two places: the evolutionary process behind the physical evolution of humans when there is no God, and in the development of the human intellectual mind, including language.

You’ve now been dialectically conditioned for social distancing and wearing masks for the purpose of discarding all traditional beliefs and the desire to even be near other people, so you are now conditioned to adopt new laws different than what you’ve ever had before.... Read that sentence again. Marxist psychology is happening right in front of you.

VI. The root cause of evil

Marxism identifies the biggest problem of all in America, and proposes a solution to that problem. The problem is private property. The solution is for the government to own all property. For real.

VI-A. Marxist statement of the cause of evil

Everyone would agree that the fundamental purpose of law is to coordinate the rules and regulations for the daily production, distribution, and exchange of goods.

This inevitably creates a government to enforce and, when necessary, to modify those laws. Think of the Mayflower Compact as an example, and then the Articles of Confederation, and then the US Constitution.

Marxists believe that (1) a dominant class always gains control of the state, (2) laws are reflections of the desires of the class that is in control, and (3) the state (that is, the government) exists to interpret and enforce those laws.

Restated, Marxists believe that it is inevitable that the power to enforce laws will grow over time to perpetuate only laws that benefit the group in power, to the detriment of those not in power.

Over time the imbalance of power will always result in two distinct classes of people: those who own property, and those who don’t.

And then class conflict arises.

Everyone agrees that laws exist to protect the right of the owner of the means of production to buy labor and direct its employment, and for the worker to sell labor power, and of each to organize to get the best terms he can in the bargain. But from the Marxist perspective, there can never actually be equal rights in practice in a capitalist society because the very nature of the system creates haves and have-nots. Marx and Lenin and Stalin all agreed that there cannot be equality between exploiters and exploited.

Marxists say the disparity between those who own property and those who do not, itself is the root problem behind all other problems. Restated, the root cause of all problems in a given society is the existence of private property. Period. Because property is what everybody is fighting over.

This class conflict must necessarily result in political differences (that is, conflicts), which means new laws are written to address the new conflicts. In other words, the law will constantly change to deal with changing conflicts in the changing society between those who own more private property versus those who own less. The law must change. And that is why nearly every business in the country is suddenly regulated with regulations that were unthinkable in 2019.

Any society that has class antagonism has the need for a state government to enforce the laws, but what if that antagonism ended? If the antagonism ended then there would be no need for a government anymore. If there were no problems to reconcile, there would be no need for laws to deal with those conflicts, and thus there would be no need for a government at all.

That's the goal of Marxism. Its aim is to create a society in which the government is an outmoded, unnecessary institution, by eliminating the root cause behind the creation of the state: class distinctions. And that is done by eliminating the cause of class distinctions itself: private property.

And from the Marxist perspective, a socialist economy is a necessary stepping stone toward that goal. That is, for the Marxist goal to be achieved, the United States must change from a capitalist economy to a socialist economy. Marx and Lenin said so.

VI-B. Marxist Ethics

As we said earlier, when there is no unchanging legal principle behind the legal system, there cannot be any unchanging foundation for human laws. Obviously.

The basis for morality, then, must be the thing that does exist: us. Mankind.

Thus, for Marxists, morality is measured against mankind's happiness and dignity and freedom.

That is, moral right/wrong are defined by how well something promotes man's all-around development into a classless society.

Track the thought: The solution to the problem of private property is obviously for the government to own everything on behalf of everyone.

But he who regulates, owns.

The power to control the when and how and how much, is equivalent to ownership.

So, whoever controls the church or the restaurant or the bar or the Kinko's store or the shoe store or the grocery store, effectively owns it.

Said another way, to end class conflict we have to get rid of the government that is upholding class distinctions. Nothing else will remove the conflict.

Thus, social rebellion in the name of socialism is right and just. It is the higher morality, higher than maintaining the unequal status quo.

"Communism" is defined as the end of all governments when, and because, people are living peacefully with one another without the need for any laws. So, by definition, social rebellion for the purpose of promoting communism is a moral good, and opposition to such rebellion is morally wrong.

To get there, the property-owner mentality must be cast off. This includes the traditional religion of the property-owning ruling class, and the traditional ethical system that is built on that religion, and the traditional laws that uphold the society that we want to change.

And now you can start to understand why churches must be closed, and why masks must be worn. First, churches promote the idea of a God and that breaks everything. And second, masks promote the dialectical reprogramming of the

mind. Marxists have an ethical imperative get rid of whatever impedes their goal, and do whatever promotes their goal, so they've closed churches and ordered everyone to reprogram their brains, with masks, to (1) look only to the government for the solution to societal problems, and (2) be the same as everyone else.

VI-C. Christian statement of the cause of evil

The side that believes in God, disagrees with the Marxists' identification of the root problem. Christians, for example, say that sin is the root problem – and that sin is voluntary freewill misbehavior. And remember that a little more than 100 years ago, this was a Christian country. The U.S. Supreme Court said so.

Sin is independent of whether or not you own property. It affects everyone equally, regardless of their social class.

Thus, from the historical point of view of this country, Marxists have missed the target completely. And that's why the historical point of view is untenable today.

VII. Religion

Notice that a belief in God triggers, like dominoes, a different foundation for law.

Once God enters the pictures, it follows that God has a say in the law. Surely the one who made you has some input into how you are supposed to live, right?

The same holds for biology and psychology.

So the root disagreement really is a belief in God versus atheism.

Because Christians and Marxist start at opposite beliefs, their views on almost everything quickly become incompatible.

VII-A. Some specific objections in the Christian religion

The preambles of the county and city orders cited above assert that human beings are bodily threats to one another. The assertion is that if we get near each other, you're going to kill me, or at least make me very sick.

But the notion that one must hide one's face in the presence of other human beings and remain apart because human beings are lethal threats to one another, is 180-degrees contrary to the historical Christian witness.

The teaching of Christianity has been that: “it is not right that man should be alone”; and

that we are to engage society as “salt and light”; and

that we are to actually befriend those around us; and

“not forsake assembling together”; and

“suffer the little children to come to me”; and

that we are to draw near to one another to help one another; and

“The Lord make his face shine upon thee,” we pray.

All of that requires being close to other people and befriending them and helping them face-to-face. Why, then, are we hiding our faces from each other? Why, then, should I believe that anyone who is showing me his face is about to kill me (or at least make me very sick)?

The touch of another human, and the proximity of another human, are undeniably healing. We want our children to make friends and socialize in person with actual human beings of similar age. Yet, we are insisting that everyone stay at least 6-feet away from everyone else. A few months ago the Governor of Arizona asked that no child hold a live birthday party. “Drive by birthday parties” were invented. This is a contradiction!

To raise a question of psychology and anthropology now, what is the psychological message that we’re teaching children when we teach them that it’s deathly dangerous to (1) approach another human being without covering their face, and (2) approach another human being whose face is not covered. Because (so the story goes) every single human being is a lethal threat to you, my child! So beware of your own kind!

The religious teaching of historical Christianity is that the elements of the eucharist are actually a human body and human blood, and that those elements that are the actual body and blood of a human, heal. The elements don’t kill.

By definition, evangelism requires a person-to-person relationship. Evangelism and preaching the Gospel are the antithesis of saying to the other person, “Stay

away! You're going to kill me, or at least make me very sick, if you get near me! So stay away and cover yourself, you dangerous creature!"

Any viewpoint predicated on the idea that humans must stay away from other humans, is antithetical to the religious belief that God became one of us, and lived among us, and healed people by touching them.

We are supposed to boldly preach that God became one of us.

Therefore, every Christian school in Phoenix is exempt under both the county and the Phoenix orders, because every Christian church in Phoenix has a religious exemption to the city order.

VII-B. Counterarguments to the common objection

A common objection to what I just said is the passage in 1 Corinthians 8, where Saint Paul says he will not eat meat when the meat offends the people to whom he is trying to minister. "Therefore," so the argument goes, "we should wear masks when the other people want us to wear masks. It's called 'loving your neighbor,'" so the argument goes.

That argument fails on the launchpad for two reasons. First, abstaining from a particular food is not inherently wrong. In no way does abstaining from a particular food conflict with any principles or any doctrines in the Christian religion. Indeed, the Christian religion has endorsed fasting from the very beginning. Fasting is inherently a "good" practice. Examples: Jesus spoke of fasting in the Gospels, and the Didache prescribes weekly fasting.

However, as explained above, the mask and separation rules directly conflict with Christian principles and, also, the mask and separation rules promote that which is inherently incompatible with Christianity. The objection is not really an "apples to apples" comparison.

This means that when you go along with the mask and separation rules "because you want to be like Saint Paul," you're actually coddling and enabling – if not outright encouraging – behavior that conflicts with the very religion that you say you want to follow. So you're actually doing the opposite of what you say that you're doing. So you're a hypocrite.

Second, there is no indication in 1 Corinthians 8 that Saint Paul abstained from the meat in questions so as to promote the position of the the so-called "weak

brethren.” It’s exactly the opposite. His whole point is that they were acting from a position of ignorance. (See verse 7: “But not everyone possesses this knowledge.”) Said another way, his whole point is that they were wrong. Now, query, do the books of the New Testament, taken as a whole, suggest that Saint Paul ever condoned or coddled false teaching? Or that he turned a blind eye to heretical catechizing? Or that he coddled misbehavior? Or does the totality of the New Testament instead suggest that Saint Paul wanted everyone to believe the truth and live out the truth and nothing but the truth, and that he expected of people nothing less than the truth? I assert it’s the latter. Now, query, when you require that everyone put on a mask at school, or at church, or at a retail store so as to “love your brother” like Saint Paul did, are you saying that the mask rule is wrong and conflicts with Christianity? Or are you coddling a false worldview and going along with behavior that contradicts Christian principles? I again assert it’s the latter. So you’re a hypocrite.

VII-C. The inherent open lies

“Thou shalt not lie” is undeniably a core ethical position of the Christian religion. In point of fact, rephrased in other words, that statement is actually one of the Ten Commandments carved by the finger of God into stone.

Consider that the ubiquitous reason asserted for wearing masks – and it is literally in the “whereas” preambles of city, county, and state government orders – is that your mask will catch germs that would otherwise kill a person, or at least make a person very sick. Said equivalently, the assertion is that the masks are catching a lethal biological hazard (or at least one that makes people very sick), to wit, the COVID-19 germ.

So where are the biohazardous waste bins?

There are none. This is lie #1.

Instead, we are directed to put that contaminated mask into our pants pocket, or purse, or on the seat of our car, and take it home with us. (Repeat that to yourself.)

That’s right. We are told that we’re catching a lethal germ on the material of our masks, emphasis on “lethal,” and we’re supposed to carry it with us back to our cars, and then back to our homes. We’re supposed to carry a lethal biological hazard around with us, back to our homes. (Repeat that to yourself.)

Surely you can track the syllogism here: If someone actually thought that the masks were contaminated with lethal biological germs, then there would be biohazard trash bins everywhere. But there aren't. So no one actually thinks he or she is carrying around a biohazardous threat. Or – everyone is patently a hypocrite, living a life in opposition to their professed belief.

But on that point of the biohazardous threat, I have been told by pastors and school principals that their congregants/students are not wearing masks out of fear. Really? That's lie #2.

If you're not doing this out of fear, why, then, did you space out the classroom desks and the lunch tables? Why are there plexiglass dividers between the students? Why are you standing 6 feet away from me right now? Why are your teachers putting on masks when they draw near to a student, to help the student? If it's not out of fear of catching a disease, then, why?

Surely, now, the assertion that a pastor or principal is not coddling and even promoting fear among those under his care, is patently disingenuous, given the blatant facts as to how his people are behaving and how he rearranged furniture.

VII-C. Marxist religion

Marxism as a matter of definition is predicated upon atheism. As we discussed above, the existence of any God breaks everything they believe.

VIII. Conclusion

Q - What is happening?

A - The mask and separation laws are steering us directly toward the Marxist goal by:

- 1) breaking down our Common Law tradition (law)
- 2) breaking down our inter-personal relationships (biology),
- 3) reprogramming our minds (psychology),
- 4) breaking down our religious beliefs (theology),
- 5) putting businesses out of business so that the owners and employees have to rely on government welfare instead of on their private property (a push toward socialism) (economic), and
- 6) making us afraid of one another, and reliant upon the government to guide us out of this scary place into safety, so that power shifts out of private hands into the government (a push toward socialism with an eye toward communism).

Q - Why is this happening?

A - Because social change is a moral imperative under Marxism. Obviously, it is morally right to get rid of the source of all human problems. And obviously it is morally wrong to oppose getting rid of the source of all human problems. Changing society is the only way to reach that moral goal.

And that brings us to the pizza versus eucharist. My lawsuit was filed, in part, because it was against the law for Christian pastors to deliver the Holy Eucharist to their congregants at their doorsteps or anywhere else, but it was perfectly legal for Grub-Hub or Dominoes Pizza to deliver a pizza to that same doorsteps.

How does that make sense?

It doesn't.

Except that, yes, it does.

Criminalizing the delivery of the Eucharist (and every other religious sacrament) but not touching the delivery of pizza obviously is not about physical health concerns, but rather it is about control over churches, because religion triggers a difference of opinion in every other area: law, biology, psychology.

Once you remove a belief in God, you have no choice but to believe in materialism, which means you have to accept an evolving society, which means that laws have to change over time. So we have to change. And without a religion behind your ethics, you have to put mankind as the standard for your ethical system.

And when mankind is the standard, then Marxism and the socialism that it requires start to make sense. (An atheist does not have to be a Marxist, or even a socialist, but it is an option for him. It is not an option for a Christian.)

And remember that Marxist psychology is built upon the idea that speech internalized into thoughts becomes cravings for more influence which creates more speech which feeds the cycle of Marxist thought. And then think of the phrase "social distancing." Or "mask up." You've been programmed.

And now you're on the verge of a fully Marxist America. "Communism" is the Marxist vocabulary word for the idealized society, the end goal, the society they are trying to create. Their goal is a communist America.

So then, should church bodies and religious schools boldly proclaim our religion, and boldly “salt and light” the world? Or should they teach timidity in the face of peer pressure? That actually is the issue when, as here, we have an obvious religious objection to a government order.

IX. Shortcut

In short: Religion affects one’s views of law and ethics and what a human is and how humans should live. Thus, when you change the religion, you change everything else.

The mask and distancing orders conflict with the Christian religion, but are consistent with Marxism. So it’s a negative as to our religion (it conflicts), and simultaneously it is a positive as to the opposite religion (consistent with).

So we are hurting the Christian worldview while simultaneously promoting the Marxist worldview. That’s morally wrong.

Besides being a second-generation tax defense attorney, Scott has been a student of philosophy in particular, and worldviews generally, since about 1986. Several times he was told by the Chairman of the history department at Bethany Lutheran College, where his daughter received her B.A. degree, that he knows enough to teach philosophy at the college level. Here Scott provides his explanation of how the mask and separation orders are utterly contrary to a Christian worldview and in fact promote a worldview antithetical to the Christian, Common Law heritage of this country.